



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB

Telephone 01-218 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

Room 7230

File

Your reference

Our reference
D/DS8/10/209⁷²³

Date

19 June 1984

Thank you for your letter of 4 June; I am sorry that we did not reply when you first wrote in March.

The letter you enclosed with yours is very interesting, but I have to say that it is a forgery. Although apparently written on Ministry of Defence headed paper it is most certainly not an official document and, as I shall explain, its contents bear no relation to our policy towards reported sightings of "Unidentified Flying Objects". Obviously I have no idea where it came from or why it was written, and I can only conclude that it is intended as a joke.

In fact, the Ministry of Defence's interest in reported sightings of UFOs is very limited. We are concerned solely with whether these reports reveal anything of defence interest, such as intruding aircraft, and if we are satisfied that there are none we take our investigations no further. There is no organization in the MOD appointed solely for the purpose of studying UFO reports, and no staff are employed on the subject full time. The reports we receive are referred to the staff responsible for the air defence of the United Kingdom, who examine them as part of their normal duties.

We did receive a report from Col Charles Malt of the USAF of lights which had been seen outside RAF Woodbridge. This was confirmed by John Stanley, Minister of State for the Armed Forces in answer to a written Parliamentary Question from Sir Patrick Wall MP on 24 October last year. A copy of this is attached for your information. The Department satisfied itself at the time that nothing in the report was of significance from a defence point of view. What the explanation for the lights is I do not know. However, I can assure you that there is absolutely no evidence of anything having intruded into British airspace and 'landing' near RAF Woodbridge.

Yours Sincerely,
H. H. H. H. H.

74


OUR REF:

YOUR REF:

RECORDED DELIVERY

4th June, 1984

B.M. Webster Esq.,
Head of D.S.8.,
Ministry of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
London SW1.



Dear Mr. Webster,


re: U.F.O. Sighting in Wendlesham Forest of December 1980.

I enclose a copy of a letter which was sent to me in January of this year, together with a copy of the front of the envelope containing the same, and would be grateful to receive your observations thereon.

Thanking you in anticipation.

Kind regards.

Yours sincerely,





MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct Dialling) 01-218 [REDACTED]

(Switchboard) 01-218 9000

Dear [REDACTED],

As you know, OSI has completed a report on the landing of a craft of unknown origin crewed by several entities near RAF Bentwaters on the night of December 29/30 1980.

Interestingly, OSI reports that the entities were approximately $1\frac{1}{2}$ metres tall, wore what appeared to be nylon-coated pressure suits, but no helmets. Conditions on the night were misty, giving the appearance that the entities were hovering above ground level.

Tape recordings were made on which the entities are heard to speak in an electronically synthesized version of English, with a strong American accent. Similar transmissions intercepted irregularly by NSA since 1975. (See attached - Flag A)

According to OSI, entities had claw-like hands with three digits and an opposable thumb.

Despite original reports (Flags B - G), OSI said the craft was not damaged but landed deliberately as part of a series of visits to SAC bases in USA and Europe. Reports that craft was repaired by US servicemen or was taken on to the base are not confirmed by OSI.

Landing is not considered a defence issue in view of the overt peaceful nature of the contact, but investigations by DS8 are to be continued on [REDACTED] authority. Precautionary plan for counter-information at a local level involving [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] [REDACTED], is strongly recommended.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB

Telephone 01-218 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

ROOM 7250

File

15

Your reference

Our reference

D/DS8/10/209 730

Date

19 June 1984

[REDACTED]

As I have explained previously, the MOD's only interest in so called "UFO sightings" is to establish whether they reveal anything of defence interest. Once we are satisfied that they do not, we do not consider them further. In the case of the lights seen outside RAF Woodbridge, we were satisfied that there were no defence implications. If you followed the press articles on the Woodbridge incident you will have seen the results of a good deal of investigative journalism which turned up quite rational and down to earth explanations for what was seen. As I recall one favourite explanation was the light from the Orfordness lighthouse. What the truth is I do not know; as explained, we do not attempt to investigate reports to a point at which a positive explanation can be made. I can assure you, though, that there is no question of anything having intruded into British airspace and "landed" near RAF Woodbridge.

I am afraid that I cannot help you with the information you requested concerning the 8 alleged sightings in 1978. Whilst we are prepared to release individual reports if they are readily available and easily to hand we do not have the staff or resources to mount extensive searches through our records and it was never our intention to provide a research service for members of the public.

Yours Sincerely,
I. Hattersley

77



Mr A Mathewson,
Defence Secretariat 8,
Ministry of Defence,
Main Building, Whitehall
London, SW1A 2HB

Your Ref: D/DS8/10/209

Our Ref: [REDACTED]

6/June/1984

Subject: Unidentified Flying Objects

Dear Mr Mathewson,

Thank you for your letter dated 11/5/1984 in relation to my question regarding an official investigation by the MOD in response to the high level of purported sightings of UFOs in the Yorks/Lancs area.

