



(c) crown copyright

UNCLASSIFIED
RESTRICTED/UNCLASSIFIED

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

MOD Form 329D
(Revised 8/00)
PPQ = 100

Date opened (Date of first enclosure)

30/7/04

Registered file reference

D/DAS/64/3

Part No.

AC

1. Attention is drawn to the notes on the inside flap.

2. Enter notes of related files on page 2 of this jacket

DIVISION/ESTABLISHMENT/UNIT/BRANCH

MOD LONDON

[FULL ADDRESS & TELEPHONE NUMBER]

SUBJECT

UFO'S

PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE AND
QUESTS
~~REPORTS~~ FOR INFORMATION.

[BLOCK CAPITALS]

RECORD OF KEYWORDS:

CLOSED

SEE PHOT

AD

17/03/05
(2014)

FOR DRO USE ONLY

1st Review date

2nd Review date

PA ACTION

(MOD Form 262F
must be completed at
the time of file closure)



RCU001712965

TNT

RESTRICTED/UNCLASSIFIED
UNCLASSIFIED



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

37

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Peachtree City
Georgia 30269
USA

Your Reference:

Our Reference:
D/DAS/64/3
Date:
17 March 2005

Dear [REDACTED] 0

I am writing with reference to your e.mail that you sent to the Public Ministers Office on 9 January 2005 regarding UFOs. Sorry for the long delay in getting back to you.

This office is the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to 'UFOs.'

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity.

Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external military source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

The MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters to the question of existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date, the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

With regards to your comment on Area 51, that is a question for the US Government to answer, not the UK.

Also, you may wish to know that The National Archives have a website giving information about the records they hold and how to access them. This can be found on the internet at <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****



LOW FLYING/UDOS /E-MAIL

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To DAS (SEC)

TO Ref No 463 /2005

CC.

Date 11/1/05

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

Most correspondence involves some form of request for information – even if it is only a request for clarification of Government policy – and is therefore covered by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) from January 2005. In general, if you meet the deadline for responding to correspondence, and comply with any requests for information, there is no need to do anything differently as this will meet the requirements of the Act. However, if the correspondence requests information which is not already in the public domain, and which might need to be withheld, then you should treat it as a FOIA request, track it using the Access to Information toolkit, and comply with the separate FOI guidance from DG Info (see <http://aitportal/default.aspx> for details). However, the deadline for responding to correspondence will still apply. If you are in any doubt as to whether a piece of correspondence should be treated as an FOIA request, you should ask your FOI Focal Point or refer to the guidance produced by DG Info.

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB

t: [REDACTED]

f: [REDACTED]; DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_parl/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

F:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

09 January 2005 15:27
public@ministers.mod.uk
Please respond -

Hello, my name is [REDACTED]. I live in the the USA. The U.S. Government has a very negative and secret policy when it comes to UFOs and Extra Terrestrial life since the 1940's when they first started studying the subject.

It seems to me that the UK and many other world powers have followed the United States in the same way. Are new air craft being developed at places such as AREA 51 in the USA and secret facilities within the UK from reverse engineered alien technology?

I just simply find it impossible to believe that the USA and the UK by now do not know what these UFOs in our sky's are. You must know by now. Decades can't pass by with UFOs invading our nuclear missile facilities and we still don't know what they are and who is controlling them.

I would appreciate an honest, detailed written response from you. I think the year 2005 is the year for disclosure about the truth about UFOs and ETs. The truth must be let free!

[REDACTED]
Peachtree City, Georgia 30269
USA

Do you Yahoo!?
The all-new My Yahoo! - Get yours free!
<http://my.yahoo.com>



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

36

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Warminster
Wiltshire
[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

17 March 2005

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing with reference to your e.mail you sent to the Public Ministers Office on 10 January 2005. Sorry for the long delay in getting back to you.

This office is the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to 'UFOs.'

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity.

Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external military source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

Hence, the Ministry of Defence does not have any opinions as to what India's Government is researching on the subject of UFOs.

Hope this has been of help.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****



LOW FLYING UFOs /E-MAIL

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To DAS (SEC)
cc.

TO Ref No 510 /2005

Date 12/1/05

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

Most correspondence involves some form of request for information – even if it is only a request for clarification of Government policy – and is therefore covered by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) from January 2005. In general, if you meet the deadline for responding to correspondence, and comply with any requests for information, there is no need to do anything differently as this will meet the requirements of the Act. However, if the correspondence requests information which is not already in the public domain, and which might need to be withheld, then you should treat it as a FOIA request, track it using the Access to Information toolkit, and comply with the separate FOI guidance from DG Info (see <http://aitportal/default.aspx> for details). However, the deadline for responding to correspondence will still apply. If you are in any doubt as to whether a piece of correspondence should be treated as an FOIA request, you should ask your FOI Focal Point or refer to the guidance produced by DG Info.

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB

t: [REDACTED]

f: [REDACTED]; DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_parl/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 January 2005 20:37
To: Ministers
Subject: Re: Grp:RE: India's research

Certainly,

Warminster
Wiltshire

Thank you for the prompt, if somewhat puzzling reply.

----- Original Message -----

From: Ministers
To: [REDACTED] n 40
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2005 9:23 AM
Subject: Grp:RE: India's research

Thank you for your email to public@ministers.mod.uk. For a reply from MOD, please re-send your message to public@ministers.mod.uk, together with your full postal address.

Many thanks,

MOD Ministerial Correspondence Unit
Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building,
Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 January 2005 02:51
To: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: India's research

To whom it may concern,

I "stumbled" across this paper.

<http://ebusiness.ada.gov.in/library/library/VymanikaShastra1.htm>

It would seem India is actively researching "unexplained" phenomena and the links with it's history.

Does the MOD have a stance or opinion on this ?

I know you get hundreds of emails about UFO's and the like, but this really is a little more than a local person reporting a white light in the sky.

Any response (even if it's a "don't be stupid" !) would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,

11/01/2005



No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG Anti-Virus.

Version: 7.0.300 / Virus Database: 265.6.9 - Release Date: 06/01/2005



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

35 ✓

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Winkleigh
Devon
[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

25 February 2005

Dear [REDACTED] 0

Have just received your message off of our answerphone.

Sorry for the misunderstanding with the spelling of your name and the name of your farm, can be quite difficult to understand the machine.

Also, with the date you saw the 'UFO'. There were nine other reports on the date of your sighting, 20 February 2005. There were three from Somerset, one from Wiltshire, Dorset, Devon, Leicestershire, London and Cardiff. We are satisfied that there is no corroborating evidence to suggest that the United Kingdom's airspace was breached by unauthorised aircraft.

As mentioned before, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us.

Hope this has been of help.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

34

I am writing concerning your message of 7 February to the Ministry of Defence in the United Kingdom, concerning Unidentified Flying Objects. Your message has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the MOD for correspondence about UFOs.

In your message you thank us for the documents about UFO activity in England, but we are not aware that we have sent any information to you. It would be helpful if you could clarify what information you are referring to.

In the meantime, it might be helpful if I explain that the MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena. The Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'UFOs' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

I hope this is helpful.

[REDACTED]
Ministry of Defence
London

e-mail:das-ufo-office@mod.uk

18th February 2005

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****



Low Flying / UFOs

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To DAS (LA) Rep

TO Ref No 1714 /2005

CC.

Date 17-2-04

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

Most correspondence involves some form of request for information – even if it is only a request for clarification of Government policy – and is therefore covered by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) from January 2005. In general, if you meet the deadline for responding to correspondence, and comply with any requests for information, there is no need to do anything differently as this will meet the requirements of the Act. However, if the correspondence requests information which is not already in the public domain, and which might need to be withheld, then you should treat it as a FOIA request, track it using the Access to Information toolkit, and comply with the separate FOI guidance from DG Info (see <http://aitportal/default.aspx> for details). However, the deadline for responding to correspondence will still apply. If you are in any doubt as to whether a piece of correspondence should be treated as an FOIA request, you should ask your FOI Focal Point or refer to the guidance produced by DG Info.

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence **will** be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB


t: [REDACTED]

f: [REDACTED]; DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_parl/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 February 2005 11:23
To: Ministers
Subject: RE: RE: From Russia

Russia, [REDACTED] RUFORS

From: [REDACTED] **On Behalf Of** Ministers
Sent: Monday, February 07, 2005 3:36 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Grp:RE: From Russia

Thank you for your email to public@ministers.mod.uk. For a reply from MOD, please re-send your message to public@ministers.mod.uk, together with your full postal address.

Many thanks,

MOD Ministerial Correspondence Unit
Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building,
Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 February 2005 10:24
To: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: From Russia
Importance: High

Thank you for you documents about UFO activity in England. Here in Russia we have a lot of military documents about UFO researching in Russian Army in 1980-1995. I attaché some samples.

Regards,

[REDACTED]
Director of Russian UFO Research Station (RUFORS)

425/1389

12.08.81

В. Ч. 82103

КОМАНДИРАМ ВОЙСКОВЫХ ЧАСТЕЙ
Только: КОМАНДИРУ ВОЙСКОВОЙ ЧАСТИ б. р. 10

Знаком Вас информационный лист результатов наблюдения аномальных атмосферных и космических явлений и их воздействия на окружающую среду, живые организмы и технические средства.

ИНФОРМАЦИОННЫЙ ЛИСТ

результатов наблюдения аномальных атмосферных и космических явлений (объектов) и их воздействия на окружающую среду, живые организмы и технические средства

1. Время наблюдения:

- 22 мая 1981 года, 00 часов 08 минут (время московское);
- время фиксировалось по часам.

2. Характер наблюдавшегося явления:

- наблюдалось два объекта;
- форма объектов не наблюдалась, т.к. небо было темное;
- оба объекта оставляли за собой длинный огненный шлейф.

За первым объектом шлейф был гораздо большего размера и шире, нежели за вторым;

- звуков, сопровождавших явление, не было;
- объекты следовали строго по горизонтали, просматривались по всей траектории. Скорость перемещения большая;
- изменений в форме шлейфов не было;
- явление длилось около минуты.

3. Оценка размеров наблюдавшихся объектов:

- явление наблюдалось возле 413 т/здания, перемещались объекты в юго-восточном направлении, размеры не наблюдались.

4. Координаты наблюдавшегося явления и пунктов наблюдения:
- пос. Голицино-2, Московской обл., Одинцовского района
5. Данные о регистрации техническими средствами:
- технические средства регистрации не применялись.
6. Воздействие на технические средства:
- не обнаружено.
7. Воздействие на людей и другие живые организмы и окружающую среду:
- явления на организмы не ощущались.
8. Методические и другие условия в период наблюдения:
- дальность не определялась;
- небо темное, звезды не наблюдались, незадолго до наблюдения прошел дождь;
- ветер отсутствовал;
- температура воздуха около 15°C;
- атмосферных явлений, сопутствующих аномальному явлению не было.

9. Данные о наблюдателе:

[redacted], старший инженер-испытатель 54 отдела
в/ч 32103-Б, 143040, Голицино-2, Московская область, Одинцовский район, пр. Мира, [redacted].

10. ВРИО начальника 106 отдела в/ч 32103 [redacted]
[redacted]

и/ч

НАЧАЛЬНИК ШТАБА ВОЙСКОВОЙ ЧАСТИ 32103
Генерал-майор

ИВАНОВ

инис. и сш. 106 отдела.
врио: и.р. [signature] - В.В. [signature]

Room old war office.
203

Defence Intelligence Language Service Translation

RUSSIA: EXAMPLES OF UFO RESEARCHING IN THE RUSSIAN ARMY

SOURCE: Document supplied by the director the Russian UFO Research Station (RUFORS)

To COMMANDERS OF MILITARY UNITS

To COMMANDER OF MILITARY UNITS action addressee only

I am issuing to you a list of the results of observations of anomalous atmospheric and space phenomena and the effects of them on the environment, living organisms and technical equipment.

INFORMATION LIST of the results of observations of anomalous atmospheric and space phenomena (objects) and the effects of them on the environment, living organisms and technical equipment

1. Time of observation:

- 22 May 1981, 00 hours 08 minutes (Moscow time);
- the time was recorded using a clock.

2. Nature of the observed phenomenon:

- two objects were seen;
- the shape of the objects could not be observed, since the sky was dark;
- the two objects left behind a long fiery trail. The trail of the first object was much larger and wider than that of the second;
- there was no sound with the phenomenon;
- the objects moved strictly horizontally, and could be seen along the whole of their path. The objects moved at a very fast speed;
- there was no change in the shape of the trail;
- the phenomenon lasted about a minute.

3. Estimation of the size of the objects:

- the phenomenon was observed near 413 technical building, the objects were moving in a south-easterly direction, the dimensions were not observed.

4. The co-ordinates of the observed phenomenon and observation points:

- housing estate Golytsino-2, Moscow Oblast, Odintsovo district

5. Information relating to recording with technical equipment:

- technical recording equipment was not used.

6. Effect on technical equipment:

- not detected.

7. Effect on people and other living organisms and on the environment:

- no effect experience on the organism.

8. Procedural and other conditions during the period of the observation:

- no range was determined;
- the sky was dark, no stars could be seen, it had rained shortly before the period of observation;
- there was no wind;
- the temperature was about 15° C;
- the anomalous phenomenon was not accompanied by any atmospheric phenomena.

9. Information about the observer:

[REDACTED] senior test engineer of department 54, military unit 32103-B, 143040, Golytsino-2, Moscow Oblast, Odintsovo district, prospekt Mira [Peace Avenue], [REDACTED]

10. Acting head of department 106, military unit 32103, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Chief of Staff of military unit 32103
Major-General Ivanov



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

33

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Holborn
London
[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:
D/DAS/64/3

Date:
10 February 2005

Dear [REDACTED]

I have just received your message from our answerphone.

This office is the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to 'UFO's.

Sorry for any distress that you are suffering, but in answer to your particular problem of your computer being stalked/hacked into, this is not a matter for this department. We deal with reports of 'UFO's being sighted to establish whether what was seen might have some kind of defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Thus, this is a matter for your company (if you work for a company), to sort out for you. Also, it could be a matter for the civil police to deal with.

Sorry, I could not have been more help.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED] 40

I am writing concerning your message of 2 February 2005, for which I have just received.

I can confirm that this Department has not, to date, received any report you may have made to West Midlands Police. The only communication we received was your e.mail message dated 24 January 2005 to public@ministers.mod.uk in which you talk about earlier e.mails. The e.mail address you used previously to this date (Dicbr-cgl@defence.mod.uk) is not known to this department and may be the reason that your messages have gone astray.

With regard to reports received between 3-8 September 2004, we received four reports, around that time, dated the 4, 5, 7 and 8 September 2004. Three of these were from Wales, and the fourth one was from East Hampshire. Three concerned lights seen in the sky, and the fourth was a black cylinder rectangle shape.

You mentioned the defence of UK airspace. The integrity of the UK's airspace in peacetime, is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Defence Region would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might be deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft). From that perspective, reports provided to us of 'UFO' sightings are examined, but consultation with air defence staff and others as necessary is considered only where there is sufficient evidence to suggest a breach of UK airspace. The vast majority of reports we receive are very sketchy and vague. Only a handful of reports in recent years have warranted further investigation and none revealed any evidence of a threat.

In your letter you also asked for details of the Department which investigates UFO sightings. This department is the focal point within the MOD for these issues. We know of no other Government Department or section within the Civil Aviation Authority which has any interest in these matters.

Finally, you refer to a "matter of a similar nature", which you want to speak to someone about confidentially. Our staff do not, and given our limited interest have no need to, visit members of the public who wish to report UFO sightings. As you are unwilling to tell us what this matter concerns, we are unable to assist you or comment further.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

✓

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 February 2005 13:33
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: Observation Letter

Importance: High

Dear [REDACTED]

I confirm I have received your letter of the 28 January 2005 this morning (2nd class post).

You mentioned a report from a different location was logged for the 5 September 2004 - please could you state if MY report was also logged with the MOD for that date, as I had contacted West Midlands Police (Enquiry Officer Tambling at Aston/Erdington Police Division) to report in some detail the observation in the afternoon/evening of 5 September 2004, but I did not receive any response to my report. Also, do you take into account in your assessment, any reports which were logged for say 2-3 days either side of a particular report, for example, 3 - 8 September 2004?

I am surprised that the MOD apparently is empowered to deal with unusual aerial activities only if there is evidence of a potential threat from an 'external military source'; why only 'military', when the MOD is responsible for the providing defensive protection from all types of threat in order to ensure the 'defence of the realm'? I realise that MOD staff are only following approved procedure, but there seems to be a measure of 'limited responsibility' - indeed you stated in your last e-mail 'limited interest' (see below).

Although you are the focal point for logging such reports, which department does provide an identification and investigative service for this type of incident - is it the Air Aeronautics Dept/Branch/Board, Royal Air Force, or the Civil Aviation Authority?

As well as this report, there is a further matter of a similar nature which I feel must speak to someone about confidentially. As you do not wish to send an official to visit my home address, I would be willing to attend an appropriate establishment for a meeting, with prior approval and at a mutually agreed time and place. I feel any greater detail sent by non-secure means i.e. e-mail, fax, post or telephone would be inappropriate.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED] Erdington, Birmingham, [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

>-- Original Message --

>Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 10:47:29 -0000

>From: [REDACTED]

>To: [REDACTED]

>Dear [REDACTED],

>Have just received your e.mail.

>Although this office is the focal point for 'UFO's, we do have a
>limited interest in this area. Unless a 'UFO' report has revealed such
>evidence of a potential threat, we do not attempt to identify the
>precise nature of each sighting reported to us. Thus, we do not send
>officials round to the home of the witness.
>We get many 'UFO' reports on our 'UFO' line, for which we log the
>calls, and then send out a response.

>Hope you have received my letter.

>Yours sincerely




Book yourself something to look forward to in 2005.
Cheap flights - <http://www.tiscali.co.uk/travel/flights/>
Bargain holidays - <http://www.tiscali.co.uk/travel/holidays/>

[REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 January 2005 16:27
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: RE:

Thank you for your e-mail.
I look forward to receiving your communication in the post very shortly.
I shall continue to keep any sensitive information confidential and secure, and look forward to meeting an official soon.

[REDACTED]
>--- Original Message ---

>Date: Mon, 31 Jan 2005 15:43:46 -0000

>From: [REDACTED]

>To: [REDACTED]

>

>

>Dear [REDACTED]

>

>

>

>I did not receive your e-mails of 21 and 24 September 2004, to this

>office, that is the focal point of 'UFO's, until last Tuesday 25

>January 2005, as your e-mails were forwarded to the wrong department.

>

>

>

>I have forwarded you a response, for which I sent today in the post,

>you should receive it very soon.

>

>

>

>Hope this will be of help.

>

>

>

>Yours sincerely

>

>

>

>

>

>

Book yourself something to look forward to in 2005.
Cheap flights - <http://www.tiscali.co.uk/travel/flights/>
Bargain holidays - <http://www.tiscali.co.uk/travel/holidays/>

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 February 2005 14:04
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: Observation matter

Importance: High

Dear [REDACTED]
Thank you for your reply.
The reason I cannot tell you precisely of the matter of a similar nature by e-mail, post or phone is because it is a sensitive and confidential matter concerning a further observation, viewed at a much lesser distance.

However, I am pleased that you confirm you have corroborative evidence of the observation I reported - a cylinder rectangle shape.

Incidentally, the e-mail address I used in September 2004 was provided on the Defence Intelligence Agency's internet website, underneath the contact name [REDACTED] the web page was last updated 15/9/04 (there are different contact details now). You have misread the e-mail address, it was
- dibcr-cgl@defence.mod.uk (not - Dicbr-cgl@defence.mod.uk).

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Erdington, Birmingham, [REDACTED]

Email addresses: [REDACTED]

<----->

>-- Original Message --

>Subject: Reply.

>Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 11:26:09 -0000

>From: [REDACTED]

>To: [REDACTED]

>

>Dear [REDACTED]

>

>I am writing concerning your message of 2 February 2005, for which I have just received.

>

>I can confirm that this Department has not, to date, received any report you may have made to West Midlands Police. The only communication we received was your e.mail message dated 24 January 2005 to public@ministers.mod.uk in which you talk about earlier e-mails. The e.mail address you used previously to this date (Dicbr-cgl@defence.mod.uk) is not known to this department and may be the reason that your messages have gone astray.

>

>With regard to reports received between 3-8 September 2004, we received four reports, around that time, dated the 4, 5, 7 and 8 September 2004. Three of these were from Wales, and the fourth one was from East Hampshire. Three concerned lights seen in the sky, and the fourth was a black cylinder rectangle shape.

>

>You mentioned the defence of UK airspace. The integrity of the UK's airspace in peacetime, is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Defence Region would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might be deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft).

>

>From that perspective, reports provided to us of 'UFO' sightings are examined, but consultation with air defence staff and others as

>necessary is considered only where there is sufficient evidence to
>suggest a breach of UK airspace. The vast majority of reports we
>receive are very sketchy and vague. Only a handful of reports in recent
>years have warranted further investigation and none revealed any
>evidence of a threat.

>
>In your letter you also asked for details of the Department which
>investigates UFO sightings. This department is the focal point within
>the MOD for these issues. We know of no other Government Department or
>section within the Civil Aviation Authority which has any interest in
>these matters.

>
>Finally, you refer to a "matter of a similar nature", which you want to
>speak to someone about confidentially. Our staff do not, and given our
>limited interest have no need to, visit members of the public who wish
>to report UFO sightings. As you are unwilling to tell us what this
>matter concerns, we are unable to assist you or comment further.

>Yours sincerely

>

>

=====

Book yourself something to look forward to in 2005.
Cheap flights - <http://www.tiscali.co.uk/travel/flights/>
Bargain holidays - <http://www.tiscali.co.uk/travel/holidays/>

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****



TO, 1037 + 80/05

Low Flying

/E-MAIL

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To DAS (LA) P+P
cc.

TO Ref No 1292 /2005

Date 4/2/05

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

Most correspondence involves some form of request for information – even if it is only a request for clarification of Government policy – and is therefore covered by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) from January 2005. In general, if you meet the deadline for responding to correspondence, and comply with any requests for information, there is no need to do anything differently as this will meet the requirements of the Act. However, if the correspondence requests information which is not already in the public domain, and which might need to be withheld, then you should treat it as a FOIA request, track it using the Access to Information toolkit, and comply with the separate FOI guidance from DG Info (see <http://aitportal/default.aspx> for details). However, the deadline for responding to correspondence will still apply. If you are in any doubt as to whether a piece of correspondence should be treated as an FOIA request, you should ask your FOI Focal Point or refer to the guidance produced by DG Info.

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB


t: [REDACTED]

f: [REDACTED] DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_parl/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

[REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 February 2005 13:33
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Observation Letter

Importance: High

Dear [REDACTED]
I confirm I have received your letter of the 28 January 2005 this morning (2nd class post).

You mentioned a report from a different location was logged for the 5 September 2004 - please could you state if MY report was also logged with the MOD for that date, as I had contacted West Midlands Police (Enquiry Officer Tambling at Aston/Erdington Police Division) to report in some detail the observation in the afternoon/evening of 5 September 2004, but I did not receive any response to my report.

Also, do you take into account in your assessment, any reports which were logged for say 2-3 days either side of a particular report, for example, 3 - 8 September 2004?

I am surprised that the MOD apparently is empowered to deal with unusual aerial activities only if there is evidence of a potential threat from an ?external military source?; why only ?military?, when the MOD is responsible for the providing defensive protection from all types of threat in order to ensure the 'defence of the realm'?

I realise that MOD staff are only following approved procedure, but there seems to a measure of 'limited responsibility' - indeed you stated in your last e-mail ?limited interest? (see below).

Although you are the focal point for logging such reports, which department does provide an identification and investigative service for this type of incident - is it the Air Aeronautics Dept/Branch/Board, Royal Air Force, or the Civil Aviation Authority?

As well as this report, there is a further matter of a similar nature which I feel must speak to someone about confidentially. As you do not wish to send an official to visit my home address, I would be willing to attend an appropriate establishment for a meeting, with prior approval and at a mutually agreed time and place. I feel any greater detail sent by non-secure means i.e. e-mail, fax, post or telephone would be inappropriate.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Erdington, Birmingham, [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

>-- Original Message --

>Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2005 10:47:29 -0000

>From: [REDACTED]

>To: [REDACTED]

>Dear [REDACTED]

>Have just received your e.mail.

>Although this office is the focal point for 'UFO's, we do have a
>limited interest in this area. Unless a 'UFO' report has revealed such
>evidence of a potential threat, we do not attempt to identify the
>precise nature of each sighting reported to us. Thus, we do not send
>officials round to the home of the witness.

>We get many 'UFO' reports on our 'UFO' line, for which we log the
>calls, and then send out a response.

>Hope you have received my letter.

(Dup of
e-mail
sent to
me)

>Your sincerely



Book yourself something to look forward to in 2005.
Cheap flights - <http://www.tiscali.co.uk/travel/flights/>
Bargain holidays - <http://www.tiscali.co.uk/travel/holidays/>



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

31

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
London

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

10 January 2005

Dear [REDACTED]

I have just received your letter dated 4 January 2005.

As from my last two previous letters dated the 18 and 25 October 2004, you will know the MOD's policy on UFO's and extraterrestrial lifeforms.

The integrity of the UK's airspace is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Defence Region would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might if deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft).


Only a handful of reports in recent years have warranted further investigation and none revealed any evidence of a threat.

Your comments have been noted, and your letter will be placed on our files.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]


M. O. D.
ROOM 6173, METROPOLIS.
BUILDING, NORTHUMBERLAND AVE.
LONDON
W.C. 2N 5BP.



4/1/05. ✓

Dear Sir or Madam,
I had a communication from a
Tau - Ceti commander said
through telepathy. That if he is
attacked or his ship is attacked
he will retaliate. He was
looking for the first cargo-star-
-ship, which was supposed to
be dropping containers for Sudan.
The commander said they lost
contact with them. He also said
if we do not attack him he will
go out of our solar system in peace.
End of communication. This could
mean something to one of your
departments. Thanking you for
your Kind attention

Yours ^YFaithfully





From: [REDACTED] 30
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]
e-mail	das-ufo-office@mod.uk	



Inverness



Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3

Date
7th January 2005

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your recent letter addressed to the Prime Minister, in which you enquired about the Government's policy regarding unidentified flying objects. Your letter has been passed to the Ministry of Defence and I have been asked to reply.

First I should explain that there is no Government Agency investigating UFO sightings. The Ministry of Defence has responsibility for defence of UK airspace and this Directorate is the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence about UFOs.

The integrity of the UK's airspace in peacetime is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Policing Area would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might if deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft). From that perspective, reports provided to us of 'UFO' sightings are examined, but consultation with air defence staff and others as necessary is considered only where there is sufficient evidence to suggest a breach of UK air space. Only a handful of reports in recent years have warranted further investigation and none revealed any evidence of a threat. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the UK from an external source, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

Finally, please be aware that the MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely,



**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

DAS
102No.
- 5 JAN 2005
FILE



UFOS

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To DAS Sec

TO Ref No 54/2004

cc.

Date 4-1-05

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

An 'Open Government Code of Practice on Access to Government Information' came into force in 1997. All replies to members of the public must be in accordance with the procedures set out in the Code. In particular, information can only be withheld if it falls within the scope of a particular exemption. However, some exemptions are subject to a 'public interest test', whereby the harm associated with disclosure must be weighed against the public interest in release. Applicants must be informed of any decision to apply an exemption and of their right to appeal against this decision by writing to D Info(Exp). A full explanation is contained in DCI(Gen) 232/01; further information is available from DG Info on [REDACTED]

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence. In addition, we are required to keep information on the number of **requests for information that specifically refer to the Code of Practice**.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB

t: [REDACTED]

f: [REDACTED] DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_parl/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Revised August 2004

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

Mod 3
~~Defence~~
Defence

INVERNESS

Dear Prime Minister,

I am writing to you in relation to the subject matter of UFO's. As a researcher in the field I have interviewed countless eye-witness, seen hours of video tape evidence that suggests the there is alien life forms visiting our planet. Of course I can only guess the reasons for visiting our planet, either for good or bad.

