

### **UFO OBSERVATIONS (pp. 98–104)**

All four reports in this issue are photographic cases, and in each of them the UFO was only the reflection of a ceiling lamp on a window pane. In three cases, we had additionally to deal with false memories, as all observers believed they had taken their photo outside of a room, even when – as in case Riegelsberg-Walpershofen – they reported their sighting within a few hours. In the Fehman case, the observer definitely recalled he had witnessed the saucer fly from left to right, and had seen it disappear behind a building. In each case, photos of ceiling lights in the respective rooms were taken, compared to the UFO, and superimposed on it, so all four cases are definitely proven misidentifications. The cases are from 6 December 2002, in Fehman, 23 August 2018, in Riegelsberg-Walpershofen, 12 August 2015, in List on Sylt, and finally, on 4 July 2017, at the North Cape of Norway. This teaches the lesson that in all sighting reports we have to account for false memories. Human observers are not machines.

### **ON THE PENTAGON RESEARCH PROJECT: AATIP OR AAWSAP? (pp. 105–110)**

Based on a parabunk dateline, Detlef Hoyer summarises the history of AATIP/AAWSAP up to 2017, when it had become TTSA. He also outlines the interview with the radar observer in the Nimitz case (authenticity unproven), and a paper on warp drive published as a Defence Intelligence Reference Document.

### **BRIEF NOTE (p. 110)**

At this year's CUN conference in Italy, Luis Elizondo and Tom DeLonge gave a talk on their work with TTSA:

### **ON A VENUS MISIDENTIFICATION IN THE YEAR 1905 (pp. 111–113)**

In the first two weeks of April 1905, hundreds of observers, even trained military observers and an admiral, repeatedly watched a giant brilliant ball of light appear over Cherbourg in France, remain in the sky for several hours, and then vanish into the sea. Theories were many: airships, a meteor, etc. Astronomers were able to show that all these observers were watching the planet Venus, and French astronomer Flammarion became furious on how even highly educated people had not the slightest knowledge in astronomy. So, it does not take belief in UFOs to mistake Venus for something else, and the complaints by astronomers when faced with such sightings are nothing new!

### **50 years ago today: the Condon Report (pp. 114–115)**

The author reread the Condon Report, edited by US physicist Edward Uhlir Condon – how does it stand after 50 years? Amazingly, all the points outlined by Condon in his famous summary still stand: no generally accepted progress in natural sciences has been made by UFO research, and UFOs still to not pose a threat to US security. The Report deserves to be taken seriously.

### **TRENT-PHOTOS, PART THREE (pp. 116–121)**

The author outlines the response of UFO researcher Brad Sparks to a study by the French group IPACO which aimed at showing that the Trent photos were due to a hoax. Sparks disagrees, says the IPACO study is full of flaws, and Horn agrees with him.

### **REVIEWS (pp. 122–128)**

No English language books are reviewed in this issue.