

the apro bulletin

VOL. 25, NO. 11

May, 1977

UFO PHOTOGRAPHED IN MEXICO



Blow-up of Photo Number Three - See Column Three

Hoax

A letter from Dennis Hauck, the current editor of *Official UFO* magazine informs us that the cover story of the July 1977 issue of that magazine is a complete hoax perpetrated by the publisher, Myron Fass, and his personal secretary.

APRO has long championed the idea that responsible UFO research must, by definition, be self-policing and that not only frauds and misrepresentations, but inept investigation as well should be disclosed for what it is. Mr. Hauck is to be congratulated for his forthright disclosure.

Looking back, we recall that Bernard O'Connor, first editor of *Official UFO*, attributed the magazine's early success to APRO's help in securing for him a group of writers who were reliable both in judgement and integrity. Mr. O'Connor subsequently resigned under pressure from Fass to play up sensational but unreliable material.

At this time we strongly suggest to our membership that a magazine that deliberately publishes a hoax does not deserve support either in the form of magazine purchase or in writing for publication in its pages. Unless we want UFO literature saturated with sensational fabrication, we must stand firm.

APRO Research Reorganized

The first major reorganization of APRO's research effort in fifteen years soon will be underway. The new system will group UFO research work into specialized subject-area committees, an idea NICAP originated when it created its Occupants Panel in 1968. The system will supplement, not replace, the Scientific Consulting Panel that APRO initiated in 1962.

The purpose of this UFO research committee system is to encourage, motivate, stimulate and help each individual committee member contribute to the body of knowledge about UFOs. To begin with, each member of a committee will have the name, address, and (optionally) the telephone number, of each other member of that committee. From there, it will be up to the committee to take the initiative. APRO HQ will not dictate committee activities.

Applications for membership in the committees are now open to all APRO members, field investigators, scientific consultants, and independent researchers. Decisions on applications will be based on the responses to the questionnaire below.

(See Research - Page Four)

UFO Photographed In Mexico

On November 3, 1973, at the close of the UFO flap in the United States, Mr. and Mrs. Jimenez (a pseudonym as the witnesses do not wish to be identified), their son and the boy's nurse, left Cocoyoc, in the state of Morelos, Mexico where they had been vacationing. Because of the heavy traffic, the Jimenezes decided to leave for their home in Mexico City after midday to avoid the "rush hour".

At about 4:45 p.m., Mrs. Jimenez saw what she at first thought was a helicopter approaching them. As it came nearer she realized it was not a helicopter and pointed it out to her husband and the nurse. Mr. Jimenez stopped the car and they all got out and watched the thing which had stopped in midair as if it or something in it had become aware of the car. Jimenez shouted to his wife, "Where's the camera?", and she told him it was on the rear seat of their sedan.

Mr. Jimenez grabbed the camera and took photo number one with a 50 mm lens with iris set at f/4 or 2.8 (he is not certain of the latter). At that point the object began to move away, so Jimenez changed to a 135 mm lens and took two more exposures with the iris set at f/3.5 or 5.6 (he is not certain of that setting either). The shutter speed was 1/250 second and he was using Kodacolor X ASA 80 Din 21 film. The camera is a Minolta SRT 101.

The object was pear-shaped and when in flight the larger portion was pointed in the direction it was traveling. It was shiny, appearing to be metallic, and had five tentacle-like appendages extending backward. Jimenez noted that these appendages were pointing in the direction from which the object was coming.

After Jimenez shot the third photo, the object, which was now descending, projected its tentacles downward and landed, using the tentacles as landing gear. Jimenez noticed two children on a bridge behind them, apparently watching the object also, and one of them ran toward the object. At this point all three of the witnesses were very frightened and upset, and after watching for a few seconds, they got into the car and Jimenez drove away at high speed.

