

DATA-NET CONTROL

WB6RPL

624 Farley Street
Mountain View, Calif. 94040
(415) 967-6878

The "Data-Net Report" is the official newsletter of Data-Net; a group of radio amateurs seriously interested in the UFO problem. Membership is \$4.00 a year. The "Report" is published monthly by the control station, WB6RPL, Michel M. Jaffe. All rights reserved. No portion may be reproduced by anyone without prior written permission. Copyright © 1968.

WB6RPL - Controller
WA5ROX - Assistant Controller
J. J. Clark - Editor

DATA-NET REPORT NO. 24

January 1969

THE LEGALITY OF FLYING SAUCERS

A year or so ago DATA-NET printed what we anticipated would be the outcome of the Colorado project. Because we were absolutely correct we received several letters and one tape wondering how we had acquired this advance information. The answer is simple; from several members of the Colorado project! This, as far as WE are concerned, proves that the project was a wet farce.

However we must agree that Saunders and Levine deserved to be fired. Giving away confidential data and displaying disloyalty to your boss remains grounds for dismissal. The third party was dismissed for narcotics violation.

Because of the recently publicized findings of the Colorado project, which, in reading between the lines, are: "Flying saucers do not appear to come from outer space AND do not pose a threat to the security of the United States," (a NAND GATE).

We find it necessary to explain again where DATA-NET stands. Our position is simply this:

We do not advertize, publicize, write articles, books, etc. Our membership is less than 50. Our research is strictly for our benefit. We are not interested in impressing the public with anything. Consequently we have exclusive informers.

Examples: The two "major" UFO groups claim thousands of members but actually their memberships are only in the low hundreds, the rest being merely one-shot subscribers.....Dr. Condon once was denied a security clearance because of his communistic activities....."Dr." Daniel Fry bought his doctorate from St. Joe's college in England..... Prof. Adamski never was a prof. Adamski never lectured for "Understanding, Inc." because he insisted on a thousand dollar guarantee.....The Colorado project is still active.....One major U.S. research center working under government contract has partially succeeded in nullifying gravity (with rather drastic results; one man was killed!).... An American aircraft overdue 4 hours from a reconnaissance mission landed with almost a full tank of fuel. The pilot a babbling idiot.....The U.S. Government has gun camera film showing a flying saucer being chased and then hit by cannon fire!.....and so on.....

DATA-NET has secured enough information to prove that UFOs are indeed crossing our skies. We do not yet know from where....or why....or how. We keep an open mind on all aspects and recognize that as yet nothing has been proven completely impossible.

Including lifting oneself by his bootstrap. We would not be too chagrined if we discovered that flying saucers actually did not come from outer space, but came from, say.....Transylvania, which although the name has changed, is still very real. Nor would we be severely shocked or panicked if we finally found that they (UFOs) did indeed come from some other area in space. But, assuming that these objects are intelligently controlled vehicles and assuming further that they come from some other area in space (outer or inner); we encounter the reasons. How would we react if: "they" are here to help us? (Our space brothers).....don't care either way? (Our space half-brothers).....intend to enslave us? (Our space wives).....or they raised hell someplace else and blame us? (Our space sisters).....or, lastley, are they trying to help us without our knowledge? Help us get rid of diseases, provide food for all, separate the wariants and keep us quietly content; similar to the farmer caring for his chickens? For a similar reason? Have they been "helping" for quite some time and the few who are cognisant of it can't do a damn thing about it? What then...OM? What then,..OL?

DATA-NET members are all technically inclined. The TRUE scientific inquirer who drops a collar button will search every inch of the room and then if he doesn't find what he is looking for will look in another room knowing that the button could have rolled there. While we get cross-eyed staring at the fly on our nose, let's not be blinded to the idea that it could be motorized. Getting irritated at the Colorado project for doing the job it was paid to do is somewhat ridiculous is it not?

In our two years of concentrated research we have learned many lessons. Such as: the majority of reports from South America are worthlessly generated trash manufactured for the gullibles. We have the same situation here with magazine articles generated monthly as "true" but when I wrote questioning one, the author answered that any intelligent reader should know that the article was a work of fiction; called "true" only for glamour in the same sense as for instance, "SHE"!

