



National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Washington, D.C.
20546

Reply to Airtel LFD-10

March 2, 1978

Peter A. Gersten
Rothblatt, Rothblatt, Seijas
& Peskin
191 East 161st Street
Bronx, NY 10451

Dear Mr. Gersten:

By letter dated February 13, 1978, you requested, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, "All documents, files, memoranda, notes, tape recordings, transcripts, minutes, inter and intra office correspondence, and all other records relating and affecting NASA's position on UFO matters as stated in the letter to Dr. Frank Press, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and also information about NASA's relationship with the Central Intelligence Agency concerning UFO matters."

I have been able to locate the following documents which fall within your request:

1. July 21, 1977, letter from Dr. Press to Dr. Frosch (1 page);
2. September 6, 1977, letter from Dr. Frosch to Dr. Press (2 pages);
3. September 14, 1977, letter from Dr. Press to Dr. Frosch (1 page);
4. December 21, 1977, letter from Dr. Frosch to Dr. Press (2 pages);
5. November 8, 1977, memorandum from the Associate Administrator for Space Science to the Administrator (4 pages); and
6. September 1, 1977, letter with attachments from Colonel Senn, USAF, to Duward L. Crow, NASA (7 pages).

Enclosed you will find copies of documents no. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 listed above.

In regard to the question about NASA's relationship with the CIA, prior to transmitting the letter in question, NASA queried the CIA to ascertain whether or not there were any classified data sources pertinent to the recommendations in the letter. No such sources were identified.

It is my initial determination that document no. 5, which is an internal agency memorandum, is exempt from release under 5 U.S.C. 552(b) (5) and 14 C.F.R. 1206.300(b) (5). That exemption applies to

"Interagency or intraagency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with NASA."

The document in question is a predecisional document which falls under this exemption. However, in accordance with my authority under 14 C.F.R. 1206.208, I have decided to release this memorandum except for the next to last paragraph on the fourth page which contains an internal agency recommendation. As such, it is exempt from release under 5 U.S.C. 552(b) (5). The release of this paragraph, which is predecisional in nature, would inhibit frank communication between officials of this agency.

You are advised that you may appeal this initial determination to the NASA Administrator. Your appeal must (1) be addressed to the Administrator, NASA Headquarters, Washington, D.C. 20546, (2) be identified clearly on the envelope and in the letter as an "Appeal under the Freedom of Information Act;" (3) include a copy of the request for the agency record and a copy of the adverse initial determination; (4) state, to the extent possible, the reasons why you believe the initial determination should be reversed; and (5) be sent to the Administrator within 30 calendar days of the date of receipt of the initial determination.

Sincerely,

Miles Waggoner

Miles Waggoner
Chief, Public Information
Services Branch

Enclosures

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

SEP 30 1977

JUL 21 1977

Dear Bob:

We have discovered that the White House is becoming the focal point for an increasing number of inquiries concerning UFO's. As you know, there appears to be a national revival of interest in the matter with a younger generation becoming involved. Those of us in the Executive Office are ill-equipped to handle these kinds of inquiries.

It seems to me that the focal point for the UFO question ought to be in NASA. I recommend two things: since it has been nearly a decade since the Condon report, I believe that a small panel of inquiry could be formed to see if there are any new significant findings. Since this is a public relations problem as much as anything else, people who are known to be interested in the problem and also highly known, such as Carl Sagan, ought to be involved. This is a panel of inquiry that could be formed by NASA.

The second thing I would like to suggest is that NASA become the focal point for general correspondence and that those inquiries which come to the White House be sent to the designated desk at NASA.

Yours sincerely,

SIGNED:
FRANK
Frank Press
Director

f.
Robert Frosch
Administrator
National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Washington, D.C. 20546

OSTP: PSmith:ka 7-21-77
bcc:
Director (2)
Subject
Chrono

AA/ Judy

SEP 6 1977

Honorable Frank Press
Director
Office of Science and Technology Policy
Executive Office of the President
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Frank:

In your letter of July 21 you expressed the view that NASA should be the focal point for UFO matters, and specifically recommended that a panel of inquiry be formed by NASA to see if there are any significant new findings since the Condon report and that NASA become the focal point for general correspondence and inquiries.