Turning to a much more recent letter acquired by this organisation from the MOD. I would appreciate your own thoughts regarding a letter forwarded to your dept, from Col. Charles Holt, Deputy Base Commander at RAF Woodbridge. He obviously is convinced an unknown flying object was in the vicinity of the base, do you not feel that the implications behind such a statement warrant an official enquiry? I have a letter from Kathleen T McCollom, Captain, USAF, Chief, Public Affairs Division, that states, "we have no official interest in what may have happened, especially since the lights were seen off base". (17.10.83). Your letter forwarded to one of our researchers clearly proves some investigation was carried out by USAF personnel, i.e. paragraph 2.:-

"The next day, three depressions 1 1/2" deep and 7" in diameter were found where the object had been sighted on the ground. The following night (29.12.80) the area was checked for radiation. Beta/gamma readings of 0.1 milliroentgens were recorded with peak readings in the three depressions and near the centre of the triangle formed by the depressions. A nearby tree had moderate (.05-07) readings on the side of the tree towards the depressions".

I feel this is more than speculative talk, the document is ample evidence that unknown craft were operating in British Airspace. Therefore one can only reach the disturbing conclusion that the British and American Governments are aware of the nature and logic which revolves around this phenomenon.

As a member of the British public I feel the subject of UFOs should be investigated totally. 4000 CIA and American Secret establishment documents prove without a shadow of a doubt, an official interest. I think the well used phrase by the MOD

hat we are only interested in Defence implications" does not ring true. Something unknown to the base commander at Woodbridge obviously broke British Airspace, one must be perplexed at the attitude the authorities have publicly shown.

I would be interested to learn of your stance, if we acquired video footage of unknown and structured craft which clearly shows the subject image on the ground, and in this case - an UFO? It is most frustrating when we acquire actual photograph of UFOs which have been analysed by the Worlds foremost authority on computer analysis, and been classified genuine, that the British Government are taking no action.

I would now like to turn to a number of sightings which occurred between the dates of 28th May - 18th August, 1978, near the Menwith Hill (USA) listening base. We investigated no fewer than 8 reported sightings by the villagers of Darley, who I must add were very frightened. The reports were investigated by this organisation who were in constant contact with a Mr Mills, Public Relations Officer at the base. I am sure Menwith Hill forwarded a number of these sightings to MOD. The exact dates and times are as follows:

28.5.1978. 7.30pm. Multiple witnesses.
29.5.1978. 9.15pm. 1 man.
1.6.1978. 11.12pm. 1 man 1 female.
3.6.1978. 11.05pm. 1 man.
28.7.1978. 10.30pm. 5 men 5 female.
5.8.1978. 10.40pm. Multiple witnesses.
9.8.1978. 10.20pm. 3 girls (teenage).
18.8.1978. 12.30pm. 5 men 5 female.

I would appreciate any data you may have regarding the above dates, and for your comments regarding the contents of the Woodbridge letter. Thank you for your valuable time.

Yours Faithfully,





MINISTRY OF DEFENCE Room 7230
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB

Telephone 01-218 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

File. (C)

Your reference

Our reference

D/DS 8/10/209-688

Date

6 June 1984

[REDACTED]

You wrote again on 16 May with further questions on the Ministry of Defence's policy towards the reports we receive of flying objects which the observer could not identify. I shall take your questions in turn.

First you asked about the number of reports we have received. For each of the years since 1978 we received the following number: 1978 - 750, 1979 - 550, 1980 - 350, 1981 - 600, 1982 - 250, 1983 - 390.

As to your second question, our policy is that we will consider releasing the details of particular, specified reports, on request, if the information is easily identifiable and readily to hand. We do not have the resources, though, to go through our files for all reports from Wigan since 1980.

Your third question concerned the lights seen in Rendelham Forest in December 1980, as reported by Colonel Halt of the United States Air Force. As you may have gathered from Mr Stanley's answer in Hansard of 24 October 1983, we received this report and satisfied ourselves that it contained nothing of defence interest. In case you have not seen it, I enclose a copy of Colonel Halt's report.

Finally, I explained in my previous letter that so long as there is nothing in the report to cause concern from a defence point of view (and there never has been) we make no attempt to identify what was seen.

Yours Sincerely,

P. H. Walters



Defence Secretariat 8
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE Room 7230
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HS
Telephone 01-218 7230 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

Your reference

Our reference

D/DS8/10/209-664

Date

31 May 1984


You wrote to me again on 19 May with further questions about our policy towards reports of 'Unidentified Flying Objects'.

We receive a lot of reports from a variety of sources, but principally from the police, RAF Stations and civil airfields. These bodies send on to us any reports they receive from members of the public of flying objects which the observer could not identify, so that operational staff here can check for possible defence implications. However, as Mr Stanley explained in his Parliamentary answer of 24 October last year, no report we have received has ever been of concern from this point of view. That includes Colonel Holt's report of lights in Rendlesham Forest.

Yours sincerely,

L. Hackett

24 MAY 1984

May 16th 1984.

REF. UFO/Further Investigation.

E25 P.F.