Some of our investigators wrote to a few "witnesses" mentioned in SAGA and other magazines and books. The letters were returned "unknown". Some of the garbage uncovered disclosed towns and police officers that did not exist. Authors checked on include Adamski, Menger, Steiger, Writenour, Fuller, Keel, Wilkins, Erskine and some jackass named (?) Malcolm Kent, who starts his book by telling the reader what a great author he (Kent) is!

PHOTOGRAPHS

DATA-NET has studied several thousand printed photographs. The classics were acquired and analyzed minutely. Although we admit that photos of UFOs exist, we could not locate any that were of value; including photos of gas (swamp and the other kind), blurs, spots and creases, whether genuine or not, prove and tell nothing. We could not locate any pictures that gave any details such as: a porthole, air insignia, rivet, loose nut, tight screw, light or hub cap, etc.....

Some of the photos which appeared in print and were for a long time considered valid were found by DATA-NET to be so crude as to be laughable. One, which for a time was accepted by NICAP as genuine, showed a cloud formation with a rough line hand drawn around it! This one had come from Japan! Yet photographs showing the results of close proximity with UFOs appear to be numerous. Items such as "saucer nests," "broken trees," "sliced trees," "damaged billboards, houses and cars," and dead horses.

DATA-NET acknowledges that some UFOs could be lightning, balls or otherwise, but cannot accept the publicized verdict on Snippy and the two other horses.

At this point we should perhaps explain that through some unusual circumstances we were able to acquire on temporary loan several color close-ups of "Snippy." The pictures were hand carried from Eastman Kodak in Palo Alto. Because of the nature of the subject we had to give our oath of secrecy.

Although Paul Cerny of NICAP was invited to join us in our analysis he was unable to attend on that date.

We acknowledge that lightning can do many unusual things, and so can tornadoes and hurricanes, but from what we saw done to Snippy and the others we would rather believe some ONE did these animals in; rather than lightning!!

THE MEN IN BLACK

Mr. Al K. Bender was one of the first UFO researchers. It appears that at one time he had quite a group situated, similar to D-N, all over the world. He was then a sincere researcher. Then suddenly, for as yet unclear reasons, he decided to chuck the whole thing. Possibly he became tired of it, or perhaps he got frustrated with his lack of solutions. Because he did not know what to tell his close associates, he explained that he had been shut up by 3 men....dressed in black. There the story started. Bender's book, "FLYING SAUCERS AND THE THREE MEN" is supposedly an autobiography. The first part is, I think, extremely interesting and entertaining. It explains about Bender and how he got started in flying saucer research, etc. However, when he gives his explanation for quitting, it is hogwash, trash and garbage. Others since have picked up the theme of sinister men in black and have kept it active up to today. In the same manner that Adamski-type saucer photos keep cropping up. Including some badly made film for sale by Menger. Some try a little imagination of their own like the VILLA still set. So successful that two other sets were made. (We understand that a fourth set is now being readied.) All of them as phony as the men in black. We acknowledge that at one time or another UFO researchers may be monitored by the CIA, FBI, IRS, (pick one), for obvious reasons, with which we agree. DATA-NET investigators have never suffered any harrassment or threats from sinister looking morbid men dressed in black (or gay fellows dressed in pink!). Most of us will admit that many times bait was purposely added to the "report" inviting contact from these people if they actually existed. Nothing occurred.

Despite the disappointment in the Colorado project and despite the lack of any headway whatsoever by NICAP, supposedly the biggest civilian UFO research group, DATA-NET will continue operation, amassing data concerning UFOs and dumping UFO garbage.

* * * * *

DATA-NET gratefully acknowledges cooperation from UFOIC, Australia, and encourages its members to make contact with the Honorable Secretary, William E. Moser, J.P. 19 Hurlstone Ave., Hurlstone Park, Sydney N.S.W. 2193 Australia. Membership is only \$1.00 per year and appears well worth it.

* * * * *

From USSR 12-1968 (UFOIC). Soviet astronomers watched UFOs through a telescope on several occasions. One of the latest reports comes from Kazan, where they tracked an object, crescent shaped, 1,000-1,200 feet in diameter and travelling at about 10,000 miles per hour at a height of 30-65 miles. Another telescopic observation refers to a disc about 300 feet in diameter surrounded by three star-like objects.