I really wanted to know the government's
stand point on UFO's and if there is a government agency looking into the subject.

Many thanks for your help in this matter, you have our families continued support & look forward to your quick response.

Yours

John Roberts


To

Andy Brink + Family

*Season's Greetings
And Best Wishes
For The New Year*

Happy CHRISTMAS,

Love, Mom



Family





From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]



Winscombe
North Somerset
[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

15 December 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter dated 13 December 2004.

I apologise for the misunderstanding with your name in my previous letter. Also, in your letter dated 26 November 2004, your post code was put down as BS23, hence, that is then what I put down, when posting the correspondence.

Thank you for your comments, they have been noted, and your letters will be placed on our files.

Yours sincerely



YOUR REF:- D/DAS/64/2.

Winccombe - N. Somerset.

13-12-04.

Directorate of Air Staff.

Thank you for your letter dated 10 December. I am pleased my notes arrived safely.

However, my surname is [REDACTED] and my Post Code is noted above.

Having served in H.M. FORCES from September 1940 to May 1946, and completed my Service with Royal Signals, you will understand my concern that my notes have reached your department.


Many thanks

Yours truly

DAS

14 DEC 2004

ARMY No. [REDACTED]



LEVEN

FIFE


2.12.04

Dear Sir/Madam

In 2002 I sent a video-Tape to RAF Leuchars in St Andrews. On the video were 1 image of three Satellites from Outer Space. I've been in touch with RAF Leuchars several times for the return of this video, and they told me that it had been sent to the UFO Center at the Ministry of Defence in London. I would very much be obliged if you were to return this video as soon as possible. I've been in touch with my MP and he says that that is theft and that I should get in touch with the Police. I've since done this and if you don't return the video, then I've to get back in touch with the Police. I have since moved Address (above). I used to live at [redacted] where I took these 1 image. Please return my video. Thank you
Yours sincerely

[redacted]

As discussed!



With Compliments of
Flight Lieutenant [REDACTED]
Air Historical Branch (RAF)
Building 266, Royal Air Force Bentley Priory
Stanmore. Middlesex. HA7 3HH
Tel: [REDACTED]

DAS
102No.
-1 DEC 2004
FILE _____



From: Flight Lieutenant [REDACTED]
Air Historical Branch 2 (RAF)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Building 266 RAF Bentley Priory Stanmore Middlesex HA7 3HH

Telephone (Direct dial) [REDACTED]
(Switchboard) 020 8838 7000
(Fax) [REDACTED]
(Military) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Chatto Heath
St Helens
[REDACTED]

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/AHB(RAF)8/1

Date
29 November 2004

Thank you for your letter of 23 November that has initially been passed to us for reply. In fact 2 separate departments within the Ministry of Defence deal with the queries you raise so I have forwarded a copy of your letter to each of them. You should hear from them both shortly.

With regard to your comment about the story connect with the crash of the Bolton Paul Defiant, it is possible that this is a rather distorted version of the arrival of Rudolf Hess in the United Kingdom. His aircraft crossed the English coast by Holy Island before turning north to fly through the Borders to Scotland.



✓
[REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
WHITEHALL
LONDON

St HELENS
MERSEYSIDE
[REDACTED]

23rd November 2004

TEL: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am currently undertaking a personal investigation into an incident that occurred during World War II in the Howfield Lane area in the borough of St Helens.

I looked into this particular story several years ago and was wondering if through the "right to public information" I may be able to obtain further confirmation.

The story that I have come across relates to a plot, by the Third Reich, to assassinate the King & Queen of England at the time. A double agent was working somewhere in government and was relaying information back to German H.Q. He was eventually captured, tried and hung for treason.

However my main interest lies in the fact that there may well be

P.70

the remains of a Rolls Royce, Merlin engine, embedded in the ground still, from a Bolton Paul Defiant night fighter which was involved in a dog fight with a Heinkel 109 sent to destroy a decoy train, unknown to Luftwaffe.

Several people whom I have been in contact with have actually confirmed that when they were a lot younger, they witnessed this incident and may be able to help me with the exact location of an engine that burrowed itself under tremendous force from the impact of it hitting the ground.

The Bolton Paul was scrambled from an airport near Southampton but unsure of which one.

I would, if it is possible, wish to attempt at locating and eventually excavating this engine, if it does still exist with the right equipment.

Therefore would the M.O.D be willing to help in any way or form to establish any facts.

Thankyou for your time and
look forward to your reply
Yours sincerely

FOUNDER - S^r J. HENS, ASTRONOMICAL SOCIETY.

UNLESS ITS NO WENDON NEAR S.A.S!
COLD ON 7-7 BALACLAVAS!

P.S.

REGARDING U.F.O's.

Frankly I'm a skeptic, with an open mind on this subject. Many hoaxes have been staged, and plenty of misidentified objects such as flocks of Geese, helicopters, the planet Venus and so on, including test vehicles.

However I do believe that life does exist elsewhere in our universe, it would be a hell of a waste of space if there wasn't any.

Are there any de-classified logs available to our society

Thankyou



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]
e-mail	das-ufo-office@mod.uk	

[REDACTED]
St Helens
Merseyside
[REDACTED]

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
14 December 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing concerning your letter of 23 November, which has been passed to this department by the Air Historical Branch as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence about 'unidentified flying objects'.

The MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

The Ministry of Defence has a limited interest in UFO reports, namely, whether they provide any evidence that UK airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

With regard to your question about whether there are any "de-classified logs available to your society", you may wish to be aware that UFO reports are not kept in logs, but filed on departmental files in the order in which they are received. All the information currently accessible to the public on UFOs is available at The National Archives, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Richmond, Surrey or on the Ministry of Defence Freedom of Information Publication Scheme at www.foi.mod.uk. We intend to add further material to the Publication Scheme in the near future.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]
e-mail	das-ufo-office@mod.uk	

[REDACTED]
Middlesborough
Cleveland
[REDACTED]

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
13th December 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing in reply to your e-mail concerning the novel you are writing about strange lights in the sky over the Cleveland Hills. Your letter has been passed to this Department as we are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence about unidentified flying objects.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

With regard to your questions about RAF Fylingdales and policing of UK airspace, you may wish to be aware that RAF Fylingdales is a space surveillance and early warning radar and plays no direct part in the defence of the UK as it is not designed to detect aircraft. Its primary role is to warn of ballistic missile attack against the UK and Continental US. Anything unusual that is detected creates an alert. There are no known instances of RAF Fylingdales detecting unusual objects that have not been resolved almost immediately as satellites or missiles.

In terms of Air Defence there are a number of air defence radars located around the UK that track airborne objects up to 100,000 feet, well above the operating height of all known aircraft. The data from these air defence radars is fed into an integrated command and control system which is manned 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The overall fused picture is observed by multiple operators at different locations in the UK with a maximum rank of Wing Commander or equivalent. As NATO is charged with the air defence of UK airspace in peacetime, the Combined Air Operations Centre (CAOC) Number 9 operators at RAF High Wycombe are the ultimate decision-makers in the command and control chain. CAOC 9 has assigned air defence fighters which are maintained on ground alert which can be scrambled by the CAOC Duty Controller to identify any suspicious airborne object within UK airspace. The scramble order would therefore be given from the CAOC through one of 2 Air Defence Control and Reporting Centres direct to

the Operations desk of the Squadron with the Quick Reaction Alert aircraft on ground alert. The aircraft can usually be airborne within 15 minutes. The actual location of the air defence fighters at readiness is privileged information although they are normally located at one or more of the Air Defence airfields along the East Coast. The callsigns of the actual quick alert fighters is privileged information but is usually a tactical callsign which comprises 2 letters and 1 number such as T4W 01. These callsigns are changed daily.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

From: [REDACTED] Wg Cdr
Sent: 10 December 2004 13:22
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: UFO Enquiry

[REDACTED] 40

Fylingdales is a space surveillance and early warning radar and plays no direct part in the air defence of the UK as it is not designed to detect aircraft. Its primary role is to warn of ballistic missile attack against the UK and Continental US. Anything unusual that is detected creates an alert. There are no known instances of RAF Fylingdales detecting unusual objects that have not been resolved almost immediately as satellites or missiles. There is therefore no point in answering the question with respect to Fylingdales.

In terms of Air Defence which I think your enquirer is really asking about we have a number of air defence radars located around the UK that track airborne objects up to 100,000ft well above the operating height of all known aircraft.

The data from these air defence radars is fed into an integrated command and control system which is manned 24/7.

The overall fused picture is observed by multiple operators at different location in the UK with a maximum rank level of Wg Cdr or equivalent.

As NATO is charged with the air defence of UK airspace in peacetime, the Combined Air Operations Centre Number (CAOC) 9 operators at RAF High Wycombe are the ultimate decision-makers in the command and control chain. CAOC 9 has assigned air defence fighters which are maintained on ground alert which can be scrambled by the CAOC Duty Controller to identify any suspicious airborne object within UK airspace. The scramble order would therefore be given from the CAOC through one of 2 Air Defence Control and Reporting Centres direct to the Operations desk of the Squadron with the Quick Reaction Alert aircraft on ground alert.

The aircraft can usually be airborne within 15 minutes.

The actual location of the air defence fighters at readiness is privileged information although they are normally located at one or more of the Air Defence airfields along the East Coast.

The aircraft are routinely held on ground alert.

The callsigns of the actual quick reaction alert fighters is privileged information but is usually a tactical callsign which comprises 2 letters and 1 number such as T4W 01. These callsigns are changed daily.

[REDACTED] n 40

SO1 Airspace Integrity

DCT&UK Ops

MB [REDACTED] Section 40

Internet account: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 December 2004 12:53
To: [REDACTED] Wg Cdr
Subject: UFO Enquiry

[REDACTED] ion 40

We have received an enquiry from someone writing a novel about strange lights in the sky over the Cleveland Hills. He said he wanted information about RAF Fylingdales and has asked a number of questions. I would be grateful for your help. I am not sure where Fylingdales fit in as far as the possibility of scrambling air defence aircraft, but maybe you could advise. His questions are as follows;

What would be the rank of an operator watching the radar screens?

10/12/2004

What would be the chain of command through which any unidentified object would be reported?

Once reported, how would aircraft be scrambled and how long would this usually take?

Where would aircraft be scrambled from or would they normally be on patrol and therefore called in?

What would be a typical call sign for military aircraft?

DAS-FOI

5-H-

Section 10

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****



Nuclear /E-MAIL
Issues

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To CBRN Pol
Nuclear Issues
cc.

TO Ref No 9507 /2004

Date 24. 11. 04

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

An 'Open Government Code of Practice on Access to Government Information' came into force in 1997. All replies to members of the public must be in accordance with the procedures set out in the Code. In particular, information can only be withheld if it falls within the scope of a particular exemption. However, some exemptions are subject to a 'public interest test', whereby the harm associated with disclosure must be weighed against the public interest in release. Applicants must be informed of any decision to apply an exemption and of their right to appeal against this decision by writing to D Info(Exp). A full explanation is contained in DCI(Gen) 232/01; further information is available from DG Info on [REDACTED]

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence. In addition, we are required to keep information on the number of requests for information that specifically refer to the Code of Practice.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB

t: [REDACTED]

f: [REDACTED]; DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_pari/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Revised August 2004

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 November 2004 11:20
To: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: RAF Fylingdales

[REDACTED]

Middlesbrough,
Cleveland,

[REDACTED]

.....

Dear Sir,

I am writing in the hope that you can provide me with some information about Fylingdales Early Warning Station.

I am a primary school teacher employed by Redcar and Cleveland and I am writing a novel for older children centred around the Cleveland Hills.

The idea I am developing includes the appearance of strange lights in the sky and the subsequent scramble of two aircraft to intercept them, and although I am able to develop my story around people and places, I have no information regarding how such an event would be dealt with.

I would therefore be grateful if you could briefly clarify any of the following points which would then add realism to my story.

22/11/2004

1. What would be the rank of an operator watching the radar screens?
2. What would be the chain of command through which any unidentified object would be reported?
3. Once reported, how would aircraft be scrambled and how long would this usually take?
4. Where would aircraft be scrambled from or would they normally be on patrol and therefore called in?
5. What would be a typical call sign for military aircraft?

I realise that with today's need for security you may be unable to provide me with some or all of this information. If this happens to be the case, then I thank you for your time in reading my letter.

Should you need to speak to me regarding my request I can be contacted at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] on [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]

Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

020 7218 2140
020 7218 9000

[REDACTED]
Leven
Fife
[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:
D/DAS/64/3

Date:
13 December 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

I have just received your letter dated 2 December 2004.


As to your question of not sending back a video tape that was sent to us in 2002, you sent this office a copy and kept the original, as you told us in your previous letter, and the reply back from [REDACTED], who worked here at the time, for which I have enclosed the previous correspondence with this letter.

We certainly have not committed theft, as the tape was promptly returned back to you. If it was lost in transit, or had been delivered to your old address, that was out of our hands.

I hope this information has settled this query.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]




UFO Centre

Ministry of Defence

D.A.S.

LONDON





[REDACTED]

From: DAS-UFO-Office
Sent: 01 December 2004 16:38
To: DAS-FOI
Subject: FW: Internet-authorised: UFOs

From: DAS-UFO-Office
Sent: 01 December 2004 12:50
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Internet-authorised: UFOs

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing concerning your message of 25 November to the MOD Ministerial Correspondence Unit regarding information about UFOs. Your message has been passed to this department as we are the focal point within the MOD for correspondence about UFOs.

First it might be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence has only a limited interest in reported sightings of 'UFOs'. Any reports we receive are examined solely to establish whether they provide any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat from an external source, and to date no UFO report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service.

With regard to the release of information, the MOD currently operates in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information (the Code). This means that information can be requested and will be released providing it does not fall under one of the exemptions of the Code. The Freedom of Information Act 2000 will come into force on 1 January 2005 when it will supersede the Code. If you wish to see information that has been released into the MOD Freedom of Information Publication Scheme please look at www.foi.mod.uk. A search for UFO will take you to the three UFO classes of information in the Scheme. We plan to put further classes into the Scheme in the near future.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely,


[REDACTED]
Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information
5th Floor, Zone H
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

E-Mail: das-ufo-office@mod.uk

1st December 2004

01/12/2004

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****



Low flying/UFOs /E-MAIL

To DAS (LA) Pop
CC.

TO Ref No 9833 /2004

Date 30th Nov 04

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

An 'Open Government Code of Practice on Access to Government Information' came into force in 1997. All replies to members of the public must be in accordance with the procedures set out in the Code. In particular, information can only be withheld if it falls within the scope of a particular exemption. However, some exemptions are subject to a 'public interest test', whereby the harm associated with disclosure must be weighed against the public interest in release. Applicants must be informed of any decision to apply an exemption and of their right to appeal against this decision by writing to D Info(Exp). A full explanation is contained in DCI(Gen) 232/01; further information is available from DG Info on [REDACTED]

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence. In addition, we are required to keep information on the number of **requests for information that specifically refer to the Code of Practice**.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB

t: [REDACTED]

f: [REDACTED] DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_pari/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****



[REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 November 2004 10:40
To: Ministers
Subject: Re: Grp:RE: U.F.O'S

Thankyou for your reply regarding information about UFO'S. Here is my postal address as requested. [REDACTED]ction 40
[REDACTED] South Shields, Tyne And Wear, [REDACTED] THANKYOU.

----- Original Message -----

From: Ministers
To: [REDACTED]n 40
Sent: Friday, November 26, 2004 8:56 AM
Subject: Grp:RE: U.F.O'S

Thank you for your email to public@ministers.mod.uk. For a reply from MOD, please re-send your message to public@ministers.mod.uk, together with your full postal address.

Many thanks,

MOD Ministerial Correspondence Unit
Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building,
Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 November 2004 18:30
To: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: U.F.O'S

I HAVE SEARCHED YOUR SITE LOOKING FOR ANY INFORMATION REGARDING U.F.O.'S. COULD YOU PLEASE POINT ME IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION, YOU MUST HAVE SOME INFORMATION UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT. MANY THANKS. STEPHEN.



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Douglas
Isle of Man
[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

1 December 2004

Dear [REDACTED] 0

Thank you for your letter dated 24 November 2004, plus your enclosed photograph. Hope you received my last letter, with regards to our policy on 'UFO's.

As to your question of the picture of the craft you sent to this office. I have enquired in my department as to what it could be, and I have been informed that it can be identified, and that it is an ATR 42 – twin propeller, Euromanx aeroplane.

We looked at the timetables for air traffic arriving and leaving the Isle of Man at Ronaldsway Airport, on the date you reported the 'UFO' and you may wish to know, that there were quite a few flights that day.

I hope this will be of help.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

DAS
102No.
30 Nov 2004
FILE ~~TREAT~~ OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE



Low flying/UFOs

To DAS (LA) P&P

TO Ref No 9825 /2004

cc.

Date 30th Nov 04

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

An 'Open Government Code of Practice on Access to Government Information' came into force in 1997. All replies to members of the public must be in accordance with the procedures set out in the Code. In particular, information can only be withheld if it falls within the scope of a particular exemption. However, some exemptions are subject to a 'public interest test', whereby the harm associated with disclosure must be weighed against the public interest in release. Applicants must be informed of any decision to apply an exemption and of their right to appeal against this decision by writing to D Info(Exp). A full explanation is contained in DCI(Gen) 232/01; further information is available from DG Info on [REDACTED]

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence. In addition, we are required to keep information on the number of requests for information that specifically refer to the Code of Practice.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB

t: [REDACTED]

f: [REDACTED]; DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_pari/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Revised August 2004

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****



Isle of Man



24-11-04

M. O. D.
Whitehall
London.

Dear Sir/Madam,
Further to our phone conversation earlier today,
please find enclosed photo. of U.F.O. taken 19th. inst. at
Ronaldsway airport. (Isle of Man). Time was 0802 and I.S.S. or
Envororat were not due at that time.

Would appreciate an I/O of the craft or your
comments - Thanks in anticipation

Yours faithfully




TOP





From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Station Operations
Lossiemouth
Moray
IV31 6SD

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

26 November 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

Enclosed is a copy of our report form, that we use when taking the details of 'UFO' sightings, for future reference, as promised from our conversation earlier today.

This office is the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for reports/correspondence relating to 'UFO's.

If you receive any reports from the public, could you send them to this department please, address listed above, as we do keep a tally/record of how many sightings that are reported to us.

Hope this will be of help.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Inverness
[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

22 November 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter that I have just received, regarding investigations into UFO's.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity.

Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external military source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be an inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

The MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters to the question of existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date, the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena. Hence, we know not, of any disc's being recovered.

Also, UK airspace is continually policed to ensure that no such aircraft enters our airspace.

I hope this has been of help.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
INVERNESS,
[REDACTED] ✓

Dear Sir / Madam,

Could you please let me know what, if any, involvement you have in investigating U.F.O.s and do we have any recovered discs that you are aware of.

I look forward to your quick response.

Yours,

DAS

102No.

19 NOV 2004

FILE [REDACTED]



Ministry of Defence (MOD)

Secretariat (Air Staff) 2a,

Room 8245,

Main Building,

Whitehall,

LONDON SW1A 2HB



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Warmington
Northants

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

15 November 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

I have just received your message on our UFO line – 15 November 2004.

Sorry for the misunderstanding. It does not put you in a bad light, if it had been a 'UFO' sighting on your account. The Northamptonshire Police, obviously misunderstood at what you were telling them.

Sorry for any distress my letter may have caused you. I was just working with the information I had been given.

As to my previous letter dated 10 November, this department only deals with sightings, it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity.

Please disregard my previous letter and I hope this letter has been of help.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]



Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing in reply to your e-mail message which I received this morning. Perhaps it would be helpful if I clarify the Ministry of Defence's position with regard to reports of sightings of 'unidentified flying objects'.

As you will be aware from my letter of 18th October, the only interest the Ministry of Defence has in reports of 'UFO' sightings, is whether they present any evidence of a threat to UK airspace by unauthorised or hostile aircraft entering our airspace. The integrity of the UK's airspace in peacetime is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Policing Area would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might if deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft). From that perspective, reports provided to us of 'UFO' sightings are examined, but consultation with air defence staff and others as necessary is considered only where there is sufficient evidence to suggest a breach of UK air space. The vast majority of reports we receive are very sketchy and vague. Only a handful of reports in recent years have warranted further investigation and none revealed any evidence of a threat.

With regard to your comments about the amount of Dollars spent by the US Congress and operations at Area 51, these are clearly questions for the US Government, not the UK. You may therefore wish to address your own Government about these issues.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information

11 November 2004

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 November 2004 18:26
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Ministry of Defense

Thank you for your written response to my questions about UFOs [REDACTED] But I find it hard to believe that with all the money, power, technology, and military strength the United States and Europe has that the UFO subject still remains unknown.

I believe you know something very special but you've agree with the United States policy of secrecy and denial. The United States spends approx 10 Billion dollars per year on a "Black-Budget" which funds a lot of projects which are unknown to the members of Congress. Don't you think they could possibly be studying recovered alien space craft to learn new technologies like new gravity propulsion systems and new forms of energy and elements?

Area 51 in Nevada is a prime example here in the United States. If an American citizen crosses a certain boundary they can be shot and killed without any repercussion! Who knows what could be going on there!

I look forward to hearing from you! [REDACTED]

Do you Yahoo!?
Check out the new Yahoo! Front Page.
www.yahoo.com



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 November 2004 16:16
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Internet-Authorised: Re - Reply.

Dear [REDACTED]

I received your letter dated 22 October 2004, for which I replied to your questions, on the 2 November 2004 and the letter was posted the same day, so you should be receiving it very soon. The letter actually took quite a few days to get to the right department. I have just received your letter dated 1 November for which I will file with your previous letter.

Hope the answers in my letter will be of help.

Your sincerely

[REDACTED]

08/11/2004

EAST 2 WEST UFO SOCIETY



"HERE TO INFORM"



**LIVINGSTON
WEST LOTHIAN**

Tel:



e-mail:



1st Nov 2004

Dear Sirs,

I am the Director of a serious Ufo Research Group here in Scotland. A resident of Dumfries contacted me to report strange lights over the town on the 9th of Sept at around 11:20pm. Another lady contacted me again from Dumfries to report strange lights over the town on the 12th of Oct around 8:07am.

I have investigated all my usual avenues airline traffic, weather satellites etc but have not come up with anything that would explain these lights over the town of Dumfries. Could you tell me if any military aircraft were in the area on these dates and times.

I did e-mail this enquiry to your e-mail address of [REDACTED]@mod.uk but never received a reply.

I hope you can help me with this matter, thanking you in anticipation.

Regards



Director of E2WUFOS



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Abercynon
Mid-Glamorgan
South Wales

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

27 October 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter dated 15 October 2004.

This office is the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to 'UFOs.'

The Ministry of Defence examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity.

Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external military source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each sighting reported to us. We believe that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them if resources were diverted for this purpose, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. It would be inappropriate use of defence resources if we were to do so.

The MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters to the question of existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date, the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

Good luck with your endeavour in building a space-ship.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Abercynon, south-
mid Glamorgan, Wales.
15 October 2004

Dear Sirs,

I am a professor
and astronaut and astro-physicist.

Trials in an Oxford
university laboratory are taking
place for the effects and use
of magnetism for flight sensitized
and de-sensitized.


I am optimistic and
hopeful of building a flying
saucer and space-ship with
known metals lead batteries
fluid and magnets.

yours

2.

● I am from the age of eight years an eight times Nobel Peace Prize Winner. As well I have ten Professorships from the age of twenty two.

I made the zip at the age of eight; the computer at twentyfour years of age.



Royal Mail De Dd, Cymru

15.10.04

05:19 pm

A13403554

SE Wales

To

The War Office,


~~Northumberland Avenue,~~
~~London.~~

DAS





From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

London

[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

25 October 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter dated 18 October 2004.

You mention again of alien intelligence/weapons of mass destruction. As I stated in my previous letter of 18 October 2004, that if we became aware of any evidence which might suggest a potential threat, action would be set in hand to investigate, analyse and counter that threat in the light of the circumstances which prevail at the time. This applies to any form of threat to the UK's security from whatever source. UK airspace is continually policed to ensure that no such aircraft enters our airspace .

The MOD is often misquoted as saying that it does not believe 'UFO/flying saucers' to be a threat; this is a distortion of the MOD's stated position which is that to date we have seen nothing which could be classed as proof that extraterrestrial life and or 'UFO/flying saucers' exist. Hence to date no threat to the UK has been discerned which has attributed to a so-called 'UFO/flying saucer'.

Your comments have been noted and your letter has been placed on our files.

Yours sincerely


[REDACTED]



With the compliments of



Sent to us in error.



20/10/04

Defence Intelligence Joint Environment
Room 273, Old War Office Building
Whitehall, London SW1A 2EU

Tel: [redacted] Fax: [redacted]
Section 10
CHOT e-mail: DIJE-PA

M. O. D.

ROOM 6/73

MET. POLE.

BUILDING

NORTHUMBERLAND, AVE

LONDON

WC 2N 5BP.

London

40



THE NATIONAL
DEAF CHILDREN'S
SOCIETY

18/10/04. ✓

Dear Sir or Madam,


Please find

enclosed drawing I made of
the effect of IRRI-SHELLI-AKE,
WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION.

Do not destroy or attack
any Alien craft or Alien being
as this could cause an ecological
disaster. I have had telepathic
thoughts in my mind that a
blue star like object is trying
to distribute supplies ^{AND MEDICINES} to Third
world countries they come in
peace. Do not attack.

This is whats in my mind
Thanking you for your Kind
attention. Yours Faithfully

IRRI-SHELLI-AKE DEVICE
LEAVES GIANTIC CANYON MANY
MILES LONG.




IRRI-SHELLI-AKE "WEAPONS OF MASS
DESTRUCTION"

3 RIDGES LIKE THIS. AND
THE WORLD WILL FALL
APART.
BY ITSELF.

Refers to [REDACTED]

sighting

DAS/64/2 Part P
Enc 59.



[REDACTED]

As discussed yesterday, you may remember we have already answered lots of ITV West's questions about this incident. They have now written directly to us and sent a DVD for us to look at. Attached is a copy of their letter. [REDACTED] 40 [REDACTED] 40ft two messages on our answerphone last night asking us to call him.

As we do not deal directly with members of the press, I would be grateful if you could pass the following message to [REDACTED]. Please give me a call if you need anything further.

Thanks

[REDACTED]
DAS-FOI

5-H- [REDACTED]

Message

To clarify the situation with regard to correspondence with [REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] wrote to the Directorate of Air Staff on 11th August 2004 informing us she had seen lights in the sky over Shepton Mallet on 31 July 2004, at approximately 22:45. She said that she had recorded these events and had sent the footage to her local ITV news and GMTV. She did not send the recording to DAS or ask us to view it. DAS staff have not spoken to [REDACTED]

With regard to the DVD ITV West provided of this footage.

- [REDACTED] should be aware from our answers to his previous questions, that the MOD's interest in alleged sightings of UFOs is limited to whether they provide any evidence of a potential threat to UK airspace. Unless there is such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting.
- We have viewed the DVD provided and we are satisfied that there is no corroborating evidence to suggest that the United Kingdom's airspace was breached by unauthorised air activity on 31 July.

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing to you with reference to a report of an 'unidentified flying object', which happened on 31 July 2004 in Shepton Mallet, Somerset.

The lady in question, [REDACTED] filmed three lights in the sky over her house and swiftly reported them to you by letter dated 12th August 2004.

Here at ITV West we are in the process of making a half hour documentary about UFO's and will be including the footage and her correspondence with the MOD in the programme.

We have noted however that she actually never sent the film to you to look at, even though she says she verbally asked if she should and was told not to do so.