Dear Sir,

Regarding your last letter dated 24th April 1984. What we here at the Center for UFO studies would like to know is:-

- ① Could we have the total numbers of UFO sightings for the years 1978-1979-1980-81-82-83-84?
- ② We also believe and have been told that the MOD released CASE files to fellow British UFO researchers (IAN MRZYGLOD) is one who received one. So why do other investigators in the phenomena, not get any DATA even when required? SUCH AS OUR INVESTIGATION TEAM.
- ③ RENDLESHAM FOREST CASE (MOD) Could we have the case and what conclusion you reached?
- ④ HAVE ALL UFO SIGHTINGS for the years 1982-1983 been identified by MOD or outside sources?..

We hope you will be able to help with our questions as it is of utmost importance that we get our facts right, so there is no misunderstanding between us all, Cooperation is the essence.

Thank you very much for your help, and may we send our best wishes for the future.

Yours sincerely



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB
Telephone 01-218 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

File. (6)

Your reference

Our reference

D/DSB/10/209-648

Date

25 May 1984

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your two letters, of 7 and 8 May.

In your letters you asked whether we had any information concerning three reported sightings of flying objects which the observer could not identify. The only one of these for which I could find a report was the one on 27 December 1980, at RAF Woodbridge. I am therefore attaching a copy of a report by Colonel Charles Hal of the United States Air Force, which is the only information we have on this.

You may also be interested in the two attached Parliamentary Questions.


Yours sincerely,

A. Mather



Mr Mathewson,
Defence Secretariat 8,
Room 7230,
Ministry of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
London SW1A 2HB.

DATE: 8.5.84.



Dear Sir/Madam,

Could you please forward any information that you have on the following reports of Unidentified Flying Objects.

Date and time of sighting: Friday the 11th of July 1980, 3.30 am.

Description of object: A large flattened oval shaped object, Colour yellow then blue/white then changed back to yellow.

Position of observers: Soyland Moor between Littleborough and Todmorden North Yorkshire, England.

How Observed: Naked eye only.

Direction object first seen: North.

Weather conditions: Cold and clear with Moon and stars visible.

Names of observers: Police Constable Stephen Howarth and Police Constable Christopher Fernhead.

Second report.

Date: December the 27th 1980 at 3am.

Description of object: Metallic triangular object, 2/3 meters across its base and 2 meters high. One red light on top with a row of blue lights underneath. The object was on some sort of "legs".

Position of observers: Tangham wood, near USAF base at RAF Woodbridge, Suffolk England.

How observed: Naked eye and 8-12 power lense.

Direction object seen: North.

P.T.O.



degrees above the horizon, just above tree top level
and on the ground.

Distance: Not determined.

Movements: Object came down through trees in a multitude of colours and landed on the ground. When moving off it manouvered between trees.

Weather conditions: Not determined.

Names of observers: Lt Colonel Charles I Helt, deputy commander of the
USAF 31st Tactical Flying Wing. Plus both British
and American Air Force personnel.

I would appreciate all the information that your department has on the
two UFO reports that I have mentioned.

If there is any cost involved for the above reports I will be only too
pleased to oblige.

Hopefully I will receive your reply before too long, until then I am,
Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE Room 7230
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB

Telephone 01-218 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

File (680)

Your reference

Our reference

D/DS8/10/209-639

Date

22 May 1984

[REDACTED]

I am afraid that previous references to us having released sixteen reports of flying objects which the observer could not identify from the South Wales area appear to have been mistaken. In fact we released only fifteen such reports. I enclose, though, the one report I think you are missing to complete the "set".

You also asked about Lt Col Halt's report on the lights which were seen near RAF Woodbridge on 27 December 1980. Mr Stanley's answer in Hansard of 24 October 1983, of which you have a copy, made it clear that we received a copy of this report and satisfied ourselves that it contained nothing of defence interest. I have nothing to add to that.

Yours Sincerely

L. Harte-War

5TH MAY

Dear Mr. Mathewson

I thank you very
much for your letter of 4th May
and the Ufo reports. I requested
16 reports which you did mention
in the letter, but on inspection
I counted only 14, would it
be possible to be also sent
these remaining two to complete
the set following the last one:
(A 191765 83 5 MINUTES OVER SWANSEA
AIRPORT?) You informed me that
my request as a "Serious inquirer"
does not come into the category
you were thinking of on a
"specific sighting." Therefore enclosed

3

with this letter is a document
which may UFO clubs know about.
could you tell me the following:
1. is the document a true statement
of happenings 27, 28 29, Oct 1980.

2. did the ministry investigate the
claim of a supposed UFO landing at
a USA base woodbridge, suffolk if so,
what were their findings. I look
forward too possibly receiving the
two ministry reports. please excuse
my persistence.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

THE ABOVE IS A SUMMARY OF THE INFORMATION ON THE SUBJECT OF THE
MURDER OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

ABTH Jan 81

RAF/CC

1. Early in the morning of 27 Dec 80 (approximately 0300L), two USAF security police patrolmen saw unusual lights outside the back gate at RAF Woodbridge. Thinking an aircraft might have crashed or been forced down, they called for permission to go outside the gate to investigate. The on-duty flight chief responded and allowed three patrolmen to proceed on foot. The individuals reported seeing a strange glowing object in the forest. The object was described as being metallic in appearance and triangular in shape, approximately two to three meters across the base and approximately two meters high. It illuminated the entire forest with a white light. The object itself had a pulsing red light on top and a bank(s) of blue lights underneath. The object was hovering or on legs. As the patrolmen approached the object, it maneuvered through the trees and disappeared. At this time the animals on a nearby farm went into a frenzy. The object was briefly sighted approximately an hour later near the back gate.