* * * * *

From Mexico, 2-11-68 (UFOIC). A Guatemalan airliner piloted by Col. Alfredo Castaneta, narrowly missed a collision with a "F-S" over Oaxaca. Both the pilot and his co-pilot, Capt. Carlos Samayoa, veterans in commercial flying, said that the object seen from the cockpit was speeding at a terrific pace toward the plane and passed it at a distance of 66 feet. It was silvery in color, about 33 feet in diameter

and had a sort of red ball on top. The stewardess and several passengers also watched the "saucer" for about ten seconds. The airport at Mexico City excluded the possibility of a weather balloon or any other conventional aircraft being involved.

* * * * *

On January 5, 1969 I boarded a Mohawk turbo-prop from JFK to Binghamton. With me was Ernest Wheeler, Technician Supreme, LINK group. Aboard we met stewardess Becky Vanzo from the Bronx. A charming girl in a most welcome way. Both Ernie and I sat in the tail. After insuring that all her other passengers were comfortable and secure, Becky joined us at the back of the bus. I explained to this pretty girl that I was a nervous passenger, that although I enjoyed skysailing I did not like these big "metal birds!" Becky assured me that we were in good hands. That the pilot, Capt. Plfanger was known as Sky-King. Soon we were ready to take off and began to taxi. After we had taxied for what seemed 10 minutes, I was convinced this would indeed be a safe trip. We were obviously going to taxi our way to Binghamton!

In order to keep me comfortable, Becky kept us company most of the one hour trip. She explained that on one trip she and several passengers had noticed a strange bright red ball following the plane. The red light, "as big as a melon" was below the aircraft, just riding above the clouds. She went to "Sky-King" who explained that obviously it was a UFO. This was said lightly. On my return trip I kept my eye out for the object. Sure enough I spotted it, exactly as Becky had described it. Big as the sun. It was below us riding on top of the clouds and matching our speed perfectly. I took a color slide of it, knowing that it should come out perfectly. It did and is available to members on a loan. You all of course should have guessed it. A sun dog. A reflection of the sun on the clouds.

Before I knew it we were on our final approach. "Look," Becky said, "You can see the wheels coming down." I looked...."I'm...I'm becoming nervous again," I said.... nervously! Becky gently took my hands in hers. I became brave. "Sky-King" put us down so very gently that I suspected Becky had told on me. As we walked to the stairs I gave Becky a soft kiss on her cheek. "Oh...Oh...Oh," she said. "I'm going to tell your wife," Ernie said. "God it's cold!" I said.

* * * * *

The following first-hand information was received from a cooperating station who is a professional UFO investigator. One of the few real ones. We honor this persons request for anonymity and like our many other anonymous informers hope that this person will continue this sincere cooperation. The data was double checked and found to be accurate. DATA-NET gratefully acknowledges the initial contact and complete follow up by WA5RON:

The Lucci photos. First, let me tell you about young Lucci. The father is a civilian employee in the air national guard. He learned photography in the Navy and the kind of pictures that he has hanging in his office (his "best" photos) are pictures of the base commander boarding his airplane, and of scenery. I consider myself a rank amateur with my 35 mm. camera, but I have pictures every bit as good as the father's "best." The father and his wife were in England when the incident happened--and the boys had airmailed the pictures (at considerable expense for a family of modest means). The father said that when he saw them he himself was suspicious they might be a hoax. When he came back, he said he tried to duplicate the pictures, using a flash bulb inside a soup plate, etc., but without success. He admitted that the boys might be smarter than he was but he couldn't figure out how it was done if they were hoaxes. He was quite candid in admitting his own suspicions--and he did not go out of his way to defend his boys or to make sweeping statements in their defense. The father had never done any trick photography--and I believe this, since any camera buff

obviously sees the possibilities of hoax much more readily than he did.

IF the father is really a sort of hack photographer, and IF the photos are a hoax, the boys must have had to dream up the approach to be used themselves. How smart are the boys? Jim Lucci, now 19, struck me as not very bright. He is very quiet, NOT outgoing; brother John, now 21, is smarter, more outgoing. Jim, who took the picture, is much an introvert.

The father bought the camera for the older boy, John, and Jim had (at time of incident) only recently begun to get interested in photography.

IF the Lucci photos had been the traditional types -- a hub cap or garbage pail cover thrown into the air -- this I could imagine the boys were capable of pulling off. But anything that required more sophisticated knowledge of photography seemed unlikely to me, after I had spent some time with them. THIS PROVES NOTHING, because as the South Hill, Socorro and other UFO cases I've investigated show, you simply cannot assume that an honest-looking, simple-minded person is incapable of pulling off a UFO hoax -- altho, it does take more skill if a photo is involved.

