


# JUST



# CAUSE

Address:

CAUS  
P.O.Box 218  
Coventry, Ct. 06238  
Rates: \$15 US, \$20 Foreign

Publisher: Lawrence Fawcett  
Editor: Barry Greenwood

NUMBER 37

Citizens Against UFO Secrecy

September 1993

## LOST BLUE BOOK RECORDS SURFACE

CAUS has recently acquired a large assembly of Project Blue Book information not presently included in the National Archives holdings. Central to this are thirty-two rolls of microfilm of the Air Force's 1952 clipping service, a product of the upgrading of Blue Book activities by Captain Edward Ruppelt, former head of the project in 1952. An assortment of other rolls of film and hardcopy relating to Project Sign (a predecessor to Blue Book) and the 1960s Condon Committee round out the holding.

We are indebted to Professor Herbert Strentz, a former research associate with the University of Colorado's Condon Committee, for making the information available.

The story behind the acquisition is that sometime during the summer of 1967 Strentz paid a visit to Project Blue Book headquarters at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, along with either Condon staffers Norman Levine, Roy Craig or David Saunders (he could not remember which at this late date). During a meeting with Colonel Hector Quintanilla, then head of Blue Book, it was discovered that Blue Book personnel were in the process of house cleaning and throwing out some "unnecessary material." Quintanilla asked the Colorado staffers if they wanted any of it. They asked Strentz, who said yes since at the time he was engaged in research on UFO press coverage for his doctoral dissertation. This research was eventually published as "A Survey of Press Coverage of Unidentified Flying Objects, 1947-1966," circa 1970 (Arcturus Books, 1982).

Saved from oblivion by Strentz were thirty-two rolls of 35mm film of the April to September 1952 press clipping coverage; two rolls of public letters reacting to the April 7, 1952 Life magazine article, "Have We Visitors from Outer Space?;" reels 1,7,8,9 of Project Sign summaries (microfilm produced by the Air Force for circulation to scientists for analysis and comment). These summaries cover cases 1-72, then 172-237 in the Sign records. They have not been sanitized as far as we can tell; two rolls titled "Varied UFO, First Part" and "1965 El Toro." These rolls appear to have been prepared for the Condon Committee and deal with high-interest cases of the 1950s-60s. The "El Toro" reference concerns the famous Rex Heflin photo from Santa Ana, California; one roll of what seems to be a newsreel film titled "Camera Headlines" by Telenews. The film is a 35mm negative showing what appears to be Air Force officers entering a

plane carrying a box. The scene then switches to outside shots while the plane is in flight. Nothing overtly peculiar is visible.

After weeding out a few other duplicate rolls, we have about 32,000 pages of 1952 UFO press coverage and 8,000 pages of other records from the early years of UFO history. The material should have been part of the National Archives UFO holdings had it not become separated in 1967. Thanks to Professor Strentz' foresight it is preserved for posterity.

In his book, *The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects* (Doubleday, 1956), Captain Edward Ruppelt described the clipping service several times:

Pgs.136-7: "Back in March (1952, Ed.), when it had become apparent that the press was reviving its interest in UFOs, I had suggested that Project Blue Book subscribe to a newspaper clipping service. Such a service could provide several things. First, it would show us exactly how much publicity the UFOs were getting and what was being said, and it would give us the feel of the situation. Then it would also provide a lot of data for our files. In many cases the newspapers got reports that didn't go to the Air Force. Newspaper reporters rival any intelligence officer when it comes to digging up facts, and there was always the possibility that they would uncover and print something we'd missed. This was especially true in the few cases of hoaxes that always accompany UFO publicity. Last, it would provide us with material on which to base a study of the effect of newspaper publicity upon the number and type of UFO reports."

"Colonel Dunn liked the idea of the clipping service, and it went into effect soon after the first publicity had appeared. Every three or four days we would get an envelope full of clippings. In March the clipping service was sending the clippings to us in letter-sized envelopes. The envelopes were thin - maybe there would be a dozen or so clippings in each one. Then they began to get thicker and thicker, until the people who were doing the clipping switched to using manila envelopes. Then the manila envelopes began to get thicker and thicker. By May we were up to old shoe boxes. The majority of the newspaper stories in the shoe boxes were based on material that had come from ATIC."

Pg.139: "In June the big flap hit - they began to deliver clippings in big cardboard cartons."