While we are inclined to agree with your recommendation, there are a number of questions which need to be resolved before any formal program is undertaken. You may know that the Air Force served as the focal point for UFO matters during the 1960's and devoted considerable resources to the program. It, however, concluded, in the absence of significant findings, that the program warranted no more than routine form letter answers to inquiries and has been handling the program in that manner since about 1970. It now handles a small number of inquiries, perhaps 10 to 12 monthly. NASA, likewise, handles routine inquiries by form letter response, 10 to 12 formal inquiries and a somewhat larger number of public inquiries monthly. NASA uses the information sheet attached in its responses. The Air Force uses similar data.

From the point of view of the Administration as a whole, this is economical. However, it fails to provide a recognized focal point for technical appraisal of sightings and understandably results in some frustration to individuals making what they consider to be serious inquiries.

A panel of inquiry such as you suggest might possibly discover new significant findings. It would certainly generate current

interest and could lead to the designation of NASA as the focal point for UFO matters. It would require some additional resources for the inquiry and for follow-on activity. Before committing to this, I feel that we should assure ourselves that an inquiry is justified. I believe we could do this by naming a NASA project officer to review reports of the last ten years and to provide a specific recommendation relative to any further inquiry by the end of this year. If you concur, I will initiate this action.

Very truly yours,

Original Signed By
Robert A. Frosch

Robert A. Frosch
Administrator

Enclosure

cc: AA ✓ A ✓
AC ✓
ADA ✓
S ✓
F ✓
L ✓
W ✓
C ✓
AE ✓

74

F/RA Newman:elt:8/19/77 A-34611
Rewritten:ADA/L:Row/Crow:8/25/77
Rewritten:ADA/Crow:aom:9/1/77

WASHINGTON D C 20500

Dear Bob:

I am pleased that you agree that NASA can handle the public inquiries on UFOs. The fact that my Office and the White House can direct such inquiries to NASA will relieve my small staff of a responsibility we are not equipped to handle. Therefore, I have asked my assistant, Stan Schneider, who has discussed this matter with your Executive Officer, Ed Andrews, to forward all our UFO inquiries to NASA.

By copy of this letter, I am informing Jim Purks of the White House Media Liaison Office of our exchange of ideas on this subject so that they are in the communications loop on this situation. I will suggest that he forward all public inquiries on UFOs to the White House to NASA (Code 4) for response.

Yours sincerely,

Honorable Robert A. Frosch
Administrator
National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Washington, D.C. 20546

cc: Jim Purke W.H. Media Liaison

then Copy to _____
 info Copy to _____
 A 94611
 A, AAF
 AAR, AG
 L, S, W
 C, AF/under
 9-19-77
 NOVE
 filed with 9-6-77

December 21, 1977

Honorable Frank Press
Director
Office of Science and Technology
Policy
Executive Office of the President
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Frank:

In response to your letter of September 14, 1977, regarding NASA's possible role in UFO matters, we are fully prepared at this time to continue responding to public inquiries along the same lines as we have in the past. If some new element of hard evidence is brought to our attention, in the future, it would be entirely appropriate for a NASA laboratory to analyze and report upon an otherwise unexplained organic or inorganic sample; we stand ready to respond to any bona fide physical evidence from credible sources. We intend to leave the door clearly open for such a possibility.

We have given considerable thought to the question of what else the United States might and should do in the area of UFO research. There is an absence of tangible or physical evidence available for thorough laboratory analysis. And because of the absence of such evidence, we have not been able to devise a sound scientific procedure for investigating these phenomena. To proceed on a research task without a disciplinary framework and an exploratory technique in mind would be wasteful and probably unproductive. I do not feel that we could mount a research effort without a better starting point than we have been able to identify thus far. I would therefore propose that NASA take no steps to establish a research activity in this area or to convene a symposium on this subject.

I wish in no way to indicate that NASA has come to any conclusion about these phenomena as such; institutionally, we retain an open mind, a keen sense of scientific curiosity, and a willingness to analyze technical problems within our competence.