If the Lucci boys were pretty much amateurs, one would expect them to take a number of UFO shots of a hoax in order to get some authentic looking ones. Yet we know that the film containing the two Lucci photos had 10 blank frames plus the two with the UFO photos. Is it conceivable that the boys would go to the trouble of setting up to make hoax photos (in their front yard for all to see) and then would shoot only two pictures -- and waste the last 10 frames? It doesn't seem to make sense.

It is possible, of course, that the boys had shot earlier a roll, of 12 exposures as an experiment to get some experience, that they went in and developed it first, before shooting the second roll which produced the two photos in question. BUT, if it is so easy to hoax such photos, they ought to have gotten two good frames out of the first roll of 12 attempts -- and then they would not need to shoot the second roll. (They could simply cut out the good frames from the first roll, destroy the others, and cook up some story as to how the other frames got lost.) IF, on the other hand, NONE of the UFO pictures in this hypothesized first roll turned out good, then they would realize that it was not going to be an easy matter. In such case, would they not then shoot all 12 frames of the next roll (the one that produced the two UFO pictures??)?

On the basis of this logic (which I admit is NOT foolproof), there is reason to question the hoax hypothesis.

Yet I admit that one can see what appears to be an illuminated hand and forearm in photo #2, and what appears to be a barely visible hand/arm in photo #1.

You write that you see Y-shaped lines in #2 as normal for a hand being held in that position and illuminated from the front. That was MY impression, until I tried to reproduce the photo with a plate using his camera, later my own. If you will study my photos carefully, you will see that the hands do not form such a Y-shaped line. BUT EVEN IF THEY DID, WE MUST ASSUME THAT THE CAMERA WAS FOCUSED AT INFINITY AND THE "SAUCER/PLATE" WAS IN CLOSE SO AS TO BE INTENTIONALLY OUT OF FOCUS. (I'm not sure Jim Lucci is smart enough to know this, but let us assume he is.) AT A DISTANCE OF 4-5 feet, with camera focused at infinity and the lens opened widest, for maximum de-focusing, YOU SIMPLY COULD NOT MAKE OUT ANY LINES IN A HUMAN HAND.

If we assume that the photo #2 was made with a plate and a human hand, how was it illuminated? Another party, perhaps, stood there with a flashlight and directed its beam at the saucer? Perhaps the cameraman himself (Jim Lucci), or the third young man present at the time -- Mike Grove? We must assume that the flashlight beam was sufficiently broad that the light illuminated the forearm as well as the saucer, right? But how then do we explain the horizontal appendages faintly visible just below the "plate?"

Well, perhaps these are caused by horizontal movement of the plate. But during such movement, the flashlight beam would also have to be directed to the left and to the right to illuminate the plate. But why, then, don't we see any evidence of the hand and forearm to the left and to the right?? IF there is enough spill light from

the flashlight to illuminate both plate and hand and arm for the main image -- why doesn't it also illuminate the hand/arm to the left-right when the plate is moved horizontally?

Let's go back now to photo #1. We must agree that the flashlight, or light source for #2, is from the front (roughly the direction of the camera). Now, where is the light source direction in #1? The same position as #2? If so, why don't we get spill-light illumination of the hand and forearm???

If you examine #1 carefully, you find that there is a faint illumination of the darkened object underneath the "UFO" visible along the left edge. But, if the light source was from the far left, why does the "UFO" appear to be illuminated from head-on rather than from the left?

If, however, the dark object in the foreground is really the tree which we know was in the foreground of the picture, then we can explain the faint illumination along the left. To the left of the photo is a white house (whose TV antenna is visible in the first photo). It is covered with white-painted aluminum siding, which, obviously, is a good reflector of light.

The full-moon light would be shining against this white siding and the moonlight reflected off this house would illuminate the tree from the left side of the picture -- precisely as we see.

Another interesting point. If you examine photo #1 and #2, you will see that the look-angle of the camera has been shifted -- perhaps 10 degrees -- to the right in the 2nd picture. If the "UFO" is "for-real", and not a house, and if it did move as the boys said, then there would be good reason to shift the look-angle of the camera -- as was done.