In our questions put to the MOD, one of the responses says '*The MOD is willing to look at any videos the public send to us in the normal course of examining these reports*'. Therefore I have had a copy made on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] behalf and would be grateful if you could look at it.

We are interested to know what you believe the lights to be, any explanations and whether you think these lights could have been a defence threat and if not how can you tell.

We would appreciate a response by Monday 1st November 2004. You can contact me on [REDACTED] or by e-mail at [REDACTED]@itv.com

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
ITV West

Sorry not to answer this sooner, I have been on leave.

All UFO reports were not investigated in the past. To my knowledge the MOD has only ever examined UFO reports for similar reasons that we do today, i.e. in order to see if they present any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Reports of sightings were once also sent to Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) in case they contained any information which was of value in DIS's task of analysing the performance and threat of foreign weapons systems, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programmes and technologies and emerging technologies. However, none of the reports received over a period of 30 years yielded any valuable information whatsoever, so in December 2000, DIS decided that they did not need to receive these reports any longer.

Since UFO reports were first reported in the late 1940's the only "investigation" that has been conducted was in August 1950 when a Working Party was set up (at the suggestion of Sir Henry Tizard) who thought "flying saucers should be investigated". Records show that the 11th meeting of the Joint Technical Intelligence Committee received the Chairman's Report of the "Flying Saucer Working Party". The Committee decided that "the document should be regarded as the final report and, in view of the conclusions the Working Party should be dissolved". A copy of the report has been released into the MOD Freedom of Information Publication Scheme and the original has been placed in The National Archive. Should [REDACTED] wish to view this document it can be found at www.foi.mod.uk. A search under 'UFO's will take him to the three classes of information on UFOs that have been released. These are, 'Correspondence' (The papers the MOD holds on the Rendlesham Forrest incident, December 1980), 'Reports' (The final report of the Flying Saucer Working Party, as mentioned above) and 'Policy' (The MOD statement on our limited interest in UFO matters).

With regard to ITV West's previous question about satellite debris, I now have a reply from RAF Fylingdales. There is no record of any part of Skylab falling on the UK in 1979. When Skylab re-entered the Earth's atmosphere some pieces did fall over land, but this was in Western Australia where some pieces were recovered. There have been other instances of satellite debris falling on land, mainly in the US, South America, Africa, Russia and Australia, but no evidence has been found of satellite debris in the UK.

I hope this answers all [REDACTED] questions. Please let me know if you need anything else.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 September 2004 12:17
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: extra question

[REDACTED]

Grateful for your thoughts on the questions below. Thanks

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]@itv.com]
Sent: 15 September 2004 11:41
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: extra question

[REDACTED]

Thanks for answering the questions i sent you regarding our programme about UFO's. I have one more thing to ask you, and that is:- On what date did the MOD stop investigating UFO reports unless there was a defence risk?

We know all reports were investigated in the past and now they are not, so there must have been some sort of cut off date. I need this to make sure the programme is factually correct.

We are also having trouble locating your statement on the MOD website concerning your general stance on UFO reports, we also need this for the programme.

Many Thanks

[REDACTED]

ITV West

[REDACTED]

Questions on UFOs from ITV West

Q.1 & 2 Directorate of Air Staff are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence on UFO matters. All reports of UFO sightings received by the MOD, from any source (i.e. military or civilian) are examined by the Directorate of Air Staff. Air defence staff are consulted where there is sufficient evidence to suggest a breach of UK airspace, or anything of potential defence concern. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

Q3. The integrity of the UK's airspace in peacetime is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Policing Area would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might if deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft). From that perspective, reports provided to us of 'UFO' sightings are examined, but are not relied upon in order to defend UK airspace.

Q4. The MOD is willing to look at any videos the public send to us in the normal course of examining these reports. In this case, [REDACTED] informed us that she had taken a video recording of her sighting and it had been shown on her local ITV news and GMTV. She did not send it to us or ask us to view it.

Q5. No, military flying records are not checked against reports of UFOs. As stated above, unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting.

Q6. No.

Q7 & 8. Until 1992 the Flying Complaints Flight (FCF), part of the HQ Provost and Security Services (UK) based at RAF Rudloe Manor, Wiltshire, was the central co-ordination point for any "UFO" reports made to RAF Stations (from whatever source, i.e. members of the public or service personnel). No action was taken on the reports by staff in the FCF, its function was simply to record details and pass the reports directly to Secretariat (Air Staff) (now the Directorate of Air Staff) in the Ministry of Defence. Secretariat (Air Staff) would then examine the reports and decide whether what was seen had defence implications. The FCF no longer have any involvement in the central collection of UFO reports made to Air Force bases. Any reports received by RAF Stations are now forwarded directly to the Directorate of Air Staff for consideration.

Q.9 No, the MOD does not, and to our knowledge never has had, staff who visit people who have reported UFO sightings.

Q10. No, there are not different Departments around the Country working on UFO reports. Directorate of Air Staff are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for handling reports and replying to correspondence on UFO matters. Air Defence staff may be consulted if necessary.

Q11. No.

Q12. This document was not "leaked". It was part of a file the MOD holds on UFO matters and was released to a member of the public in February 2003 following a request under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. When satellites come to the end of their life, they generally decay and burn up in the Earth's atmosphere. In July 1979 the satellite, SKYLAB, was due to break up and these documents are simply contingency plans for actions in the unlikely event that pieces were to fall on the UK. SKYLAB did not contain any nuclear material. The MOD was consulted because military personnel sometimes provide assistance to the Police and Emergency Services. These papers were contained in a file on UFOs because this department was listed as a contact in Home Office circulars because of our responsibility for UFO matters. With regard to your questions about whether satellite debris has ever come down in British airspace, we are making enquiries with RAF Fylingdales and will get back to you in due course.


Directorate of Air Staff

Ministry of Defence

5th Floor

~~Philip Amey~~

Zone H

~~COO letter~~

Main Building

Whitehall, London

SW1A 2HB



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

15

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]
e-mail [REDACTED]@mod.uk

[REDACTED]
Defence Contracts Limited
[REDACTED]
London
[REDACTED]

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
19 October 2004

Dear [REDACTED]


I am writing in reply to your letter dated 11th August concerning enquiries made to the Ministry of Defence about 'unidentified flying objects'. I apologise for the delay in replying.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the integrity of the UK's airspace in peacetime is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Policing Area would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might if deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft). From that perspective, reports provided to us of 'UFO' sightings are examined, and there is consultation with air defence staff and others, as necessary where there is sufficient evidence to suggest a breach of UK air space.

With regard to your offer to handle public correspondence on our behalf, we believe that the Ministry of Defence is in the best position to assess whether the UFO reports we receive provide such evidence. The systems that we have in place are sufficient for our defence needs, and we therefore, have no requirement for the service you are offering.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



Defence Contracts Limited

[REDACTED] London, [REDACTED]

11th Aug 2004

Ministry of Defence
Directorate of Air Staff (Secretariat) 3
Room 6/73
Metropole Building
Northumberland Avenue
London
WC2N 5BP

UFO enquires to the MoD

As the alleged UFO phenomena is of no defence significance, it would perhaps make economic sense for the handling of such enquires to be outsourced to the private sector.

I believe that my company could perhaps deal with public responses by post on your behalf and at a significant cost saving to the MoD.

By using in most cases a standard reply letter. We would stick rigidly to the current MOD Policy on Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO) and all our responses would conclude that "*the alleged UFO phenomenon is of no defence significance*".

If this is something you would be interested in, I would need some figures, such as the average number of enquires received per year, the current cost of responding to them and how you would like us to respond to enquires.

If you have any questions or require any further information, please contact me at the above address, in the first instance.

I thank you in anticipation and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours truly,

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

020 7218 2140
020 7218 9000

e-mail

[REDACTED]@mod.uk

[REDACTED]
Peachtree City
Georgia 30269
USA

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
18th October 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing concerning your e-mail message of 13 September to the Ministry of Defence, Minister's e-mail address, about the UK government's policy on UFOs. This office is the focal point for correspondence regarding these matters and I have been asked to reply.

First, it may be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena. Any reports of UFOs the Ministry of Defence receives are examined solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

With regard to the release of information about UFOs, the Ministry of Defence operates in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information (the Code), which encourages the provision of information unless its disclosure would, for example, cause harm to defence, invade on an individual's privacy, or if it would take an unreasonable diversion of resources to respond to a request. Information requested is supplied wherever possible providing it does not fall under one of the exemptions in the Code. The Code will be superseded by the Freedom of Information Act 2000 which comes into force on 1 January 2005. Information currently available in the MOD Freedom of Information Publication Scheme can be viewed via the internet at www.foi.mod.uk.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

Request for
info on UFOs



Low flying / UFOs / E-MAIL

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To DAS LA (rap)
cc.

TO Ref No 6991 /2004

Date 26 SEP 04

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent within **15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

An 'Open Government Code of Practice on Access to Government Information' came into force in 1997. All replies to members of the public must be in accordance with the procedures set out in the Code. In particular, information can only be withheld if it falls within the scope of a particular exemption. However, some exemptions are subject to a 'public interest test', whereby the harm associated with disclosure must be weighed against the public interest in release. Applicants must be informed of any decision to apply an exemption and of their right to appeal against this decision by writing to D Info(Exp). A full explanation is contained in DCI(Gen) 232/01; further information is available from DG Info on [REDACTED]

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence. In addition, we are required to keep information on the number of requests for information that specifically refer to the Code of Practice.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB

[REDACTED] DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_pari/ParlBrch.TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 September 2004 15:14
To: public@ministers.mod.uk
Subject: RE: Question

My address is:

[REDACTED]
Peachtree City, Georgia 30269

My original message is attached below. Thanks!

--- Ministers <Ministers@mod.uk> wrote:

> Thank you for your email to public@ministers.mod.uk.
> For a reply from MOD, please re-send your message to
> public@ministers.mod.uk, together with your full postal address.

>
> Many thanks,
>
> MOD Ministerial Correspondence Unit
> Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building,
> Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

>
>
> -----Original Message-----

> From: [REDACTED]
> Sent: 13 September 2004 18:05
> To: public@ministers.mod.uk
> Subject: Question


>
>
> I am an American. The US Governments policy on UFOs and extra
> terrestrials is secrecy, cover up, and denial. I have heard that the
> British Government has been more open to this issue over the years.
> Do you have any information/records on crashed or recovered UFOs?

>
> Thanks!

>
>

> Do You Yahoo!?
> Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
> <http://mail.yahoo.com>


>
>
>



Do you Yahoo!?
Declare Yourself - Register online to vote today!
<http://vote.yahoo.com>



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

London

[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

18 October 2004

Dear [REDACTED] 0

Thank you for your letter dated 7 October 2004.

You mentioned in your letter about Alien intelligence. If we became aware of any evidence which might suggest a potential threat, action would be set in hand to investigate, analyse and counter that threat, in the light of the circumstances which prevail at the time. This applies to any form of threat to the UK's security from whatever source. I should point out that to date the MOD is not aware of any evidence which might substantiate the existence of craft or lifeforms of extraterrestrial origin, and no threat has been discerned which has been attributed to a 'UFO'.

The MOD does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which is remains totally open-minded.

Your comments have been noted and your letter has been placed on our files.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]


To

M. D.

SECRETARIAT (AIR STAFF) ZA
ROOM 8245, MAIN BUILDING,
WHITEHALL.

LONDON

SW1 2HB.




7/10/04.

Dear Sir or Madam,
If any
Alien intelligence came to our
planet, this idea I have, should
be considered.


DO NOT DESTROY OR
ATTACK ANY SPACE CRAFT OR
ALIEN BEINGS AS THIS COULD CAUSE
AN ECOLOGICAL DISASTER, POSSIBLY
ON A GLOBAL SCALE.

Thanking you for your kind
attention.

Yours faithfully



PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL ,



To
THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (M. D. D.)
SECRETARIAT (AIR STAFF) Z A.
ROOM 8245, MAIN BUILDING
WHITE HALL
LONDON
SW1 2 HB.



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]
e-mail	[REDACTED]	@mod.uk



Stoke-on-Trent
Staffordshire



Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3/11
Date
13th October 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

It was good to meet you and [REDACTED] on 1 October. [REDACTED] and myself hope you found our discussion useful.

I have written to [REDACTED] following up the points discussed at the meeting, however I recall you asked a question about whether balloons can be seen on radar and the possibility of terrorist organisations using balloons to infiltrate UK airspace. Our radar specialist has advised that there is currently no threat assessment that any terrorist organisation is using balloons. It is possible to see balloons on air defence radar, but the radar is configured to ignore objects such as balloons, flocks of birds, etc in order to avoid cluttering the radar screen. Civil air traffic radar are able to see balloons and will alert air defence staff of any unusual air activity that may be a threat to the security of UK airspace.

Finally, I understand you have sent a message to the MOD Ministers e-mail address concerning the future of the files that have been stored in the asbestos contaminated archive. Given our discussion on 1 October, I have been asked to reply. To clarify what we said at the meeting, the Old War Office basement provided accommodation for the storage of files from three MOD branches; the Defence Intelligence Staff; the Departmental Records Officer (on behalf of the whole MOD) and the Air Historical Branch. All of the affected files have now been removed to another defence facility and a Project Board has been set up to consider options for the future of this information. No decisions have been made at this time.

I hope this information is helpful.

Yours sincerely,



**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
ID 407
2-5-04
INFO (EXP) ANALYSIS
ANCHOR



Records/E-MAIL

TREAT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

To Inf (Exp) Analysis

TO Ref No 6650 /2004

cc.

Date 22/9/04

Due by 13 Oct 2004

The Prime Minister/SofS/Min(AF)/Min(DP)/USofS/MOD* has received the attached correspondence from a member of the public, which this office has neither retained nor acknowledged. Please send a reply on behalf of the PM/Minister/Department*.

Ministers attach great importance to correspondence being answered promptly, and your reply should be sent **within 15 working days of the above date**. If, exceptionally, this should prove impossible, an interim reply should be sent within the same timescale. You should be aware that No 10 periodically calls for a sample of letters sent by officials on the PM's behalf for his perusal.

An 'Open Government Code of Practice on Access to Government Information' came into force in 1997. All replies to members of the public must be in accordance with the procedures set out in the Code. In particular, information can only be withheld if it falls within the scope of a particular exemption. However, some exemptions are subject to a 'public interest test', whereby the harm associated with disclosure must be weighed against the public interest in release. Applicants must be informed of any decision to apply an exemption and of their right to appeal against this decision by writing to D Info(Exp). A full explanation is contained in DCI(Gen) 232/01; further information is available from DG Info on [REDACTED]

It is vital that branches ensure they have simple systems to record and track correspondence received from members of the public. This information should be regularly monitored and reviewed against the targets for answering correspondence published in the Spending Review 2000 Service Delivery Agreement for the Ministry of Defence. In addition, we are required to keep information on the number of requests for information that specifically refer to the Code of Practice.

As part of our monitoring procedure, random spot checks on the accuracy of your branch records on correspondence will be performed throughout the year.

Ministerial Correspondence Unit

Floor 5, Zone A, Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB

[REDACTED] DII: Ministerial Correspondence; e: Ministerial-Correspondence@mod.uk.

Detailed guidance on handling TO Correspondence can be found on the Defence Intranet at http://main.defence.mod.uk/min_pari/ParlBrch/TOGuid.htm
If you do not have access to the Intranet, please inform the Ministerial Correspondence Unit.

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

* Delete as appropriate.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

**** TO BE GIVEN A HIGH PRIORITY ****

[REDACTED]
From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

[REDACTED]
17 September 2004 00:46
public@ministers.mod.uk
Destruction of Public files

To whom it may concern,

It has recently come to my attention that an important part of our heritage is at risk of being destroyed.

Records held by the Ministry of Defence relating to a critical period of the cold war and other records relating to the MOD handling of UFO reports have been contaminated with Asbestos, and consideration is being given to their destruction.

These records are potentially of enormous importance to historians that want to better understand military and political decisions made during a very stressful period. If they are destroyed, rumours of "cover-up" will be rampant, and the resulting cost of dealing with such accusations will exceed any cost of salvaging the documents.

Not only would this be a waste of public money, but it would also be a denial of the rights of voters to be informed the decisions made by their elected representatives and Civil Service departments.

We have already had to wait for over a quarter of a century to learn what is in these files, and it seems that we may never have the opportunity to see them at all.

I have written to the my MP and the Prime Minister about this already, and I sincerely hope that you will give this matter serious consideration before deciding to destroy such an important part of our heritage.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Stoke on Trent
[REDACTED]

Email provided by <http://www.ntlhome.com/>

ANALYSIS WORKSHEET **ID NUMBER: 407**

DATE IN: 23 SEP 2004 **TYPE:** To 6650/2004 **DEADLINE:** 13 Oct 2004

PASSED TO:

TMS

INSTRUCTIONS/DRAFT BY:

Can you please put him right on what is
being done with those docs that may have
been contaminated by asbestos.



FINAL REPLY DATE:

FILE REF:



[REDACTED]

From: Info-Records1 on behalf of Info Records1
Sent: 11 August 2004 07:35
To: DAS-FOI
Subject: FW: Internet-Authorised: LIVINGSTON, WEST LoTHIAN, 9 NOVEMBER 1979

[REDACTED] 0

Herewith my reply to [REDACTED] my staff checked the 1979/80 DS8 files and found nothing!

[REDACTED] 40

-----Original Message-----

From: Info-Records1
Sent: 11 August 2004 07:33
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Internet-Authorised: LIVINGSTON, WEST LoTHIAN, 9 NOVEMBER 1979

Dear [REDACTED]

Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to your email of 4 June 2004 and for the lack of clarity in my earlier reply.

I can confirm from an examination of surviving Air Staff files (prefixed D/DS8), and dated 1979/80, that there is no record of a report being made about an apparent incident at Livingston, West Lothian, Scotland on 9 November 1979.

Regards

[REDACTED]
D/DRO
MOD
[REDACTED]

11/08/2004

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 June 2004 15:26
To: Info-Records1
Subject: Re: ACCESS TO RECORDS

Dear [REDACTED]

Thanks for your prompt reply to my enquiry.

To ensure I have understood your reply correctly, I am unsure about the word contemporary. Do you mean that 'Secretariat Air Staff 2' have no knowledge or record of the incident what so ever? or that they have no record which is contemporary with the events of 1979? or that today they have no record which is contemporary?

Sorry to press you but we don't want to start recording and subsequently find an entire strand has been missed from the story, or even worse been included in error!

Thanks again and I look forward to receiving your reply.

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Info-Records1 <Info-Records1@defence.mod.uk>

To: [REDACTED]

Date: 27 May 2004 10:49

Subject: ACCESS TO RECORDS

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter dated 24 May 2004 concerning Air Staff's files and in particular whether a file exists on an UFO sighting/encounter that occurred in Livingston, West Lothian on 9 November 1979.

I have discussed with Air Staff and I can advise you that there is no contemporary record of the incident on file.

Regards

[REDACTED]

D/DRO
Ministry of Defence
Mezz 2
3-5 Great Scotland Yard
London SW1A 2HW

[REDACTED]

19/07/2004

Ministry of Defence
Secretariat Air Staff 2
Room 8245
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

Edinburgh

24 05 04

Dear Sir,

Access to records: Secretariat Air Staff 2

Incident: UFO sighting / encounter

Date: 9th November 1979

Location: Livingston, West Lothian, Scotland

I am an independent television producer. At present I am researching the apparently inexplicable incident above, prior to development into a short TV documentary. I wondered 2 points:

1. Are Secretariat AS 2 aware of, and or, have compiled or hold a file on, the above incident?
2. If so, is it available for inspection and what steps should I follow to access the file?

I look forward to receiving your reply.

Yours faithfully,

e mail:



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 September 2004 09:42
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: extra question

[REDACTED]

Sorry not to answer this sooner, I have been on leave.

All UFO reports were not investigated in the past. To my knowledge the MOD has only ever examined UFO reports for similar reasons that we do today, i.e. in order to see if they present any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Reports of sightings were once also sent to Defence Intelligence Staff (DIS) in case they contained any information which was of value in DIS's task of analysing the performance and threat of foreign weapons systems, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programmes and technologies and emerging technologies. However, none of the reports received over a period of 30 years yielded any valuable information whatsoever, so in December 2000, DIS decided that they did not need to receive these reports any longer.

Since UFO reports were first reported in the late 1940's the only "investigation" that has been conducted was in August 1950 when a Working Party was set up (at the suggestion of Sir Henry Tizard) who thought "flying saucers should be investigated". Records show that the 11th meeting of the Joint Technical Intelligence Committee received the Chairman's Report of the "Flying Saucer Working Party". The Committee decided that "the document should be regarded as the final report and, in view of the conclusions the Working Party should be dissolved". A copy of the report has been released into the MOD Freedom of Information Publication Scheme and the original has been placed in The National Archive. Should [REDACTED] wish to view this document it can be found at www.foi.mod.uk. A search under 'UFO's will take him to the three classes of information on UFOs that have been released. These are, 'Correspondence' (The papers the MOD holds on the Rendlesham Forrest incident, December 1980), 'Reports' (The final report of the Flying Saucer Working Party, as mentioned above) and 'Policy' (The MOD statement on our limited interest in UFO matters).

With regard to ITV West's previous question about satellite debris, I now have a reply from RAF Fylingdales. There is no record of any part of Skylab falling on the UK in 1979. When Skylab re-entered the Earth's atmosphere some pieces did fall over land, but this was in Western Australia where some pieces were recovered. There have been other instances of satellite debris falling on land, mainly in the US, South America, Africa, Russia and Australia, but no evidence has been found of satellite debris in the UK.

I hope this answers all [REDACTED] questions. Please let me know if you need anything else.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 September 2004 12:17
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: extra question

[REDACTED] D

Grateful for your thoughts on the questions below. Thanks

[REDACTED] D

From: [REDACTED]@itv.com]
Sent: 15 September 2004 11:41
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: extra question

[REDACTED] D

Thanks for answering the questions i sent you regarding our programme about UFO's. I have one more thing to ask you, and that is:- On what date did the MOD stop investigating UFO reports unless there was a defence risk?

We know all reports were investigated in the past and now they are not, so there must have been some sort of cut off date. I need this to make sure the progamme is factually correct.

We are also having trouble locating your statement on the MOD website concerning your general stance on UFO reports, we also need this for the programme.

Many Thanks

[REDACTED]

ITV West

[REDACTED]

21/09/2004

From: CTandUKOps-Airspace Integrity SO1 [CTandUKOps-AirspaceIntegritySO1@mod.uk]
Sent: 06 September 2004 13:28
To: DAS-FOI
Subject: FW: Internet-authorised: RE: Satellites

40

Please see below.

40

SO1 Airspace Integrity
D CT&UK Ops
MT 466

Please note that this CHOtS account will cease to exist at 1200 on 10 Sep 04. Messages **cannot** be forwarded to the new account.

From 1200 on 13 Sep 04 my new e-mail addresses will be: @mod.uk (internet compatible) or CTandUKOps-Airspace Integrity SO1. Other details are:

SO1 Airspace Integrity,
MOD Level 4, Zone I,
Main Building,
Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB
Tel: Fax:

-----Original Message-----

From: FYL-Ops-OC
Sent: 06 September 2004 12:05
To: 'CTandUKOps-Airspace Integrity SO1'
Subject: Internet-authorised: RE: Satellites

Response to Skylab queries.

We have no record of any part of Skylab falling on the UK in 1979. When Skylab re-entered the Earth's atmosphere some pieces did fall over land, but this was in Western Australia where some pieces were recovered.

There are over 50 instances of satellite debris falling on land (with physical evidence being found), mainly the US, South America, Africa, Russia and Australia, but I know of no evidence of satellite debris being found in the UK.

-----Original Message-----

From: CTandUKOps-Airspace Integrity SO1
Sent: 31 August 2004 07:56
To: FYL-Ops-OC
Cc: 3GP-C2SPT AVAIL
Subject: FW: Satellites

40

Could you provide me with some unclassified answers to the questions below.

21/09/2004

Thanks in anticipation.

[REDACTED] 0
SO1 Airspace Integrity
D CT&UK Ops
MT 466 [REDACTED] 0

Please note the change of e-mail address and ensure that your personal address books are updated. E-mails are not routinely auto forwarded from my old (D UK-SO1 Air Ops 2) e-mail account.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 August 2004 11:00
To: CTandUKOps-Airspace Integrity SO1
Subject: Satellites

[REDACTED] 40

Today's silly question from the UFO desk.

Do you know whether Fylingdales could tell me if any pieces of the satellite, SKYLAB fell on the UK in July 1979?

Also have any pieces of satellite ever fallen on the UK?

I know satellite debris usually burns up in the Earth's atmosphere, but ITV West have ask about this as part of list of questions on UFOs.

If you can give me a contact at Fylingdales I am happy to speak to them if you prefer.

[REDACTED] 40
DAS-FOI

Questions on UFOs from ITV West

Q.1 & 2 Directorate of Air Staff are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence on UFO matters. All reports of UFO sightings received by the MOD, from any source (i.e. military or civilian) are examined by the Directorate of Air Staff. Air defence staff are consulted where there is sufficient evidence to suggest a breach of UK airspace, or anything of potential defence concern. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

Q3. The integrity of the UK's airspace in peacetime is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Policing Area would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might if deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft). From that perspective, reports provided to us of 'UFO' sightings are examined, but are not relied upon in order to defend UK airspace.

Q4. The MOD is willing to look at any videos the public send to us in the normal course of examining these reports. In this case, [REDACTED] informed us that she had taken a video recording of her sighting and it had been shown on her local ITV news and GMTV. She did not send it to us or ask us to view it.

Q5. No, military flying records are not checked against reports of UFOs. As stated above, unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting.

Q6. No.

Q7 & 8. Until 1992 the Flying Complaints Flight (FCF), part of the HQ Provost and Security Services (UK) based at RAF Rudloe Manor, Wiltshire, was the central co-ordination point for any "UFO" reports made to RAF Stations (from whatever source, i.e. members of the public or service personnel). No action was taken on the reports by staff in the FCF, its function was simply to record details and pass the reports directly to Secretariat (Air Staff) (now the Directorate of Air Staff) in the Ministry of Defence. Secretariat (Air Staff) would then examine the reports and decide whether what was seen had defence implications. The FCF no longer have any involvement in the central collection of UFO reports made to Air Force bases. Any reports received by RAF Stations are now forwarded directly to the Directorate of Air Staff for consideration.


Q.9 No, the MOD does not, and to our knowledge never has had, staff who visit people who have reported UFO sightings.

Q10. No, there are not different Departments around the Country working on UFO reports. Directorate of Air Staff are the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for handling reports and replying to correspondence on UFO matters. Air Defence staff may be consulted if necessary.

Q11. No.

Q12. This document was not "leaked". It was part of a file the MOD holds on UFO matters and was released to a member of the public in February 2003 following a request under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. When satellites come to the end of their life, they generally decay and burn up in the Earth's atmosphere. In July 1979 the satellite, SKYLAB, was due to break up and these documents are simply contingency plans for actions in the unlikely event that pieces were to fall on the UK. SKYLAB did not contain any nuclear material. The MOD was consulted because military personnel sometimes provide assistance to the Police and Emergency Services. These papers were contained in a file on UFOs because this department was listed as a contact in Home Office circulars because of our responsibility for UFO matters. With regard to your questions about whether satellite debris has ever come down in British airspace, we are making enquiries with RAF Fylingdales and will get back to you in due course.