(See Mexico - Page Three)

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN
 Copyright © 1977 by the
 AERIAL PHENOMENA
 RESEARCH ORGANIZATION, INC.
 3910 E. Kleindale Road
 Tucson, Arizona 85712
 Phone: 602 — 793-1825 and 602 — 326-0059
 Coral E. Lorenzen, 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. Harder, Ph.D.
 Public Relations Hal Starr
 Secretary-Treasurer Coral E. Lorenzen
 Membership Secretary Madeline H. Cooper
 Staff Librarian Allen Benz
 Office Manager Sheila Kudrle

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

A.P.R.O. Membership including Bulletin:
 United States \$10.00/yr.
 Canada & Mexico \$11.00/yr.
 (Canadian Currency will be accepted)
 All other countries \$12.00/yr.
 Subscription to Bulletin only: Same as Above

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.



New Consultant

Dr. L. K. Lepley, APRO's newest addition to the Scientific Consulting Staff, received his BS in Geological Engineering with a Mining Geology Option from the Colorado School of Mines in 1959, his MS in Oceanography with a minor in Geology from Texas A & M University in 1964 and PhD in Geo-physics and Geosciences from the University of Hawaii in 1970.

Dr. Lepley's experience is so extensive and diverse that it cannot be adequately covered in the limited amount of space available here. However, he has several published papers and has five inventions to his credit.

Dr. Lepley is currently an Independent Consultant in Economic Remote Sensing in Tucson, Arizona.

1976 Dutch Opinion Poll

The following are the results of an opinion poll on UFO's conducted throughout Holland in July of 1976. The respondents were from all segments of the population. Eighteen hundred persons were questioned, which is the maximum for polls conducted by the Dutch Opinion Research Organization (NIPO). The respondents were 1,035 men and 765 women over 17 years of age. Following are the replies to the series of questions on UFO's.

The first question asked was: Have you ever heard of the term UFO? 59% said yes, they had heard of this term. However, when asked if they had heard of the term "flying saucer", 99% responded positively. The large difference here could be due to the fact that in most press articles the more sensational term flying saucer is used instead of the relatively neutral "UFO".

When asked what they thought of flying saucers, only 22% believed them to be extraterrestrial spaceships. However, 77% of the respondents said they believe in extraterrestrial intelligences. Other replies as to what flying saucers are were these: 38% - celestial bodies or parts of them, 44% - fantasy or suggestion, 39% - natural phenomena, 32% - mirages or

optical illusions and 3% - secret missiles of one of the world powers. (More than one possibility was allowed to be mentioned.)

68% believe UFO's are seen in Holland. Asked if they believe the Dutch Air Force is investigating UFO's, 39% said yes, 51% said no and 10% didn't know. Only 0.3% admit to having seen a UFO. This differs greatly with the latest U.S. Gallup Poll where 15 million Americans say they have had a UFO experience. (Holland's population is about 14 million.)

Asked if they felt that people were afraid to report UFO's for fear of being ridiculed or of even losing their job, 44% answered yes, but 78% said that if they saw a UFO, they would report it. When asked where they would report their sighting, 46% said to the police, 25% to the Air Force, 15% did not know where they would report it, 8% to an observatory, 5% to the weather bureau, 3% to the press and 6% elsewhere.

Letters

Dear Sirs:

I read with great interest your last bulletin concerning the so-called *Kentucky abduction case*. I found the report to be very detailed which brings me to the reason for my letter. I am concerned by the abducted man's past history. For instance, you state that "He was interested in psychic phenomenon, and had previously had some peculiar things happen to him" and further that "He told of willing an outdoor light to go on. It was un-plugged at the time, but it mysteriously came on anyway." I find this statement very suspicious and seriously raises question to the credibility of his story. The young man obviously wants to take part in some psychic event and it sounds as if he used the previous night's sightings as an excuse to concoct the entire story. I seriously doubt he took part in any of this so-called abduction . . .

Sincerely yours,
 Russell L. Blaylock, M.D.
 APRO Consultant

Book Review

By Stanton T. Friedman

THE UFO ENIGMA: The Definitive Explanation of the UFO Phenomenon - Donald H. Menzel and Ernest H. Taves. Doubleday & Company, 1977. \$8.95. 297 Pages.