Very truly yours,

Original Signed By
Robert A. Frosch
Robert A. Frosch
Administrator



National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

INFORMATION SHEET

FGM 76-6

Prepared by

FGM/Office of Public Affairs
NASA Headquarters
Washington, D.C. 20546

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

NASA is not involved in research concerning unidentified flying objects. Reports of unidentified objects entering U.S. air space are of interest to the U.S. military as a regular part of defense surveillance, but no government agency is conducting an ongoing investigation of UFOs at this time.

An extensive study known as Project Blue Book was undertaken in the 1960's by the U.S. Air Force through a contract with the University of Colorado. Based on the findings of this study as reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences, the Air Force terminated the project December 17, 1969.

The University of Colorado report, entitled Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects, was published in paperback by Bantam Books. A three-volume photoduplication (AD 680:975-6-7) may be purchased for \$18 from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22151. The complete reports were transferred from Air Force storage in July 1976 to The National Archives, 8th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20408. Those wishing to view the report must obtain a researcher's permit from the National Archives and Records Service.

The University of Colorado study reached the following conclusions: (1) there was no evidence that the subject of UFOs had been "shrouded in official security"; (2) UFOs did not constitute any hazard to national security; (3) two decades of UFO study had made no significant contribution to scientific knowledge; and (4) further extensive study of the general topic could not be expected to contribute meaningfully to the advancement of science.

The panel of the National Academy of Sciences agreed with these conclusions and further commented, "On the basis of present knowledge the least likely explanation of UFOs is the hypothesis of extraterrestrial visitations by intelligent beings."

Although the U.S. government no longer dedicates funds and personnel to the study of UFOs, investigations are continuing under private auspices. The Center for UFO Studies, P.O. Box 11, Northfield, Illinois 60093 (telephone 312/491-1870) is a source for publications and information on UFO phenomena. The National Investigating Committee on Aerial Phenomena, Suite 23, 3535 University Boulevard, Kensington, Maryland 20795 (telephone 301/949-1267) also replies to requests for general information. Both organizations investigate reported sightings of unidentified flying objects.

July 1976



National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Washington, D C
20546

November 8, 1977

S

MEMORANDUM

TO: A/Administrator

FROM: S/Associate Administrator for Space Science

SUBJECT: UFO Study Considerations

Following the recent exchange of correspondence with Frank Press, I have been giving the UFO matter some thought, especially the question of what NASA could reasonably do in both the short and long term.

The environment since the 1969 Condon report seems to have changed:

- There is a widespread interest in UFO's (and in related paranormal phenomena) that cannot be dismissed lightly as involving only a fringe of the population; probably 50% of the United States believes that "something" in the way of persistent phenomena exists or has existed (based on public poll).
- The UN is currently considering a resolution to establish a specialized agency for UFO matters.
- In France, the CNES has been formally charged with setting up a UFO study activity under Claude Poher.
- There are many apparently viable private organizations in the United States with responsible memberships that are following the UFO phenomena from several different view points.
- There seems to have been an increase in reports of the "near encounter" type (Pascagoula, Miss., 1973; Prospect, Ky., 1977) over the last few years.

- There is a general feeling among the UFO organizations at least that the United States Government "knows" far more than it has released, and may even have pieces of UFO hardware in hand.

Open-mindedness about UFO and paranormal phenomena seems to be becoming more "respectable" in the general public. Books and articles flourish. The IEEE is often a forum for matters that would have been rejected out of hand ten years ago. Classified and unclassified research supported by Federal agencies has brushed the UFO community (proponents of "remote viewing" often cross-couple with UFO proponents). At the same time, there are vocal "debunking" groups active on the other side of the issue; the matter seems rather polarized in modern society.

There are two major problems involved in considering any review of the UFO phenomenon by NASA: first, an apparent lack of any tangible or physical evidence available for laboratory analysis; second, the absence of any sound scientific protocol for investigating the phenomenon firsthand. There is a plethora of secondary source material -- human observation and reports thereon -- but hearsay is difficult to deal with scientifically. There are, of course, other problems as well: the probability of hoaxes, the tendency for any investigator to pre-judge, the delicate interface of the Government with any private individual reporting an incident, and the danger of projecting an inaccurate NASA or Administration image. All in all, undertaking a formal study at this time appears fraught with perils.