The service was dropped, Ruppelt explained, because Blue Book ran out of room to keep them all. The clipping service then disappeared into history. Because the clips did not shift over to the National Archives with the Blue Book records in 1976, the originals were very likely destroyed, but before that the entire lot was transferred to microfilm as early as December 1952. We know this because the microfilm boxes bear a label "Develop Before December 1952." They were kept at Blue Book for the next fifteen years until their release to Strentz. For the record, this is how the boxes were labeled:

- |                                   |                         |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1) May June/24 July               | 8) 28 July              |
| 2) 19 June/ 15-23 Sept.           | 9) 29 July              |
| 3) 1-15 July                      | 10) 29-30 July          |
| 4) 16-19 July, Nash Fort. 19 July | 11) 29 July/ 14-15 Aug. |
| 5) 23-24 July                     | 12) 30 July             |
| 6) 25 July                        | 13) 30 July             |
| 7) 25-27 July/ 15-18 Sept.        | 14) 30-31 July          |

- |             |               |                     |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|
| 15) 31 July | 22) 6-7 Aug   | 29) 24-31 Aug       |
| 16) 31 July | 23) 7-8 Aug   | 30) mixed dates Aug |
| 17) Aug 52  | 24) 9 Aug     | 31) 2-13 Sept       |
| 18) 2 Aug   | 25) 8-19 Aug  | 32) 19 July         |
| 19) 2-3 Aug | 26) 10-12 Aug |                     |
| 20) 3-4 Aug | 27) 13-14 Aug |                     |
| 21) 5-6 Aug | 28) 23 Aug    |                     |

The Project Sign case summaries were notable as well due to the fact that CAUS had sought them for several years, getting nowhere even though we had microfilm numbers for the records. Now we know why they were unavailable -- some of the reels were given to Strentz, the rest may have been destroyed in simple house cleaning by the Air Force.

A bonus was included with the microfilm release. Professor Strentz also added another clipping collection, one of a group in the possession of the Condon Committee from a private collection, and used in Strentz' dissertation. This spread of 4,000 clips covers 1961-66.

Government UFO records are not found in large quantities anymore, particularly ones which had become separated from the owning agency. We continue to seek and unearth these early materials.

#### MORE ON PENTACLE

Due to the expanded article on the 1952 wave in our last issue, reaction to the Pentacle article in the March 1993 Just Cause has been held over until now.

Two reactions were especially noteworthy. One from Dr. Vallee is reproduced here:

27 April 1993

Dear Barry:

Thank you for sending me your thoughtful commentary about the Pentacle document. I do agree with you on one point: the significance of the memo comes, in part, from what it does not say. In particular, it makes no reference to any recovered UFO hardware, at Roswell or elsewhere, or to alien bodies. The greater significance of what it *does* say will slowly emerge in coming years as the overall implications come to light. Let me draw your attention to three specific points.

1. Project Twinkle and other observational efforts by the military, which you mention in an effort to show that Pentacle was only dusting off an old idea, were purely passive projects. In sharp contrast the Pentacle proposal goes far beyond anything mentioned before. It daringly states that "many different types of aerial activity should be *secretly and purposefully scheduled within the area* (my emphasis)." It is difficult to be more clear. We are not talking simply about setting up observing stations and cameras. We are talking about large-scale, covert simulation of UFO waves under military control.

2. The greatest implication, which is perhaps not obvious on first reading but which amounts to a scandal of major proportion in the eyes of any scientist, has to do with the outright manipulation of the Robertson panel. Here is a special meeting of the five most eminent scientists in the land, assembled by the government to discuss a matter of national security. Not only are they not made aware of all the data, but another group has already decided "what can and cannot be discussed (Pentacle's own words!)" when they meet. Dr. Hynek categorically stated to me that the panel was not briefed about the Pentacle proposals.

3. Revelation of this document may seem irrelevant to *Just Cause*, but its explosive nature wasn't lost on Battelle. As I noted in *Forbidden Science*, and as Fred Beckman vividly recalls to this day, the Project Stork team reacted with fury when Hynek went back to Battelle in 1967, demanding to know the truth. The man I have called Pentacle snatched his notes away and told him in no uncertain terms that the contents of the memo were not to be discussed, under any circumstances.