2. The next day, three depressions 1 1/2" deep and 7" in diameter were found where the object had been sighted on the ground. The following night (29 Dec 80) the area was checked for radiation. Beta/gamma readings of 0.1 milliroentgens were recorded with peak readings in the three depressions and near the center of the triangle formed by the depressions. A nearby tree had moderate (.06-.07) readings on the side of the tree toward the depressions.

3. Later in the night a red sun-like light was seen through the trees. It moved about and pulsed. At one point it appeared to throw off glowing particles and then broke into five separate white objects and then disappeared. Immediately thereafter, three star-like objects were noticed in the sky, two objects to the north and one to the south, all of which were about 10° off the horizon. The objects moved rapidly in sharp angular movements and displayed red, green and blue lights. The objects to the north appeared to be elliptical through an 8-12 power lens. They then turned to full circles. The objects to the north remained in the sky for an hour or more. The object to the south was visible for two or three hours and beamed down a stream of light from time to time. Numerous individuals, including the undersigned, witnessed the activities in paragraphs 2 and 3.

CHARLES I. HALT. Lt Col, USAF
Deputy Base Commander

Your ref: D/DS8/10/209.

A. Mathewson,
Defence Secretariat 8, Room 7230,
Ministry of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
LONDON, SW1A 2HB.

May 19th., 1984

Dear Sir/Madam,

X Thank you for your letter of the 10th instant, which was very informative.

With reference to the 'Hansard' extract for 13th. March last, my colleagues and I were wondering whether you could kindly provide OSEAP with a breakdown of the sources for the UFO reports your Department received from 1981 to 1983. It seems quite remarkable that you have received so many, whilst OSEAP, and others, have received none.

In fact, OSEAP has received no reports for approximately 18 months! Hence our interest in some old, interesting cases.

So, if at all possible, we would like to know from what channels the MOD gets its reports in such great numbers.

Coming to Rendlesham, would you confirm that an unidentified aerial craft hovering very near to a Tactical Combat Base must surely have defence implications? The facts, as reported by Col. Halt would seem to give some cause for concern. One does not feel reassured by the nature of the Secretary of States for Defence's reply in Handsard for 24th. October last.

Once again, thank you for your cooperation in these matter.

Yours truly,





MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB
Telephone 01-218 2638 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

File.

(E)

Your reference

Our reference

D/DS8/10/209-611

Date

10 May 1984

Thank you for your recent letters on the subject of reported UFO sightings. I am sorry to have been some time replying.

To take your general question first, it has now been decided not to publish the reports of alleged UFO sightings we receive. As you may know, we get several hundred of these each year and to prepare them for publication would be a considerable editorial task, for which we have neither the staff nor resources. This would also fall well outside our defence responsibilities. However, for some time we have been prepared to release the details of particular reports to serious enquirers provided the information was easily identifiable and readily to hand. That continues to be our policy.

As to your questions about specific 'incidents', I am afraid that neither the first, third nor fourth of those you mentioned was reported to the Ministry of Defence, so I am unable to help with those. The only information we have on the lights seen in Newquay Forest is the report by Colonel Halt of the United States Air Force. You will probably already have seen this, but in case you have not I enclose a copy.

... You may also be interested in the enclosed Parliamentary Questions on the Ministry of Defence's interest in alleged UFO sightings.

Yours Sincerely,

I. Hatten

91


30th. April, 1984

Defence Secretariat Division 8,
Ministry of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
LONDON, SW1A 2HB.

Dear Sir/Madam,

re: release of information on UFO Reports.

Regarding the above matter, until early this year I had received courteous replies to my enquiries, from your Department.

However, my colleagues and myself are somewhat perturbed that you have apparently ceased to respond to any letters from this quarter. Indeed, this year I have written on behalf of OSEAP on three occasions: 22nd. January, 13th. March and 23rd. March.

Following reports in the press, however accurate, we were led to believe that you were supplying information where possible in response to enquiries from serious bodies. OSEAP is one such organisation and feels that the least you could do is to write and confirm your Department's position on the matter being discussed. Surely it would be just a matter of good manners, even though you will have more important matters to attend to.

Yours faithfully,


(687)

22nd. January, 1984

Defence Secretariat Division 8,
Ministry of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
LONDON, SW1A 2HB.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
U.S. 8
30 JAN 1984
FILE

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: release of information relating to UFO reports.

Just a line to say my colleagues and I are still interested in your Department's position on the above matter.

Therefore, may we again ask you what is being done with the information, if anything?

Yours truly,



93

(68)

23rd. March, 1984

Defence Secretariat Division 8,
Ministry of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
LONDON, SW1A 2HB.