Dr. Menzel, who died just a few months before this book was published was one of the outstanding American astronomers of the past half century. Dr. (See Review - Page Four)

Donald Menzel Dead

Dr. Donald H. Menzel, an eminent solar physicist who pioneered the application of quantum mechanics to astrophysical problems, died on December 14, 1976, at the age of 75.

Menzel was a native of Colorado, obtained his master's degree at the University of Denver and his PhD from Princeton in 1924. He was a staff astronomer at Lick Observatory from 1926 to 1932, after which he joined the staff at the Harvard College Observatory. He served as acting director and then as director of the Observatory from 1952 to 1966. Among his many accomplishments were the development of the first coronagraph in the United States and the development of a second solar observatory at Sacramento Peak, New Mexico, under the aegis of the U. S. Air Force.

Menzel wrote hundreds of articles on astronomy and was a prolific science-fiction writer as well. UFOlogists will remember him best as the first UFO detractor. He offered the temperature inversion as the explanation of most UFOs and he authored three books debunking UFOs.

Mexico

(Continued from Page One)

It is unfortunate that Mr. Jimenez didn't photograph the object on the ground, for it would have supplied us with much more information than we now have. We hope to locate the exact spot where the incident took place, which will be helpful in possibly determining the object's size.

The day after the incident, Mr. Jimenez finished the roll of film, taking snapshots of scenes around his home, then took the film to the drugstore for developing. On the day the prints were ready, the Jimenezes, along with some friends and relatives, went to pick them up. The Jimenez' companions were of the opinion that either there would be nothing on the

3. The film emulsion is the same throughout the roll and the numbers of the separate negatives are in sequence.

4. Negative number fourteen has a tiny bubble indicative of damage, but this was caused by the age and use of the negative and has no bearing on the genuineness of the photos.

5. The roll of film indicates that Jimenez had taken several shots of his family in the swimming pool, then three frames show a strange flying object, followed by more photos of Jimenez' home. If I wanted to falsify photos, I would use several rolls and only show the best ones.

6. The reason that photos two and three of the UFO are brighter than number one is due to the fact that when Mr. Jimenez changed from the 50 mm

lens to the 135 mm lens, he needed to open the diaphragm to let in more light, but he opened it one stop more than was necessary, which is a common mistake with amateur photographers and the reason photos numbers two and three are more clear than number one.

Mr. Tellez asked for a letter or certificate about the validity of the negatives but because of company rules Mr. Padilla was not able to accommodate him. However, he did say that APRO could publish his conclusions and that he would be happy to discuss the photos further in the future. An on-going investigation is being conducted, and we are hoping to locate the two children whom Jimenez feels were observing the UFO also.

Meanwhile headquarters would like to ask the membership to inform us of any sighting in the literature or elsewhere which resembles the object Jimenez photographed. To our knowledge, this is the clearest set of UFO photos showing a well-defined object but it is also one of the strangest we have ever encountered.

Cosmic Voyeurs

CONCLUSION

The second case also involves a night visitor standing watch over people as they sleep. In reading over it I couldn't help wondering if the episode wouldn't have been perceived differently if it happened today; and yet be generated by the same source. Perhaps even the fact that in both episodes the clothing worn by the visitors was noted in detail is significant. This second case took place well before UFOs were on people's minds - or at least before things called UFOs were on their minds. As well documented, there are many records of airships across North America

(See Cosmic - Page Five)




Photo Number One of Mexican Set

film or that Jimenez had photographed a meteorological balloon. All were amazed when they saw the prints and how clear the images were. When they arrived at the Jimenez residence, Mr. Jimenez put the negatives in a box on his desk and forgot about them.

In early 1977, a friend of APRO Field Investigator Fernando Tellez told him about the incident and photos and Tellez began the investigation. He obtained the negatives which were examined by Mr. Robert Padilla, who is Special Services Director of Kodak Mexico, who pronounced them genuine for the following reasons:

1. The camera's shutter is out of adjustment and projects a slight shadow over the negatives, which appears in all the photographs. This indicates that the film was taken in sequence.