It appears that NASA has two immediate choices, each with its follow-on implications:

1. We could, on the basis of the situation outlined above and without taking further action, recommend to OSTP that we see no responsible way at this time for the Federal government, and especially NASA, to investigate the UFO phenomenon.

- a. This approach might encourage the vocal pro-UFO groups to continue their charges of cover-up and bureaucratic blindness.

- b. It might avoid fomenting controversy and division within the science community NASA deals with.
- c. It would require no change in our current PIO responses to the public.
- d. It would divert no resources from those higher priority applications, science, and technology activities which are our legislated charges.
- e. It would also be begging the question.

2. We could make a formal request, from my office or Ken Chapman's, to the largest and best-known of the UFO organizations (APRO, NICAP, MUFON, CUFOs, etc.) requesting them to submit their "best" cases to aid us in determining the Government's possible role. We could then compile this material into a usable format, do some first-order checks (probably involving some interviews and data-gathering), and, before drawing our own conclusions, ask for a "peer review"--possibly by the Smithsonian Institution. NASA would then make its own assessment as to whether further research were warranted or not, and if so, in what direction it should proceed. As a minimum, having gone this far and this publicly, NASA should stand ready to investigate new hard evidence that might come in -- this could logically be an added assignment for ARC and MSFC, depending on the physical or biological character of the evidence.

- a. This approach commits NASA and the Administration publicly to at least some review of the phenomenon; an eventual negative decision will not satisfy the enthusiasts and a positive one will enrage the non-enthusiasts.
- b. It will encourage a great deal of correspondence on both sides of the question; it may lead to a rash of sightings, hoaxes, and/or public excitement.

- c. It will place severe demands on the few NASA people involved in the first phase: there will be problems of workload, peer pressure, and pre-judgment.
- d. If any follow-through becomes necessary, the resources needed could be quite large -- travel, tests, interviews, and reports.

We are available to discuss the implications of either Option 1 or 2 with you.

Noel W. Hinners

Noel W. Hinners

AD/Dr. Lovelace

X/Mr. Williamson

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON D.C. 20330



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

1 SEP 1977

Lieutenant General Duward L. Crow, USAF (Ret)
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
400 Maryland Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20546

Dear General Crow:

Inclosed are the UFO Fact Sheet and standard response
to UFO public inquiries you requested.

I sincerely hope you are successful in preventing a
reopening of UFO investigations.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. SEVIN, Colonel, USAF
Chief, Community Relations Division
Office of Information

Attachments



Action Copy to ADA
1 to Copy to AF
A35481 AFAC
S.F.L. W.C.
AE
Filed in NASA 9-2-77
Disposition Date None
Excluded from _____
2-1 A35481

INFORMATION SHEET

FGM 76-6

Prepared by

FGM/Office of Public Affairs
NASA Headquarters
Washington, D.C. 20546

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

NASA is not involved in research concerning unidentified flying objects. Reports of unidentified objects entering U.S. air space are of interest to the U.S. military as a regular part of defense surveillance, but no government agency is conducting an ongoing investigation of UFOs at this time.

An extensive study known as Project Blue Book was undertaken in the 1960's by the U.S. Air Force through a contract with the University of Colorado. Based on the findings of this study as reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences, the Air Force terminated the project December 17, 1969.

The University of Colorado report, entitled Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects, was published in paperback by Bantam Books. A three-volume photoduplication (AD 680:975-6-7) may be purchased for \$18 from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, Virginia 22151. The complete reports were transferred from Air Force storage in July 1976 to The National Archives, 8th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20408. Those wishing to view the report must obtain a researcher's permit from the National Archives and Records Service.