UNCLASSIFIED



Our reference:
Your reference:

HOME OFFICE
Queen Anne's Gate, LONDON, SW1H 9AT
Direct line: 01-213
Switchboard: 01-213 3000

20 April 1979

Q 12
EF

DATE RECEIVED IN DI 54 23 APR 1979
--

For Action: Chief Officers of Police in England and Wales

For Information: Chief Fire Officers in England and Wales
Chief Executives/Clerks of -
The Greater London Council and all County
Councils in England and Wales
The Common Council of the City of London,
London Borough Councils and all District Councils
in England and Wales

Dear Sir

Home Office Circular No ES 5/1979

Satellite Accidents

Introduction

Following the descent of a nuclear-powered Soviet satellite in Canada on 24 January 1978, consideration has been given to contingency arrangements for dealing with the possibility of a similar incident in the United Kingdom. It is recognised that the likelihood of such an accident is remote. Moreover, the additional hazards to life from nuclear-powered satellites are very small and are limited to potential exposure to radioactive debris following accidental re-entry. Nevertheless, the special considerations that affect the use of nuclear materials and the safety standards applied to them make it prudent to devise plans to deal with such an incident on United Kingdom territory, should it ever occur.

2. A crash involving a satellite which was not powered by nuclear fuel would present problems which would fall to be dealt with through normal major accident procedures. This circular is therefore concerned only with contingency arrangements for dealing with the crash of a satellite which is known to be nuclear-powered or whose energy source has not been established (but see paragraph 21 for reporting arrangements for non-nuclear space objects). Similar circulars are being issued by the Scottish Office and Northern Ireland Office.

Features of a Satellite Accident

3. In the absence of extensive experience it is difficult to make any firm assumptions about the features of a satellite accident. A major problem is that the prediction of the location of a satellite's point of return to earth is very difficult. Although it is likely that knowledge

UNCLASSIFIED

of changes in the orbital pattern which might lead to premature return to earth would be available many hours or even days before re-entry occurred, it would not be such that a reasonably accurate prediction of the final orbit over the earth could be made until 12-24 hours before impact. Even then forecasts of the precise point of re-entry along this track might still be in error by thousands of kilometres. It is therefore probable that accurate warning would not be available until a few minutes before impact, and it is possible that there might be no warning at all.

4. On re-entry into the earth's atmosphere, the behaviour of the satellite would largely be determined by its mechanical construction. Some satellites are designed in such a way that they will disintegrate on re-entry; others are so designed that fairly large components will remain intact on entering the earth's atmosphere. The debris from a crashing satellite might thus vary from minute dust particles to heavy and sizeable objects, and the latter might include the radioactive source - but any part might be radioactive.

5. Although the parameters of the orbit of a crashing satellite can be fairly closely defined, debris might fall over an area 2000 kilometres long by 200 kilometres wide. It would not therefore be possible to alert police forces on a selective basis; in the event of a warning that a satellite might crash in or near the United Kingdom, all police forces would have to be alerted.

6. The crash of a nuclear-powered satellite would present particular problems such as -

- a. there would be a possible radiation hazard, the degree of which could not be determined in advance;
- b. debris from the crashed satellite might be scattered over a very large area, perhaps the greater part of the country;
- c. individual pieces of debris might be very small, yet each might present a small radiation hazard.

There would be no explosion of the type associated with the detonation of an atomic bomb.

Contingency Arrangements

7. If the malfunctioning of a satellite became known before it came out of orbit the Ministry of Defence (MOD) would be responsible for arranging for the preparation of an assessment

RESTRICTED
UNCLASSIFIED

Chief Officers will no doubt wish to consider in advance what procedure should be instituted locally to allocate reference numbers to findings. One way would be for the force operational headquarters to allocate a unique serial number to each finding as soon as there is reason to believe that it may have come from a satellite. Each reference number should consist of two letters identifying the police force concerned followed by a number allocated locally (e.g. MP7). Following are the letters to be incorporated in these reference numbers:

Avon and Somerset	AV	Lincolnshire	LI
Bedfordshire	BE	Merseyside	ME
Cambridgeshire	CA	Metropolitan	MP
Cheshire	CH	Norfolk	NF
City of London	CY	Northamptonshire	NH
Cleveland	CV	Northumbria	NU
Cumbria	CM	North Wales	NW
Derbyshire	DE	North Yorkshire	NY
Devon and Cornwall	DC	Nottinghamshire	NT
Dorset	DO	South Wales	SW
Durham	DU	South Yorkshire	SY
Dyfed-Powys	DP	Staffordshire	ST
Essex	EX	Suffolk	SF
Gloucestershire	GL	Surrey	SR
Greater Manchester	GM	Sussex	SX
Gwent	GW	Thames Valley	TV
Hampshire	HA	Warwickshire	WA
Hertfordshire	HE	West Mercia	WC
Humberside	HU	West Midlands	WD
Kent	KE	West Yorkshire	WY
Lancashire	LA	Wiltshire	WI
Leicestershire	LE		

~~RESTRICTED~~
UNCLASSIFIED

of the possible risks to the United Kingdom. A Government decision would then be sought on whether the police should be alerted and whether a public statement should be made. If such action were decided on, overall responsibility for the measures to deal with an incident would be exercised from a central control point in Whitehall, in a manner similar to procedures already established to handle a terrorist incident and with similar Ministerial and senior official representation from all the Government Departments concerned. Warning to the police would be given by means of a broadcast over the Police National Computer (PNC) system. The focal point for the collection of scientific data would be the Atomic Weapons Research Establishment (AWRE), Aldermaston, which would in conjunction with the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB) arrange for appropriate scientific and technical advice to be made available to central Government and to police forces who might be involved.

8. On receipt of the warning message, police forces should arrange to gather reports of debris. Chief fire officers should be informed of the warning and asked to notify the police promptly of any reports which they may receive. Fire service personnel are trained to fight fires involving radioactive sources and have a limited range of equipment for the detection of radiation; they are able to confirm the presence of some but not all types of radioactivity, and are not able therefore to say authoritatively that debris is not radioactive.

9. When reports of suspected or actual locations have been received, the police should take such steps as may be needed locally to prevent people entering areas which may be dangerous because of radioactive material (see also paragraph 15 below). For advice as to the dangers of radioactivity and for the examination and disposal of suspect material they should call upon the National Arrangements for Incidents Involving Radioactivity (the NAIR scheme). Under this the immediate attendance of the Stage 1 contact is requested, followed if necessary by calling out the Stage 2 establishment (Home Office Circulars ES 7/1972 and ES 3/1977). The NAIR representatives should advise local police on their own initiative until contact is established with, and scientific and technical advice received from, AWRE and/or NRPB under the arrangements described in paragraph 7. All persons should be told to keep well away from possible radioactive debris. Although highly unlikely, some large pieces of debris might have radiation fields of significance over distances of the order of 100 metres, and some limited evacuation might be necessary; widespread continuous contamination is, however, unlikely. Advice on the degree of evacuation required would be available in the first instance from the NAIR representatives

UNCLASSIFIED
~~RESTRICTED~~

RESTRICTED
UNCLASSIFIED

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

and subsequently from representatives of the AWRE and the NRPB. In the case of damage requiring rescue or firefighting operations, the possible hazard from radioactivity should be borne in mind and existing disaster plans relating to rescue operations in such circumstances should be implemented as appropriate.

10. Details of all findings of material which the police have reason to believe is satellite debris should be reported immediately, together with a brief outline of the action taken and quoting a unique reference number identifying the police force concerned. Such reports should be sent via the FNC system to New Scotland Yard (from where they will be passed to the central control point) in accordance with standard proforma headings - see Annex A. This will enable a nationwide picture of confirmed sightings to be built up and consideration to be given to the need for specialist assistance. The central control point will pass the reports received to the scientific data centre at AWRE (paragraph 7 above). If debris is expected over a considerable area of the country it may be necessary to set up a field operations centre to provide overall direction of both land and air searches, and this centre would operate within general directions provided by the central control point. Special communications equipment available at the central control point could be deployed locally if there were a need to reinforce facilities in particular areas.

11. If the warning time was only a matter of minutes, it would not be possible to alert police forces before reports of falling debris began to come in. A FNC broadcast would, however, be sent as soon as possible and a subsequent message would confirm that the central control point arrangements had been established. The reports required under paragraph 9 above should then be passed immediately to the control point.

12. If no warning at all were received, the first indication that a satellite had crashed might be reports to the police of debris. In many cases such reports might prove to be false or it might be possible to establish immediately that the debris could not have come from a satellite. Whenever a report of debris has been confirmed, however, and there are no valid reasons for believing that the debris could not have formed part of a satellite, the action outlined in paragraph 9 above should be taken and the central control point should be notified immediately. The appropriate contact is the Duty Officer on 01- [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]. Action would then be taken to bring the central control point arrangements into operation if necessary.

Search for Unreported Fragments

13. Since much of the debris would be very small many of the fragments would not be sighted and unnoticed irradiated debris might be scattered over an area of thousands of square

kilometres. A major search operation might have to be mounted to locate radioactive fragments. Whether to mount a search, and if so what area should be covered, would be decided by the central control point. Arrangements would be made to deploy, using the framework of the NAIR scheme, the resources of every available technical support service, including teams from MOD, NRPB, United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority (UKAEA), British Nuclear Fuels Limited (BNFL) and the Electricity Generating Boards, using specialist aircraft and vehicle search techniques. In rural areas the most effective initial search to locate major sources of radioactivity might be from the air. Police forces would then be asked to organise ground searches of specific areas under arrangements by the central control point or forward operations centre and with the advice of AWRE and NRPB staffs.

Recovery of Fragments

14. Special arrangements would be made centrally under AWRE advice for the recovery of all fragments, when they had been located and examined, and these would be notified to the police forces concerned. Where, in the interests of public safety, and on scientific advice, a fragment is removed from the point of impact, the central control point should be informed where it is to be stored while awaiting recovery.

Public Warning about Radioactivity

15. It is for the Government to decide whether, and if so by what means, a public warning of danger from radioactivity should be given. In reaching that decision, the need to prevent unnecessary alarm would be carefully considered. Chief Officers should therefore ensure that nothing is done locally to anticipate a Government statement.

Press and Publicity

16. It is essential that those dealing locally with a satellite accident and the Government team in Whitehall should not issue inconsistent statements. Chief Officers should ensure that all local press enquiries are directed to a senior officer at force headquarters, who is briefed to deal with them, working in close liaison with Government Information Officers who would make appropriate arrangements to co-ordinate the national dissemination of information from Whitehall.

~~RESTRICTED~~
UNCLASSIFIED

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Extra Costs

17. International law makes provision for a country in which a satellite falls to be reimbursed for any damage and other costs arising from the incident. In order to establish facts and enable costs to be calculated, for inclusion in any claim submitted by the United Kingdom, police forces (and fire and local authorities) should keep a record of all debris found and all action taken from the receipt of the warning message (or, if no warning message is given, from the receipt of the first reports of falling debris) until the incident is closed.

Claims Procedure

18. The Government is under an obligation to consider claims from the general public for injury or death following a nuclear accident and there is already a registration procedure in existence for this purpose. In the event of a nuclear powered satellite accident a Government announcement would be published about how to obtain registration forms to provide information of assistance in looking into claims for compensation by those in the affected area at the relevant time.

Communications

19. As indicated in paragraph ¹⁰9, reports will be sent via the PNC terminal in New Scotland Yard and from there, depending on the volume of traffic, by Telex or by courier to the central control point. Any general directions issued by the control point will be sent by these means.

20. Messages addressed to the central control point should be confined to operational matters concerning the search for debris, public control, etc. Any enquiry about subsidiary administrative matters arising in consequence of the operations envisaged in this circular should be addressed to the Home Office, F6 Division - by telephone to Mr [REDACTED] (tel no [REDACTED]) or Mr [REDACTED] (tel no [REDACTED]) or by Telex message. The normal Home Office Telex number is [REDACTED]. The additional number [REDACTED] (answer back code [REDACTED]) may be activated to handle such messages exclusively when the need arises

Non-nuclear debris from space

21. As indicated in paragraph 2, the contingency arrangements set out in this circular are applicable to the crash of a satellite known or believed to be carrying radioactive material. Nuclear powered satellites are few but many non-nuclear satellites and other space debris are in orbit and there is continuing likelihood of such objects falling from space and parts of them surviving re-entry to the atmosphere and landing on the earth's surface. Though the likelihood

UNCLASSIFIED

~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

is small the police may become aware of such debris if the fall is observed and reported to them. In that event it would be appreciated if chief officers would inform the Ministry of Defence so that the object may be examined and if possible identified. The point of contact at the Ministry of Defence is Mr [REDACTED], Head of S4f(Air), Ministry of Defence, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB (tel no [REDACTED]).

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED
~~RESTRICTED~~

RESTRICTED
UNCLASSIFIED

ANNEX A

SATELLITE ACCIDENT REPORT PROFORMA

To be reported via the Police National Computer terminal in
New Scotland Yard to the Government Central Control Point
(See paragraph 8) 10

ADDRESSEE - 02B6 SATELLITE

Item

ALPHA	<u>From</u> (state name of force).
BRAVO	<u>Date/Time</u> (state ONE, time of sighting; TWO, time report submitted).
CHARLIE	<u>Reference No</u> (state local unique ref no *).
DELTA	<u>Exact location</u> of debris (giving grid reference and map sheet number where possible; otherwise by direction and distance from easily identified point on Ordnance Survey map).
ECHO	<u>Description</u> (state rough size and shape, material, whether radioactive).
FOXTROT	<u>Casualties/Damage</u> (brief description of dead/ seriously injured and damage to property).
GOLF	<u>RV</u> (state location, telephone number if available, of guide to lead investigator to incident).
HOTEL	<u>Action</u> (state what action taken locally or proposed and any other relevant information).
INDIA	<u>Assistance</u> already at or ordered to scene, other than police.
JULIET	<u>Assistance Required</u> (state type and approximate number).

* It will be very important, in making initial reports and
to assist subsequent action and enquiries, to identify each
finding of possibly dangerous debris by means of a reference
number unique to that finding. The reference number, when
allocated, should be notified to those concerned with action on
the spot as well as to the central government control point.

CLASSIFIED & UNCLASSIFIED *

FLOOR

es Walk Bermondsey

CONTACT: [REDACTED]
PHONE: London SE1 4SB

No. 00039532 24/08/2004 16:06

Acct: 16000\16001

Acct PO#:

Service Date: 25/08/2004 17:00

Auth: F6208A, F6208A

Notes: Please sign to confirm the receipt of the following assets and send back by post or fax to the following address/number

TNT Archive Services

Bourne Avenue

Hayes

Middlesex

UB3 1RF

Fax # [REDACTED]

Signature. [REDACTED]

Date/Time... 25/08/04... 14:50

If an Item is on this Workorder is a No Trace then you will be contacted by the Helpdesk within the next 24 hours

If an Item on this Workorder is Out Of Store then you will be contacted by the Helpdesk within the next 24 hours

If an Item on this Workorder is Not Found then there is No Trace of it at Hayes

Location	Container	Alternate Code	Requestor\Cost Center
Building: Y Floor: A			
HAY7A03CC09A01	RCU000000065035		
Tape: RCU000087446	Desc: D/DAS/64/3	Part 2	

WORKORDER SUMMARY

Total Delivery Items
Containers: 0

Filefolders: 0

Tapes: 1

*** TRANSMISSION REPORT ***

SID :

Number :

Date : 25-08-04 14:52

Date/Time	25-08 14:52
Dialled number	[REDACTED]
Durat.	0' 13"
Mode	NORMAL
Pages	1
Status	Correct

Next Working Day by 5pm Page 1

CLASSIFIED & UNCLASSIFIED *

5TH FLOOR

Pages Walk Remondsay

CONTACT: [REDACTED]

PHONE: [REDACTED]

No. 00039532 24/08/2004 16:06

Acct: 16000\16001

Acct POB:

Service Date: 25/08/2004 17:00

Auth: P6208A, P6208A

Section 40

Notes: Please sign to confirm the receipt of the following assets and send back by post or fax to the following address/number

TNT Archive Services

Bourne Avenue

Hayes

Middlesex

UB3 1RP

Fax [REDACTED]

Signature [REDACTED]

Date/Time... 25/08/04 14:50

If an Item is on this Workorder is a No Trace then you will be contacted by the Helpdesk within the next 24 hours

If an Item on this Workorder is Out of Store then you will be contacted by the Helpdesk within the next 24 hours

If an Item on this Workorder is Not Found then there is No Trace of it at Hayes

Location Container Alternate Code Requestor/Cost Center

Building: Y Floor: A

RCU0000000065035

Tape: RCU000007445 Desc: D/DAS/64/3 Part 2

Section 40

WORKORDER SUMMARY

Total Delivery Items

Containers: 0

Filefolders: 0

Tapes: 1

Archive Services

CLASSIFIED & UNCLASSIFIED *

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 August 2004 16:10
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Questions about UFO's



Questions for the
MOD.doc (23 ...

[REDACTED]

Grateful for your assistance in answering the attached questions.
The last question is a Home office issue and they will need to address that one.
I have declined the offer to provide a spokesperson on the subject!!

Many thanks

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]@itv.com]
Sent: 23 August 2004 14:10
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Questions about UFO's

[REDACTED]

I have attached a list of questions for you to answer. If you wish to discuss any of them with myself or my producer please give me a call.
Thanks for all your help.

Best Wishes

[REDACTED]
ITV West
[REDACTED]

Questions for the MOD

1. -What are the general procedures when the MOD receives reports from members of the public about Unidentified Flying Objects?
2. -Does the response differ if the reports are from military personnel?
3. -How can the MOD be sure the objects reported are not causing a threat to defence if they don't actually investigate the sightings?
4. -In our case study of a lady called [REDACTED] (from Shepton Mallet, Somerset) she had video evidence of three very unusual objects in the sky, why did the MOD not even want to watch the footage?
5. -In this particular case on 31st July 2004 [REDACTED] responded by saying that there were no other reports of UFO's that night and there was no evidence of a defence threat, but no explanation was offered. Does this mean that all flying records would have been checked to discount military operations? And why are no efforts made to come up with an explanation?
6. -Are things spotted by people in our skies often secret military operations that the public are not permitted to know about?
7. -What connections has Rudloe Manor in Wiltshire had with UFO monitoring in the past or indeed now in the present?
8. -Is it true to say that up until the 1980's Rudloe Manor was the headquarters of the Provost Security Service that had the mandate to investigate UFO's?
9. -Does the MOD have personnel who go out and meet people who have reported sightings or have knowledge about UFO's? Have they ever had them? Have these people been based at Rudloe Manor?
10. -Are there different departments around the country working on UFO cases or is everything now directed through one office in London?
11. -Are MOD personnel given guidance in how to play down sightings of UFO's?
12. -We have knowledge of a leaked document that was sent to Police forces, Councils and Fire services across the country in 1979. The Home Office document details a plan to deal with the possibility of Nuclear-powered satellites re-entering the earth's atmosphere and coming down over the UK. Was this a big worry for the MOD? Did any ever come down over British airspace? Have people confused UFO's with these falling satellites? If one of these fell to earth would this not be considered a 'risk to defence' and therefore would this be investigated? Why were the public not told about this risk? Were they encouraged to believe things like this could be UFO's, so as not to cause alarm?

Flying dates

(This document is headed 'Home Office Circular No ES/1979 – Satellite Accidents' it is dated 20 April 1979. I have already contacted the Home Office Press Office and they are coming back to me)



[REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 September 2004 17:29
To: MGS R5-aAMA6d
Subject: Internet-Authorised: UFO's!

Dear [REDACTED] 0

The e.mail you sent to DG Info was copied back to me.

This office is the focal point within the Ministry of Defence for correspondence relating to 'UFO's.

If you would like to send the picture of the 'UFO' to this office for us to have a look at, the address is:-

Ministry of Defence
DAS - FOI 1
5th Floor
Zone H
Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

Hope this is of help.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

16/09/2004

✓

[REDACTED]

From: Info-IM3 on behalf of Info Mgmt-3
Sent: 16 September 2004 16:25
To: MGS R5-aAMA6d
Cc: DAS-FOI1
Subject: RE: Unidentified flying objects

Please would you contact [REDACTED] DAS-FOI [REDACTED] who is the formal contact UFOs and Freedom of Information.

Regards,

[REDACTED]
Info-IM3, Metadata Policy and Taxonomy Adviser
Information Management Branch
DG Information, UK MOD
Minerva House, Delta Office Park 800
Swindon SN5 7XQ

[REDACTED]
Mil [REDACTED]
info-im3@defence.mod.uk


-----Original Message-----

From: MGS R5 - aAMA6d
Sent: 12 September 2004 23:42
To: Info-IM3
Subject: Unidentified flying objects

DEAR SIR :

I DO NOT KNOW IF YOU ARE THE RIGHT PERSON TO ASKED THIS BUT NOT THAT LONG AGO I WAS OUT AND ABOUT WITH MY DEAR OLD WIFE , WITH MY OLD CAMERA AND GOT A PHOTO OF SOMETHING ODD IN THE SKY AND IN NEED OF SOME HELP WITH THIS ONE I CAN NOT MAKE ANY SENSE OF IT WHAT SO EVER , AND CAN YOU HELP ME OUT WITH THIS ONE PLEASE , SORRY TO BE A PAIN BUT DO NOT KNOW WHAT TO DO WITH THIS ONE , CAN YOU HELP OUT PERHAPS YOU MAY KNOW SOME ONE WHO I CAN SEND THE PHOTO TO , AS LONG AS I GET IT THE PHOTO BACK :

[REDACTED]
P/S TO GIVE YOU A CLUE ITS LIKE THE SUN BUT NOT IN THE SHAPE YOU WOULD NORMALLY SEE IT :



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 September 2004 15:15
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Internet-Authorised: UFO - request.

Dear [REDACTED]

Sorry for such a long delay in getting back to you.

The files I requested from archives have become available and I have searched for the information you enquired after.

It appears though, that no report was received by this office over the Malinslee, Telford incident, made by either the pilot of the jet fighter plane, or by a member of the public. Not all incidents/sightings are reported to this office.

Sorry I could not have been more help.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]


13/09/2004



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]
e-mail	[REDACTED]	@mod.uk



Retford
Notts
[REDACTED]

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
31 August 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

Please find enclosed a copy of the report from our imagery analyst regarding your photograph of Retford Town Hall. I apologise for the length of time it has taken to produce this report.

The Joint Air Reconnaissance Intelligence Centre (JARIC) have agreed that this report should be released to you without any redaction. If you have any comments please remember that this office is the focal point within the MOD for UFO issues. You should, therefore, write to us and not attempt to contact JARIC direct.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely,



UNCLASSIFIED



Defence Geographic and Imagery Intelligence Agency
JOINT AIR RECONNAISSANCE INTELLIGENCE CENTRE
Royal Air Force Brampton
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE28 4YG
UNITED KINGDOM



Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

pcmf@jaric.com

Reference:

Date: 27 July 2004

PHOTOGRAMMETRY & COMPUTER MODELLING FLIGHT'S ASSESSMENT
OF ELLIPTICAL SHAPED OBJECT ON SLIDE

Reference:

- A. To determine size of elliptical shaped object identified on supplied colour slide (not original).

1. Photogrammetry and Computer Modelling Flight were tasked to examine and if possible, photogrammetrically derive, dimensions of an object seen at night on a colour slide. This elliptical shaped object is clearly visible on the slide above and to the right of a large building.

2. To determine the size of an object from a photographic slide, apart from knowing the film format and focal length of the camera, certain other criteria must be available. These are either:-

- a. Known distance from the camera to the object (scale).
- b. Known scalar (distance) on the object.

3. Assuming the distance of the object to the camera is unknown and that there are no scalars to use on or close to the object it is evident there is insufficient data for the Flight to determine the size of the elliptical shaped object.



Hd Photogrammetry & Computer Modelling Flight
GISS

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED



Defence Geographic and Imagery Intelligence Agency
JOINT AIR RECONNAISSANCE INTELLIGENCE CENTRE
Royal Air Force Brampton
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE28 4YG
UNITED KINGDOM



Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

dgf01@jaric.com

Reference:

Date: August 2, 2004

PHOTOGRAPHIC ASSESSMENT OF THE ELLIPTICAL SHAPED OBJECT ON SLIDE.

Reference:

To provide an expert evaluation as to any possible photographic causes behind the object on the supplied slide (not original).

a. All required, background knowledge is missing, namely:

- a. Film speed and type.
- b. Exposure time.
- c. Lens Type and Aperture.
- d. Camera Type.
- e. Weather conditions.
- f. Was a tripod used?
- g. Was fill in flash used?

2. This lack of information does not permit a totally informed opinion to be put forward.


A scan was produced at 2,400dpi to enable us to investigate, at greater magnification the structure of the anomaly. From this several points were noted:

- h. There appeared to be no or little image movement across the frame, which would indicate a relatively fast exposure or the use of a tripod.
- i. There is no indication of specular reflection nor of lens flare.
- j. The illuminated plane of the object passes through the very center of the frame.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED


3. No definitive conclusions can be gathered from evidence submitted, however, it may coincidental that the illuminated plane of the object passes through the center of the frame, indicating a possible lens anomaly e.g. a droplet of moisture.




Graphics and Digital Imaging Section
GISS

UNCLASSIFIED







ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 08-22-2011 BY 60322 UCBAW



With Compliments of:

[REDACTED]
**CCIRM IMINT
Room 373
Old War Office Building
Whitehall
LONDON SW1A 2 EU**

Ext [REDACTED]
Brent [REDACTED]



Re: Telecom 9 Aug 04

*Please find the paperwork re our
'UFO' enclosed.*

Yours Aye
[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff (Secretariat)3


MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Room 6/73, Metropole Building, Northumberland Avenue, London,
WC2N 5BP

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)
(GTN)

020 7218 2140
020 7218 9000
[REDACTED]



Retford
Notts



Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
6 April 2004

Dear [REDACTED]


Thank you for your letters of 27th and 29th March with which you enclosed a copy of your slide and the letter from the developers. Your slide has now been passed to the imagery analyst as indicated in my letter of 24 March and we expect his report within approximately two months time.

With regard to paragraph three of your letter of 27th March, you seem to have the impression that there are military aircraft flights taking place in UK airspace without authorisation or for which there are no records. This is not the case. In common with arrangements over other countries around the world, foreign military aircraft wishing to enter UK airspace are required to seek prior authority. Any foreign military aircraft entering without such authority, may be challenged by air defence aircraft. As for UK based military aircraft flights within the UK, all sorties are carefully planned and flight plans are filed or records of training flights held.

In your letter you said that you wish to keep details of your photograph and report secret, and have no desire for this information to be made public. It is not our practice to discuss members of the public's correspondence with third parties. However, you should be aware that the MOD currently operates in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information (the Code) which encourages the provision of information unless its disclosure would, for example, cause harm to defence, invade on an individual's privacy, or if it would take an unreasonable diversion of resources to respond to a request. This means that individuals can request information from our records and it will be supplied wherever possible providing it does not fall under one of the exemptions in the Code. In such cases all personal data is removed before release in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The Code will be superseded by the Freedom of Information Act 2000 when it comes into force on 1 January 2005.

I hope this is helpful. I will write to you again when we have received the information from the imagery analyst.

Yours sincerely,





From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff (Secretariat)3

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Room 6/73, Metropole Building, Northumberland Avenue, London,
WC2N 5BP

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)
(GTN)

020 7218 2140
020 7218 9000
[REDACTED]



Hayton
Retford



Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
24 March 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing concerning your 'UFO' report and photographs which you delivered to us 9th March 2004. I apologise for not writing to you sooner.

First it might be helpful if I explain that the Ministry of Defence does not have any expertise or role in respect of 'UFO/flying saucer' matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains totally open-minded. I should add that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

The MOD examines any reports of 'unidentified flying objects' it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the United Kingdom's airspace might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorised air activity. Unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external source, and to date no 'UFO' report has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported sighting. We believe it is possible that rational explanations, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, could be found for them, but it is not the function of the MOD to provide this kind of aerial identification service. We could not justify expenditure of public funds on investigations which go beyond our specific defence remit.