2. In photos two and three there appears a cloud which serves as a frame of reference to determine the angle of the object's descent.





Photo Number Two - See Page Four for Photo Number Three



Jimenez' Third Photo — Note object's relationship with clouds compared to Photo Number Two (see page three).

Research

(Continued from Page One)

We will be selecting committee members for the qualities: (a) Taking the initiative to do active research; (b) original, creative thinking; (c) critical thinking; (d) careful, thoughtful research, as opposed to hasty jumping to conclusions.

The creation of particular subject-area committees will be based mostly on the stated choices of the applicants. With two exceptions, the Field Instrumentation Committee formed in August 1976, and the Medical Committee now forming, we will not choose tentative subject areas around which to build committees until we receive the first large group of applications because the research will be done by the committee members, not APRO HQ.

Any subject area and any degree of specialization will be eligible. For example, subject areas might include: occupant morphology, landing traces, investigative techniques, contactee psychology, publishing & dissemination activities, astronaut cases, government secrecy, investigation of skeptics, etc. Again, we emphasize, it is your task to invent the specific subject labels that best suit your interests and your ability to do active research. Membership in more than one committee will be allowed.

Each committee will initially consist of members and a coordinator. The duties of the coordinator will be: to maintain the master files of the committee; to receive relevant APRO HQ file copies to loan to committee members for their individual copying; to report to APRO HQ on the progress and problems of the committee; to be responsible to APRO HQ for preserving committee integrity by seeing to it that only authorized committee

members obtain APRO HQ file material and participate in committee activities; and to perform such other duties the committee as a whole sees fit to assign.

The structure and procedures outlined above are meant to be flexible. The committees will be free to appoint their officers and draft their own rules of procedure, if they wish, so long as they do not interfere with the coordinators' duties. Eventually, the committee coordinator-concept may be modified or abolished if some other system proves more workable. After committees are set up, new members may join in either of two ways: by a committee's appointment, or by the same process that created the committee (see below).

Committee activities might include occasional meetings in person, a regular newsletter or journal, field expeditions, conference telephone calls — anything committee members have the desire and resources to do. Eventually committees might submit funding proposals to APRO HQ for special projects. But, the first thing committee members should do is simply to start corresponding with each other and, thus, exchange data and opinions.

Committees may well succeed with nothing more extravagant than letter-writing as the main activity. At some point, though, a committee might realize that it, perhaps, would be easier to circulate its own newsletter or journal than to write substantially the same letters to each of several committee members. Since it has acquired an off-set printing press, APRO HQ will be able to help with the printing of such a journal, but all costs must be borne by the committee.

APRO would encourage committees to make available their journals to anyone who is interested—with the requester paying for all extra expenses incurred.

We believe that this new system has great potential for inter-organizational cooperation—to this end, committees will be encouraged to admit qualified researchers from other groups into their membership.

If you are interested in participating in this UFO research system, please answer the following questions on a separate sheet or sheets of paper:

1. Name:
2. Address:
3. Phone Number:
4. Do you want your phone number to be given to other members of your committee(s)?
5. Age:
6. Sex: Male or Female
7. Present Occupation: Name of employer and one-sentence description of job.
8. Education:
9. Special Training or Background:
10. Publications: Have you published anything in the UFO field? If so, please list where, when, and the title(s) of the paper(s), and if possible enclose reprints.
11. What exactly is your UFO-related field of interest? (If you have more than one, try to list them in order of importance.)
12. Explain how you might contribute to this field, or why you think you are qualified to investigate this field: (If you listed more than one field, answer this question for each field of interest.)
13. Are you interested in serving as a Committee Coordinator?

Mail your answers to this questionnaire to:

Mr. Brad C. Sparks
Apt. 306
2725 Haste Street
Berkeley, California 94704
U.S.A.

Brad C. Sparks is the temporary supervisor of the APRO research committee program. Sparks, in turn, reports to Dr. J. A. Harder (APRO Director of Research) and L. J. Lorenzen (APRO Director).