I find it odd that a group that claims to be interested in the historical study of our field, as *Just Cause* does, should fail to see the significance of the Pentacle Memo, which is an authentic document, when so much time, money and ink have been devoted over the last several years to an in-depth analysis of the MJ-12 papers, which were faked. Perhaps the Pentacle memo only proves that scientific studies of UFOs (and even their classified components) have been manipulated since the fifties. But it also suggests several avenues of research which are vital to the future of this field: why were Pentacle's proposals kept from the panel? Were his plans for a secret simulation of UFO waves implemented? If so, when, where and how? What was discovered as a result? Are these simulations still going on? I invite your group to turn its investigative resources and its analytical talent to this important task.

In reading *Forbidden Science*, you should recognize that the book is a Diary, not an analytical report or a memoir. Therefore many important inferences, many relevant details, can only be found by reading between the lines. Your preliminary analysis of the Pentacle memo is not unfair, but it is somewhat simplistic, and it takes it out of context. I invite you to go back for a second, closer reading.

cc: Fred Beckman

With best regards,  
Jacqueline Allie

The other pertinent letter on Pentacle was from a current staffer at Battelle Memorial Institute who desires anonymity at this time (name and address on file at CAUS). Since we have already extensively commented on the Pentacle matter in our March number, this extract of the Battelle staffer's letter will serve as an appropriate balance to Dr. Vallee's:

April 27, 1993:"I find the Pentacle letter very interesting from a historical point of view. However, I also agree with your assessment that it does not prove, as Vallee came to believe, there was a top secret project above Blue Book. There might have been, but this letter doesn't prove it nor does it prove Battelle's involvement in it. This letter was more likely a normal part of Battelle's efforts on behalf of Blue Book/ATIC. It shows a scientist, Howard Cross, approaching the UFO problem from a scientific perspective. He has some new ideas on how to approach the problem and is offering them up to the Air Force informally for consideration. I am sure if they had shown an interest he would have submitted a formal technical and cost proposal to them. The letter also shows the care that Battelle used in approaching the problem. He warns the Air Force that it is too early for the Robertson Panel to convene. He realized that there wasn't enough data available for the Panel to use to reach the conclusions being asked of it. Obviously, and unfortunately, his recommendation was ignored. Lastly it shows that Howard Cross was a true contract researcher. Since Battelle lives by selling research projects, there is a bit of salesman evident in the letter as well. All of this fits very well into the Blue Book project, including the date when it was written; Battelle was still under contract to assist the Air Force with Blue Book at that time."

"One correction needs to be made. The "Stork" project was not primarily directed to the UFO problem. The Battelle/Blue Book work was authorized by use of the "Stork" contract which had a much broader and mostly unrelated scope of work. "Stork" was not the name of the UFO part of the contract. Perhaps, and I don't know this for a fact, the "Bear" name mentioned by Ruppelt was the name for the UFO part of the contract." ("Bear" was a convenient nickname used to describe Battelle's activities on UFOs by Captain Ed Ruppelt in his 1956 book. There's no evidence that it was an official name of any kind in this regard. Ed.)

"I would like to correct another error that keeps showing up in the public discussion of the Battelle/Blue Book connection. Battelle is not a "think tank" in the same mold as the Rand Corporation. It is a research and development laboratory with all of the equipment, facilities and technical labor resources that this definition implies. Using the words "think tank" incorrectly describes the Battelle mission."

"Based on my review of the letter as you published it, I can say with 100% assurance that it is genuine. We do not have another MJ-12 controversy here. The "G-1579-4" number in the upper left hand corner is the project (accounting) number for the overall contract. The G number system is still in use at Battelle, a fact that would not have been known to an outside hoaxer (This system is soon to be changed.). Whatever the letter is, it is not a fake."

"....I would like to add one final comment. The research Battelle undertakes is done with integrity and an ethical regard for the confidentiality of its clients, both governmental and industrial (commercial). Battelle will not discuss with others the work it does for its clients. Because of this ethical approach to its work, including due regard to matters of national security, Battelle will

not respond to inquiries about Blue Book or any of its other work. I know for a fact that they will merely refer the requestor to the National Archives. This should not be seen as proof of cooperation in any sort of imagined cover up. It is part of the ethical tradition that has been part of the Battelle business philosophy since its founding in 1929. Coming out of the high-flying 80s, a lot of companies have lost sight of the value of ethics in business. Battelle did not lose sight of its ethical tradition and it is with pride that I can say that I work for such a company."

