

NARCAP International Air Safety Report
NARCAP IR-6, 2013

Aviation Safety Reports Related by
Argentine Pilots Concerning Unidentified Aerial Phenomena

Carlos Daniel Ferguson
State Employee at the Department of Culture and Education
(Area Logistics / Artist Art / University Studies in Library)

August 29, 2013
Copyright

INTRODUCTION

Encounters between pilots and Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (UAP) in Argentina, number more than one hundred cases (about 50 in flight), and can be placed in one of these alternatives:

- a) UAP on a collision course
- b) UAP in conventional aircraft tracking
- c) UAP causing electromagnetic (EM) effects
- d) UAP effects at airports (captured visually or by radar or a combination of both)

The most dramatic cases are related to c, which affect directly the safety of the crew of conventional aircraft.

Perhaps such events led the Argentine Air Force to create the *State Commission for the Study of Aerospace Phenomena* in 2011 (I have the honor of being the first civilian to participate as an advisor related to UAP since then).

Let us examine some examples that serve to highlight the importance that should be given to these types of events, considering their safety implications, and show that in Argentina, and the rest of the world, that UAP appear to have an intentionality that is manifested in a fundamentally different way in the presence of conventional stimuli.

In my recent book "UAP Encounters Between Pilots in Argentina" (2012) I presented a statistical work of 149 cases involving encounters and observations from pilots on the ground and in the air as well as confirmed airport malfunctions, etc. Many of these possess features and characteristics of extreme complexity. Eighteen of them are presented here.

In the French COMETA report one can find some features of this type of case. In its section on "Implications from Aircraft" it states:

"It is intellectually impossible to remain indifferent to unexplained aeronautical phenomena that numerous civil and military pilots have faced. The quantity of the evidence and the quality of the witnesses makes it impossible to avoid the phenomenon, so airman and others on defense should be sensitized and prepared to face such situations. It is necessary to inculcate staff, faced with the phenomenon, with reflex actions that you need to take concrete steps (e.g. San Carlos de Bariloche: sudden shutdown of the lights of the runway during the UAP phenomenon's presence). It is true that to remain master of the situation to an unforeseen and poorly understood event, it is best to be prepared. These responses are of different types depending on whether observing, recording testimony, transmitting the information that is collected or reacting instantly to take appropriate measures against the phenomenon."

What we read in the COMETA REPORT is clear. Also, the task of the *National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena* (NARCAP) technical reports is very important to alert the attention it should receive to these types of air safety cases.

The remarkable Argentine UAP analyst Prof. Oscar Uriondo has defined these events as INTENTIONAL because of the intelligence that is behind the phenomenon.

And it should also be mentioned that Carl Jung, in his "Flying Saucers, a Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Skies" (Nilomex, Mexico, 1983 - page 23), also clearly warned about these unusual characteristics of UAP movements. He wrote:

"It looks like the path that describes a flying insect ... suddenly it stops near a subject that interests it (Jung referred to a conventional aircraft), for a longer or shorter period of time, or flies in a circle around it, showing lively curiosity and then suddenly leaves the place as to search for other object in zigzagging flight ... "

And later he added:

"Their flights don't appear to be based on any recognizable system. They behave more like a group of tourists watching the landscape unsystematically, stopping now here for a while, and now there, erratically following one interest first and then another, to sometimes shooting upward huge altitudes for unexplained reasons, or performing acrobatic evolutions in front of the noses of the exasperated drivers."

With regard to what we call intentional behavior, it is interesting to mention here the eminent psychologist William McDougall, the creator of the theory *hórmica*, (Greek for "mold" which means life force or impulse to action). He listed the features of the behavior of living things that

differentiate them, through observation, from more simple mechanical action. Some of these features include:

- Some spontaneity of movement.
- Persistence of the activity.
- Variation in the direction of movement.
- Completion of the movement.
- Preparing for a new situation.