RECEIVED
4 APR 1984
DEFENCE SECRETARIAT

Dear Sir/Madam,

re: release of information on UFO reports.

Following my letter to your department of the 13th. inst., I would like your comments on a front page article that appeared in 'THE ADVERTISER' for March 16th. It concerns the release of 16 reports to BUFORA and contains the following: "So it is interesting now to see that a Government department is now willing 'to consider' providing reports on specific incidents to serious inquiries", writes Walter Harding".

On behalf of my colleagues I would ask your criteria for serious inquiries and their acceptance.

If the newspaper report is correct then I take this opportunity to ask your department on the following cases:-

1. Llanerchymedd, Anglesey 1st. Sept., 1973. (OSSEAP was involved in the main investigation of the incidents and subsequently produced a special report).
2. Rendlehsan Forest. (Highly publicised in the press but seemingly lacking substance. Although not initially involved, OSSEAP has become interested in the case after paying this area a visit last year).
3. Llandrillo, Glynedd 23rd. Jan., 1974. (OSSEAP followed this incident up last year which involved aerial lights and earth tremors. Although these may not be connected).
4. South Stack, Holyhead, Anglesey: Lth. Feb. 1974. (Due to nearness, in time, to the previous incident OSSEAP has become interested in the washing-up on the shore of a plane-like object. The RAF and Aberporth Range Establishment said it was not theirs and the Navy's underwater research base at Portsmouth was sent a drawing. The object was 9' long, with a wingspan of 5', with a black aluminium body and the remnants of an aerial.)

I trust that you will kindly supply any information you are able on the above incidents. I hardly need remind you that OSSEAP is a serious investigative team.

Finally, I would ask your department if you have had any connections with a mysterious UFO group called: APEN, or a David McGroarty who resides in Redcar and is supposedly a representative of the same.


Yours truly,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

688
Your ref:- D/DS8/10/209.

Defence Secretariat Division 8
Ministry of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
LONDON, SW1A 2HB.



13th. March, 1984.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Further to my letter of 22nd. January last and the report in the 5th. March issue of the Daily Express, I once again would ask your department's position in relation to the release of information relating to UFO reports.

I would again stress the need for caution in releasing this type of material. Not only because of 'national security' considerations, but also of the type of person who might have access to it. You will be aware that 'distortion of the facts' is endemic within so-called UFO research circles.

Hoping that this communication is received favourably, I am

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular redaction mark covering the signature area.



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE, Room 7230
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB
Telephone 01-218 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 3000 (Switchboard)

Your reference

Our reference

D/DS8/10/209-9.7

Date

24 April 1984

Thank you for your letter of 9 March 1984. Your suggestion that the Ministry of Defence has documents relating to the alleged UFO sighting at RAF Woodbridge in December 1980, other than Colonel Halt's report, is quite mistaken.

Perhaps I ought to explain that the sole interest of the Ministry of Defence in reported sightings of Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOs) is to establish whether they have any bearing on the defence of the country.

There is no organisation in the Ministry of Defence appointed solely for the purpose of studying UFOs, and no staff are employed on the subject full time. The reports we receive are referred to the staff in the Department who are responsible for the air defence of the United Kingdom, and they examine the reports as part of their normal duties.

Since our interest in UFOs is limited to possible defence implications we have not carried out a study into the scientific significance of these phenomena. Unless there are defence implications we do not attempt to identify sightings and we cannot inform observers of the probable identity of the object seen. The Department could not justify the expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond the pure defence interests.

We have to recognise that there are many strange things to be seen in the sky, but we believe there are adequate explanations for them. They may be satellite debris re-entering the earth atmosphere, ball lightning, unusual cloud formations, meteorological balloons, aircraft lights, aircraft at unusual angles or many other things. There is certainly no evidence that alien spacecraft have landed on the planet. Although we have not carried out our own studies, we are aware of independent studies into the UFOs, notably by the University of Colorado published in 1969. This concluded that 90% of all UFOs reported could be plausibly related to ordinary phenomena.

I attach copies of 2 recent Parliamentary Questions on the Ministry of Defence's interest in UFO reports. I am returning your stamped addressed envelope.

Yours Sincerely,

Baroness Hattersley

ICS:

96.

[REDACTED]

Defence Secretariat Division 8.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall
London
SWIA 2HB.

9th March 1984.

RE:- WOODBRIDGE INCIDENT DEC '80'.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have been informed that a certain amount of UFO Documents are being released. As I am a credited UFO Investigator for BUFORA, 'BRITISH UFO RESEARCH ASSOCIATION'. I would be grateful if you could assist me with my enquiries. For the past 3 years I have been one of the main investigators on the Woodbridge incident in December 1980. We the investigators, the other being [REDACTED], now know that Photographs, Tape recording and signed witnesses statements do exist. Our source of information being reliable. We have been informed that the Ministry of Defence has Documentation on the said mention case. We received Col Charles I Holt's report via the Freedom of Informations Act, in the United States. This report was first sent to the MoD, by Sqn Leader Donald Moreland. The MoD eventually sent a copy to the US Air Force in the United States. We have been informed that Col Holt's report is but only a brief account of the incident and a full report has been made. We would be grateful if you would provide us with the latter also other Documentation on the Woodbridge incident. I have enclosed just one of many Documents we have received. The enclosed being from the Air Force Headquarters 515th Combat Support Group (U.S.A.F.E.).