We would like to add a few of our own remarks to this exchange. The original article in the March Just Cause offered more mundane explanations for the key points discussed in the memo, including what was thought to be an entirely reasonable explanation as to why the aerial activity was to be scheduled in the given proposed test area. The point was to see if the equipment was adequate to the task (as well as the personnel) of being able to distinguish knowns (aircraft) from unknowns (UFOs?). Also, we agree with Dr. Vallee that there was a scandalous attempt to manipulate scientific data, but it appeared to be the other way around - the Robertson Panel trying to manipulate Battelle's information. How could the Robertson people expect to tackle a complex issue like flying saucers in a scant dozen hours, and get away with usurping Battelle's data only part way through their research? It would be easier to challenge the Robertson Panel's motivation on this than Battelle's.

By way of James Moseley, we have received a communication from Dr. Thornton Page, the last surviving Robertson Panel member. Page said in his note that he generally agreed with what CAUS had said about Pentacle and added that he thought he recalled seeing the document and liking its suggestion for the large scale monitoring.

CAUS has spent nearly twenty years trying to unearth everything related to government UFO activity. If we had found anything supporting Dr. Vallee's interpretation of the Pentacle memo, we would certainly concede the possibility that he was correct and not argue the point. However, the evidence is not there.

Dr. Vallee has suggested that we read between the lines when we review Pentacle. We prefer to read the lines themselves to extract authentic meaning.

#### EDITORIAL

Two matters at hand. We had alluded to changes in CAUS within the next year in our last issue. The economy is such at the moment that virtually all periodicals are feeling a monetary pinch by way of reduced numbers of subscribers. We generally don't advertise because it costs large amounts to advertise. Neither do we carry advertising because it is anathema for us to use our limited space for issues unrelated to our purpose. So we pretty much depend on the "grapevine" to let people know we exist. If there isn't a respectable increase in our numbers, we may be forced to go "exchange only" and let the UFO press give our news widespread coverage, as far as that goes. For sure we will be around for the foreseeable future, but we will not beg and plead for funds from a population hit upon endlessly to give what little they have. Instead, tell people we exist. If we have wide appeal then numbers will pick up. If we don't then we will have to keep our product among the special interests and little beyond.

Earlier this year newspapers carried headlines to the effect that "Scientific Illiteracy of U.S. Public Endangers Nation" (Birmingham, AL Post-Herald, 3-30-93). One long-time used book seller in Cambridge, Mass-

achusetts offered his stock of literature to institutions in the Boston area in a going-out-of-business action. No one would come to take advantage of the free offer so the entire stock of books was thrown into a dumpster for disposal (Boston Globe, 5-21-93). More recently still, basic literacy (reading, writing) is in question with about ninety million Americans, around forty percent of the entire population.

We have plowed this ground before in editorials. The fact is that there is a communications problem in relating the results of research into aerial anomalies to a population that is increasingly unaware, unwilling to learn, or unable to read or write with understanding. While a mad scramble exists to see whose theories on UFO reality will catch the fancy of the largest number of people, a very large percentage of them don't even fathom what is being put before them.

A major problem is the ever-growing unavailability of good information, both pro and con, through public institutes. As library budgets disappear through the floor and space to store books vanishes (how does space vanish?), only a select number of items on particular topics are kept. At the moment, aside from abductions, there is little interest in the history of the UFO controversy. Libraries don't keep things that do not circulate so that when one wishes to find a good book on UFOs from the 1950s or 60s, they will be lucky to find one. It is then left to the tight-budgeted UFO organizations to provide the historical background. Depending on the philosophical bend of the organization, a very slanted education can often be expected.

There are a few attempts to make serious scientific UFO collections available at colleges and universities, but few are given much attention by the UFO community, too embroiled in reenacting assorted miniature versions of the Bosnian civil war in their case presentations.

One collection at Columbia University in New York City is a set of donated files of Dr. Leon Davidson, containing many rare books, newsletters and an impressive assortment of scrapbooks from the early years of UFO research. It is not an actively supplemented collection however, and it is only partially what one might consider to be scientifically oriented.

Another academic collection on UFOs is building at Ohio State University, through the efforts of William Jones. Any use of or contributions to this collection should be directed to Mr. Jones at Box 162, 5837 Karric Square Drive, Dublin, Ohio 43017.