On this occasion, however, as you have obviously gone to a great deal of trouble to identify what this image on your photograph could be, we are prepared to make an exception and I have now found a defence imagery analyst who is prepared to look at your photographs and give us his professional opinion. In order to do this he has to have a negative, so I would be grateful if you could forward this to me. Please insure that you keep either the original or a copy of the negative for yourself as we can not guarantee that we can return it because of the potential nature of the processing required. Following receipt of the negative, we will, of course, endeavour to give you a substantive reply as soon as possible, however, I hope you will appreciate that this is not within

the normal course of work for this imagery analyst and he has agreed to fit this in around his essential defence work. He has therefore estimated that he should be able to provide us with a reply within two months of receipt of the negative.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely,



[REDACTED]
Hayton
Retford [REDACTED]
Notts.

Tel [REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Ministry of Defence
Room 6/73
Metropole Building
Northumberland Avenue
London WC2N 5BP
27th March 2004

Your Reference; D/DAS/64/3

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you so much for your letter dated the 24th March 2004.

As you say within your letter the MOD does not have expertise or any role in regards to UFO/flying saucer matters or the existence of 'extraterrestrial life forms', I fully understand that statement, and it would be ridiculous of me to expect your department to assign any 'extraterrestrial' tag to the object shown within my transparency slide shown to you within the metropole building on the 9th of March last.

However I sincerely hope that your department and your learned expert might be able to enlighten me on what the object could be ? I understand from our conversation in London that certain unrecorded military flights take place, and they have no definitive record within air space logs kept by both military and commercial airports, so they are in essence top secret, my only difficulty within this scenario is the shape of the craft (if it was a craft ?) I know of no such aircraft in existence that fills the shape and format of the object shown on my transparency in question, however I accept that certain aircraft being classified as 'top secret' might exist within the secret files of the MOD, although if such aircraft do exist ? then aero technology must have come a long way since the cutting edge design of the U.S F18 fighter aircraft.

I also understand as per the contents of your letter, that the MOD must examine certain reports regarding UFO's solely to establish if the object or objects might be a defence compromise by a hostile nation, or simply unauthorised flight activity, I accept that this is a very important role that your department takes on, a position that should not be taken lightly, the use of aircraft within the New York 911 incident spring to the forefront, and taking this into account I wish to help the MOD in anyway I can in regards to the enigma of my transparency slide showing the object in aerial view.

I have throughout this event tried my hardest to get a rational explanation, even at this

moment the complete film is in the hands of Fuji Scientific in Bedfordshire, they have placed one of their most experienced researchers onto the case, a gentleman called [REDACTED] who will I understand take ten days to complete his tests regarding all aspects of the exposed film, please keep in mind that I have already had the film examined by Kodak experts in Lincoln, and you have a copy of that said report.

It had occurred to me that due to the film being manufactured by Fuji, it would only be sensible to get their technical department to look at the exposures, the film may have tendencies that only the company know about, a report from these people in my view is the end of the matter in regards to any anomaly within the film structure and exposure tendencies of the film, I look forward to the report and my film being sent back to me, and I can assure you I will forward a copy of that report as soon as its on my desk here in Retford.

I am trying very hard to keep this story under wraps, it is very difficult due to certain organisations requiring the background story of why I want the tests undertaken, I have been ensured by all the people concerned that they will keep it completely secret, but as you know people talk to each other and confidences get leaked, it is important to me that this account is not furnished to anyone, other than the experts concerned, I have no interest in this story being made public, and sincerely hope you will abide to my request, my position could not carry the stigma of this story.

Last week I had the foresight to get the transparency copied, I handed it in to a professional developing laboratory by hand, I requested 5 exact copies to be made on transparency slide emulsion, you will find enclosed one of these slides, they are a very good representation of the transparency and the resolution is absolutely correct, I have however seen a very small shift in contrast from the original, the copies are slightly brighter, this is probably due to the equipment lighting used in the copy lab, it is no detriment to the transparency, but I can confirm that the **original transparency** is available to you and your research team if you require it, on condition that you return it to me, without damage created under your stringent tests.

Please find enclosed a letter written by the managing director of 'Peak Imaging' it is to ensure you - and your research team, that no digital alteration has taken place within any of the copies made, and in such the copy slide is exactly the same as the original, apart from the minor shift in contrast.

I am available most times on the above numbers, and due to the gravity of the matter I am quite willing to help in anyway I can to solve this enigma, if you require more information through an interview in London or perhaps an on site inspection, please have no hesitation in contacting me.

Perhaps I could take this opportunity to apologise regarding our last meeting, I felt afterwards that the incumbrance of other persons present with me, was not the format we had agreed within our telephone conversation, and probably the meeting was degraded to short discussion within the foyer of the Metropole building directly through that incumbrance, I can assure you that this will ~~not happen~~ again and please accept my apology for this mistake on my behalf
regards
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Hayton
Retford [REDACTED]
Notts.

Tel [REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Ministry of Defence
Room 6/73
Metropole Building
Northumberland Avenue
London WC2N 5BP
29th March 2004

Your Reference; D/DAS/64/3

Dear [REDACTED]

I am so sorry but due to a oversight on my behalf, I forgot to place the letter from the developing company within the Transparency slide envelope I sent to you.

Please find enclosed the letter from the developers regarding the copy transparencies, its just a confirmation that no digital imaging or retouching has taken place on the duplicate slides, in other words they are the same, except for a slight shift in contrast, due to the lighting technique used within duplication.

I will forward the Fuji report as I have promised as soon as it arrives here on my desk.

I r
yo


[REDACTED]

26 March 2004



To whom it may concern

Reference:



**Hayton
Retford**




On March 16th 2004, Peak Imaging was asked to produce 5 duplicate transparencies from 1 original. This work was completed and collected by the customer 2 days later, on the 18th March. Peak Imaging order reference 57133.

The duplicate transparencies were created by optical, camera copying techniques and at no time were the images loaded onto computer. No computer manipulation or amendment has been performed on the said images.

Peak Imaging has an immaculate reputation founded upon quality and performance and the pure nature of our work demands discretion and confidentiality at all times.

Yours faithfully



Managing Director

[REDACTED]
Section Air Staff 2
Metropol Building
Northumberland Avenue
London.

Awaiting negative
from [REDACTED]

24/3/2004 Rec
30/3/2004

[REDACTED]
Hayton
Retford [REDACTED]
Notts
[REDACTED]



Given to [REDACTED]

31/3/2004

Mobile; [REDACTED]

7th March 2004

Dear [REDACTED] 40

Please find enclosed within this folder all relevant information to date regarding the UFO picture taken at Retford on the 27th January 2004, I understand that such an incident without the photographer viewing the object would mostly be placed down to an aberration within the film processing or some other freak photographic defect, however I hope that the enclosed reports regarding this photograph will clarify that such an aberration did not occur within this roll of film or any of the developed slides, culminating to the only conclusion available - that this object must have been in the aerial space defined within the transparency slide picture.

I have endeavoured to get a reasonable and logical explanation for this photograph, and to be honest my investigation towards an explanation has come up with nothing ! I have had experts in their field examine the full roll of exposed film - and the said slide which portrays the UFO, all experts are in agreement that this must have been an exposed incident, and not an aberration within subsequent processing or any other possible flaw that could occur through camera or lens fault or corruption of both.

I have checked the Lunar position through advice from eminent experts within their field, it has been shown without doubt that this UFO could not have been any Lunar flare or reflection, the moon was in a different position at this time and almost setting, I have checked all surrounding airports regarding air traffic, and once again this investigation has come up with 'No Traffic' within that area at that time, I also have verification from both civil and military authorities that on the 27th of January at 23.08 or thereabouts ' the area was clear from any type of aviation flight or passing aircraft'.

The photograph is unique, it displays the time exactly and also gives a cross reference to the date exactly, if you care to look at the banner draped to the front of the Town Hall it shows an advertisement of a forthcoming sale, this banner advertisement date can be verified to the day by Retford Town Hall markets division, or commerce department, also the snow fall can be verified by our local weather station, giving all exact times and dates.

The UFO object shows a definite line between its dome and other body structure, I have had the image scanned at 5400DPI and enlarged to full view on a 19 inch monitor, until the artifacts and pixel composition become evident, it is astounding!

The UFO is shown entering or leaving the picture frame in an isometric fashion, the Retford town lights can be seen clearly reflecting off the UFO structure as it passes through the picture format, the edges of the UFO are consistent to edges within the other parts of the photograph, also grain structure and density are exactly the same in all the proportions throughout the photograph, and that includes the UFO object, a calculus on the speed of this object (enclosed calculus) using aperture and shutter speed shows it to be travelling very fast.

On reversal film tungsten lighting creates a 'yellow' cast within the colours, that is why the post lighting, the building bright area's, and the snow show this yellow cast within the picture, please note the UFO object shows this same yellow cast, if the UFO had been some defect within the film structure, the defect would have been a different colour, ie; blue, red, or even completely clear as in emulsion degeneration or breakdown, the fact that the UFO object shows the same colour cast and grain structure and density is without doubt proof that the object was in its aerial position as the shutter was opened and closed at that moment.

Further the many reports and many hours of investigation on my part - to find a logical explanation as proven to me that no inherent fault within the film structure, or its process, or even its exposure could have caused such an object to be present on this transparency, however being a person who wishes to prove this theory beyond any shadow of doubt, I am contacting the science dept of Fuji films UK in the morning (Monday 8th March 2004) for a second opinion - hopefully to arrange their independent report on the film exposed and their expert representation of the UFO object, I am also contacting Canon UK to get independent tests on both SSC lenses, and the Canon T90 camera to check for any aberration or fault within the equipment, I will send you these reports when I receive them in due course.

I understand from our telephone conversation that some defence experts within your building would be interested in examining the exposed slide film and the slide presenting the UFO object, I remember you mentioned that it is not the policy of the MOD to remark or explain what such object might be ? in honesty I can understand that statement - it would be impossible on my behalf to explain the incident on the 27th January 2004 in Retford, any reasonable person however would inquire what these object are ?, or where do they come from - why does radar not pick them up ? there is so much that is not explained, perhaps much is already known of these objects by our government, and its policy is to keep it under wraps ?, or there again perhaps they know nothing after all.

I am willing to take a lie detector test regarding this incident and the subsequent photograph, I want you to have no shadow of a doubt that the statement I have given regarding this account is completely true, there is other things that as yet I cannot explain? in regards to the whole incident and picture, at the moment only my wife and family know about them, and at this time I do not wish to disclose this personal information for fear of losing my credibility completely, hopefully I will have a logical explanation in the near future.

It is in reality a situation that I did not ask to be part of, and I fear the publication of this incident with great dread, the stigma attached to such circumstances lead to one being classed as a liar or a nut case, people and friends would never treat you the same ever again.

I ask finally that you will give your word that this incident will not be disclosed to anyone in the public domain, I will help the MOD in anyway I can, if you require more information please have no hesitation in contacting me at the above address or telephone numbers, I am willing to give my account to anyone in your dept at London, or perhaps meet them on site in Retford, if that may help your investigation regarding this matter.

I remain
yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

**RAF. Waddington
communication.**

COPY

Copy of Communication to RAF Waddington.

Operations Officer RAF Waddington.

Thank you for talking to me today regarding the above incident in Retford, below you will find an outline of what exactly happened on the day in question, hopefully the information will allow you to investigate the matter more thoroughly.

I am a member of Retford Photographic Society, we have meetings on a Monday evening at 7pm, the meetings consist of lectures by other well known photographers, and monthly in-club competitions, we also embark on trips country wide (in the summer) to photograph well known area's of England.

The club had a competition called 'Series of Three' where each member was invited to submit three photographs, they would be judged on quality and artistic value regarding the theme of the competition, I had very little for this competition that I considered to be good enough, and awaited the opportunity to get some shots, although the winter months are pretty bad for any photographer due to light and other parameters.

I have always loved 'Night Time Photography' this aspect of photography has many problems, one mainly called repository failure of film (when the shutter is left open for to long) so in night time photography bright light is one of the items needed, be it through lamp post light or shop window light, also its always nice to have a wet floor where the reflections of light make the shot even brighter.

I was sat in my bungalow with my wife watching TV when it suddenly started to snow pretty heavy, the date was 27th January 2004 the opportunity of getting my night time shots for this competition was available, so I got my camera and two lenses and took off for Retford Square immediately, the time was approx 9.15pm and I just rushed out of the bungalow without even telling my wife (she would have complained) I drove towards Retford from my village in Hayton (nr Retford) in a small Corsa Diesel Van, the snow was falling that heavy I had to have my wipers on 'full wipe' and even at that speed they could only just cope with the falling snow.

I finally arrived in Retford and parked next to the Lloyds Bank in the square, there was no one about anywhere ! not even a car drove past, it had stopped snowing heavy by then and the square was nicely covered in snow, which reflected the light from the lampposts and buildings very good, I had brought two lenses with me, one was a 20mm FD Canon SSC, the other was a 35mm FD Canon SSC, the Camera was a Canon T90 FD series, I started to take shots of the wet road, the square and also buildings within the square using both lenses in turn.

I am 55 years of age and have not completely embraced 'Digital Photography' my love is to use 'Transparency medium, the quality and resolution I believe cannot be beaten, on this particular shoot I was using FUJIA SENSIA 200ASA Reversal Film, the film is stable and ideal for any night time work.

I ran the roll of 36 frames to complete my theme of 'Series of Three', and duly sent it to 'Transpa Colour Developers' a company renowned for quality developing, the slides came back mounted within a plastic case ready for me to examine on my light box or within my viewer, because I was busy I initially asked my wife to look through them to see if she could find anything suitable for the competition, she did so and later that day after supper told me there was nothing any good within the slides.

Accepting this remark I left the slides until the next day, and took them to bed with me to examine them before going to sleep, I took my battery viewer to look at each slide, as I went through the slides I found 3 shots that were perfect for the competition, I placed them to one side on my bedroom cabinet, and carried on looking through the slides - to my amazement on

COPY

one of the slides which is a frontal view of the Town Hall in Retford was a UFO flying to the right hand side of the clock tower, the clock clearly reads 11.08pm, so there is no doubt on the time of the incident, the shot is good and crisp, the resolution is good, and by looking at the diagonals of the buildings I think the lens must have been the 35mm FD Canon SSC, I had the camera on full automatic, and the shutter was closing at about 60th of a second, there is no movement of double image on the photograph, or camera shake.

There is no possibility of 'Lens Flare' or water droplets on the lens, the later incident would not create anything like this image more probably a fuzzy cloudy inclusion to the side of the photograph, there is no problem with the developing side either, I have verification that no chemical or aberration would have created such an enigma, I am without a shadow of a doubt that this object was taken in the sky above the clock tower at Retford.

I duly contacted [REDACTED] from the dept of Astro Physics in Nottingham University, he kindly verified that the moon at that time was approx 4 degrees Azimuth - 275 degrees West, and very close to setting, I also contacted [REDACTED] of Astro Physics dept in Sheffield University, he also verified the exact same data regarding the Lunar position, both gentlemen used software called XEPHEM - IRAF I believe this software to be an industry standard.

Due to the position of this UFO and its correspondence to the clock tower (which has North;South;East;& West above) it was easy to calculate the object position at the time, we used a Clinometer in daylight to calculate the height of the object, and a compass to verify its position, the findings are set below.

Object was approx - South South West - at 29 degrees Azimuth.

It can be seen clearly on the photograph that some sort of line is present below the dome, almost a joining line ? and further it can be seen that light reflection is present from the town centre due to the UFO object being slightly isometric to the ground as it flies past.


I can verify that I did not see this object, and consider it to be a stroke of luck that I pressed the shutter at exactly the time it passed, probably a small moment in time captured, one second before or after and I would not have the photograph, I was too interested in getting the shot of the town hall correct.

I can also verify that I won the competition and was delighted with the results of the evenings shoot, I have just been voted the competition secretary of my camera club, and do not wish anyone to know about this incident, I am sure you can understand why.

I request that no one else is told in regards to this matter, I sincerely do not want anyone to know about it, also if you have any passing traffic within this area I will gladly furnish you a digital copy of this photograph, on condition that it is not passed on to any publisher or used in any form of publication without my specific authority, I have furnished my address and telephone numbers below for your attention, please note my home numbers do not accept 'Anonymous calls' but my mobile phone is on 24 hours a day, I do not trust the transport of this photograph by email platform which is not secure.

I hope you can give me a report of the air traffic in the area at that time, I will keep all such information in confidence.

My Details are;



COPY

HAYTON [REDACTED] 0

NOTTS

UK

tel [REDACTED]

tel [REDACTED]

mob [REDACTED]

Sincerest regards

[REDACTED]

Gamston Aerodrome communication

COPY

Communication from Opps at Gamston Airport nr Retford Notts.

The Airport normally closes at 18:00 hours each day and is not permitted to accept flights after 21:00 hours unless the flight is for emergency purposes. Consequently, we have no knowledge of any aircraft in the area at the date and time that you state. However, aircraft in transit through the region do use a navigational aid maintained by the National Air Traffic Services that is located at the Airport.

[REDACTED]
Aerodrome Manager

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]

To: <ops@gamstonairport.co.uk>

Sent: Wednesday, February 11, 2004 8:29 PM

Subject: WWW Form Submission

**Communication
from**



**Astro-Physics
Sheffield
University**

Communication from [REDACTED]

COPY

[REDACTED] 40

for the date/time in question, details about the lunar phase and position are.

Altitude - 4 degrees, Azimuth - 275 degrees (West)

The moon was close to setting (23:40). Hopefully this is everything you need. I used a package called xephem to calculate these data.

[REDACTED] 40

Cns	Az	Alt	Zenith	VMag	Elong	RisTm	TrnTm	TrnAlt	SetTm
Sun	Cap	332:35:42	-54:30:26	144:30:26	-27 0.0	7:47	12:13	19:59	16:40
Moon	Psc	275:25:37	4:01:39	85:58:21	-12 75.7	10:21	16:52	43:30	23:40
Mercury	Sgr	12:36:02	-60:44:37	150:44:37	-1.3 -21.9	6:43	10:40	15:51	14:38
Venus	Aqr	295:27:48	-26:50:50	116:50:50	-4.2 38.7	9:16	14:45	31:46	20:15
Mars	Psc	276:16:51	8:35:36	81:24:24	0.6 78.6	10:13	17:10	48:59	0:08
Jupiter	Leo	114:07:07	25:17:44	64:42:16	-2.4 -139.4	20:19	2:56	44:27	9:29
Saturn	Gem	207:37:34	58:50:41	31:09:19	0.5 150.3	13:58	22:08	61:06	6:22
Uranus	Aqr	305:56:50	-38:34:49	128:34:49	5.9 24.0	8:48	13:51	26:51	18:53
Neptune	Cap	325:21:35	-51:27:55	141:27:55	8.0 5.3	8:04	12:37	21:29	17:09
Pluto	Se2	46:44:58	-44:56:34	134:56:34	13.9 -46.6	4:14	9:01	24:00	13:49
ISS-912	Ara	95:01:49	-69:46:24	159:46:24	11:49	11:52	5:08	11:56	

Limb 1/27/2004 23:08:00 GMT:

Lat: 51:30:30

Long: 0:11:00

Elev: -1m

Temp: 10C

Pres: 1010mB

Site: London, England

--

[REDACTED]
Dept of Physics & Astronomy, Group Tel: [REDACTED]

University of Sheffield, FAX: [REDACTED]

Hicks Building, Hounsfield Rd email: [REDACTED]

Sheffield S3 7RH [REDACTED]

**Communication
from**



**Nottingham
University**

COPY

**Information Regarding Lunar Position on the 27th January 2004 at 23.08pm
from [REDACTED] Nottingham University**

I had contacted [REDACTED] at the dept of Astrophysics at Nottingham University by telephone, he then checked out the exact Lunar position at the above time and date using a software called Xephem to calculate the data I had requested - his findings were exactly the same as [REDACTED] from Dept of Physics & Astronomy at Sheffield University.

I therefore accept the findings enclosed on the data sheet from [REDACTED] and bring to the attention that the Lunar orbit could not have been in the position of the UFO at that time, further more please note the moon at this time was close to setting at 4 degrees Azimuth - 275 degrees (West).

**Reversal Film
Detailed
Examination
and
UFO
Slide Detailed
Examination**

COPY

Transparency Slide Examination

I took the developed UFO slide and the other developed slides from the same roll of film to the Kodak Developing Laboratory in Lincoln, the slide was examined and found to have no Emulsion degeneration, or Emulsion damage of any kind, it was further explained to me that chemical process of development regarding this film could not create any such imperfection of the UFO image.

Further it was noticed that the UFO image has the same density pattern and colour of the surrounding picture, also under high magnification it was found that the grain was exactly the same pattern within the UFO image and the surrounding picture, which would confirm that the object was photographed, and could not have been a fault within development.

Reciprocity Failure;

No evidence of reciprocity Failure have been found within the total run of the slide film.

Multiple Exposure;

No evidence of multi exposure can be found within this transparency.

Sandwich Technique;

No evidence of sandwich technique can be found within this transparency.

Cross Contamination;

No evidence of cross contamination or chemical fogging can be found within this transparency.

Drying Stains;

No evidence of any drying stains could be found within any of the transparency film.

Retouching of Transparency;

No evidence of re-touching could be found to this slide or any other slide within the same roll.

Chemical Bleaching;

No evidence of chemical bleaching can be found within this transparency or any other transparency within the same roll.

Aberration;

Any failing of the lens in its ability to produce a true image would not come under this category, or create such a anomaly.

Automatic Iris;

Any sticking of the automatic iris within the lens would not create this anomaly, the 35mm Canon SSC lens was tested and is in perfect working order.

Camera Shake;

No evidence of camera shake can be found, the photographer states all shots were hand held and therefore our calculation of shutter speed would be from 60th sec to 90th of a second.

COPY

Flash Exposure;

No evidence is shown of flash exposure or cross flare reflection, the photographer states he did not use flash in any photograph within the film roll, we are in agreement with this statement and cannot find any evidence of flash exposure what so ever.

Contrast;

A good tonal difference was shown throughout the transparency, indicating correct exposure for the situation.

Depth of Field;

Depth of Field is good and complies with the use of a wide angle lens, the diagonals within the transparency converge showing use of a wide angle lens as the photographer states.

Diaphragm;

The UFO subject is not consistent with any ghost diaphragm image, its shape and density and colour do not correspond with that anomaly.

Effective Aperture;

The photographer had the Canon T90 on full automatic, therefore no effective aperture was recorded by the photographer, in our view the aperture would have been consistent with f2 or f2.8 on close examination of the transparency.

Filter;

The photographer has stated that no filter was used on the 35mm SSC Canon lens, the resulting colour portrayed on the transparency from the halogen outside lighting confirms this statement.

Grain;

The granular structure of the grain throughout the transparency was the same, including the UFO object, therefore the exposure technique must be considered the same throughout the transparency, therefore no double exposure could have been possible on this evidence.

Perspective;

The transparency image shows a photograph being consistent with a wide angle lens shot.

Polarized Light;

No evidence of polarizing is shown within the photograph.

Resolution;

The resolution of the transparency is consistent with exposure of Fuji Sensia 200ASA within that environment.

Sharpness;

The sharpness of the resulting transparency shows consistency of the environment when the film was exposed, via assessing adjacency effects within the transparency.

UFO Object;

The abruptness of change within the density between adjoining area's of the UFO object, and collating tonal value, contrast, grain and adjacency effect, show without doubt that the object

COPY

was photographed within the aerial view portrayed by the transparency.

Stereoscopic Photography;

Absolutely no evidence of stereoscopic photography was used within this transparency.

Supplementary Lens;

The photographer states that no supplementary lens was used, we agree with this statement.

Vignetting;

No evidence of under exposure of the image corners could be found.

**RAF. Waddington
Telephone
Communication**

COPY

I furnished a digital copy of the Retford UFO photograph and details of the incident to Opps at RAF Waddington, I also a request any information regarding 'Air Traffic' within the area at that time on condition that I would not disclose any information given to me, I asked that RAF Waddington would not publish or make known to any public sector the information regarding this incident or photograph of the UFO object.

On the 2nd of March 2004 I received a telephone call from Opps RAF Waddington regarding my request for information on Air Traffic for the date 27th January 2004 at 11.08pm on a heading of South South West at 29 degrees Azimuth.

The officer within that telephone call verified that no air traffic was in that area at that time, she also told me that under the circumstances I should contact 'Room 824' Section Air Staff 2, Whitehall, London, I did so and had numerous telephone conversations with other staff at Whitehall regarding this photograph- I finally made contact with [REDACTED] Section Air Staff 2. Metropol Building, Northumberland Avenue, London.

Within that telephone conversation we agreed to meet within the Metropol building on the 9th of March 2004 at 1pm, [REDACTED] said that defence experts would be interested in looking at the UFO slide, we also agreed that I should bring some copies of the UFO photograph, and the slide which contained the UFO object, and also subsequent slides from the roll of developed film, [REDACTED] stated that she or any of her colleagues would not be able to define what the object might be, and that condition was agreed by us both.

SUGGESTED SHUTTER SPEEDS TO 'FREEZE' SUBJECTS MOVING ACROSS THE LINE OF A STATIONARY CAMERA FITTED WITH A STANDARD LENS

Distance		Shutter speed for subjects moving at a speed of:						
		4	8	15	30	60	250	1000 kph
m	ft	2.5	5	10	20	40	150	600 mph
0.5	1.5	1/2000						
1	3	1/1000	1/2000					
2	6	1/500	1/1000	1/2000				
4	12	1/250	1/500	1/1000	1/2000			
8	25	1/125	1/250	1/500	1/1000	1/2000		
15	50	1/60	1/125	1/250	1/500	1/1000		
30	100	1/30	1/60	1/125	1/250	1/500	1/2000	
60	200	1/15	1/30	1/60	1/125	1/250	1/1000	
125	400	1/8	1/15	1/30	1/60	1/125	1/500	1/2000
250	750	1/4	1/8	1/15	1/30	1/60	1/250	1/1000
500	1500	1/2	1/4	1/8	1/15	1/30	1/125	1/500
1 km	1/2 mi	1	1/2	1/4	1/8	1/15	1/60	1/250
2 km	1 mi	2	1	1/2	1/4	1/8	1/30	1/125

COPY

The Square Retford.


The Town Hall.

The Lunar Setting Aspect.

The UFO Object Approx Position.

Lunar Point 4 deg

UFO



UFO
Incident
Retford Square
Nottinghamshire

January 27th 2004
11.08pm

Taken by



File contains;
Digital Images scanned from original Transparency;
One Colour Photograph;
One Monochrome Photograph;
One Negative Aspect Photograph;
One Enlarged Negative Aspect Photograph.



Section Air Staff 2
Metropol Building
Northumberland Avenue
London



October 27, 2004 Time 23:08 pm Fujifilm Sensia Reversal Film ASA 200, Canon F90, 35mm SSC F

Warning !

This photograph is subject to Copyright Law therefore it cannot be used for display reproduced in any form, or published, without the specific written authority of

on 40

www.kodakexpresslincoln.co.uk
5 Guildhall Street
Lincoln LN1 1TT

This image has not been altered or
manipulated in anyway.





Photo Taken 27th January 1915



Photo taken 9/2/00





From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone	(Direct dial)	020 7218 2140
	(Switchboard)	020 7218 9000
	(Fax)	[REDACTED]
e-mail	[REDACTED]	@mod.uk

[REDACTED]
Macmillan Education Australia
627 Chapel Street
South Yarra Vic 3141
AUSTRALIA

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
25 August 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing regarding your letter of 11 August 2004 addressed to the Ministry of Defence Departmental Records Officer, concerning an official memo from Lt Colonel Charles Halt. I understand you wish to reproduce this document in an educational publication for primary school children. Your letter has been passed to me as this Department is the focal point within the MOD for correspondence about 'UFO' matters.

First, you should be aware that the website you have quoted is not an MOD site and therefore the information it contains should not be regarded as official MOD policy on UFOs. The official memo by Lt Col Halt and a large number of other papers on the Rendlesham Forest incident were released in November 2002 as part of the MOD Freedom of Information Publication Scheme. If you wish to view these documents, please see www.foi.mod.uk and search under 'UFO' then, look at the class of information named, 'Correspondence'.