Applicants who are accepted will be notified after tentative committee assignments are made.

Review

(Continued from Page Two)

Taves was a close personal friend of Dr. Menzel, was a practicing psycho-analyst and is an active writer of science-fiction. Despite the authors' outstanding professional backgrounds, the book in no way lives up to the subtitle. The tools used here are not those of science. Instead they are character assassination, positive and

(See Review - Page Five)

Review

(Continued from Page Four)

negative name calling, selective choice of facts, misrepresentation, errors of omission and the other techniques of the propagandist.

Much of the book is not about UFOs at all but is textbook material about sundogs, moondogs, rainbows, meteorological optics, etc. Of the 33 photos and drawings, two were intentional hoaxes, two were of a hoax exposed first by a UFO group of Pittsburgh (though the group isn't acknowledged), and one dealt with the Hill abduction. The other 28 had nothing to do with UFOs. The 21 chapters have a total of 129 footnotes. Eleven are to biblical sources, and twenty-one are to pre-1940 sources. Yet there is no mention of the 247 page UFO Symposium Proceedings published for a congressional committee after official hearings on UFOs and containing the testimony of 12 scientists—including Dr. Menzel. There is no mention of the 310 page book "UFOs: A Scientific Debate" published by Cornell University Press and edited by two astronomers with papers by 16 scientists—including Dr. Menzel. There is no mention of Project Blue Book Special Report Number 14, a 300 page volume and the largest officially sponsored, scientific investigation of UFOs ever published. It has categorizations, quality evaluations, statistical cross comparisons of over 2000 UFO sightings by professional persons at Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio. According to the Blue Book files Dr. Menzel had a copy. Dr. J. Allen Hynek, an astronomer and dean of American ufologists is mentioned several times but his book "The UFO Experience" is not. None of the four PhD theses that deal with UFOs are referenced. No mention is made of compilations of UFO landings though one catalog covers more than 800 such cases from 39 countries. The 1966 Gallup Poll on UFOs is briefly noted but the 1973 Gallup Poll and several others are not. One wonders if Drs. Menzel and Taves are unwilling to face up to the facts provided by these polls—especially the fact that the greater the education of the individual the MORE likely to accept UFO reality and the older the individual (Menzel was 74 and Taves 61) the less likely to accept UFO reality.

The primary investigative technique used to "identify" almost every case discussed seems to be arm chair theorizing. Field investigation, witness interrogation, checking with the weather records, quantitative calculations all appear to be practically nonexistent. The reasoning seems to be that if one can find a possible explanation for a particular sighting, the fact that it doesn't fit several important aspects of the sighting doesn't really matter.

The October, 1961, Salt Lake City UFO sighting witnessed by the pilot of a small plane and seven other witnesses on

the ground at mid-day with 40 mile visibility in clear skies is dismissed as a sundog. The facts of the sighting are grossly distorted; no mention is made of the facts that the pilot saw the UFO between him and a mountain, that the UFO was observed to tilt back and forth while hovering, had a lenticular shape, rose straight up extremely rapidly for about 1000 feet, stopped and then moved off at high speed. The famous series of photos taken near the island of Trinidad in 1958 by a Brazilian navy photographer is dismissed as an "obvious hoax" though computer enhancement techniques do not support this view nor does the testimony of the others present at the time the pictures were taken. No source is given for the statement that the photographer was a "known hoaxter". As is the case throughout the book, holier-than-thou statements are made to take the place of solid facts.