A third collection, continuously updated and focused upon the serious, scientific aspects of UFO research, is the Onondaga Community College UFO collection in Syracuse, New York. The collection's founder, Steve Zalewski, has been building it since the 1970s. Depending upon donations and an almost non-existent budget, the collection may well be the largest of the academic collections with many rare and unusual items. Contact Zalewski at: 409 Milton Ave. #5, Syracuse, N.Y. 13204 for information and visiting hours.

We would appreciate hearing about other academic UFO collections. It is ironic that in such an information age as we now see, it is conceivable that portions of UFO history could be lost forever because of neglect. Preservation of the body of UFO literature will have serious impact on several areas of hard scientific research including the histories of meteorology and meteoritics. For example, CAUS had continuously located reports of fireballs and bolides among the reports of "flying saucers" in small newspapers and journals across the country.

Support these efforts for the sake of knowledge overcoming mediocrity. Many UFO researchers have large collections of books and other ephemera that for one reason or another are no longer of interest to them. Rather than scraping the information for landfill, send them to one of the building collections.

# UNIDENTIFIED PHENOMENON

## North Atlantic Ocean


s.s. *Osaka Bay*. Captain R. Moore. Cape Town to Southampton. Observers, the Master, Mr D. M. Illingworth, 2nd Officer and Mr T. Smullen.

22 June 1976. At 2113 GMT a pale orange glow was seen to be coming from behind a bank of towering cumulus to the west.


At 2115 a ghostly white disc, see sketches, was observed at an approximate altitude of  $10^\circ$  and bearing  $290^\circ$ . The glow from behind the cloud persisted.

At 2125 the disc had grown to such an extent that the lower limb was touching the horizon and the upper limb had reached an altitude of  $24^\circ 30'$ ; the altitude of the upper limb did not increase any further as the lower limb sank below the horizon. The outer edges were brighter now so giving the appearance of a well-defined globe rather than a disc. Stars were visible through the disc at all times.


By 2130 half of the enlarged disc was below the horizon although its upper limb




2115 GMT




2120 GMT



2125 GMT



2130 GMT



2135 GMT

was still at an altitude of  $24^\circ 30'$ . The light from behind the cloud was becoming elongated, like a searchlight beam, as the disc sank. This beam of light had grown with the disc.

At 2135, the well-defined edges of the disc had become much fainter but the beam of light maintained its brilliance. The cumulus cloud had by this time gone.

By 2140 the disc had disappeared completely but the beam of light was visible for a further five minutes before it too lost its brightness and disappeared. The western sky maintained a brightness, as it does after the moon has set, for another ten minutes.

Weather conditions at the time were as follows: dry bulb  $20.2^\circ\text{C}$ , wet bulb  $19.0^\circ\text{C}$ , barometer reading 1018.0 mb, rising slowly, wind  $020^\circ$  20 knots, a thin complete covering of cirrostratus cloud was evident at twilight but no cloud apart from the cumulus could be seen at the time of the observation, a slight haze prevailed, visibility was about 12 n. mile. Sunset that evening was at 1956 GMT.

Position of ship at 2115:  $24^\circ 25'N$ ,  $17^\circ 09'W$ .

Extract from the Marine Observer  
April 1977

## EXPANDING BALL OF LIGHT PHENOMENA

In our next issue we plan to do a more extensive treatment of the expanding ball of light phenomena, reports of which have become increasingly apparent in our various historical searches. The EBOLs, as we will call them, are a curiosity and have become the subject of a few high-profile news stories. And the phenomena has turned up in newly-seen government records, to our surprise.

## UPDATE ON THE MENDEZ STORY

The FBI recently responded to an appeal CAUS had filed, regarding the non-release of withheld records on the Simone Mendez interrogations of 1982. We had presented a two-part story on the Mendez case in the June and September 1991 issues of *Just Cause*.

The FBI re-released a copy of one document already given to us in one of the previous file releases, and advised us that any further appeals should be directed to the Air Force. Since the FBI does not admit to having a copy of the original document that created problems for Mendez, and since the Air Force Office of Special Investigations has denied having a copy of the document, we are caught between the proverbial rock and a hard place. We have to know where it is to get it. So the story seems destined to remain in that twilight zone of mystery UFO stories until someone in the government decides to rediscover the document and settle the issue.