With regard to the reproduction of any of these documents for publication, I must inform you that they are subject to Crown Copyright regulations and if you wish to publish them you must obtain a licence from the MOD Copyright Unit, at the following address. It is likely that you will be charged a fee for the licence.

[REDACTED]
MOD Copyright Administrator
IPR Group
Poplar 2 #2218
MOD Abbey Wood
Bristol
BS34 8JH
E-mail: ipr-cu@dpa.mod.uk

I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]

Thank you.

40

From: IPR-CTM3, [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 August 2004 13:03
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Crown Copyright

40

When you send them the information tell them to contact the MOD Copyright Unit, the details are:

[REDACTED]
MOD Copyright Administrator
IPR Group
Poplar 2 #2218
MOD Abbey Wood
Bristol
BS34 8JH

Tel [REDACTED]
Fax [REDACTED]
E-mail ipr-cu@dpa.mod.uk

Regards

40

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 August 2004 12:18
To: IPR-CTM3
Subject: RE: Crown Copyright

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your help. It looks like I will have to tell my enquirer to write to the MOD Copyright Unit. I do not seem to be able to find them on our wonderful new DII directories. Are they part of your organisation and/or do you have an address?

[REDACTED]
DAS-FOI

From: IPR-CTM3, [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 August 2004 09:24
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: LEGAL ADVISERS-LA17; IPR-CTM
Subject: RE: Crown Copyright

Dear All,

I am unsure of peoples knowledge as to the relationship between FOI and copyright, so apologies for the proverbial granny's and sucking eggs.

The way we describe FOI, is the ability of a person to achieve 'self enlightenment' by accessing the information available by virtue of the various provisions of the FOI Act. The information they are provided with is a copy of the original and it may not be further reproduced without the permission of the copyright owner. In our case the majority will be owned by the Crown and they would be infringing the Crown's copyright if they made copies, although there are a number of exceptions under the Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988. Essentially these exceptions are its use for private study or non-commercial research (s29) or criticism, news reporting or review (s30). Where the information does not belong to the Crown, we have to have permission of the copyright owner before we can copy it and that includes copying it to supply for an FOI request.

Therefore while it may be determined that no fee will be payable under the FOI for the provision of the material, where a person/organisation intends to commercially exploit the material they will require a licence from the MODs Copyright Unit and a fee will be charged. Where the information is not going to be commercially exploited, for instance a person receives information under FOI and intends to put it on a website, they would still need a licence before reproducing it (and we are still likely to charge a licence fee) otherwise it will be an infringement of the Crown's copyright.

It is essential, therefore, that any information made available through the publication scheme clearly identifies who owns the copyright. If it is wrongly marked as Crown Copyright, when it is in fact owned by one of our contractors, and the MOD licence's it's use to a third party, we leave ourselves open to an action for infringement and damages.

On the MODs external website (www.mod.uk), if you go to the bottom of the home page and click on copyright the wording below is shown.

Freedom of Information

Supply of information under the Freedom of Information Act does not give the person or organisation the automatic right to reuse the documents in a way which will infringe copyright, for example, by making multiple copies, publishing or issuing copies to the public.'

This statement should be made on any release of information under the FOI Act to ensure that the recipient is in no doubt as to the position they are in.

If you wish to discuss any of the points raised above please give me a call.

Regards

[REDACTED] 40

[REDACTED]
Patent Officer
Intellectual Property Rights Group
Ministry of Defence
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 24 August 2004 17:45

To: IPR-CU: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Crown Copyright

[REDACTED] 0

We spoke, PSA, thanks for your help on this

[REDACTED] works in the Crown Copyright Team at
DPA.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 August 2004 13:00
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: LEGAL ADVISERS-LA17
Subject: RE: Crown Copyright

[REDACTED] 40

It is one of the Rendlesham Forest documents in the UFO Correspondence class and can be accessed for free.

[REDACTED] 40

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 August 2004 12:10
To: [REDACTED] LEGAL ADVISERS-LA17
Subject: FW: Crown Copyright

[REDACTED] 40

Was it on the publication scheme as readily available or something that would be released for a fee?

I've copied in [REDACTED] LA17. [REDACTED] on 40
grateful for any advice you can offer on
the crown copyright issue.

Regards

[REDACTED] 0

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 August 2004 11:45
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Crown Copyright

[REDACTED]


I have received a letter from Macmillan Education Australia (a publisher of educational books for primary and secondary

schools) who want to use an image of the Lt Col Charles Holt memo which we have put in the publication scheme as part of one of our classes on UFOs. They want to print this document in 5000 copies of a publication called 'Marvels and Mysteries' which is used by primary school children.

I would be grateful for some advice as to whether this would be subject to Crown Copyright regulations and if so, what do we have to do about this request?.

[REDACTED]
DAS-FOI
5th Floor, Zone H
MB
[REDACTED]

DAS reviewed 20/8/04



✓ (on-databases)

copy:



DAS FOI



MACMILLAN

Macmillan Education Australia

627 Chapel Street
South Yarra Vic 3141

Tel:



Fax:

Email:



Ministry of Defence,
Departmental Record Officer
Mezzanine 2
3-5 Great Scotland Yard
London
SW1A 2HW
UK

11 August 2004

Re: Macmillan Education Australia's forthcoming title 'Marvels and Mysteries'

Hello,

Macmillan Education Australia is currently preparing for publication a primary school series called 'Marvels and Mysteries'.

The authors would like to use an image of the official memo written by Lt Colonel Charles Halt, regarding the Rendlesham incident in 1981 (as seen at: www.envasion.net/2002/rendlesham.html)

Would you have a copy of this memo we could use?

Our publication details are:

Print run: Less than 5,000
Markets: Aust/NZ
Size: ¼

Please note that full acknowledgment will be provided.

Many thanks. I look forward to hearing from you, and please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further information.

Kind Regards,



(Freelance) Picture Research
Macmillan Education Australia
www.macmillan.com.au



On Her Majesty's Service

2

POSTAGE
PAID
PHQ 334




DAS For


5th Floor Zone H

Man Bolding



If undelivered please return to:-
P.O. BOX 701, LONDON WC2H 8BG





[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 August 2004 16:10
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Internet-Authorised: UFO query

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your e.mail dated 20 August 2004.

Sorry for not replying sooner, I was out of office, plus the long delay in getting back to you about the incident over Malinslee, Telford.

I am experiencing problems, retrieving the files I requested, back from archives, so at the moment, am unable to check for the information that you require for that incident, if at the time, a report was made to this office. I have put in various requests for the files, so hopefully, in the next few days, they will become available.

I will write to you again when the files become available.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

23/08/2004

✓ (on databases).

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 August 2004 12:41
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: UFO query.

Dear [REDACTED]
Thank you for your e-mail. Have you been able to gather any info. Please let me have an update.

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 04, 2004 3:00 PM
Subject: UFO query.

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing with reference to the e.mail you sent to this office on 11 April 2004. Sorry for such a long delay in getting back to you.

I have recalled the 1991 UFO Report file from Archives, to see if the incident over Malinslee, Telford, was reported to this office.


I will be in contact in due course and if the report and any photographs are available, will be able to forward you a copy.

Yours sincerely
[REDACTED]

23/08/2004



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Shipston-On-Stour
Warwickshire
[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

12 August 2004

Dear [REDACTED] 0

Thank you for your letter dated 2 August 2004.

I am sorry to hear that you did not receive a reply to your letter to RAF Cosford. I have been in contact with the Community Relations Officer at RAF Cosford who has no record of receiving your letter. We received a letter dated 13th June to which we replied on 20th July and it is possible that this is the letter intended for RAF Cosford.

With regard to your question about whether RAF Cosford had a helicopter flying in the area at the time of the sightings or saw anything on their radar, you may wish to be aware that the only helicopter based at RAF Cosford is the County Air Ambulance and this was not in the area at the time of the sightings. The only radar RAF Cosford have is a local Air Traffic Control radar which is used for their own air traffic and for training purposes. This radar does not cover the area of the sightings and is usually switched off at around 1700 each night.

Finally, you mentioned documents that were released to another member of the public concerning an alleged UFO incident in the vicinity of the home of the Rt Hon Michael Howard QC MP on 8 March 1997. Please find enclosed, for your information, a copy of the papers that were released.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

YOUR REFERENCE
D/DAS/64/3



✓ (on databases)
[Redacted]
Shipston on Stour
Warwickshire
[Redacted]

21/8/04

DEAR [Redacted]

THANK YOU FOR LETTER DATED 20 JULY 2004. I ASSUME YOU ARE REPLYING ON BEHALF OF R.A.F. COSFORD. AS I HAVE NOT RECEIVED A REPLY DIRECT FROM THEM, EVEN ENCLOSING A S.A.E. IF THEY PASSED MY LETTER TO YOU, YOU WILL SEE THAT I ALSO ASKED IF THEY PICKED UP ANYTHING UNUSUAL ON THEIR RADAR.

THE REASON I ASK FOR THE RADAR INFORMATION IS TO SEE IF IT WAS A 'SOLID' OBJECT AND NOT A REFLECTION FROM SOMETHING ELSE. SO FAR THE WITNESSES HAVE NOT COMPLETED A REPORT FORM, SO I CAN ONLY USE THE INFORMATION STATED IN THE NEWSPAPER ARTICLE. I HAVE NOT ENCLOSED A S.A.E, BECAUSE I ALREADY SENT ONE TO R.A.F. COSFORD, AND THE ONE I SENT TO YOUR COLLEAGUE [Redacted] WAS SENT TO SOMEONE IN SOUTHAMPTON WITH SOME PAPERS HE ASKED FOR. I FOUND THIS OUT WHEN HE WROTE TO ME FOR MY VIEWS ON THE INCIDENT IN LYMPNE, KENT ON THE 8/3/97. A WITNESS SAW A BLACK FLYING TRIANGLE NEAR THE HOME OF THE THEN HOME SECRETARY MICHAEL HOWARD.

HE DID NOT SAY WHAT PAPERS WERE SENT TO HIM CONCERNING THE ABOVE INFORMATION. I WILL HAVE TO WRITE TO HIM AGAIN AND FIND OUT AND SEE IF I CAN GET PHOTO COPIES TO ADD TO MY FILE ON IT.

YOURS SINCERELY
[Redacted]

Supreme Headquarters Alien Defence Organisation

UFO © 1995 PolyGram Television International
A Fenderson Product

✓ ✓
[REDACTED]
Folkestone
Kent
[REDACTED]
REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

25 May 1997

The Honourable Roger Gale MP
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

Dear Sir,

I have been reading extracts from a book on the subject of UFOs called "Open Skies-Closed Minds" by a Mr Nick Pope. I found the material quite incredible, especially coming from a civil servant in The Ministry of Defence.

What I find quite inconceivable is that the government continue to deny or even acknowledge the existence of UFOs in spite of all the evidence.

For The Ministry of Defence to claim that incidents such as that at Rendlesham Forest in 1980 are of no defence significance is totally outrageous and I feel this policy needs to be reversed.

It would not be a good idea for me to approach my own MP, Michael Howard on this, as I understand he had an experience of his own (see enclosure). Nevertheless, I feel that this particular incident is a grave matter of security.

I hope you will consider raising these issues in Parliament.

Yours Sincerely
[REDACTED]

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

- 1 JUN 1997

FOLKESTONE,
KENT. [REDACTED]
Tel [REDACTED]

TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE HOME DEPARTMENT.

THE PETITION OF A NUMBER OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE COUNTY OF KENT AND ELSEWHERE DECLARES THAT THERE WAS AN INCIDENT INVOLVING A SIGHTING OF AN UNIDENTIFIED CRAFT IN THE VICINITY OF THE RESIDENCE OF THE MP FOR FOLKESTONE AND HYTHE (SHEPHERD), ON OR AROUND THE 8TH OF MARCH, 1997.

THE PETITIONERS THEREFORE REQUEST THAT THE HOME DEPARTMENT SHOULD HOLD A FULL PUBLIC ENQUIRY INTO THE SAID INCIDENT, AND PUBLICISE ANY SUCH FINDINGS THAT MAY ARISE FROM SAID INQUIRY.

AND THE PETITIONERS REMAIN ETC."

SIGNATURE

4

MAIDSTONE KENT

UFOMIEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

Name: [REDACTED]

Address: [REDACTED]

HYTHE

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Tel:

Age/D.O.B: 4/10/71 (25 Yrs).

Date of observation: 08/03/97. Time: 03:00 hrs.

Locality of observation: DUNKEY ST. BURNMASH, WEST HYTHE.

How long was the object visible: 1 minute

Please describe the weather conditions if possible: Cloudy. Cold.

Position of Sun/Moon in relation to object seen: N/A.

Please try and describe the object seen as best as you can: TRIANGULAR/ELONGATED.
Size about 2 planes in length.

Was the object brighter than the background sky: Yes.

If so was it brighter than the Sun/Moon/Headlights: Lights bright Diamond faceted effect / in full-lux.

Was the object observed through binoculars/telescope: N/A.

Try to give an approximation of the objects size: About size of two large passenger planes in length.

How did you happen to notice the object: Saw the lights in front of car to the left.

Where were you and what were you doing at the time: Driving home after dropping off friends.

Please try and estimate the distance of the object: About 3-400 metres.

Are there any Airports/Military/Governmental facilities in the area of your observation: Army Ranges nearby.

Have you ever seen anything else which you would describe as unusual: N/A

(If yes please give details on a separate sheet of paper)

Please draw a rough sketch of the area and of the object observed on the reverse of this form.

Have you reported the incident to anyone else (if so who and when): N/A.

Please enclose any photographs/video which will be returned if requested. N/A.

Do you object to us using your name with regard to this report: No.

Thanking you for your co-operation in this matter, and, if you agree, we may contact you further regarding this incident.

Date: 14.3.97.

Signed: [REDACTED]

UFOMEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

STATEMENT OF DECLARATION

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

I.....

OF..........*HY-ME*.....

DECLARE THAT THE DETAILS GIVEN BY MYSELF, ARE TO MY KNOWLEDGE TRUE AND CORRECT. I ALSO APPROVE/~~DO NOT APPROVE~~ OF MY NAME BEING USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE REPORT GIVEN BY ME.

I ALSO APPROVE/~~DO NOT APPROVE~~ OF ANY PHOTOGRAPHS/VIDEO FOOTAGE MADE BY ME, OR OF MYSELF PRODUCED BY UFOMEK DURING INTERVIEWS BEING USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH MY REPORT IN ANY PUBLICATION.

SIGNED

DATE:*14.3.97.*.....

SIGNED: .......

(UFOMEK INVESTIGATOR)

DATE: *14 March 1997*.....

UFO MEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

BRAMLING,
CANTERBURY,
KENT.
Tel. [REDACTED]

FOLKESTONE.
KENT.
Tel. [REDACTED]

BURMARSH SIGHTING WITNESS STATEMENT

"It was very early in the morning, I think it was about three o'clock. I was driving back from dropping some friends off and I was coming down the road and I felt, I said afterwards to other people since, that I felt really weird. I was really looking over my shoulder on the way home. I was a bit scared, a weird feeling anyway.

And I saw something in front of me, and thought "Oh my God what the hell is it?", and sort of slowed down because I thought it was coming at me, and it stopped in a field in front of me. Probably 3 to 400 yards away, and I slowed down looking at it. It was just this huge triangle thing, which was a lot bigger than an aeroplane, but there is no way that I could have mistaken it for an aeroplane. or anything like that.

It had lights all around the outside, and this disc attached to the back, and a big light on the front. I pulled up to stop, and as I did it shot off. Literally shot off. I thought "Oh God what is this? This is really, really scary." And it stopped again, sort of another 500 yards away from me, and it did that four times. It just shot further and further away, but stopped four times, sort of moved for about 5-6 seconds, stopped for 2 sec's, then moved again for another 5-6 seconds and so on. The object was moving Westwards., and all the time it was making this weird humming sound. There was no other noise, like an aircraft engine.

It was really peculiar, it was, I wouldn't say shiny, but looked more sort of tin foily, sort of shimmery. It was shiny in places, and not in others. I just don't know what it was, it was so weird. The lights were really bright, a very bright one at the front, and when it shot off, I saw a light in each corner, which were white in colour. The ones around the outside were a sort of yellow-white, and there was also a circle of light in the middle, of the same colour as the outside ones.

When I first saw it, the point was facing me, but when it shot off it sort of.... I don't know, it must have swiveld, but I don't remember it swivelling, because I could see it side on then, and I could see underneath as it shot off, and there was this circle of lights.

I probably got a good look at it literally for a matter of seconds, and then it flicked off, and then stopped for a few seconds, and then it flicked off again and so on. I would say no more than 25 seconds, if that. I saw it for quite a long time in the distance, because I saw all these lights, and thought they were just lights. It wasn't until I got closer that I thought "Bloody hell, what is that?" So maybe I saw it for a lot longer that I thought.

It wasn't something like you see on television, like the futuristic planes,

well you can always tell that they are planes. Where as this was not like that. I was really frightened by it, and I'm not stupid. I don't believe in anything like that (UFO's). This is not something I've ever seen before or like something we would have built. It was just too weird, too odd, and the strange shimmer effect. It looked like an object suspended, had no wobble or anything like that. And when it moved off it was like a fluid movement, it was really odd. There was no slowing down or speeding up during each movement, like when you flip a coin or stone across the water.

The object was like an equilateral triangle, about double the size of an airliner, maybe as big as a football field. It wasn't very thick, but seemed thin along the edges, but sort of mounding in the middle. As I said there was this humming sound, like the sound you hear when you stand under overhead power cables. When I first heard the noise I thought it was the car engine playing up, and put my foot on the accelerator, for a second or two, but the noise was still there, and it was then that I realised the sound was coming from the object.

When the object finally disappeared, I kept looking around in the sky, thinking "Oh God where has it gone?" Looking for lights, anything, even aircraft lights and it was then that I noticed there were no stars visible.

All the time I had the feeling of the hairs standing up on the back of my neck, and I was convinced I had someone in the car with me. I felt really scared, as I drove home. I think I arrived home about twenty past three, maybe half-past three, I don't remember. But I woke everyone up and told them what I had seen and had a drink to calm me down. I was really shaken by the whole thing."

SIGNED: [REDACTED]

(Sarah Hall).

DATE: 25th APRIL, 1997

WITNESSED BY: [REDACTED]

(Chris Rolfe)

DATE: 25th APRIL, 1997


WITNESSED BY: [REDACTED]

(Barry Oldfield)

DATE: 25th APRIL, 1997

ORIGINAL

25 APR 1997



UFO is sighted over the marsh!

By Sarah Hall

SHEPWAY has once again become the centre of a wave of suspected UFO sightings.

Three people contacted the *Herald* this week after a strange object was seen looming in the sky over the Romney Marsh area in the early hours of last Saturday morning.

Sophie Wadleigh, 25, of Shepherds walk, Hythe,

was amazed to see a large triangular 'space-ship' stop in a field directly in front of her, as she drove home through Donkey Street in New Romney at just after 3am on Saturday morning.

Shocked Sophie said: "It

was so peculiar, it all felt really odd and I heard this humming noise.

"As I looked across the field I saw a large triangular shaped flying craft hovering about 300 metres off the ground.

"It had a large dome at one end and a lot of bright lights around the sides and looked quite shiny — I really had no idea what it

was and just sat in the car looking at it.

"After a few seconds it shot off leaving in a flash of light, travelling about 500m across the field and stopping again.

"It did this four times and then flew into the distance and I watched until it was out of sight.

"I have talked to friends since who have said that it was probably an aeroplane or an advanced Stealth bomber — but I have never seen anything like it before."

And it would seem the strange object was also spotted by two men as they returned home from a night out.

Ji Lane, 23, and Christopher Lee, 27, from Lathe Farm in New Romney were just locking up when they spotted a mysterious shape in the field opposite.

Mr Lane said: "It was crazy — I was getting a drink in the kitchen when I saw these strange lights in the sky just over the field across the road from our house.

"I wasn't sure what they were as they weren't moving so I called Chris and we both watched this weird floating object.

"We could only just make it out as we were quite far away, but when we ran outside to get a better look it had shot into the distance."

Silent

Mr Lee added: "If it was an aeroplane of some sort you would have expected there to have been loads of noise but this was silent.

"Also it was a lot longer than a plane and moved incredibly quickly — I have no idea what it was and we were both left speechless."

Both descriptions of the UFO fit those researched by the Shepway based UFOMEK monitoring group — who have collated files on reported UFO sightings in the area.

According to UFOMEK strange objects seen in the sky are usually described by 'spotters' as triangular disc-like objects with a

finish almost like a diamond.

These objects are also said to be capable of staying completely still and then shooting off at incredible speeds, normally after a dramatic flash in the air.

Local expert and UFOMEK assistant co-ordinator, Chris Rolfe from Hill Road, Folkestone said: "I am really not at all surprised at the descriptions given about the flying objects — these flying triangles have been spotted all over the country."

Myth

"The earliest record we have of such a sighting was in 1973, when a group of boys at the Duke of York's school in Dover spotted the triangular shaped UFO.

"We don't know what they are but the humming noise rules out the Stealth bomber myth as they make no noise at all.

"The really peculiar thing about this sighting is that we thought something might happen as much of Folkestone experienced a power cut last week — an occurrence which often happens before or after a sighting."

Mr Rolfe also believes the military know all about the mysterious craft spotted in the sky.

He claims that after several UFO sightings RAF and NATO aircraft have been seen patrolling the area.

He said: "We believe the military know a lot more than they are letting on about these sightings.

"For example a couple who reported a UFO in Thanet also told of military activity in Minnis Bay and numerous other people have seen RAF planes patrolling sighting spots.

"We don't know what these objects are at this moment in time and unfortunately can only record them as Unidentifiable Flying Objects."

"Anyone wanting to report a UFO can contact Chris Rolfe at UFOMEK on (01303) 254774."

(LOCAL PRESS)

FOLKESTONE HERALD

13th MARCH, 1997.

Spaceships, aliens and the Home Sec

UFO'S spotted over Shepway could have been looking for Home Secretary, Michael Howard, experts have warned.

By Sarah Hall

Following reports of mystery aircraft sightings in New Romney and Burmarsh in last week's *Herald*, Chris Rolfe, co-ordinator of UFOMEK, has highlighted the closeness of the sightings to the Shepway MP's home near the old Lympne Castle ruins.

And he fears that the position of the sightings is more than just coincidence.

Mr Rolfe cautioned: "It would seem the UFO was totally disinterested in Sophie, the girl who reported it and watched it for quite a long time.

"This certainly makes it seem like it had a purpose and has left me wondering if it's purpose had something to do with Mr Howard."

However Mr Rolfe was amazed to learn that Mr Howard's party agent knew all about the UFO.

He said: "I phoned Mr Howard's party agent in Folkestone and asked whether Mr Howard had seen anything strange I was immediately asked if I meant the UFO.

"The story in last

week's *Herald* only said Donkey Street as the sight of the spotting.

"Donkey Street is a very long road and the report did not state which end the UFO was seen at - so it seems very odd that those close to Mr Howard already knew that it was near his house."

And now Mr Rolfe and UFOMEK would like to see some questions answered.

"I would like to know whether anyone spotted any strange men poking about around the area afterwards or whether Mr Howard's security system was activated in any way.

"The whole story is creating a lot of interest all over England and when

you think of the implications it is quite easy to see why.

"I would love to know what the Government think of a strange aircraft being spotted near to the home of one of its senior cabinet ministers."

Sophie Wadleigh, of Shepherds Walk, Hythe, who saw the large object in the sky while driving home in the early hours of Saturday, March 8 said: "The UFO I saw was a large triangular shaped craft with bright lights running all round it's edge - it was above the field which lays directly opposite the turn off to Donkey Street in Burmarsh.

"When you have seen something like that you have to ask yourself why was it there - and maybe the Home secretary was the reason."

When the *Herald* contacted Mr Howard's office he was unavailable for comment.

through her window, and when she 76381.

Extract from The Folkestone Herald; 20.3.97

CONCLUSIONS

- A:- Whilst we do not pretend to know what it was that was observed, we think we can make some suggestions as to what it wasn't.
- (1): AIRCRAFT:- No normal aircraft looks like this object, or even performs the way that this observed object did.
- (2): HELICOPTER:- A helicopter can hover, however the sheer size of the observed object rules this out, and the noise from a helicopter would have been horrendous given the height of the observed object.
- (3): STEALTH TECHNOLOGY:- There have been suggestions that the object observed was a Stealth bomber. Firstly, there are only 15 of these aircraft in the USAF inventory and they have only become on a fully operational status in April of this year (1997), according to our sources.

Because of the sheer cost of the B-2 Stealth bomber (said to be approximately 22 million per aircraft), would the USAF risk flying the aircraft over European Countries? So far as we know the B-2 has only appeared twice in Europe, both times during International Airshows, at Paris, France in 1995, and again at the 1996 Farnborough Airshow.

The B-2 bomber cannot hover, and makes a tremendous amount of noise, and the shape of the aircraft in no way resembles a triangle. The object observed had many lights on its base, which is something that the Stealth bomber does not have. If the B-2 had the amount of lights that this object had, it would not be Stealth.

- (4): BALLOON:- It has been suggested that the object observed have been a new generation of balloon. This could be a possibility, but again the size of the object which the main witness describes as being about the size of a field, or two Passenger Planes end to end, rules this out as a possible explanation, until such time as hard evidence becomes available.
- (5): HALLUCINATION:- It is felt that this could not be a possible explanation for the sighting, as we feel it to be impossible for five different witnesses at three different locations (Donkey St, Burmarsh/Lower Wall Rd, Burmarsh/Aldersgate Lane Lympne), to experience the same hallucination. Also information has come to light that other witnesses saw the same or similar triangle object at Lydd, and Aldington.
- (6): TEMPERATURE INVERSION:- Due to not having the appropriate data, we cannot say for sure if this could be the answer. However we feel confident that this is not the explanation.

(7): ASTRONOMICAL:- The old chestnut, ie the Planet Venus. This explanation may sound ludicrous, but the M.O.D. and R.A.F. along with the U.S. Air Force, have often come up with this explanation to try and explain sightings of UFO's. However on this occasion it was cloudy/overcast with no stars visible. So unless Venus has the ability to sprout wings and come down and fly several hundred feet in the air below cloud, we think it is safe to assume that this is not the answer, and the Planet Venus was hidden by the Sun's glare to be visible, and will not be fully visible again around June/July (1997). There were no reports of any bright meteors being seen.

B:- The main witness has been fully co-operative throughout the entire investigation, with both ourselves and other persons. We have offered her the opportunity to withdraw her statement on more than one occasion, and she has declined to do so. Stating that she is only reporting what she saw, and believes to be the truth, on what she has seen.

There are also at least four other witnesses in the immediate vicinity, as well as several witnesses to the same or similar object at the town of Lydd (which is approx nine and a half miles South West of the Burmarsh area), at about 02:50/02:55 hours, and at the village of Aldington (which is approx 4 miles North West of the Burmarsh area), at about 03:30 hours. Taking into consideration that the object seen at Lydd and Aldington, is the same one observed in the Burmarsh/Lymne area (the location of Michael Howard's residence is approx one and a half miles North West of location of the main witness sightings), we believe that the sequence of events regarding the objects track (movements) could be as follows:-

- 1):- Lydd, at approx 02:50/02:55 hrs.
- 2):- In field opposite Great Lath Farm, Donkey Street, Burmarsh. At 03:00 hrs by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] approx 10 miles from Lydd.
- 3):- In field opposite with Donkey Street, and Lower Wall Road, Burmarsh. At 03:00/03:05 hrs approx, by [REDACTED] approx 1 mile from Great Lath Farm.
- 4):- Above residence of the then Home Secretary Michael Howard, in Aldersgate Lane, Lymne. At some time between 03:05/03:10 hrs by two Firemen? approx 1 and half miles from Lower Wall Rd/Donkey St.
- 5):- At Aldington, at approx 03:30 hrs. approx 2 and half miles from Howard's residence.