Much effort is spent in explaining away the famous abduction of Betty and Barney Hill and Marjorie Fish's detailed efforts to reconstruct in 3 dimensions the 2-dimensional star map drawn by Betty under posthypnotic suggestion. She had earlier described this map as having been shown her on board a UFO. Menzel and Taves were able to show, as anybody would expect, that if one throws 47 seeds on a two dimensional flat area and selects 15 seed positions to find the best fit with a preselected pattern, namely Betty's map, one can find a pattern that more or less matches the given pattern. The number 47 was selected because that is the number of sun-like stars in our close galactic neighborhood. However, Ms. Fish did NOT restrict attention to only the sun-like stars. One of the models, for example, included all 252 stars in the volume taken up by that model. The stars in our neighborhood are NOT distributed at random like seeds thrown on a table. They are where they are. The pattern found by Ms. Fish was the only one of thousands considered which matched reality and made sense. If her solution was just a random guess "hit", why was it not found until AFTER the release of the 1969 Gliese catalog of nearby stars with its updated distance data? Why doesn't Menzel deal with, or even mention, the very special features of the base stars, Zeta 1 Reticuli and Zeta 2 Reticuli, found by Ms. Fish? Is it really just coincidence that they happen to be not only suitable for planets and life but are also the pair of such stars closest to each other in our entire neighborhood being only 3 light weeks apart?

That Drs. Menzel and Taves have no real concern with a scientific approach to UFO investigations is clear from the statement "Philip Klass, author of several books on UFOs has been the one other investigator (in addition to DHM) who has adopted an unfailingly scientific approach in his inquiries". A study of both books by avionics writer Klass and

the cases explained therein shows that he used the same unscientific techniques as Menzel and Taves. The facts in sighting after sighting are misrepresented, positive and negative name calling abound, there are significant errors of omission which the reader has no way of knowing. Klass did do far more in the way of actual rather than armchair investigation but the bias is equally clear. In short *The UFO Enigma* is a good book for those interested in atmospheric physics and identified flying objects. It is definitely NOT the definitive explanation of the phenomenon of UNIDENTIFIED Flying Objects.

Stanton T. Friedman is the only space scientist in North American known to be devoting full time to UFOs. He has lectured about UFOs at more than 350 colleges in 47 states and 4 Canadian provinces. He spent 14 years in industry as a nuclear physicist working on nuclear systems for space and terrestrial applications.

Book Review - Copyright © 1977 by Stanton T. Friedman.

Cosmic

(Continued from Page Three)

in 1896 and 1897. Not quite a decade earlier two young prospectors in California went through an experience reported in the Calgary (Alberta) *Tribune* of April 8, 1887 as follows:

A Mountain Mystery

Parties returning from hunting trips to the mountains often tell strange tales of their experience when miles away from human habitation, of conflicts with grizzly bears, mountain lions, etc., but by far the most weird story we have heard is told by two well-known young men of this place, who were on a prospecting tour some time since near Cobblestone Mountain, at the northern boundary of this country. The story they tell - and they are willing to take their oath on the truth of the statement - is as follows:

"One cold night they were simultaneously awakened about 2 o'clock by the noise of crackling brush that had been thrown on the fire. They arose to a sitting posture and saw the figure of an Indian woman standing by the fire. She was dressed in a robe of gayly colored material that almost reached to her feet. A glistening necklace, evidently of gold and silver, enriched her neck and hanging pendant from this were a number of bear's claws. Her black hair reached below her waist. In her ears were large hoop ear-rings of gold.

"Upon seeing the form, one of the young men instinctively reached for his rifle by his side while the other started in amazement at seeing such a sight in the

(See *Cosmic* - Page Six)

Cosmic

(Continued from Page Five)

dead of night and thirty miles from any house. When the figure saw the motion made to reach the rifle she motioned for them not to fire and moved down the trail, beckoning to them. Before disappearing from view she again beckoned to them, but they were too dumb-founded to follow.


"The next morning they followed the trail and after much difficulty traced the foot prints to the base of a high cliff about a mile from their camp. The rest of the story is told to this effect. "When I awoke" said one of the young men. "I was horrified, I couldn't move to save my life. I was frozen with astonishment. The next morning we discussed the matter, and determined to investigate. So the next night we took out blankets and went to the base of the cliff. At about midnight, the same hour the figure appears to us, we saw a bright phosphorescent light on the brow of the cliff, and I am sure we hear a voice calling Neeneeah! Neeneeah! several times. This is the strangest experience I ever passed through. I never have believe in ghosts, but I would like to know what this was. If it was a woman how did she come there at that time thirty miles from civilization?"