The University of Colorado study reached the following conclusions: (1) there was no evidence that the subject of UFOs had been "shrouded in official security"; (2) UFOs did not constitute any hazard to national security; (3) two decades of UFO study had made no significant contribution to scientific knowledge; and (4) further extensive study of the general topic could not be expected to contribute meaningfully to the advancement of science.

The panel of the National Academy of Sciences agreed with these conclusions and further commented, "On the basis of present knowledge the least likely explanation of UFOs is the hypothesis of extraterrestrial visitations by intelligent beings."

Although the U.S. government no longer dedicates funds and personnel to the study of UFOs, investigations are continuing under private auspices. The Center for UFO Studies, P.O. Box 11, Northfield, Illinois 60093 (telephone 312/491-1970) is a source for publications and information on UFO phenomena. The National Investigating Committee on Aerial Phenomena, Suite 23, 3535 University Boulevard, Kensington, Maryland 20795 (telephone 301/949-1267) also replies to requests for general information. Both organizations investigate reported sightings of unidentified flying objects.

July 1976

MORE PIECES OF THE PUZZLE

FROM APRO BULLETIN, Vol. 30, No. 8,
1982 STRANGE MATERIAL



A recent letter from a member who had the opportunity to inspect some rather strange material in 1963 adds to the information APRO has on file concerning strange materials related to landed or crashed discs. To wit:

Said member (who will remain anonymous but whose information and name are on file at Headquarters) claims that he had the opportunity to handle and inspect some unusual material at Milhoff Steel Products of Bloomington, Minnesota in 1963. The material, he said, was being manufactured by the 3M Company (Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing) under a contract with the Honeywell Company. He also claimed that the material was being used on a classified project for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

This same member directs our attention to Page 9 of "The Rosewell Incident-Update and Conclusion", a paper by author William B. Moore, delivered at the UFO Ohio Symposium in Cleveland, Ohio in June, 1981. This paper describes material whose physical characteristics closely resemble those of the following described material: (Available from APRO at \$3.50 postpaid).

Our informant said that at first glance, the material he examined appeared to be aluminum or lead foil. When handled, it felt like plastic. It would not tear, and when stretched very taught between two vises and struck with a two pound hammer, the hammer bounded back as though it had struck a trampoline.

The material could be crumpled into a ball, but if left alone, would return to its original state (flat, absolutely smooth) within 6 seconds.

At the end of the work day during which he examined this material, he folded it into a 1½ inch square and placed it under 20 tons pressure, and left it overnight. The next day, when taken out of the press, and allowed to lie at rest, it once again took its original form.

Although the material could be stretched, it returned to its original shape in seconds, yet it could be cut very easily with a razor blade. It was about 4 mil thick, but its weight was practically nothing.

Our informant, at the end of his description, points

(See Puzzle—Page Two)

travelers needed water and food, while they apparently made repairs to their craft. In return, when they left, they gave the Indians a container which they had used to transport the water.

This container was shiny, soft, pliable, weightless (or approximately so) and could be crumpled, hammered, etc., but always returned to its original shape.

Somehow, one of the reporters got the container (probably either paid money or exchanged material for it) and took it back to Buenos Aires with him. The story of the Indians' strange visitors began to appear in the press, and then suddenly stopped. The container was allegedly confiscated by the Argentinian Army and that was the end of that.

Although the Lorenzens could get no firm fix on the date of the alleged "visitations", it was estimated to have been in the early or mid-fifties.

If we take the general history of each of the three incidents depicted in this article, we get a significant sequence: The crash of a disc and confiscation of same in the 1940s in the United States. The crash or landing of a disc-shaped object in the early or mid 1950s in Argentina, an artifact of which was confiscated by the military. The examination of a "strange material" in 1963 by an American employed in the American military-industrial complex.

This all adds up. It would seem that the United States learned something from the retrieval of crashed UFOs of the 1940s. Did we somehow also obtain information or samples of the material confiscated by the Argentine military in the 1950s?

Considering the maze of interwoven intelligence agencies throughout the world, it is not entirely unlikely that the 1950s Argentinian material and the 1963 material examined at Milhoff Steel are somehow related.