C:- With regard to the sightings at Lydd, and Aldington, we are awaiting full reports on these from an independent source.

The two firemen who are rumoured to have seen the object at Michael Howards' residence have not been easy to track down. However if there is any truth to the report, then the two firemen must have been at Mr. Howards' residence in an official capacity, as it is about quarter a mile from the main road (B2067), that runs through the village of Lyme. You cannot see Mr. Howards' residence from the B2067, as the wood (Hill Hurst/Aldersate), blocks the view, which we feel rules out the idea that the two firemen were off duty and driving along the main road. Therefore we believe that they must have either been approaching Mr. Howards' residence, or had arrived when they saw the object. Until the two firemen come forward we cannot know the full facts. All efforts to track them down have been so far met with failure.

D:- We now come to the object being sighted over the residence of Mr. Michael Howard (the then Home Secretary of the British Government). Taking into account the above regarding the two firemen who had reported that they had seen the object above Mr. Howards' residence, to a freelance reporter, it could be that the Security Personnel assigned to the said residence saw the object coming towards them from the Donkey Street/Lower Wall Road (Burmarsh), area to the South/South-East, and thinking that it was an aircraft of some description, or indeed a helicopter hit the panic button. Which could explain why the two firemen were there.

Indeed it would be interesting to know if Mr. Howards was in residence at the time of the incident? Also it would be very interesting to know what the security personnel made of the object when they realised that it could in no way be an aircraft or helicopter, none of which they were familiar with? It seems logical to assume that the local Police were contacted, in fact they would probably have arrived at the said residence in answer to the security alert. But who else would have arrived on the scene? Indeed once it was realised that they were not dealing with a normal every day object, who would they have contacted? Would the M.O.D. have been contacted? It is obvious that a full report would have been submitted to persons at a higher level, but how high? The then Prime Minister John Major?

This brings to question the security issue in this incident. For years the Ministry Of Defence, the Royal Air Force, and indeed the British Government, have allways stated that UFOs were not a defence issue (the term most frequently used is: "of no defence significance"), and were certainly of no security risk! Yet here we have an object which is unassessable, flying around British airspace, and also entering what could be termed as restricted airspace, as it passes over the residence of the then Home Secretary. If that cannot be classed as a potential security risk, let alone then it seems that the powers that be, do not even have their own senior Cabinet Ministers interests and personal safety at the forefront when it comes to UNIDENTIFIED air traffic! Is it not time for the whole matter of what the British government know about UFOs, (especially with regard to incidence of this nature), to come clean, and stop pussy footings around, telling the British public that there is nothing to the UFO problem? As this case demonstrates, it is time for a change in the way that the situation regarding UFOs are dealt with, and a better understanding between the Ministry Of Defence, the R.A.F. and the Government and the British people, being developed.

E:- FINAL CONCLUSION

With regard to the whole incident during the early hours of Saturday, 8 March, 1997, the degree of risk can only be one of UNASSESSABLE. The cause of the incident: UNASSESSABLE.



Roger Gale, M.P.

RECEIVED

MAY 1997 30 MAY 1997

29.5.97

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

House of Commons
London, SW1A 0AA

01227 722366 (Private Office - a.m. only)
01227 720593 (FAX - 24hr)
0171 219 3000 (House of Commons)
0171 219 4343 (Members' messages)

[REDACTED]
Folkestone
kent [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter of 25th May which has been received in our office during Mr Gale's absence.

There is a very strict Parliamentary convention and Members of Parliament do not deal with each other's constituents' enquiries and we would normally send your correspondence on to Michael Howard for attention. However, as you do not seem to want to contact Mr Howard we are returning this to you.

With my best wishes
Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]


Parliamentary Office Secretary

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

HoD

Folkestone
Kent

The Rt Hon Jack Straw MP
Secretary Of State for The Home Department
Home Office
50 Queen Anne's Gate
London
SW1H 9AT



Dear Sir,

I would very much like to see a full public enquiry into the recent UFO incident of the 8th March that occurred at/near the residence of the former Home Secretary Michael Howard.

As Michael Howard is my MP, I tried to bring up the issue with Roger Gale MP, who was unable to help (see enclosures). I have turned to your Department as a last resort. I would also like to express my indignance and outrage at the way this incident has been ignored.

I have enclosed a full report and a completed petition which should demonstrate that there is some public concern relating to this issue.

I would be grateful to you, if you would raise this issue as a Parliamentary Question, something to the effect:-

"To ask The Right Hon. Member for Folkestone and Hythe (i) was he in his Sherway Residence during the early hours of 8th March, 1997?
(ii) what was the nature of the security incident at his Sherway Residence during the early hours of 8th March, 1997? and if he will make a statement."

I should also like to point out, that many others including myself do feel that there is a very serious matter of security involving this particular incident. It is also felt that it is quite inconceivable that the Government continue to deny or even acknowledge the existence of UFOs, in spite of all the evidence, such as CIA/NSA/FBI records which have been released over the years in the United States, and of course the MOD records now available for inspection at the Public Records Office. If the Government continue to maintain that there are no serious problems concerning UFOs, then why the records, and Departmental records?

I await your reply with interest.

Yours Sincerely,


[Redacted signature block]

KENT



COUNTY CONSTABULARY

Chief Inspector [REDACTED] Operations Centre, Police Headquarters, Sutton Road, Maidstone, Kent ME15 9BZ
Direct Dial: [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
SEC (AS) 2
Room 8245
MOD Main Building
Whitehall
London
SW1A 2HB

10 June 1997

Dear [REDACTED]


I have forwarded the enclosed correspondence to you in case it is of use to your department.

I was contacted in March to verify whether or not we had the incident reported to Kent Police Operations Centre and we did not. [REDACTED] has now send me the full account which is of no significance to my organisation. I am therefore forwarding it to you.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Chief Inspector [REDACTED]
Operations Centre



UFOMIEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

BRAMLING,
CANTERBURY,
KENT.
Tel. [REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Reply to:-

FOLKESTONE,
KENT.
Tel. [REDACTED]

Chief Inspector [REDACTED]
Operations Centre,
Kent County Constabulary,
Police Headquarters,
Sutton Road,
Maidstone,
Kent
ME15 9BZ.

30th May, 1997.

Dear Sir,

I would be most grateful if you would please comment on the enclosed report. Could you also pass this report onto the appropriate senior authorities for their possible interest?

Also, what are the possibilities of our group seeing or even being forwarded copies of past reports to the Kent County Constabulary, from members of the public? I realise there is a question of confidentiality regarding such matters, but we are not interested in the names of the witnesses, only the reports of what they observed.

Thanking you for your time in this matter,

Yours Sincerely, [REDACTED]

LOOSE MINUTE

D/Sec(AS)/64/1

1 Jul 97

ADGE1

ALLEGED "UFO" INCIDENT AT THE HOME OF MICHAEL HOWARD

1. I have been passed a letter which was addressed to the Home Secretary which asks questions about an alleged "security incident" with a possible "UFO" connection at the then Home Secretary's residence on 8 March 1997. Michael Howard was and remains the MP for Folkestone and Hythe and lives in the constituency.

2. Unsurprisingly, the Home Office have confirmed that there was no such security incident involving the Home Secretary on 8 March and in responding along the usual lines I would like to make the following statement:

"... there is no evidence that the UK Air Defence Region was compromised by unauthorized foreign military activity on the date in question."

3. I should be grateful for confirmation that this statement is factual.

[original signed]

Sec(AS)
MB8245

64/3



LOOSE MINUTE

D/DAO/1/13

2 Jul 97

Sec(AS) [REDACTED]

ALLEGED 'UFO' INCIDENT AT THE HOME OF MICHAEL HOWARD

Reference: D/Sec(AS)/64/1 dated Jul 97.

1. At Reference, you asked for confirmation that no unauthorised military activity occurred in the UKADR on 8 Mar 97.
2. Having consulted HQ 11/18 Gp, I can confirm that there was no such military activity reported anywhere and, specifically, in the Kent/Folkstone area.
3. Additional inquiries with AIS LATCC, West Drayton, have also confirmed that no unusual or unauthorised air activity, civil or military, was reported or observed in that area on that date. LATCC holds a radar recording of air traffic in the Folkstone area for 8 Mar 97. As a precaution, since the Home Secretary was involved, I have asked for the tape to be preserved until 31 Jul 97 in case further enquiries are launched.

[original signed]

[REDACTED]
Wg Cdr
ADGE 1
[REDACTED]

The Home Office have
confirmed that there
was no security alert
at Mr Howard's home
on 8 March at the
time in question.

[REDACTED]
16/6.

Folkestone
Kent

Air Secretariat (Air Staff)
Ministry Of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
London,
SE1A 2HB.

1st July, 1997.

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing to you, as I understand that a letter, and a report regarding a UFO sighting in the Burmarsh/Lymene area of Kent, which was sent by myself to the Home Secretary, was passed on to you by his department.


As you may be aware, the said sighting of the "Unidentified craft", was also reportedly seen over the former Home Secretary's (Michael Howard), residence. I will not go into detail as to the alleged witnesses who claimed to have seen it over Mr. Howard's home, (and if you have read the report you will know who they are), but just to say that we are now very close to finding the two fire officers. Incidentally this is not the only fire crew to see something unusual over the Sherway area of Kent. It has come to my notice that a fire crew whilst out on a call at approximately 04:00 hrs, over this past weekend saw a very brightly lit "Unidentified object" over the roof tops of houses.

With regard to the Burmarsh sighting, as stated in the report and letter to the Home Secretary the Rt Hon Jack Straw, MP., in this particular case there is a very serious matter of security. As this involved the "Unidentified craft" not being just near the former Home Secretary's residence, but also possibly over the grounds of his property. I would very much like to know your reaction to this particular incident, or that of your superiors?

As I understand from the Home Office, the report was transferred to your department on the 9th of June, so I wonder what action has been taken by the Ministry Of Defence, regarding this matter, and why your department has not contacted me regarding same? If you would wish me to, I will keep you informed of the investigation as it progresses. I should also point out that the said "Unidentified craft" was also seen at the following places and times:- Lydd 02:10 hrs./Lydd 03:00 hrs./Ashford 03:10 hrs./Smeeth 03:20 hrs./Aldington 03:30 hrs. These sightings were all on the same night, as the Burmarsh/Lymene sightings, and all describe the same object. I also enclose another completed form which should be attached to the report you already have.

I await your reply with interest, however on this occasion can you not please send out your usual standard reply that is normally sent, but a proper serious reply, as I am sure you will agree this is a very serious matter, and demands to be treated seriously.

Yours Sincerely,



ORIGINAL

UFO MEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

FIELD INVESTIGATION REPORT FORM

Date Of Sighting: 08TH MARCH 1997

Time Of SIGHTING: 03:05 Hours

Location Of Sighting: JUNCTION OF DONKEY STREET, WITH LOWER WALL ROAD, BURMARSH, KENT.

National Map Grid Reference Of Observer: APPROX $51^{\circ}N / 01^{\circ}01'E$.

National Map Grid Reference Of Object If Known: APPROX ~~330000~~ $51^{\circ}N / 01^{\circ}01'E$

General Description Of Local Terrain Where Object Was Seen: FLAT FIELD WITH CROPS WHERE OBJECT SEEN. HILLS TO THE NORTH, AND FLAT AREAS OF THE ROMNEY MARSH TO THE WEST. THE SEA IS TO THE SOUTH. A SEWER SYSTEM RUNS THROUGH THE FIELD, WITH THE ROYAL MILITARY CANAL RUNNING TO THE NORTH OF THE FIELD. UFO WAS SEEN IN WOODS TO THE NORTH AND NORTH WEST OF THE AREA, AND A WILDLIFE ZOO PARK TO THE NORTH WEST.

Are There Any Radio Transmission Masts Near Locality: ~~Yes~~/No

Are There Any Water Reservoirs Near Locality: ~~Yes~~/No BUT THERE IS A SEWER SYSTEM RUNNING THROUGH THE FIELD WHERE OBJECT WAS SEEN.

Are There Any Military Installations Near Locality: ~~Yes~~/No THERE ARE ARMY SMALL ARMS RANGES ABOUT $1\frac{1}{2}$ MILES TO THE SOUTH EAST, AND ARMY SMALL ARMS RANGES ABOUT 10 MILES TO THE SOUTH WEST.

Are There Any Nuclear Facilities Near Locality: ~~Yes~~/No DUNGENESS POWER STATION ABOUT $10\frac{1}{2}$ MILES TO THE SOUTH WEST.

Did The Object Leave Any Physical Traces: ~~Yes~~/No

What Were The Traces Found: N/A-

Did The Object Affect Anything During Its Presence: ~~Yes~~/No

Name Of Witness: [REDACTED]

Age Of Witness: 25 Yrs D.O.B 04/10/71.

Address Of Witness: [REDACTED]
HYTHE, KENT.

What Was The Witness Doing Immediately Before The Sighting:

DRIVING HOME AFTER DROPPING OFF SOME FRIENDS.

What Was The Witness Movements On The Day Of Sighting:

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Did Anything Unusual Occur To The Witness Before The Sighting:

WITNESS SAID SHE FELT THE HAIR ON THE BACK OF HER NECK - STAND-UP WHEN SHE SAW THE OBJECTS LIGHTS IN THE DISTANCE

Has The Witness Had Any Previous Sightings: ~~Yes~~/No

Has The Witness Ever Had Any Previous Psychic Experiences: ~~Yes~~/No

Was The Witness Receiving Any Medication At The Time Of The Incident: ~~Yes~~/No

Was The Incident Reported To Any Other Organisation (U F O Group/Newspaper Ect)
FOLKESTONE HERALD. (SOUTH KENT NEWSPAPERS)

If The Incident Was Reported To The Authorities What Feed Back Was There:

If The Incident Was Reported To Another U F O Group What Was Their Conclusions:

N/A.

What Does The Witness Think The Object Could Have Been: *THOUGHT THAT IT WAS POSSIBLY A STEALTH OF ADVANCED FUTURISTIC AIRCRAFT, BUT THEN FELT THIS WAS NOT POSSIBLE DUE TO OBJECTS BEHAVIOUR, AND WAS A UFO.*

How Do They Come To The Conclusion That They Have Reached:

BECAUSE OF THE OBSERVED OBJECTS BEHAVIOUR,

Has The Witness Suffered Any Effects Since The Incident: *NO.*

How Did The Witness Come Across During The Time You Spoke To Them Concerning The Incident: *WAS STILL VERY FRIGHTENED AT TIME OF INTERVIEW.*

Has The Witness Ever Read Any Books On UFOs: ~~Yes~~/No

What Is The Witnesses Feeling On UFOs: *HAS FOUND IT FASCINATING SINCE THE SIGHTING.*

Has Any Other Member Of The Witness's Family Ever Seen A UFO: ~~Yes~~/No

Are There Any Other Comments Or Details Regarding This Incident That May Be Of Relevance:


(See Separate Sheet If Needed)

Signature Of Field Investigator: 

Date: 14 MAR 1997



From: [REDACTED] Secretariat (Air Staff) [REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
 (Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
 (Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
 Folkestone
 Kent
 [REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference
 D/Sec(AS)/64/3
 Date
 3 July 1997

Dear [REDACTED]

1. Thank you for your recent letter addressed to the Secretary of State for the Home Department concerning an alleged "UFO sighting" near the residence of the former Home Secretary, Michael Howard. Your letter and the supporting papers have been passed to the Ministry of Defence and I have been asked to reply. You also wrote to the Chief Inspector of the Operations Centre, Kent County Constabulary, Maidstone. Chief Inspector [REDACTED] has also forwarded his correspondence to me.

2. The Ministry of Defence examines any reports of "unidentified flying objects" it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the UK Air Defence Region might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorized foreign military activity. The integrity of the United Kingdom's airspace in peacetime is maintained through continuous policing of the UK Air Defence Region by the Royal Air Force which remains vigilant for any potential military threat. Unless there is evidence of such a threat, and to date no "unidentified flying object" sighting has revealed such evidence, no attempt is made to identify the precise nature of each reported incident. We believe that down to earth explanations could be found for these reports, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, if resources were diverted for this purpose. It would, however, be an inappropriate use of defence resources to provide this kind of aerial identification service.

3. The MOD has no expertise or role in respect of "UFO/flying saucer" matters or to the question of the existence or otherwise of extraterrestrial lifeforms, about which it remains open-minded. I should emphasize that to date the MOD knows of no evidence which substantiates the existence of these alleged phenomena.

4. MOD Air Defence staff have confirmed that there is no evidence to suggest an unauthorized incursion of the UK Air Defence Region on 8 March. The Home Office has confirmed that no security incident occurred in the home of the former Home Secretary on this date as you allege in your letter.

5. I hope this explains the position.

Yours sincerely,





From: [REDACTED] Secretariat (Air Staff) [REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
(Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Folkestone
Kent
[REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference
D/Sec(AS)/64/3
Date
4 July 1997

Dear [REDACTED],


1. Thank you for your letter of 1 July concerning "unidentified flying objects".
2. You should by now have received my letter of 3 July which covers the points you raised in your letter to the Home Secretary.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED] Secretariat(Air Staff) [REDACTED] Room 8245
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
 (Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
 (Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Farnborough,
 Hampshire.

[REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference
 D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Date
 4 July 1997

Dear [REDACTED]

1. Thank you for your letter of 2 May addressed to the Prime Minister concerning "unidentified flying objects". Your letter was only passed to this office on 26 June for reply and I am sorry for the overall delay. You also wrote in a similar vein to me on 17 June - please take this as a reply to both your letters.
2. As you know from previous correspondence with this office, the Ministry of Defence examines any reports of "unidentified flying objects" it receives solely to establish whether what was seen might have some defence significance; namely, whether there is any evidence that the UK Air Defence Region might have been compromised by hostile or unauthorized foreign military activity.
3. Unless there is evidence of a potential military threat, and to date no "unidentified flying object" sighting has revealed such evidence, we do not attempt to identify the precise nature of each reported incident. We believe that down to earth explanations could be found for these reports, such as aircraft lights or natural phenomena, if resources were diverted for this purpose but it would be an inappropriate use of defence resources to provide this kind of aerial identification service.
4. Your letters mention a "UFO" sighting over the home of the former Home Secretary, Michael Howard, near Folkestone. Although the MOD has received reports of an alleged "UFO" sighting near Michael Howard's home on 8 March 1997, MOD Air Defence staff have confirmed that there is no evidence to suggest any unauthorized incursion of the UK Air Defence Region on that date.
5. You have also asked about the MOD's old "UFO" report files. As is the case with other government files, MOD files are subject to the provisions of the Public Records Act of 1958 and 1967. This Act of Parliament states that official files selected for preservation generally remain closed from public viewing for 30 years after the last action has been taken and are then transferred to the Public Record Office for release into the public domain. It was generally the case that before 1967 all "UFO" files were destroyed after five years, as there was insufficient public interest in the subject to merit their

permanent retention. However since 1967, following an increase in public interest in this subject "UFO" report files are now routinely preserved. A few files from the fifties and sixties did, however, survive and are available for examination by members of the public. They may be viewed at the Public Record Office, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU. The references of these files are as follows:

AIR 16/1199	AIR 2/16918
AIR 20/7390	AIR 2/17318
AIR 20/9320	AIR 2/17526
AIR 20/9321	AIR 2/17527
AIR 20/9322	AIR 2/17982
AIR 20/9994	AIR 2/17983
PREM 11/855	

6. You will also wish to know that the Cabinet Office has the responsibility for taking forward the Government's manifesto pledge to introduce a Freedom of Information Act. The timetable currently envisaged involves the publication of a White Paper before this year's Summer Recess. This would be followed by a period of open consultation leading to a draft Bill early next year and further consultation.

Yours sincerely,



Official ACTION MoD

3

~~DI~~ MoD

2.5.97

**PRIME MINISTER'S
CORRESPONDENCE SECTION**

*Writer informed that letter has been
forwarded to the appropriate
Government Department
for a full reply*



Mr Tony Blair PM,
10 Downing Street,
London.

Dear Sir,

Firstly I would like to congratulate you in becoming PM and in getting Labour into government.

The main reason for this letter, of which considering the vast amount of work that now lies ahead of you, you probably will find this letter a trivial matter. Nevertheless, do you feel that it is time that this country lifts the lid on the cover up that is being facilitated to hide all material/information concerning UFO's reported in this country and more so the incidents that the MoD have had dealings with. I understand that earlier in the year a large UFO was sighted close to the residence of Mr Michael Howard MP near Folkestone in Kent and that details were *altered* when it was put out in the local papers and did not seem to reach the main tabloids?

We are heading for the millennium, don't you think that it is time this country wakes up to join the modern era approaching us at great speed instead of lying behind cover ups and false denials.

In the mean time I wish you every success. I'm glad that your Labour party has got into number ten.

Thank you for your help in this matter.

Yours Faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

Farnborough,
Hants,

[Redacted address line]

25 JUN 1997
ROOM 613A MOD BLDG

17.6.97

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

[REDACTED]
Sec (AS) [REDACTED]
Room 8245,
MoD,
Whitehall,
London.

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing to you following a phone conversation I had with one of your colleagues on the above date regarding a letter I had sent direct to the new Prime Minister on 2.5.97. I enquired on the matter of his new government stopping the cover up that presently exists on UFO incidents/material etc. As an example I referred to an incident that took place earlier in the year close to the residence of Mr Michael Howard MP near Folkestone in Kent that had many witnesses but whose stories were altered i.e. location of the UFO, to make it appear that it was nowhere near Mr Howard's home when it was reported in the local papers. The main tabloid papers strangely had no mention of it. The reply I obtained by a Miss [REDACTED] advised me that the letter had been forwarded to one of the Principal government departments who would reply to my letter.

As yet I have not received a reply and as your colleague advised me, they too have not received my letter via No. 10.

I would therefore be very grateful if you could advise me on this matter regarding the existing retention of UFO reports etc. by the government/MoD. Would it ever come about that such information would be available to the public as many countries do now have a freedom of information policy whereby people can have access to this information. Many UFO sightings have many witnesses and yet in many cases this information is then hidden. Why is this so? The year 2000 is quickly approaching. Surely it's about time we were allowed to join this new *modern* era. Public opinion on this matter is gaining strength, sooner or later the government and powers that be are going to have to submit and give us the true answers to our questions.


Thank you for your help in this matter.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED], Farnborough, Hants, [REDACTED]



Replied
OUR Ref
16/97
REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

[REDACTED]
Folkestone,
Kent
[REDACTED]

Mr Alistair Mc Gowan,
Ministry Of Defence,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
London,
SW1A 2HB.

8 July, 1997.

Dear Mr Mc Gowan,

I am writing to you regarding a UFO sightings report that was sent to the current Home Secretary (Rt Hon Jack Straw MP). This report regarded the sightings of a reported "Unidentified craft", seen near and possibly above the residence of the former Home Secretary (Rt Hon Michael Howard), on 8 March, 1997.

I have received a reply from [REDACTED] of Secretariat (Air Staff) [REDACTED] of which I was not happy with.

In her letter of 3 July, she states: "MOD Air Defence Staff have confirmed that there is no evidence to suggest an unauthorized incursion of the UK Air Defence Region on 8 March". However at least twelve witnesses observed an "Unidentified craft", at six different locations. All describe seeing the same or similar type object. Can we then conclude in respect of the MOD Air Defence Staff reply, that all these people were seeing something that wasn't there?

The "Unidentified craft", was seen at Lydd at 02:10 and 03:00 hrs/ Burmarsh between 03:05/03:07 hrs/Lymene (Mr Howards' property), at 03:08 hrs/Ashford at 03:10 hrs/Smeeth at 03:20 hrs/Aldington at 03:30 hrs. This object was flying around these areas for about one and a half hours, and yet we are expected to believe that Air Defence Staff, did not observe this event on radar?

It should not be forgotten that on the night of March 30/31 1990, when two Belgian F-16 aircraft, were in pursuit of an "Unidentified craft" which came within six minutes of British airspace. And once again the British public were led to believe that the MOD knew nothing of the events of that night. It is a known fact that Belgium is a member of NATO, and that all other NATO member countries are informed of any "uncorrelated" targets, tracked on radar by other Countries, and that they have launched intercept aircraft. So for the MOD not to have known of the events that night, they must have been asleep.

In the letter and document that was sent to the Home Secretary, was also a petition that was signed by concerned members of the public who felt that there was a very serious matter regarding security, with regard to the "Unidentified craft" being seen near the Rt Hon Michael Howards' residence (Burmarsh one and half mile SE/Aldington two miles NW). Can you please tell me what has happened to this petition?

With regard to the "Unidentified craft" being seen over Rt Hon Howards' residence. This was observed by a Fire Brigade crew, who must have been on the track (road) leading to his property, as you cannot see the above mentioned property from the main road (B2067), because the wood blocks the view. So what was the fire crew doing near the Rt Hon Michael Howards' property at that time of the morning? Again I quote from [REDACTED]'s letter of 3 July, she states:- "The Home Office have confirmed that no security incident occurred at the home of the former Home Secretary on this date". So what were the fire crew doing there? Are we expected to believe that the fire crew were lying? What could they possibly gain from doing so?

I wonder if you have read the report that was passed onto the MOD, by the Home Office? I understand that Chief Inspector [REDACTED], of the Operations Centre, at the Kent County Constabulary Headquarters, has also forwarded a copy of the report/correspondence to the MOD. Should you have read this report, I would be very interested in your comments. Like other concerned residents of Kent, I feel that this incident does pose the possibility of a security risk, if not of a Defence issue.

I await your reply with interest, and thank you for taking the time in looking into this matter.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

[REDACTED]

Sutton Coldfield - West Midlands - UK

Phone : [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

E-Mail: [REDACTED]

Fax Cover Sheet

To: [REDACTED] - Secretariat (AS) [REDACTED]

Phone: 0171 218 2140

Fax: [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Date: 30/06/97

Pages including this cover: 1

Subject: Rendlesham Forest Incidents

Comments:

I am writing an article on the above subject and would like to include the MoD's conclusions concerning the events there over the Christmas period in 1980.

On a separate matter: Have any reports of a large triangular craft seen by former Home Secretary, Michael Howard's house in Kent been forwarded to your office? If not, perhaps you would let me know how to submit such a report.

Sincerely

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED], Secretariat (Air Staff) [REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
(Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
Sutton Coldfield
West Midlands
[REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference
D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Date
11 July 1997

Dear [REDACTED],

1. Thank you for your facsimile message of 30 June in which you asked for MOD comments on the incidents which are alleged to have occurred at RAF Woodbridge/Rendlesham Forest in December 1980.
2. When the Ministry of Defence was informed of the events which are alleged to have occurred at Rendlesham Forest/RAF Woodbridge in December 1980, all available substantiated evidence was looked at in the usual manner by those within the MOD/RAF with responsibility for air defence matters. The judgement was that there was no indication that a breach of the United Kingdom's air defences had occurred on the nights in question.
3. As there was no evidence to substantiate an event of defence concern no further investigation into the matter was necessary. Although a number of allegations have subsequently been made about these reported events, nothing has emerged over the last 16 years which has given us reason to believe that the original assessment made by this Department was incorrect.
4. In your letter you also ask how you might submit a formal report of a "UFO" sighting to the MOD. Anyone who wishes to report an "unexplained" aerial sighting to the MOD can do so by writing to this office with the full details. The report will be assessed in the usual manner to determine whether there is a defence interest.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

-6 64/3



REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Alasdair McGowan

SPECIAL ADVISER TO
SECRETARY OF STATE

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
WHITEHALL LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone [REDACTED]

D/SA (16/97)

[REDACTED]
Folkestone
Kent
[REDACTED]

14th July 1997

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for your letter of 8th July.