These characteristics can provide a useful reference when it comes to defining whether UAP are natural or intentional (artificial) phenomena.

The statements made by Prof. Uriondo are important because they allow us to expose a sample set of behaviors in which the UAP have changed their flight paths in relation to airplanes nearby.

NEAR APPROACHES / NEAR COLLISION

In these kinds of events there is a deliberate attitude of approach to conventional aircraft, (often along with) a sudden maneuver.

Five Cases are Presented, some are more dramatic than others.

1. August 31, 1958: Flight Machagay / Resistencia (Chaco) 11:16 am:

The civilian pilot Raul N. Lopez was flying his Piper Cub PA-11-L, registration LV-XJW. The day was glorious. Suddenly he saw at 110 degrees a bright object that rose up to 2,400 m altitude. At first he thought it was a reflection of sunlight off something. Lopez changed his course in order to get closer but noticed that the object was coming to meet him. It stopped about 12 miles from his plane. When their separation distance was about 4.4 miles its brightness diminished somewhat and it looked like a flat plate with a dome. Its diameter was 30 meters. The object began to spin rapidly and gave off greenish-red flashes. His engine's speed began to increase as the distance to the UAP decreased, reaching about 100 rpm more than his (normal) cruise rpm where it remained. But the UAP then immediately turned away from him rising in a climbing maneuver. Lopez made it clear that he had not touched the throttle during this time. As the UAP departed his engine rpm returned to its normal value. (1)

2. November 21, 1965: 10 km from Resistencia Airport (Chaco) 21:45 pm:

Commander Domingo V. Longo and co-pilot Pedro Bassi (38) were in charge of flight 289 of "Aerolineas Argentinas", and preparing to land at the Resistencia airport in a "Caravelle". At that moment they began to notice a strange phenomenon, an object of intense light, coming towards their plane and causing great concern because it stopped only 100 meters away. Longo shouted to his companion: " Careful, we will collide! " The copilot turned the airplane quickly by 30 degrees, to a new heading of 300 degrees and altitude of 2,100 meters, trying to dodge what seemed an imminent collision. At the time of the turn the UAP rose vertically at a fantastic speed and was out of sight in seconds. The UAP made two nearly simultaneous movements: stopped

short, and then projected vertically upwards, disappearing in seconds. When contacting the control tower it was confirmed that, indeed, he had detected a strange object that approached him and then ascended rapidly. The pilots ruled out the possibility of confusion with Venus, not only because the planet was fixed in space, noting firmly that this strange object approached and almost caused a collision. Longo added, "It was the size of two full moons and had a powerful light but our vision was not dazzled. It was not a satellite or meteorite but was the biggest impression on my life." First Officer Bassi had 20 years of flight experience at the time and reported that the UAP had stopped with an unusual spring-like effect and then projected upwards". A third witness was the airplane's mechanic, Pedro D'Jourian (34). There is no doubt that had they continued the flight without turning the UAP would have crashed into their plane.

(2)

3. June 18, 1968: La Guardia (Catamarca) 16:40 pm:

In a Cessna 182 (LV-ITR) piloted by Jorge Raul Scassa Sutter (airline pilot with 25 years of experience) and Ruben Andrawos, flying at an elevation of 7,500 feet in a clear sky, the two men noticed a discoidal shaped UAP with a metallic dome that was rotating clockwise. It appeared to be 1,000 meters away and would have been about 30 meters in diameter. On a couple of occasions the foreign object came almost to the nose of the plane, which suggested to the crew that an imminent collision was going to occur. They tried to contact the control tower of Catamarca, but this turned out to be impossible due to interference known as "frequency fading". Finally they were able to send a message and received an answer from the crew of another plane, "Aerolineas Argentinas" (flight 713). After the UAP withdrew, only then could the crew contact Catamarca Airfield. According to Scassa Suter, an experienced pilot, he had never before seen anything like this anomalous aircraft move as it did in all his years of experience as a pilot. A driver and three passengers of a car on the ground also witnessed this incident. As the UAP passed them, the car's engine stopped altogether. The witnesses were surprised and went to make a complaint to the police. (3)