Now perhaps the membership can more clearly realize why the Cash-Landrum case does not represent a UFO to some researchers, but rather, our first glimpse of an experimental UFO-like Aircraft MANUFACTURED RIGHT HERE ON EARTH—in these United States!

Puzzle

(Continued from Page One)

out that the Air Force and NASA know a lot more than is generally accepted.

A CONTINENT AWAY AND YEARS BEFORE

In July, 1967, Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzen made a tour of South America, where they contacted and visited the representatives of five countries: Peru, Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela. During one of these conversations (it is best not to be more specific) we questioned an individual who had knowledge of the landing of a UFO in a region north of Salto, Argentina, which was populated largely by Indians. News of the "landing" eventually leaked out and representatives of the press investigated. They heard a strange tale:

An object, described as plate-shaped, and metallic in color, crashed near a village in the area. Over a period of days, the occupants of the craft approached the local inhabitants, and bartering took place. The ai

Serial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc.

(APRO)

3597 W. Grape Drive
Tucson, Arizona 85741 U.S.A.
(602) 297-7791

10 July, 1988

STAFF

L.J. Lorenzen International Director
Robert Marsland Deputy Director
Coral E. Lorenzen Secretary-Treasurer
Maxine McCoy Membership Secretary

Dear Mr. Cameron:

CONSULTANTS

Mr. Rayford R. Sanders	Aeronautics
Costa Mesa, Ca	
Dr. Kenneth V. Anderson	Anatomy
Emory University, Atlanta, Ga	
Mr. Daniel A. Harris	Astronomy
Tucson, Az	
Dr. Leo V. Standerford	Astronomy
Mankato State College, Mankato, Mn	
Mr. Walter N. Webb	Astronomy
Hayden Planetarium, Boston, Ma	
Dr. Richard C. Henry	Astrophysics
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md	
Dr. Vladimir Stetsko	Biochemistry
Boston University, Boston, Ma	
Dr. Michael J. Hudak	Biology
Seneca College, E. Willowdale, Ont. Canada	
Dr. Robert S. Mellor	Botany
University of Arizona, Tucson, Az	
Dr. John C. Munday	Biophysics
University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont. Canada	
Dr. James A. Harder	Civil Engineering
University of California, Berkeley, Ca	
Mr. Charles E. Martin	Civil Engineering
Marco Soil and Foundation Engineers, Tucson, Az	
Dr. Vladimir Vysin	Computer Technology
Irvine, Ca	
Dr. Kenneth Hessel	Electrical Engineering
Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	
Dr. Frank B. Salisbury	Exobiology
Utah State University, Logan, Ut	
Dr. Harold H. Williams	Geochemistry
Sunwapta Minerals, Ltd., Calgary, Alt. Canada	
Dr. Philip Seft	Geology
TRW Systems Group, Redondo Beach, Ca	
Dr. David M. Jacobs	History
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa	
Dr. P.M.H. Edwards	Linguistics
University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., Canada	
Dr. G.K. Ginnings	Mathematics
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tn	
Dr. Allan K. Andrews	Mechanical Engineering
Greensboro, NC	
Dr. Benjamin Sawyer	Medicine
Middletown, Oh	
Dr. R. Donald Woodson	Medicine
Medical College of Ohio Hospital, Toledo, Oh	
Dr. Robert W. Johnson	Metallurgy
Materials Research Corp., Orangeburg, NY	
Dr. Walter W. Walker	Metallurgy
Hughes Aircraft Corporation, Tucson, Az	
Dr. Dale E. Brandon	Oceanography
ESSO Production Research Co., Houston, Tx	
Dr. B. Roy Frieden	Optics
University of Arizona, Tucson, Az	
Dr. Robert F. Cregan	Philosophy
State University of New York at Albany, NY	
Dr. Kathryn M. Squadrito	Philosophy
Purdue University at Ft. Wayne, In	
Dr. Emerson W. Shideler	Philosophy
Denver, Co. Retired	
Dr. Michael J. Duggan	Physics
Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research	
Organization, Sydney, NSW, Australia	
Dr. Gerhard A. Wolter	Physics
California State University, San Diego, Ca	
Dr. Robert M. Wood	Physics
McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Company, Los	
Angeles, Ca	
Dr. Harold A. Cahn	Parapsychology
Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Az	
Dr. Jule Eisenhart	Psychiatry
Denver, Co	
Dr. L. Gerald Lauter	Psychiatry
Cornell University, New York, NY	
Dr. Berthold E. Schwert	Psychiatry
Monclair, NJ	
Dr. Michael A. Persinger	Psychiatry
Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ont. Canada	
Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle	Psychology
University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wy	
Dr. Horace C. Dudley	Radiation Physics
University of Illinois, Chicago, Il	
Dr. Norman A. Godburn	Religion
Surrey, England	
Dr. A. Henry Swann	Science Education
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tn	
Dr. John S. Derr	Seismology
U.S. Geological Survey, Boulder, Co	
Dr. Richard Etheridge	Zoology
San Diego State College, San Diego, Ca	