I appreciate that you have already been in correspondence with Secretariat (Air Staff) but, given that this subject does not directly fall within my responsibilities at the MOD, I have passed your letter back to them, as they are the appropriate branch within the Ministry of Defence to deal with this topic.


Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

A D MCGOWAN



From: [REDACTED], Secretariat (Air Staff) [REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8247, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone (Direct dial) [REDACTED]
(Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Folkestone
Kent
[REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference
D/Sec(AS)/64/3
Date
29th July 1997

Dear [REDACTED],

As you know, the Secretary of State for Defence's Special Adviser, Alasdair McGowan, has forwarded your letter of 8th July to Secretariat (Air Staff).

I am sorry you were not happy with [REDACTED]'s response to your letter to the Home Secretary. In view of the comments you have made to Mr McGowan I have reviewed the correspondence and the way your letter was handled. As you know, the Ministry of Defence has only a limited interest in 'UFO'-related issues and, within the terms of this remit, I am satisfied that you were provided with the facts of the case. There really is nothing further to say.

I am sorry to send what I know will be a disappointing reply.

Yours sincerely,
[REDACTED]

UFOMEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

BRAMLING,
CANTERBURY,
KENT.
Tel. [REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

REPLY TO:-

FOLKESTONE,
KENT.
Tel. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Secretariat (Air Staff) [REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE,
Main Buildings,
Whitehall,
London.
SW1A 2HB.

14 January, 1998.

REF:- D/sec(AS)/64/3 BURMARSH SIGHTING/Rt Hon MICHAEL HOWARD MP.


Dear [REDACTED],

You may remember that in July, last year (1997), I was in contact with your department, regarding the sighting of a UFO in the vicinity of the Rt Hon Michael Howard MP residence during the early hours of 8 March, 1997. Your department recieved (I was led to believe), two copies of the report, one from the Home Office, and one from Chief Inspector [REDACTED] of Kent County Constabulary.

I am now writing to you regarding this sighting again, in the hope that your department has re-considered their position with regard to this sighting, as I think I stated to your department last year, our investigators will not give up on this matter.

We know have correspondence, from Kent County Constabulary which confirms that there was a security incident at the residence of Rt Hon Michael Howard MP, around the date of the UFO sighting. Not only that we were contacted by a member of the security contingent who was on duty on the night in question, who has stated that the unidentified object was directly over the residence of Mr. Howard.

East Kent Euro MP Mark Watts, brought the matter before the European Parliament, on 23 May, 1997, and I have been in contact with Mr Watts' office, and he has promised to look further into the matter.



REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

FOLKESTONE
Kent

The Rt Hon Jack Straw MP,
Secretary Of State for The Home Department
Home Office,
50 Queen Anne's Gate,
LONDON,
SW1H 9AT.



0603

15 January, 1998.

Dear Sir,

On the 5 June, last year, I sent you a copy of a report regarding the sighting of a UFO in the Burmarsh/Lymene area of Kent, and at the location of the previous Home Secretary the Rt Hon Michael Howard MP. This incident occurred during the early hours of 8 March, 1997.


The reason I know write to you is to ask whether your staff, or yourself, can please confirm to me that the report was passed by your department to Air Staff [redacted] at the Ministry Of Defence, was on the date of 9 June, 1997?

If you or your department could confirm this for me, I would be most appreciative.


Thanking you for your time in this matter.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]



[REDACTED]
FOLKESTONE
Kent
[REDACTED]



0938

The Rt Hon Jack Straw MP,
Secretary Of State for The Home Department
Home Office,
50 Queen Anne's Gate,
LONDON,
SW1H 9AT.

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

1 February, 1998.

Dear Sir,

On the 5 June, last year, I sent you a copy of a report regarding the sighting of a UFO in the Burmarsh/Lymene area of Kent, and at the location of the previous Home Secretary the Rt Hon Michael Howard MP. This incident occurred during the early hours of 8 March, 1997.

The reason I know write to you is to ask whether your staff, or yourself, can please confirm to me that the report was passed by your department to Air Staff [REDACTED] at the Ministry Of Defence, was on the date of 9 June, 1997?

If you or your department could confirm this for me, I would be most appreciative.

Thanking you for your time in this matter,

Yours Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

UFOMEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

[REDACTED], FOLKESTONE, KENT [REDACTED]
Tel. [REDACTED] Pager Number [REDACTED]

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

[REDACTED]
Secretariat (Air Staff) 2a1,
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
London,
SW1A 2HB.

2 February, 1998.

REF:- D/sec(AS)/64/3 BURMARSH SIGHTING/Rt Hon MICHAEL HOWARD MP.


Dear [REDACTED]

You may remember that in July, last year (1997), I was in contact with your department, regarding the sighting of a UFO in the vicinity of the Rt Hon Michael Howard MP residence during the early hours of 8 March, 1997. Your department received (I was led to believe), two copies of the report, one from the Home Office, and one from Chief Inspector [REDACTED] of Kent County Constabulary.

I am now writing to you regarding this sighting again, in the hope that your department has re-considered their position with regard to this sighting, as I think I stated to your department last year, our investigators will not give up on this matter.

We know have correspondence, from Kent County Constabulary which confirms that there was a security incident at the residence of Rt Hon Michael Howard MP, around the date of the UFO sighting. Not only that we were contacted by a member of the security contingent who was on duty on the night in question, who has stated that the unidentified object was directly over the residence of Mr. Howard.

East Kent Euro MP Mark Watts, brought the matter before the European Parliament, on 23 May, 1997, and I have been in contact with Mr Watts' office, and he has promised to look further into the matter.



REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

In your letter of 3 July, 1997, you state that to date no UFO sighting has revealed evidence of being a threat to National Security, however it is quite obvious, even to a blind man, that this particular incident carries very serious security implications.

How can an unidentified aerial craft fly so close, or even over the residence of a Senior Cabinet Minister, and no one raise so much as an eyebrow? As far as UFOMEK is concerned the object seen is unidentified, which in our books DOES NOT MEAN that it is an Alien space craft. With it therefore being unidentified, then surely because of its near presence to such an important Government person who held the position of Home Secretary, this must surely be one of the most serious breaches of security that one could ever imagine, as the object in question was unidentified, and therefore by not knowing what it was, should surely raise questions as to its true identity. (Unless of course someone in Government already knows?). The object could just as easily have been a helicopter carrying a terrorist.

Because of the response that we have received from the Kent County Constabulary, it is quite obvious that there was a security incident, yet in your letter of 3 July, 1997, you state that MOD Air Defence Staff confirmed that there was no unauthorized incursion of the UK Air Defence Region on 8 March. Does that mean the incursion was of an authorized nature, and therefore you know what the UFO was? You also state in the same letter that the Home Office confirmed that no security incident occurred in the home of the former Home Secretary. This is at odds with what Kent County Constabulary has stated. How do you account for this?

Also in July of last year, a Mr [REDACTED] from Sutton Coldfield, West Midlands contacted your department by fax, to ask what it knew of the UFO incident near/over the residence of the former Home Secretary? Your department told him that it knew nothing of this incident. Yet it had already received a full report that had been sent to the current Home Secretary the Rt Hon Jack Straw MP, and details (and possibly another copy of the report), from Chief Insp [REDACTED] of Kent County Constabulary. How can this be explained? You yourself admitted to me, that both the Home Office and Kent County Constabulary had contacted your department regarding this incident, yet it was felt that it was necessary to lie to an inquirer into this matter.

I await your reply with interest.


Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]

Je did
ot say
as -
se
id
or if
never
2
quesions



From: [REDACTED], Secretariat (Air Staff)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Room 8247, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone (Direct dial)
 (Switchboard)
 (Fax)

0171 218 9000

[REDACTED]
 Home Office
 50 Queen Anne's Gate
 London SW1H 9AT

Your reference

Our reference
 D/Sec(AS)/64/3
 Date
 25th February 1998

Dear [REDACTED]

1. We spoke recently about my letter to you of 30th January concerning allegations made by a member of the public ([REDACTED]) that a 'UFO' had landed in the vicinity of the former Home Secretary's house in March last year. You said that you hoped to let me have something in reply very soon.
2. We now have two more 'ufologists' asking about this issue:
 - a. [REDACTED] of [REDACTED], Sutton Coldfield claims to be a journalist researching the incident and has asked us to confirm that an incident occurred on the day in question.
 - b. [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] Beaumaris, Anglesey, [REDACTED] has written to say that the Society is jointly holding a conference with the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology on 17th March at which he will be asking two questions. The first concerns the Freedom of Information Act; the second is to request a public inquiry into the alleged incident at Mr Howards house.
3. I would like to respond to all three letter writers as soon as possible, particularly given the date of the Select Committee conference and put the facts, whatever they are, in the public domain. As I said previously, I am more than happy to come along and talk to your colleagues about what might or might not be relevant, or collaborate with lines to take.
4. Could I have something soon please.

Yours ever

[REDACTED]

64/B



HOME OFFICE

50 Queen Anne's Gate, London SW1H 9AT

Tel: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED]

David Omand

Permanent Under Secretary of State

26 February 1998

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter of 30 January concerning the alleged UFO sighting at the former Home Secretary's home in Kent.

As a result of your letter Kent County Constabulary have rechecked their records between the 1-15 March 1997 and have confirmed that no security incident took place at the property in question between these dates or that they have had any correspondence with [REDACTED] about the matter.


Given what the police have had to say, it is doubtful whether much could be gained from a meeting with officials. However should you consider that such a meeting would be helpful then [REDACTED] who is responsible for the arrangements for Mr Howard's security, would be willing to attend and could arrange for a representative from Kent County Constabulary to be present. [REDACTED]

Yours ever,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Secretariat (Air Staff) [REDACTED]
Ministry Of Defence
Room 8247
Main Building
London SW1A 2HB



UFO MEEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

[REDACTED] FOLKESTONE, KENT
Tel. [REDACTED] Pager Number [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8247,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
London,
SW1A 2HB.

10 FEB 1999

Dear [REDACTED]

Recently, your department sent one of our members, Mr [REDACTED], of Ramsgate, Kent, a listing of all UFO sightings reported to the Ministry Of Defence during 1997.

One entry on that listing was for 8 March, 1997, at Hythe, Kent. Would it be possible for you to forward to me a copy of that report, of details of the time of the reported incident on that date, and the exact location, with brief description of what was observed?

I would be most grateful for your co-operation regarding this particular incident.

Would it also be possible for us to obtain copies of incidents that are reported to the police, and in turn passed onto your department? I know from Mr Graham Birdsall, of Quest Publications that this was done in the past.

Thanking you for your time and attention regarding this matter.

Yours Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

12 FEB 1999
12 10

UFOMEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

Tel. [REDACTED] FOLKESTONE, KENT
Pager Number [REDACTED]

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
22 FEB 1999
27

[REDACTED]
Secretariat (Air Staff) [REDACTED]
Room 8245.
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE,
Main Buildings,
Whitehall,
LONDON
SW1A 2HB.

26th February, 1999.

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter of 22 February, regarding my enquiry on the UFO sightings of 8 March, 1997.

Therefore I am writing to you under the terms of the Code of Practice on Access to Government information.

In your letter, you state that the only information that your department has with regard to a sighting on that date is from a member of the public, who drew Air Staff 2, attention to a report in a Kent newspaper. I would very much like to know what newspaper that was, and the date of the article, or the date when this member of the public contacted your department?

How you can say that your department has no other information, with regard to other sightings on the 8 March, 1997, seems impossible to believe, especially when [REDACTED] wrote to myself on the 3 July, 1997, to acknowledge receipt of two reports from the Home Office, and Chief Inspector [REDACTED] of Kent County Constabulary.

The reports we sent to the Home Office, and Kent Police, included a completed UFOMEK report form, signed by the witness, and a complete witness statement on UFOMEK headed paper, also signed and dated by the witness. I also believe that I sent another copy of the report to [REDACTED], along with a copy of a Field Investigation Report Form. Therefore if you do not have these letters of correspondence, and supporting documents/papers, then which department has them?

I know from the Home Office that the report I sent them on 5 June, 1997, was passed onto your department on the 9 June, 1997. How you can claim that you only have details of one sighting for the date of 8 March, 1997, from a newspaper article, is absolutely unbelievable!

REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

When the Press contacted your department in January, 1998, they were told that they knew nothing about this incident. And when another journalist contacted Air Staff 2, back in mid-July, 1997, he was sent a fax telling him the same thing. Can you please explain to me why your department still insist on denying all knowledge of the other incidents on the 8 March, 1997, when I they have received details of these as acknowledged by [REDACTED] in her letter of 3 July, 1997, to me (copy enclosed).


Thanking you for your time and attention regarding this matter, and I await your reply with interest.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED] Secretariat (Air Staff) [REDACTED]
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
(Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Folkestone
Kent
[REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference
D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Date
3 March 1998

Dear [REDACTED]


1. Thank you for your letter of 14 January which you sent again on 2 February. Your letter of 15 January addressed to the Home Secretary, which you repeated on 1 February, has been passed to MOD for reply.
2. The extent of the MOD's interest in the alleged events of 8 March last year have been fully explained to you in previous correspondence and, as we have already stated, the Home Office have confirmed that no security incident occurred at the former Home Secretary's home in Kent.
3. As my letter of 3 July made clear, the copy of the report you submitted to the Home Secretary with your undated letter in June last year was passed to the Ministry of Defence.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED], Secretariat(Air Staff) [REDACTED] Room 8245,
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
(Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Folkestone,
Kent.
[REDACTED]

Your reference

Our reference
D/Sec(AS)/64/3
Date

24 August 1998

Dear [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] has asked me to reply to your letter of 17 August.

You say that you believe the enclosure forwarded with your letter is a fake and ask for advice on how to deal with it. As the document appears to have been unsolicited, I can only suggest that you treat it as you would any other unsolicited item of correspondence.

You also ask about how to respond to telephone calls. Most telephone companies offer an advisory service on how to deal with unwanted callers and you may therefore find it helpful to talk with the organisation providing your own facility.

Finally, if you or anyone you know feels threatened in any way by unsolicited mail or telephone calls you may also find it helpful to talk about your concerns with your local police force.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED], Secretariat(Air Staff) [REDACTED] Room 8245
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB



Telephone (Direct dial)
 (Switchboard)
 (Fax)

0171 218 2140
 0171 218 9000

[REDACTED]
 Folkestone,
 Kent.
 [REDACTED]

Your Reference

Our Reference
 D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Date
 22 February 1999

Dear [REDACTED],

Thank you for your letter of 10 February addressed to [REDACTED]. I have been asked to reply.

Having seen a list of reported 'UFO' sightings for 1997, you asked for a copy of a 'UFO' report from Hythe, Kent dated 8 March 1997. The inclusion of this date in the MOD list of alleged sightings during 1997 reflected the fact that a member of the public drew our attention to a report in a Kent newspaper about an alleged sighting in the Hythe area on that date. The MOD did not receive any reported sightings direct about what was alleged to have occurred although we did receive correspondence seeking more information. As you know, the MOD does not investigate alleged sightings unless there is evidence of a potential threat to the United Kingdom from an external military source. On this occasion there was no substantive evidence and no further action was taken.

You have also asked for copies of any reports forwarded to the MOD by the civil police. Any reports of this nature would be provided in confidence and would not be available for public scrutiny for 30 years. This is due to the Public Records Act of 1958 and 1967. This Act of Parliament states that official files generally remain closed from public viewing for 30 years after the last action has been taken. It was generally the case that before 1967 all 'UFO' files were destroyed after five years, as there was insufficient public interest in the subject to merit their permanent retention. However since 1967, following an increase in public interest in this subject 'UFO' report files are now routinely preserved. Any files from the 1950s and early 1960s which did survive are already available for examination by members of the public at the Public Record Office, Ruskin Avenue, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU. Files from 1967 onwards will be routinely released to the Public Record Office at the 30 year point.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



REDACTION ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

From: [REDACTED] Secretariat(Air Staff)2a, Room 8245
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

0171 218 2140
0171 218 9000



[REDACTED]
Folkestone,
Kent.
[REDACTED]

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/Sec(AS)/64/3
Date

29 March 1999

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter of 26 February regarding an alleged incident near the former Home Secretary's house on 8 March 1997.

In previous correspondence, it was stated that Sec(AS)2 have no additional information regarding this sighting. You then pointed out that [REDACTED] had formerly referred to reports forwarded to this office from the Home Office and the Police. I assumed you were aware of these reports as they were originally written by you and addressed to the Home Office and Police. They were then forwarded to Sec(AS) for reply. I can confirm that Sec(AS)2 holds all the papers you sent directly to us regarding the incident, including the UFOMEK report form and UFOMEK witness statement.

I have enclosed newspaper cuttings regarding the alleged incident over the former Home Secretary's house on 8 March 1997.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

17 AUG 1998



ROYAL AIR FORCE

1st August 1997

[REDACTED]
As a scheduled first hand warning, you are no longer permitted to carry on investigations into the supposed triangular-shaped object that was seen over Burmarsh, Kent.


The report of this unidentified craft by [REDACTED] on the 10th March 1997 (which was received by researchers at UFOMEK) was made at haste. She had actually seen a Rapid Response military aircraft, but as to new developments, I am not permitted to release details on its structure. The "disc like" shape [REDACTED] attached to the rear of the aircraft was a distance radar, but yet again due to new developments I can only be vague about its description and function.

May I state, therefore, this is not Official Denial. Your co-operation into this matter is vital for the security of military intelligence. You should now, therefore, proceed to leave this mistake for [REDACTED] to realise and forget. Other reports have come through from Dymchurch of a similar supposed UFO. These reports were acknowledged by us and the relevant people were told the situation.

From our obvious co-operation, we would appreciate yours. This matter, as we both know is also causing "emotional stress" for certain individuals, and should only strengthen the need to pass this case by as solved.

Once again this is a Conditional Warning.

Yours Sincerely,



Wing Commander
Field Force Commander

UFOMIEK

UFO MONITORS EAST KENT

[REDACTED] FOLKESTONE, KENT
Tel. [REDACTED] Pager Number [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Secretariat (Air Staff)
Ministry Of Defence,
Room 8247,
Main Building,
Whitehall,
London
SW1A 2HB.

17 August, 1998.

Dear [REDACTED],


I am writing to you with regard to the enclosed letter that I received this morning. As you can see it is from someone claiming to be an RAF Wing Commander. It is obvious that the letter is a fake, which I feel makes the matter more serious, as it shows that there is someone posing as a member of Her Majesty's Forces, of which I understand can be considered an offence.


The reason I am sending this letter to you, is to make you aware that indeed there could well be someone posing as a member of the Royal Air Force. Should I discover who this is, what action do you suggest I take, if this person should send similar letters or makes telephone calls to either [REDACTED], or myself? Do you think it appropriate for me to report the matter to the local police, or report to you, should the identity of the person be discovered? I do know that through my dealings with the U.S. Airforce in the past, they take a very serious and dim view of persons impersonating personnel from their branch of the armed services.

Should this letter be from a genuine member of the RAF, imparting official information, then surely that is an offence within the constraints of the Official Secrets Act.

I await your reply with interest.

Yours Sincerely,
[REDACTED]





[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2004 15:01
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Internet-Authorised: UFO query.

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing with reference to the e.mail you sent to this office on 11 April 2004. Sorry for such a long delay in getting back to you.

I have recalled the 1991 UFO Report file from Archives, to see if the incident over Malinslee, Telford, was reported to this office.

I will be in contact in due course and if the report and any photographs are available, will be able to forward you a copy.

Yours sincerely

04/08/2004

✓
(on database).**DAS-SEC3**

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 April 2004 23:24
To: das-sec3@defence.mod.uk
Subject: ufos[1].pdf

Dear Sir,

Going back to 1991 there was an incident at the rear and above my house in Malinslee, Telford which was witnessed by a jet fighter-bomber plane I assumed belonging to the RAF. The time and date is as follows:-

Date Friday 21.6.1991.
Time From 21.30Hrs to 22.00Hrs.
 Interception took place at around 21.50Hrs.
Place Eastern end of Stone Row Malinslee Telford.

I was wondering if there is available, to the public, a copy of the pilots report and photos. If so can I have a copy.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

14/04/2004



(Faxed -
11/8/04)

From: [REDACTED]

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1,
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone: (Direct dial) [REDACTED]
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) [REDACTED]
DAS-FOI 1

FAX MESSAGE

TO: Helpdesk, TNT Archive Services, Attn: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: Two files requested. (Previous memo and letter faxed with this one).

DATE: 10/08/04

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: Three.

I requested two files:

D/Sec (AS) 12/2 Pt K 1991 UFO Reports.
D/Sec (AS) 12/3 Pt I 1991 UFO Correspondence.

First request was on memo on the 29/07/04, and the second request on 06/08/04 in form of a letter, as faxed today.

As in the letter, I was asking as to why the files are taking so long to be despatched to me. Plus if there were any problems there was a number I enclosed, so that TNT Archive Services could get in touch with me.

Can you please let me know the state of play as to when the files will be despatched to me, as I have a member of the public waiting for some information, the reason for why I requested the files in the first place!

Thank you for your help.

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

[REDACTED]
020 7218 9000
[REDACTED]

Helpdesk
TNT Archive Services
Bourne Avenue
Hayes
Middlesex
UB3 1RF

Your Reference:
Our Reference: D/DAS/64
Date: 16 August 2004

Dear [REDACTED] 40

I am writing in reference again, to enquire after two files that I recalled from Archives over four weeks ago. I have faxed the request through and have written one other letter before this one on the 6 August, plus have sent a requisition form on the 27th July. Plus have been trying to ring your helpdesk no, but at the moment no one answers it. A lady, [REDACTED] left 40 message on my phone to contact her, but as such have not been able to get hold of her.

As I have said before, I require those files as a member of the public has requested information and it has to be redacted and then sent out.

The files are:- D/Sec (AS) 12/2 Pt K 1991 UFO Reports.
D/Sec (AS) 12/3 Pt I 1991 UFO Correspondence .

Will you please let me know the state of play as to when these files are going to be despatched to me. I have been told that TNT Services are meant to deal with a request withing 24 hours, so why has it taken so long for my files to be despatched to me, and why has no one sent me correspondence back letting me know at what stage the files are at. My number is [REDACTED]

Look forward to either receiving the files requested or a reason as to why they can't be sent out to me yet.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information 1

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

[REDACTED]
020 7218 9000
[REDACTED]

Helpdesk
TNT Archive Services
Bourne Avenue
Hayes
Middlesex
UB3 1RF

Your Reference
Our Reference: D/DAS/64
Date: 6 August 2004

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing in reference to two files that I recalled back from your archives on the 29 July 2004. As yet, I have not received them, I require them, so that they can be redacted and sent out to a member of the public, who has requested information from them.

The files are: D/Sec (AS) 12/2 Pt K 1991 UFO Reports.
D/Sec (AS) 12/3 Pt I 1991 UFO Correspondence.

Can you please let me know if there is a problem retrieving these two files, I enclosed my work no, on the memo I sent on the 29 July 2004 but as yet, have not had a call as to why the files are taking so long to be despatched to me.

Also, has your office no changed? The number I have is 020 8813 5436, but I can't get through on this number, just makes a noise like a fax machine number does.

Thank you for your help.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

REQUISITION FOR A REGISTERED FILE

To:- DR2a2, Files Section,

Fax Number: [REDACTED]

File Nos: Can you please send me two files;

D/Sec (AS) 12/2 Pt K 1991 UFO Reports.

D/Sec (AS) 12/3 Pt I 1991 UFO Correspondence.

Thank you.

TRACED TO YOU ON:

(DATE) IS REQUIRED BY:
ASAP Please

BRANCH: DAS – FOI 1

BUILDING:
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building,
Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

SIGNATURE: [REDACTED]

TEL. EXT: [REDACTED]

RANK: E1

DATE: 29/07/04

NOTE:- If the file is not immediately available for any reason,
please advise the requisitioning branch by telephone.

Original sent 29/7/04.



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 July 2004 15:05
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Internet-Authorised: UFO's.

Dear [REDACTED] D

Thank you for your e.mail dated 29 July 2004.

We are not questioning your intelligence, nor are we suggesting that you did not see something that you were unable to identify.

It may assist you if I explain that the integrity of the UK's airspace in peacetime is maintained through continuous surveillance of the UK Air Policing Area by the Royal Air Force. This is achieved by using a combination of civil and military radar installations, which provide a continuous real-time "picture" of the UK airspace. Any threat to the UK Air Defence Region would be handled in the light of the particular circumstances at the time (it might if deemed appropriate, involve the scrambling or diversion of air defence aircraft).

As you will be aware from our last e.mail, we are satisfied that there was no threat to the integrity of the UK's airspace, on the date of your report.

Finally, you indicated that full details of your sighting could be found on your website. You may wish to be aware that we are unable to access your website as the site has been 'disabled'.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

30/07/2004

✓
(on database)

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 July 2004 20:22
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: UFO Sighting.

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your e-mail.

I have a responsibility to report my sighting, whether to wish to do anything (not that you will be able to) is not my concern.

If someone was in the process of breaking into my neighbours house, that someone saw me and then ran off - should I keep it to myself? I should report it to those you are paid and who have the RESPONSIBILITY to protect us and others.

You can find my full report posted on website <http://www.ufosightingsuk.co.uk/> under ufo in s.ascot/posted by sara.

There is no authority to deny, merge, manipulate or dismiss my own experience. There is nothing that you or I or anyone else can do about the events that day. The technology is not our own. But you do need to know what is going on up and out there. Time tells a different story.

If there is anything we can agree with - these visitors are not here to harm us, but the past and present does not necessarily predict the future. According to some texts, ancient and other that i have read, such things are actually no real big deal at all.

Overall, i am very please to have witness this 'foreign aircraft'. I saw every detail - all the grooves, windows, everything. There was no room for humans to fit within it.

[REDACTED]

30/07/2004



From: [REDACTED]
Directorate of Air Staff - Freedom of Information
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB



Con database


Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

020 7218 2140
020 7218 9000

E-mail

[REDACTED]@mod.uk



Hayton
Retford
Nottinghamshire



Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS/64/3
Date
28 July 2004

Dear [REDACTED]


Further to my letter of 6 April, I am writing regarding the slide of an unidentified object over Retford Town Hall which you sent to me in April.

I apologise for the length of time you have been waiting for a reply. We have been in contact with the Imagery Analyst who has assured us that they will be in a position to send us their report by the 2nd August. As soon as the report arrives, I will write to you again.

In the meantime, please note that we have recently moved back into our main office building which has been under refurbishment. We are currently experiencing some technical problems with our UFO telephone line, so if you wish to contact us, I suggest you write to us at our postal address or e-mail, the details of which are at the head of this letter.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely,



1. What would be the rank of an operator watching the radar screens?
2. What would be the chain of command through which any unidentified object would be reported?
3. Once reported, how would aircraft be scrambled and how long would this usually take?
4. Where would aircraft be scrambled from or would they normally be on patrol and therefore called in?
5. What would be a typical call sign for military aircraft?

I realise that with today's need for security you may be unable to provide me with some or all of this information. If this happens to be the case, then I thank you for your time in reading my letter.

Should you need to speak to me regarding my request I can be contacted at [REDACTED]
Junior School on [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]



From: [REDACTED]

Directorate of Air Staff – Freedom of Information



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

5th Floor, Zone H, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1A 2HB

Telephone

(Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

020 7218 2140
020 7218 9000

[REDACTED]

Leven

Fife

[REDACTED]

Your Reference:

Our Reference:

D/DAS/64/3

Date:

13 December 2004

Dear [REDACTED]

I have just received your letter dated 2 December 2004.

As to your question of not sending back a video tape that was sent to us in 2002, you sent this office a copy and kept the original, as you told us in your previous letter, and the reply back from [REDACTED], who worked here at the time, for which I have enclosed the previous correspondence with this letter.

We certainly have not committed theft, as the tape was promptly returned back to you. If it was lost in transit, or had been delivered to your old address, that was out of our hands.

I hope this information has settled this query.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]