4. June 14, 1980: Camet Airport, Mar del Plata (Bs. As.) 19:00 pm:

An Aerolineas Argentinas airplane (registration LV-JTD) was preparing to land at the airport when its commander warned Camet authorities about the presence of a stationary light and apparatus on a collision course with them. The pilot thought that there would be an imminent shock but the UAP rose just before impact. A soldier, Edgardo Spano, (a security guard at the Camet airport) said he could also see the strange device making these movements; he tried to alert the tower. Others soldiers present also agreed with him: Carlos Gauna, Daniel Rodriguez and Martinez Churillo. (4)

5. July 31, 1995: San Carlos de Bariloche Airport (RIO NEGRO) 20:45 pm:

The commander of an Aerolineas Argentinas Boeing 727-287, Jorge Polanco, was piloting flight AR-674 from Buenos Aires to Bariloche (Black River). His First Officer was Carlos Dortona and Flight Engineer-Jorge Allende. Capt. Roberto Benavente, another company pilot, was also present in the cockpit as a witness. When Captain Polanco requested authorization from the control tower to descend into Bariloche Airport a city-wide power outage occurred forcing him to circle the airport for an hour. Radio communication was also disrupted. During this same period the flight crew saw a strange lighted object ahead of them which was also seen by control tower personnel. The object was about the size of a Boeing 737 and approached the

airplane suddenly stopping and maintaining position about 100 m on their right side. Major Jose Luis Oviedo, airport chief, said that when viewed from the ground (with the airplane at 5,500 feet altitude at the time) the lighted object was near it. The UAP appeared as a bright white body with 2 green lights at the ends and an orange light in the center, which appeared intermittently. When the plane turned, the UAP accompanied it remaining only 40 meters away from the right wing of the Boeing jet. When Polanco's go-around maneuver began, the UAP performed a maneuver that the pilot described as "impossible" (i.e., a sharp 90 degree rotation, breaking known laws of physics"). The flight crew of a National Gendarmerie turboprop PA 315/GN air ambulance (piloted by Ruben Cipusak and Gaitan) also observed the phenomenon flying near the jet from their higher location; the UAP was also seen by staff in the control tower. Capt. Cipuzak said the maneuver of 90 degrees was violent, as that made at a rate calculated at Mach 3 (about 4,000 km ph). The case received widespread publicity and is considered to be one of the best that has occurred (including emphasis in the COMETA Report because of the high level of expertise of the pilots). The UAP was about 30 meters in diameter and the encounter lasted minutes. (5)

In these 5 cases, 3 of them (60%) were with objects whose size was judged to be 30 feet in diameter, and who approached the aircraft incredibly fast. It is clear that the phenomenon has a great capacity for immediate aviation interference.

ACCOMPANYING / SURVEILLANCE

In the following cases we perceive that the UAP do accompany conventional aircraft, demonstrating complete mastery of the situation. It highlights the cases of the Naval Air Station Indian Point June 1965, which includes valuable radar - visual evidence.

1. October 16, 1959: Flight between Presidencia Roque Saenz (CHACO) and Santa Fe (CHACO) 15:30 pm:

A Douglas DC-3 Aerolineas Argentinas airplane (registration LV-ACE), whose pilots were Capt. Nestor del Blanco and F/O Manso, flying to Santa Fe was at an altitude of 2,400 meters, in a clear sky. Suddenly the pilots noticed the presence of a large spindle-shaped metallic object. Moments later three more objects arrived and were seen silhouetted against the mist. They performed horizontal maneuvers. Four disks fell off of a part of one of the ("very large") objects and moved away each in a different direction. This was also observed by Miguel Villafane (radio operator on-board) and Wilson Green (purser). At 17:00 hours, the crew again observed three moving silhouettes. One of them followed the aircraft as it descended. (6)