"An old Indian tradition is to the effect that many, many years ago an Indian maiden - Neeneeah, the only daughter of a chief was lost in this region and starved to death near the place called Squaw Flat. It is said that different oamping parties have seen the phosphorescent light spoken of in the vicinity where these young men were camped . . . *Ventura (Cal.) Free Press.*"

Episodes such as these two from the 19th and 20th centuries may not be unique. Quite likely most who experience them either explain them away as dreams or don't remember them consciously. In many cases it's only when an independent witness observed a light or UFO at the same time in the same location, that it enters the mind that there may be something substantial to the experience. These cosmic voyeurs may ultimately be from outer space or inner space. But as the young man said almost a century ago, "This is the strangest experience I ever passed through."

Lorenzen in Canada for TV Appearance

In early January, 1977, Mr. Lorenzen and Travis Walton traveled to Ottawa, Canada, to appear as guests on the panel show "Connection". The connection between the guests in the case was UFOs, of course. Mr. Lorenzen is second from the left and Mr. Walton is seated at the far right.



APRO Visited By Nippon TV

Jun-ichi Yaoi, writer - director - producer for Nippon TV interviews Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzen at the APRO office for a recent Japanese UFO feature.

Pilot Sights Blinding UFO


An Agence France-Press release out of Bogota, Colombia on May 8, 1977 announced that on that day a Colombian pilot claimed he was blinded by a UFO and he circled over Bogota in his single-engine plane for two hours before being helped to a landing.

A local radio station broadcast tape recordings of the pilot's terrified calls for help. "I've lost my sight and don't know what to do", the pilot, Manuel Lopez,

kept repeating.

Four aircraft were sent aloft to help guide Lopez to a safe landing at the city's airport. The release said that Lopez was taken to a military hospital where specialists were studying his case.

We have no further information at this writing but if further details are forthcoming, they will be presented in the *Bulletin*.



UFO RADIO PROGRAM
INFORMATION NEEDED

As reported in earlier editions of The Bulletin, APRO embarked on a project to produce a radio program series, titled "UFO REPORT". These were written and voiced by our Public Relations Director, Hal Starr, and met with enthusiastic response from stations, sponsors, and listeners. The series was distributed by Hollywood syndicators, Creative Radio Shows, headed by Mr. Darwin Lamm.

It was the purpose of these programs to educate and inform the membership and general public, at the same time earning badly needed money for A.P.R.O. Unfortunately, neither A.P.R.O. nor Mr. Starr has ever received one penny for delivering approximately 200 program masters to the Hollywood Company. It has been quite discouraging to see no return after spending so much time and personal money on this venture, especially after such enthusiastic predictions as Mr. Lamm gave us, and such good reports from dozens of stations.

Now it has come to our attention that some radio stations apparently experienced problems with Creative Radio Shows service, some stations apparently broadcast more programs than Mr. Lamm reported to us, and, possibly some stations carried the series without our knowledge. All these could be important factors in our never having received any return for our effort. Quite simply, we may have been "ripped off", a rather unsavory prospect for a non-profit corporation.

Because of these possibilities, we no longer are associated with Creative Radio Shows. Further, we are appealing to all members to search their memory and drop us a postcard immediately if they have ever heard the program. Please give dates of broadcast, station call letters, and city in which station is located. This information will be invaluable in persuing our effort against the syndicator.

APRO

AERIAL PHENOMENA RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
TUCSON, ARIZONA

FIELD INVESTIGATION in progress

The above is a replica of one of the plasticized cards impressed with the APRO seal (seal does not show on replica) available to APRO Field Investigators. These can be placed in the front and rear windows of your vehicle while you are conducting an investigation - much as PRESS cards are used.

The art work is by Dick Ruhl. Dick, who has been using these cards for some time, reports that they help "open doors". Sold to Field Investigators only - \$2.00 per pair.

AVAILABLE FROM APRO
\$2.25 Including Postage
and Handling.