But if these are hoax photos -- involving elaborate positioning and lighting (elaborate for some young, simple-minded, not very experienced boys), would they think to shift the look-angle of the camera after having taken only one photo? Perhaps? If they had taken 4, 5 or 6 hoax photos in one position, then I might expect that someone could have suggested shifting the camera angle. But not for such a brief picture session.

I am anxious to find the truth -- if we can -- no matter what. If the Lucci photos are hoaxes, I would like to see them exposed as such. At the moment, I merely have my doubts and remain unconvinced that they positively are hoaxes. (If these photos did indeed show authentic pictures of a freak atmospheric phenomenon at the root of some UFO sightings, it would be a great pity to throw it out as a hoax.)

* * * * *

From K7YXP, 2-9-69. "I think the following is interesting but perhaps it's coincidental that these occurred about five hours apart in the same section of the country:"

Tucson Daily Citizen, 2-8-69. "LIGHT BULB" UFO SIGHTED NEAR NOGALES. Several residents in the Nogales area last night reported sighting an unidentified flying object that one Arizona Highway Patrolman described as "a great big light bulb hanging in the sky."

Callers told the AHP office in Nogales the object was visible about 8 miles northwest of Nogales from about 9 to 9:30 pm. Some said it could be seen from as far away as Bisbee.

One caller viewed the reddish amber object through a telescope and said it stood still about 10 minutes before disappearing over the western horizon.

Highway patrolmen reported the call to Davis-Monthan AFB flight service, where officials recorded it but were unable to explain the object.

* * * * *

Arizona Republic, 2-9-69, HUGE FIREBALL LIGHTS MEXICO. SUSPECTED METEOR ROCKS EARTH,

SCAPES VILLAGERS. Chihuahua, Mexico, UPI, -- A blinding blue-white fireball, believed to be a meteor, turned night into day across northern Mexico and the southwestern United States early yesterday, then pounded to earth like a bomb.

"The light was so brilliant we could see an ant walking on the floor," said Guillermo Asunsolo, a Chihuahua newspaper editor. "It was so bright we had to hide our eyes."

The light from the fireball was sighted for at least 1,000 miles along a line stretching from central Arizona deep into the superstition-ridden outlands of northern Mexico.

"The people, especially the people in the small villages, are very alarmed," Asunsolo said. "They say this is an announcement that the world will soon end."

Asunsolo and other witnesses in both countries indicated the suspected meteor thundered to earth in the almost impassable terrain of the Sierra Madre Mountains south of Chihuahua and north of Durango, Mexico.

"It was the brightest light since Halley's Comet in 1908," said Asunsolo, editor of the newspaper El Heraldo. He said he felt the impact when the fireball struck ground, and was "quite scared."

"We ran up to the roof and saw a very big round ball moving from south to north," he said before the object crashed. "It was not red, but an intense blue-white."

Reports from such mountain towns as Parral, Santa Barbara de Oro and Velle Allende said the Mexican residents saw the fireball and felt it pound to earth. Asunsolo said the impact created "a tremendous tremor" that shook the ground for hundreds of miles so hard that "some windows were broke."

But Dr. Ronald Schors, an astronomer with the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at Pasadena, Calif., who was visiting the McDonald Observatory at Fort Davis, Texas, said the fireball might have broken up and never landed. He said the tremors felt by residents might have been caused by a sonic boom created by the fireball streaking through the night sky.

"It was extremely bright," Schors said. "We had high clouds in the area, but it burned right through. It was much brighter than Halley's Comet."

Schors said it was "several times brighter than a full moon."

A spokesman for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory at Cambridge, Mass., said the fireball had characteristics of both a meteor and a satellite."

* * * * *

From KTYXP, 2-4-69. The Arizona Daily Star. UA SCIENTIST CHALLENGES UFO REPORT by Judy Tindall. A University of Arizona scientist criticized the recent Condon Committee report on unidentified flying objects financed by the U.S. Air Force as "the largest piece of bad advice on UFOs the Air Force has received to date."

Dr. James E. McDonald, senior physicist at the UA Institute of Atmospheric Physics, said that Dr. Edward U. Condon, a University of Colorado physicist who headed the two-year study, misconceived the UFO problem, tending to equate it with a lot of nutty people with nutty theories.

"He sets up the obvious straw men in the report, a group of about 20 cases that any serious investigator wouldn't have paid any attention to, and when he knocks them down, gets applauded for it," he said. "The obviously insignificant cases get top billing while he ignores several well-known cases. About a dozen cases he does cite, startlingly significant ones, remained completely unexplained."