It is with deepest regret that I tell you that there will be no more issues of the APRO Bulletin. Mrs. Lorenzen has been through some very trying times, both physically and emotionally, no doubt hastened by the death of her daughter last month. Now her doctor advises that for her own welfare, she must not take on any more of the burdens imposed in running this organization. And since there is no one else with the editorial skills and endless font of memory to do the job, I must attend the last rites.

If you have unexpired subscription fees due you, I shall be happy to mail you the equivalent in past issues, if you will be so good as to tell me which ones you prefer. (at a rate of \$1.50 ae.)

With trust that you will assist me in accomplishing a most unpleasant duty. Sincerely,

Robert G. Marsland, for APRO

P.S. If your interest in this subject continues, you might try to contact CUFOS 2457 W. Peterson, Chicago, IL 60659 or MUFON 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155

Recommended reading: "ABOVE TOP SECRET", Timothy Good (British) 1987 Sidgwick & Jackson, Ltd. 1 Tavistock Chambers, Bloomsbury Way, London WC1A 2SG ENGLAND

"INTRUDERS" 1987 Budd Hopkins

"COMMUNION" 1987 Whitley Streiber

"CLEAR INTENT" 1984 By Fawcett & Greenwood, Prentice-Hall

"PROJECT IDENTIFICATION" by Harlev D. Rutledge, Professor of Physics at S.E. Missouri State Univ.

May your interest in UFO last a long lifetime.

Robert G. Marsland, for APRO

O.S. Mrs. Lorenzen died on 12 April, 1988, and there is no more APRO. However, as noted above, we still offer an assortment of past issue bulletins, with some case histories in them much like those of today. Many thanks for your interest.

(OVER)

In answer to your request of 2 July, I have looked through every possible file drawer in search of the material used for the basis of that article in V 30/8, and I come up a blank.

After reading the Bulletin mentioned and the "Roswell Investigation" again, I came to the conclusion that at this point you know as much as I do about the matter.

I believe you will find that even though the Air Force, the Army, NASA, and some of the larger source corporations are in the process of producing this material, the chance of your finding out anything definite is rather small.

I much regret that I can offer you no leads beyond what you already have.

Most sincerely, Robert G. Marsland

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Robert G. Marsland". The signature is fluid and extends to the right with a long, sweeping tail.

MORE PIECES OF THE PUZZLE

From APRO BULLETIN, Vol. 30, No. 8,
1982

STRANGE MATERIAL

NOV 1

A recent letter from a member who had the opportunity to inspect some rather strange material in 1963 adds to the information APRO has on file concerning strange materials related to landed or crashed discs. To wit:

Said member (who will remain anonymous but whose information and name are on file at Headquarters) claims that he had the opportunity to handle and inspect some unusual material at Milhoff Steel Products of Bloomington, Minnesota in 1963. The material, he said, was being manufactured by the 3M Company (Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing) under a contract with the Honeywell Company. He also claimed that the material was being used on a classified project for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

This same member directs our attention to Page 9 of "The Rosewell Incident-Update and Conclusion", a paper by author William B. Moore, delivered at the UFO Ohio Symposium in Cleveland, Ohio in June, 1981. This paper describes material whose physical characteristics closely resemble those of the following described material: (Available from APRO at \$3.50 postpaid).

