



Respectfully submitted,  
*Raymond E. Fowler*  
 Raymond E. Fowler  
 Chairman: NICAP Mass. Subcommittee

OK, now we're getting somewhere! A legible (nearly) copy of Ray's field report sketch, with the "\*" note which we can now pin to a just-readable comment on p.4. And we get this:

The object was first seen in the northeast and last seen in the north moving in an east to west flight pattern in a straight line with an elevation of about 10 deg above the tree-line.\*  
 \* NOTE - OFFICER'S RECORDED EAST - WEST MOVEMENT OF UFO ACTUALLY S[-] - NW BY THE COMPASS.

The NE-N motion exactly fits Bertrand's and Hunt's report forms. The refined compass directions (presumably SE-NW?) are qualitatively speaking the same, given some reasonable wiggle room. Maj Griffin's AF investigation report says the object disappeared to the SE (160 deg magnetic, indicating that Griffin used a compass on-site), but, as I said, evidence of confusion in his report between Muscarello's first sighting (M) and the later one with Bertrand-Hunt (MBH) may well explain this. Note that Griffin records that the object traversed an arc of 135 deg but doesn't give any heading direction (even whether this was L-R or R-L) so it could fit either the M sighting - R-L motion from NW to a bit S of E - or the MBH sighting - L-R motion from (say) SSE to NNW. This is all good (or we can make it *acceptable* - that Griffin could have cocked it up so badly in the first place is far from good!)

Then we get to Fuller's quotes of his interviews with Bertrand and Hunt. He never spoke to Muscarello until weeks later and doesn't give any details at all of what M said, just that it

“coincided almost exactly” with the accounts of B & H (p.189). But he does say one important thing here:

. . . the interview with him was strangely anticlimactic. The recorded tapes of Officer Bertrand, Officer Hunt, his mother, Officer Toland, Miss Fisset, so surrounded the incident in detail that Muscarello’s story was simply a total; but necessary confirmation . . .

This is something I hadn’t noticed before in my readings of Fuller: “the recorded tapes”. So when Fuller quotes from interviews with Bertrand or Hunt or Toland in his book – which he does often and at length – he is using *tape recordings*, not just memory or shorthand notes. This is hugely important for two reasons:

- 1) Those tapes or copies of them may still exist somewhere and could (should?) be sought out and preserved if at all possible (Mike, did any of Fuller’s recordings reach Wendy Connors?)
- 2) When we read the Officers’ words in Fuller’s book we can presumably rely on them to be verbatim.

This being so, I’m not so sure that we can load all of the blame for the confusion on very shoddy journalism by Fuller or some slip by less-involved, johnnie-come-lately Hunt.

Mike Swords suggests:

‘Muscarello is not confused as to exactly where he is, nor is Bertrand. But Hunt apparently is. He initially says to the USAF guy that the object disappeared to the SE. Somehow he has gotten turned exactly around, thinking that he is facing more or less south at the farm instead of north. Hunt repeats this error to someone else [a newspaper?] and adds in "towards Hampton and the ocean". Muscarello and Bertrand do not make this mistake.’

But Bertrand does “make this mistake”:

“And here’s another interesting thing,” Bertrand said. “Right after the thing disappeared toward Hampton, we waited, and that’s when we saw the B-47 going over . . . Anyway when we got back to the station and Scratch Toland told us about the hysterical man calling from the Hampton phone booth, Dave and I back-timed what happened and figured that the man made this call just about the time the craft had moved from us to Hampton.” (p.62-63)

And so does Toland, who was talking to Bertrand on the radio when Hunt showed up in time to see the object leaving:

“By the time Dave got there, the thing was just taking off over the field toward Hampton. And right after that I got the call from the telephone operator about the man in the phone booth at Hampton.” (p.71)

Bertrand again, with Hunt:

“You both were right where we are standing now?” I asked. We were still at the edge of the road looking down the field, next to the KEEP OUT sign.

“We were standing where we are now,” Hunt said.

“Dave was right by the car, and I jumped out to join him here [Bertrand had been in his patrol car making the call to Toland that Hunt overheard]. We decided to take off, but we

waited a few minutes, and then we saw it go off across the horizon. Towards Hampton.”  
(p.61)

Hunt:

“When the thing was leaving this area,” Hunt said, “it moved across the tops of those trees. And it stopped still twice. When it stopped the second time, there’s a house barely out there, you can barely see it I mean. it went from left to right across the horizon” (p.61)

To my mind, the only possible interpretation that makes sense now is this:

- This MBH sighting was actually a two-part sighting. That is, after the right-left traverse of the trees the object vanished as described, but then came back again, going left –right and down to Hampton.
- For some reason the report forms compiled for Ray are incomplete and only describe “part one”.
- And for some reason the various bearing and heading quotes given by Fuller relate only to “part two”.

This would fit the last two quotes. When Bertrand said “We [he and Hunt] decided to take off, but waited a few minutes, and then we saw it go off across the horizon towards Hampton” this might well imply that this is after the main event is over – else why would they think about leaving, and why would they “wait”? Again, when Hunt describes the recession towards Hampton he qualifies this with “when the thing was leaving this area”.

But if this is right, it’s very unsatisfactory that nobody ever makes this very basic fact explicit in any quoted statement that I can find. Neither is it easy to understand how people like Fuller, and Fowler – standing there with the witnesses reconstructing the event compass in hand – managed not to realise that this is what happened and say “Er, hang on, guys, what about the rest of it?” when handed the half-finished report forms etc.

So, this still isn’t sewn up tight, not to my mind. Any other ideas?

Martin