The Feb. 1 issue of the "Saturday Review" magazine carries an article by Condon on the UFO study and a personality portrait of the investigator. The only UFO theory mentioned in their personality piece refers to a hypothetical planet with headquarters for extraterrestrial intelligence which someone asked him to comment on.

"The plant story is a typical example of the nuts who have been plaguing the Air Force and the scientific community for years, the crackpot fringe, and yet Condon turns to it as if that's the problem at hand," he said.

McDonald remarked that Condon apparently paid little attention to project members who were investigating the seemingly strong cases in favor of personally looking into crackpot cases.

Furthermore, the Air Force, which spent \$500,000 to have the investigation conducted

has led scientists into believing the finest USAF scientific talent came up with nothing on UFOs, he said. Dr. McDonald is convinced the best men have not studied the problem.

Next week the UA physicist will address the Symposium on Meteorological Observations and Instrumentation in Washington, D.C., and will strongly urge the scientific community not to take Condon's recommendation to drop all investigation of UFOs.

"This thing isn't over yet, and even I am surprised at the editorial comment and letters I've been getting on the Condon report," he said.

* * * * *

From W60RPL, 2-3-69. The Christian Science Monitor. UFOs ARE STILL AROUND, by Roscoe Drummond. Washington. It was hoped that the "scientific study of unidentified flying objects" undertaken by Dr. Edward U. Condon and his team at the University of Colorado, would be conclusive.

It isn't. It is inconclusive at significant points.

The massive, 1500-page report does offer a number of judgements:

That UFOs are not "spacecraft visiting the earth from another civilization."

That man should not expect to be visited by spaceships from other solar systems "in the next 10,000 years."

That any further study of UFOs will not "advance science" and that on the basis of present information there is no need for the government to sponsor further investigations.

Obviously the Colorado study is useful, welcome, impressive.

But it is inconclusive because while the report has identified many flying objects, it leaves unidentified many others.

It may be a valid finding that UFOs are not intelligently guided craft from distant space, but that does not prove that they are not unidentified flying objects.

I am no UFO buff, but I have become convinced that it is well to be skeptical of the UFO skeptics who have been so certain that they could all be explained away by swamp gas, or radar malfunctioning or hysterical witnesses. I have simply come to doubt those who are determined to cast all doubt on all UFO sightings.

I don't contend that UFOs are visits from extra-terrestrials. I simply argue that UFOs are UFOs -- unidentified flying objects, no more but certainly no less.

The Condon report provides credible explanations to many of the reported sightings which were investigated. But the fact remains that a substantial percentage of UFO sightings in the Condon report remain unexplained in terms of natural phenomena -- a percentage perhaps five to six times larger than the Air Force's own percentage of unexplained cases.

I find it hard to escape the conclusion that there are too many unexplained and presently unexplainable unidentified flying objects from too many credible and responsible witnesses to banish the subject from public concern.

It should not be banished and it seems clear that the Condon report does not erase the UFO question from the minds of many laymen and from the minds of a good number of scientists. Fifty of them recently joined with the responsible National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena in urging a congressional investigation of UFOs.

One thing which has caused me to be skeptical of the UFO skeptics is patronizing disdain by many scientists toward other scientists who interest themselves in UFOs. This bias against investigation of the unfamiliar on the part of the scientific community is so acute that the University of Colorado hesitated to undertake the UFO study until it became persuaded that there might be a way to fool the public into believing the investigation would be objective and to fool the scientific community into believing the team would be packed with unbelievers.

I quote from a memo which led to Colorado's final decision to go ahead:

"The trick would be," wrote the man who was later to be the study's project director, "to describe the project so that, to the public, it would appear a totally objective study but, to the scientific community, would present the image of a group of nonbelievers

trying their best to be objective but having an almost zero expectation of finding a saucer."

The tendency of the human mind has always been to believe it can't be done -- that the submarine wouldn't work, that heavier-than-air craft wouldn't fly.

Wonder what they thought about Jules Verne when 110 years ago he predicted that the time would come when three astronauts would take off from Florida for the moon. They probably said -- not in 10,000 years!

The opposite to all these negatives is nearest the truth. Anything good which man can conceive, he can do. And we can, I think, accept the expectation that the time will come when we will be able to look out from the stars.