Our informant said that at first glance, the material he examined appeared to be aluminum or lead foil. When handled, it felt like plastic. It would not tear, and when stretched very taught between two vises and struck with a two pound hammer, the hammer bounced back as though it had struck a trampoline.

The material could be crumpled into a ball, but if left alone, would return to its original state (flat, absolutely smooth) within 6 seconds.

At the end of the work day during which he examined this material, he folded it into a 1½ inch square and placed it under 20 tons pressure, and left it overnight. The next day, when taken out of the press, and allowed to lie at rest, it once again took its original form.

Although the material could be stretched, it returned to its original shape in seconds, yet it could be cut very easily with a razor blade. It was about 4 mil thick, but its weight was practically nothing.

Our informant, at the end of his description, points

(See Puzzle—Page Two)

Puzzle

(Continued from Page One)

out that the Air Force and NASA know a lot more than is generally accepted.

A CONTINENT AWAY AND YEARS BEFORE

In July, 1967, Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzen made a tour of South America, where they contacted and visited the representatives of five countries: Peru, Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela. During one of these conversations (it is best not to be more specific) we questioned an individual who had knowledge of the landing of a UFO in a region north of Salto, Argentina, which was populated largely by Indians. News of the "landing" eventually leaked out and representatives of the press investigated. They heard a strange tale:

An object, described as plate-shaped, and metallic in color, crashed near a village in the area. Over a period of days, the occupants of the craft approached the local inhabitants, and bartering took place. The air

VOL. 30, NO. 8, 1982

THE A.P.R.O.

BULLETIN

travelers needed water and food, while they apparently made repairs to their craft. In return, when they left, they gave the Indians a container which they had used to transport the water.

This container was shiny, soft, pliable, weightless (or approximately so), and could be crumpled, hammered, etc., but always returned to its original shape.

Somehow, one of the reporters got the container (probably either paid money or exchanged material for it) and took it back to Buenos Aires with him. The story of the Indians' strange visitors began to appear in the press, and then suddenly stopped. The container was allegedly confiscated by the Argentinian Army and that was the end of that.

Although the Lorenzens could get no firm fix on the date of the alleged "visitations", it was estimated to have been in the early or mid-fifties.

If we take the general history of each of the three incidents depicted in this article, we get a significant sequence: The crash of a disc and confiscation of same in the 1940s in the United States. The crash or landing of a disc-shaped object in the early or mid 1950s in Argentina, an artifact of which was confiscated by the military. The examination of a "strange material" in 1963 by an American employed in the American military-industrial complex.

This all adds up. It would seem that the United States learned something from the retrieval of crashed UFOs of the 1940s. Did we somehow also obtain information or samples of the material confiscated by the Argentine military in the 1950s?

Considering the maze of interwoven intelligence agencies throughout the world, it is not entirely unlikely that the 1950s Argentinian material and the 1963 material examined at Milhoff Steel are somehow related.

Now perhaps the membership can more clearly realize why the Cash-Landrum case does not represent a UFO to some researchers, but rather, our first glimpse of an experimental UFO-like Aircraft MANUFACTURED RIGHT HERE ON EARTH—in these United States!

Doc. 11: 8 FEBRUARY, 1978. NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

NASA officially admits that the unidentified objects entering United States airspace are a regular part of the National Defense surveillance as proven by the Documents # 4-10.



National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

EXCERPTS:

Document # 11

INFORMATION SHEET

Number 78-1

Prepared by:

LFF-3/Public Services Branch
Office of External Relations
NASA Headquarters
Washington, DC 20546

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

The information contained here has been compiled to respond to queries on Unidentified Flying Objects directed to the White House as well as NASA.

NASA is the focal point for answering public inquiries to the White House relating to UFOs. NASA is not engaged in a research program involving these phenomena, nor is any other government agency.

Reports of unidentified objects entering United States airspace are of interest to the military as a regular part of defense surveillance. Beyond that, the U.S. Air Force no longer investigates reports of UFO sightings.

February 1, 1978