We look Forward to your Acknowledgement of this Letter.

YOURS SINCERELY

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

97



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS 513TH COMBAT SUPPORT GROUP (USAF)
APO NEW YORK 09127


[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
14 June 1983

I am pleased to be able to respond to your request for information dated 7 May 1983. As you may now know, the 513th Combat Support Group provides document management services for Headquarters, Third Air Force. After extensive effort, we are able to successfully answer your four separately directed requests for information concerning unexplained lights on 27 December 1980.

It might interest you to know that the US Air Force had no longer retained a copy of the 13 January 1981 letter written by Lt Col Charles I. Halt. The Air Force file copy had been properly disposed of in accordance with Air Force Regulations. Fortunately, through diligent inquiry and the gracious consent of Her Majesty's government, the British Ministry of Defence and the Royal Air Force, the US Air Force was provided a copy for you. We trust this adequately explains the initial inability to provide a favorable response.

As you also asked, we have attached such documentation as we had concerning the processing of your several FOIA requests as of receipt of your 7 May 1983 request.

Sincerely,


PETER W. BENT, Colonel, USAF
Commander

DOCUMENT # 4



Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB

Telephone 01-218

(Direct Dialling)

01-218 9000

(Switchboard)

Your reference

Our reference

D/DS8/10/209-525

Date

24 April 1984

Thank you for your letter of 31 January. I am sorry to have taken so long before replying.

I should first of all point out that the sole interest of the Ministry of Defence in reported sightings of UFOs is to establish whether they have any bearing on the defence of the country.

There is no organization in the Ministry of Defence appointed solely for the purpose of studying UFOs, and no staff are employed on the subject full time. The reports we receive are referred to the staff in the Department who are responsible for the air defence of the United Kingdom, and they examine the reports as part of their normal duties.

Since our interest in UFOs is limited to possible defence implications we have not carried out a study into the scientific significance of these phenomena. Unless there are defence implications we do not attempt to identify sightings and we cannot inform observers of the probable identify of the object seen. The Department could not justify the expenditure of public funds in investigations which go beyond the pure defence interests.

We have to recognize that there are many strange things to be seen in the sky, but we believe there are adequate explanations for them. They may be satellite debris re-entering the earth atmosphere, ball lightning, unusual cloud formations, meteorological balloons, aircraft lights, aircraft at unusual angles or many other things. There is certainly no evidence that alien spacecraft have landed on the planet. Although we have not carried out our own studies, we are aware of independent studies into the UFOs, notably by the University of Colorado published in 1969. This concluded that 90% of all UFOs reported could be plausibly related to ordinary phenomena.

I attach copies of two recent Parliamentary Questions on the Ministry of Defence's interest in UFO reports.

Yours Sincerely

L. Hattersen

99

DATE. JANUARY 31st 1984

To/MOD, DEPT. 54 (AIR) main Building

REF.. UFO Investigations.

Dear Sir/madam,

With reference to UFO Investigations which your department have been dealing with from 1980 up to present time 1984. So could you kindly supply us with our following requests for information.

1. UFO Cases for Wigan 1980 - onwards.
2. Official Evaluation of the Bentwaters, Suffolk sighting 27/12/1980.
3. The overall opinion of your depts, Investigations (do UFOs exist?)
(Not flying saucers with green men inside.)
4. CONDON Committee report (USA) Could you supply us with it / or where would we be able to obtain it from.
5. Any International Contact addresses you could supply us with.

Many thanks for your Co-operation, time and trouble.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

(36) 232



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE ROOM 7230
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB
Telephone 01-218 2638 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

Your reference.

Our reference

D/DS8/10/209-518

Date

24 April 1984

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter of 12 March. Since Mrs Titchmarsh, my predecessor here, last wrote to you it has been decided not to publish the reports of alleged UFO sightings we receive. As you may know, we receive hundreds of these reports each year and to prepare them for publication would involve a great deal of editorial work, for which we have neither the money nor the staff. This would, in any case, fall outside our defence responsibilities. It is also not possible for you to be allowed privileged access to these reports. Although they contain no classified papers they are, like all Ministry of Defence files, subject to the Public Records Act. Under this Act official files are, in general, to remain closed for 30 years after the last action has been taken on them.

You may be interested in the two attached Parliamentary Questions on the MOD's interest in reports of alleged UFO sightings.

Yours sincerely,

David Mather

101

11

12 MAR 1984

Dear Sirs,

We have corresponded on many occasions in the past regarding your low-key investigation into UFO sightings. I am fully conversant with your policy and appreciate the difficulties under which you labour.

You will realise, if you check back through my records, that I have no grand illusions about UFOs. I do not believe you are covering up evidence of an alien invasion. Essentially, I believe that 90% (plus) of sightings are readily explicable. As for the rest, the solutions lie in terms of novel atmospheric and psychological phenomena. Some of these phenomena have decided scientific value, and since they represent the harnessing of radiating energy have (both in my view and that of a number of scientists who work with me) potential to offer economic advantages to those who study them.