2. August 11, 1964: Cabo Virgenes (SANTA CRUZ) 17:00 pm:

A Beechcraft 5 G-2 aircraft of the Armada Argentina, piloted by Lieutenant Commander Raul Salgado, was flying along the route Ushuaia - Rio Gallegos, when suddenly the pilot observed a luminous object, which seemed to float over the sea. At first he thought it was a boat that reflected the sun's rays, but when the object moved to the land near Cape Cabo Virgenes, he changed his mind. For half an hour the object kept on the same course as the plane and finally departed at high speed in the opposite direction. (7)

3. June 1965: Naval Air Station Punta Indio (Bs. As.):

UAP were detected as radar echoes over a three week period, with the airplanes flying either alone or together (during training). This led to the formation of a committee comprising the Head of the Base Frontroth Hugo, and two members of an official Navy research team on Unidentified Aerial Phenomena (Ch. Omar Pagani and Constantino Nunez) who authorized the descent of the various aircraft. Sr. Hugo Boss Frontroth confirmed that radar echoes did occur during different practice flights, adding the following story: "Once, I climbed to about 8,000 feet when this unusual maneuver was demonstrated by the brilliant UAP in the Southwest region and it approached the plane... I must make it clear that such approaches were made across the entire radar screen within a couple of seconds, i.e., a 40 mile radius of the search radar scope." "In the same way it stopped next to the airplane and escorted it for a few seconds and then it disappeared... Sometimes when raising the radar antenna up to about 30 degrees the UAP appeared to reach incredible heights, 40 or 50 thousand feet. In this case I told the operator that I flew toward the object and every time I went toward it, it moved away to the side or moved behind me. This happened several times. Finally, I decided to terminate the game and returned to the base to finish the job. The sighting lasted about 15 minutes. "We had a notebook with UAP sightings recording date, time, direction, quantity". (8)

4. June 1965: Naval Air Station Punta Indio (Bs. As.) Daytime:

A two engine Beechcraft C-45 Aeroparque airplane took off from the naval base. Two unidentified objects were spotted by ground control approach (GCA) radar that followed behind the plane until they sped away to the south. (9)

5. End of October 1965: Alt. Córdoba (CORDOBA):

A first lieutenant of military aviation was flying from Cordoba to Buenos Aires in a Morane Saulnier-760 jet when he noticed he was being followed by a foreign object. Quickly the pilot radioed the local Air Base to inform them about the incident while also supplying them with position "tracking information": Distance, 30 miles and at an angle of 45 degrees above the horizon. "The pilot noticed that the UAP was leaving him due south. The UAP was also seen by staff at the Pajas Blancas Airport. (10)

6. March 13, 1974: Córdoba (Córdoba) Evening:

Flight 537 of Argentinas Airlines flying from San Juan to Cordoba was flanked by two luminous UAP that accompanied it for several minutes. The foreign objects were oval in shape and disappeared at a fantastic speed. The aircraft was under the control of commanders Ecurra and Retegno and was flying at 6,500 meters altitude at the time. The crew experienced a strong emotional impact from the sighting. (11)

7. September 23, 1984: Alt. Reconquista (SANTA FE) Approx. 19:30 pm:

In good weather, a Piper LV-MEE two engine propeller airplane was on a flight from Cordoba to Resistencia with 6 passengers on board. Its pilot was Carlos Sorini. Upon reaching Reconquista a UAP having the shape of a saucer began to follow the plane and caused various effects on the radio compass. Its needle oscillated between 0.05 and 270 degrees. The tracking of the airplane lasted almost 45 minutes and terrorized the passengers. Their stories were recorded after landing at the Resistencia International Airport. The UAP emitted different intense colors ranging from silver to orange and appeared on the left side of the airplane at high speed, passing

right on down the side, and re-approaching from behind and to the right, in a downward trend and crossing to the left in the NNW direction. Sorini was conclusive when he said, "Any conventional machine, with aerodynamics known to us is unable to make such maneuvers." "I have over 6,500 flight hours and never have seen anything like this and I can say that this phenomenon is not due to anything known within the aviation field." Two other aircrews (Austral Airlines flt. 61; Aerolineas Argentinas flt. 760) also confirmed the UAP's presence. (12)