* * * * *

From K5QFI. Houston Chronicle, 1-7-69 NO PROOF FLYING SAUCERS ALIEN. Washington (AP) A secret report on an Air Force financed investigation of flying saucers will say there is no scientific evidence to indicate that unidentified flying objects are spaceships from another world.

Informed sources told the Associated Press this will be the primary thrust of the closely-guarded report on a two-year study by a team of nongovernment scientists.

The sources said the report will not claim the study produced proof that UFOs are not manned surveillance craft from outer space. "You can't prove a negative," the sources said.

Neither, they said, will it question the possibility that intelligent life exists beyond the Earth. Instead, it will emphasize that the investigation uncovered no scientific evidence to support contentions by various individual scientists and private organizations that flying saucers are visitors from a distant planet.

The study, financed by a \$500,000 grant from the Air Force, was made by a team of scientists under the direction of Dr. Edward U. Condon of the University of Colorado.

Tight security has been imposed on the project from the start and authorities are still working hard to guard against leaks.

The 1000-page report has been turned over, at the Air Force's request, to a special appraisal committee of the National Academy of Sciences, which refuses to divulge any information, even the names of committee members.

Findings of the academy committee are to be attached to the report for simultaneous release by the Air Force, now tentatively scheduled for Friday.

It was learned that the only other copies of the report are locked in a basement at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Dr. Condon, 65, a physicist and a former chief of the U.S. Bureau of Standards, has repeatedly refused to talk about the findings of the project.

Asked in an interview last February whether the study had made him a believer or disbeliever in the theory that flying saucers are spacecraft from other planets, he replied:

"I'm now getting to be more one way than the other, but I'm not going to tell you what that way is."

Condon's project staff included a dozen astronomers, physicists and psychologists. He also enlisted the aid of outside consultants and contracted with private agencies for some research.

The Air Force commissioned Condon's study in the face of persistent criticism of its own UFO investigations, begun 20 years ago and still continuing.

Critics of the Air Force claim its studies are biased against the possibility that UFOs are manned surveillance craft from outer space and accuse it of withholding information that might prove the contention. The Air Force has vigorously denied both accusations. The upcoming report appears certain to prompt renewed controversy.

Last May, the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena, a private group

that gathers information on flying saucers, charged that the Condon study lacked impartiality. The organization said it had broken relations with the Condon group after what it called 17 months of cooperation.

That same month, Rep. J. Edward Roush, D-Ind., called for a congressional investigation of flying saucers, saying the Condon study was floundering in dissension.

He apparently referred to Condon's firing of two project scientists, Dr. David R. Saunders and Dr. Norman Levine. Condon accused the two of "incompetence."

The House Space and Astronautics Committee held a "seminar" on UFOs last July. Ground rules prohibited specific discussion of the Condon project, but Rep. William F. Ryan, D-N.Y., asked Dr. James E. McDonald, senior physicist at the University of Arizona's Institute of Atmospheric Physics, whether more study than the Colorado project was needed.

"Emphatically yes," the witness replied. "We need a broader base. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the National Science Foundation ought to support some universities to make studies of UFOs."

In announcing the Condon project in October, 1966, Air Force Secretary Harold Brown said the University of Colorado had been commissioned "to analyze phenomena associated with UFO sightings."

He added that the National Academy of Sciences review "will not be part of the investigation team, but will provide a further independent check on the scientific validity of the method of investigation."

* * * * *

We are attempting to get caught up with our reports. We hope to have the next one out within two weeks.

Until further notice WB6RPL will be calling CQ every Wednesday at 8:00 PM California time, 10:00 PM Texas time, on 7265.

If I forget to request more money and stamps; assume that I need it anyway.

The DATA-NET house is open to all members any time. Food, lodging, drinks, etc....

We need more members for more sources of data. We need to cover more areas.

Remember; as members you all have access to the DATA-NET library.

The DATA-NET reward for an authentic UFO photo is \$25.00. Please send unprocessed film along with as much pertinent data as possible.

KP4CH is on daily on 21.442. WB6RPL is on weekly on 7265 Wednesday evenings. Other stations willing to hold skeds please contact the controller or assistant controller (WA5RON, 224 Roberts Mall, Austin, Texas).

I will try to work faster,

73



Michel M. Jaffe
Control Station
DATA-NET