For this reason I have been urging the department since 1978 to release the files you hold to the scientific community, since the problem (as you freely admit) is one much more of a scientific nature than of a defence concern.

In October 1982 you wrote to me advising that a decision had been taken to release data and you were currently contemplating the best way by which this might be achieved. I kept this to myself at the time, since I did not wish to prejudice your decision with receipt of numerous claims. However, you gave me a statement to make public some months later and several sample reports from South Wales. These were in lieu of the case I specifically requested.

Recently, I was approached by the Sunday Observer, who planned to do an article on the MOD and UFOs. I gave them full cooperation, to the maximum of my ability, since I felt this was the right kind of influential source to discuss the matter publicly. I had no control over Martin Bailey's conclusions (which I think were reasonably fair), but it is difficult to do this when I have incomplete data. Had I been in possession of more documents I could have possibly helped the paper give an even more fair appraisal.

In February 1983 myself and Peter Warrington published an article "The Neglected Science of UFOs" in New Scientist. You may peruse this, since it adequately reflects my position on the matter. I think this demonstrates that I am not making outlandish claims, and that cooperation between us could be to mutual advantage. You must realise the problems caused when unscrupulous sources wrongly promoted the essence of the Woodbridge Air Base (December 1980) sighting, in the News of the World last year. This generated public relations headaches I am sure. And the real truth was in no sense given. After a lot of work on the case I know that a UFO and aliens were not responsible for the events of that night.

Following our New Scientist article, Peter and I were approached by a scientific publishers (Blackwell) and commissioned to write a book that reflects the history of science and its dealings with the UFO phenomenon. A section of this deals with official government policy towards UFO science (in the USA and here). In this way a few thousand words on the British MOD policy have been included.

I have brought this to your attention before, in a letter that did not receive a reply. We feel that this book will be influential, reaching as it does the scientific community (ie it will not be a mass market paperback). It would be an ideal opportunity to help one another. That is, you offering data to us, and we offering a good public relations job for you. This we would be delighted to do.

Whilst the book is largely complete we can delay a little while, if there is promise of significant new data.

When I first discussed the document release with your department, almost 18 months ago, I requested privileged access to the files. I suggested that I would be happy to sign the official secrets act, or any other waiver you may require to protect the identity of the people who have written to you, which you explained to me as the main problem in clearing the data for release. Surely such a commitment on my part would be sufficient?

I supported my application with reference to Bill Chalker, who acts as my opposite number in Australia (we are coordinators of national investigations). Prior to the granting of the Freedom of Information Act in Australia he was offered access (on terms similar to those I suggest) to all the cleared documents. He was then encouraged to report on this as widely as possible in the UFO media. This he did, very fairly I might add. His reports (which I have if you wish to see them) have had a number of significant advantages.

- (1) They have effectively demolished the 'cover-up' myth, by showing in detail the full truth of the file content.
- (2) They have eased the burden of enquiries that the government would have received by presenting this material, through Bill, to the people who required it.
- (3) They allowed a person with the UFO background knowledge (that your team do not have) to act in a public relations capacity for the government. In other words all enquiries are deflected to him, and he is in a position to respond to them.

This is an effective system that has worked well. Of course, I realise it was precipitated by the imminence of Freedom of Information there. No doubt the Australian government wished to avoid what took place in the USA, where law suit after law suit (using the F.O.I. act) has been tabbed in order to obtain perceived documents.

I asked Bill to endorse my claim for similar treatment, which he did.

One problem you raised was that there are many UFO groups here, and that sponsorship of me might leave you open to requests from the others. But surely you are able to make a value judgement and appreciate that most groups lack knowledge, experience, and a credible public relations position. I have been a full-time worker in this field for six years and have established a public relations position. I also have hopefully demonstrated that I am capable of expressing the situation objectively, without wild suppositions or illogical assumptions.

I am in the position to report to the UFO community, as Bill Chalker did. In this way I could help you. What is more, via the book, Peter and I could truly provide a beneficial service to both science and yourselves.

You did say that if a substantial delay, further to the one already in effect in late 1982, were to take place, then you would seriously consider this proposal. As it would now appear that you have concluded (I think reasonably) that there is

3..

Just too much information to release it all, then this might make the suggestion even more advantageous.

Can I please ask you to contemplate such a move. It is in my interests to present the realities of the UFO problem to the scientific community, and to try to educate the UFO enthusiasts (based upon the facts). It is in your interests to ease the public relations burden, whilst being as open as possible. It will not be easy to demonstrate that you are not withholding vital information. To do so effectively we must start now. There may not be a Freedom of Information Act here at the present, but as you must know it is feasible. If it comes, it would be well to have prepared, just as they did in Australia. In which case I believe that my proposition must have merit.

Yours sincerely,



MINUTE

1988/10/209

84

AD MOD Sy 1

CORRESPONDENCE FROM [REDACTED]

1. I attach a letter and attachments we recently received from a [REDACTED] for your information and whatever action you think necessary.
2. As you will see, [REDACTED] has sent us a copy of a letter which purports to be a report of landing of a UFO crewed by several "entities" near RAF Bentwaters in 1980. This letter is clearly a forgery. Although it is written on MOD headed paper it is most certainly not an official document. I do not want to be too alarmist about what could be simply a harmless joke, but this could prove rather embarrassing if it ever found its way to a newspaper. The News of the World ran a very sensational story in October last year, alleging that a UFO had landed near RAF Bentwaters. They based this on a report by a USAF Colonel, of some unexplained lights near the base, which they had managed to get hold of. They would no doubt seize on this letter as further "proof" that something had happened. There could also be Parliamentary interest. Sir Patrick Wall MP has recently asked 2 questions on the MOD's interest in UFO reports and might ask questions about this. In the worst case, then, this letter could cause a good deal of unnecessary and unwelcome bother.
3. [REDACTED] addressed the letter to Mrs Titchmarsh, my predecessor in this post, because he had spoken to her shortly after the News of the World story appeared: my phone number has become fairly well known amongst UFO spotters. The reference to DS8 in the text of the letter is also easily explained; anyone who has received a letter explaining our policy on UFO reports would know that DS8 are the responsible division, although we do not, contrary to what the letter suggests, carry out investigations.
4. By way of background, I attach a note explaining the limited extent of our interest in UFO reports and the 2 recent PQS. I should, of course, be happy to speak to you about this.

A Mathewson

A MATHEWSON
DS8
MB 7230 2638 MB

401 889 3843
RECORDED DELIVERY

30th March, 1984

For the attention of Miss P. Titchmarsh


Ministry of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
LONDON SW1A 2HB

Dear Miss Titchmarsh,

re: UFO Matters and Rendlesham Forest Sighting.

I enclose a copy of a letter which I received in January, together with a copy of the front of the envelope which contained the same, and would be grateful to receive your comments thereon.

Thanking you in anticipation.

Yours faithfully,




MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct Dialling) 01-218 [REDACTED]

(Switchboard) 01-218 9000

Dear [REDACTED],

As you know, OSI has completed a report on the landing of a craft of unknown origin crewed by several entities near RAF Bentwaters on the night of December 29/30 1980.

Interestingly, OSI reports that the entities were approximately 1½ metres tall, wore what appeared to be nylon-coated pressure suits, but no helmets. Conditions on the night were misty, giving the appearance that the entities were hovering above ground level.

Tape recordings were made on which the entities are heard to speak in an electronically synthesized version of English, with a strong American accent. Similar transmissions intercepted irregularly by NSA since 1975. (See attached - Flag A)

According to OSI, entities had claw-like hands with three digits and an opposable thumb.

Despite original reports (Flags B - G), OSI said the craft was not damaged but landed deliberately as part of a series of visits to SAC bases in USA and Europe. Reports that craft was repaired by US servicemen or was taken on to the base are not confirmed by OSI.

Landing is not considered a defence issue in view of the overt peaceful nature of the contact, but investigations by DS8 are to be continued on [REDACTED] authority. Precautionary plan for counter-information at a local level involving [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] [REDACTED], is strongly recommended.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]

The sole interest of the Ministry of Defence in reported sightings of Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOs) is to establish whether they have any bearing on the defence of the country.

There is no organization in the Ministry of Defence appointed solely for the purpose of studying UFOs, and no staff are employed on the subject full time. The reports we receive, which we are grateful for, are referred to the staff in the Department who are responsible for the air defence of the United Kingdom, and they examine the reports as part of their normal duties.

Since our interest in UFOs is limited to possible defence implications we have not carried out a study into the scientific significance of these phenomena. Unless there are defence implications we do not attempt to identify sightings and we cannot inform observers of the probable identity of the object seen. The Department could not justify the expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond the pure defence interests.

We have to recognize that there are many strange things to be seen in the sky, but we believe there are adequate explanations for them. They may be satellite debris re-entering the earth atmosphere, ball lightning, unusual cloud formations, meteorological balloons, aircraft lights, aircraft at unusual angles or many other things. There is certainly no evidence that alien spacecraft have landed on the planet. Although we have not carried out our own studies, we are aware of independent studies into the UFOs, notably by the University of Colorado published in 1969. This concluded that 90% of all UFOs reported could be plausibly related to ordinary phenomena.

Hansard Extract

13 March 1984

Cols 132 & 133

Unidentified Flying Objects

Sir Patrick Wall asked the Secretary of State for Defence (1) how many alleged landings by unidentified flying objects have been made in 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983, respectively; and how many have been investigated by his Department's personnel;

(2) how many unexplained sightings there have been in 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983, respectively; and which of these had been traced by radar and with what result.

Mr. Lee [*pursuant to his reply, 9 March 1984, c. 728*]:
For the years in question, the Ministry of Defence received the following numbers of reports of sightings of flying objects which the observer could not identify: 350, 600, 250, and 390. Reports of alleged landings are not separately identified. The Department was satisfied that none of these reports was of any defence significance and, in such cases, does not maintain records of the extent of its investigations.