8. Before mid-year 1995: Córdoba (Córdoba) 3 hours:

The pilot Jorge Polanco was commanding a "Aerolineas Argentinas" flight from Rio de Janeiro to Cordoba. The airport's control tower informed him that the Boeing 727 was followed by an unidentified body was placed below the plane, accompanied for 15 minutes. At that time, in the cabin, all the crew heard the warning of the tower. Using an autopilot system, Polanco slightly inclined the plane and there all could see a luminous object to the left, following the Boeing for 7-10 minutes, until it moved away. (13)

(Note: This pilot had also observed another UAP while flying on July 31, 1995 (see above) but has steadfastly maintained that the two events were independent.)

FLIGHT FROM PURSUERS

Another case occurred at the Indian Point Naval Air Station that clearly shows a UAP's response to the persecution by an airplane. In rare cases, the UAP makes a hasty retreat, leaving his pursuer at high speed.

June 1965: Naval Air Station Punta Indio (Bs. As.) 13:30:

When on one occasion an echo was detected for 20 minutes, the naval air station sent a plane aloft piloted by Lieutenant Frederick Machain. Clouds covered the sky. The pilot climbed without seeing anything at first. Fifteen minutes later, Machain ascended and coming out of a cloud he saw at 200 feet to the right of his plane and 45 degrees on the bow, a bright object that had stopped. After a few seconds, the UAP sped away to the south. This was also confirmed by ground radar. (14)

EFFECTS ON INSTRUMENTS

Here are four interesting cases where conventional aircraft experienced electromagnetic (EM) interference of some sort. In some cases this could directly and dramatically affect flight safety. The case of August 31, 1958 (Case #1 summarized earlier in the Accompanying/ Surveillance section could also be included here).

1. January 1963: e / CORDOBA and TUCUMÁN:

The crew of a DC-4 "Aerolineas Argentinas" airplane (on a flight from Buenos Aires to Salta province), observed a bright UAP tracking their aircraft. A powerful white light illuminated the inside of the cabin of the DC-4. At the time of the approach one of the plane's four engines

stopped working. Finally the pilot managed to land the airplane smoothly at the B. Matienzo airport. Who crewed the aircraft but commander Bassi with César Meloni radioman. - (15)

2. May 13 1971: Villa Jimenez (Santiago del Estero) 20:25 pm:

Commander José Almonacid was in flight when he spotted a single UAP. After he saw the strange object, the plane began to experience unusual radio communication interference. When the UAP turned away, everything returned to normal. (16)

3. March 1973: Marcos Juarez Airport (CORDOBA) 21:00 pm:

The Argentinian Air Force Vice-commodore Horacio Riciardelli was traveling with his copilot when they observed an intense flash of light from a UAP. Immediately, all the instruments (except the compass) went out of service. After a few seconds, everything returned to normal. Upon landing they learned that the control tower at M. Juárez airport also had observed and photographed the light. (17)

4. December 5 1974: Flight between Makallé (CHACO) and Bella Vista (CURRENT) 00:00 pm:

Aníbal Ayerza Unzué was traveling in his plane when he saw an object moving from south to north. At that time the plane's engine stopped, causing a sudden drop in altitude of 150 meters. Then the engines returned to normal. The witness suffered an emotional shock during the incident. (18)

DISCUSSION

It is clear that in Argentina, as well as internationally, there are cases that directly affect aviation safety. I agree with the analysis of Professor Oscar Uriondo when he speaks about an intention of the UAP phenomenon. (19) This view coincides with another colleague, Angel Diaz, in the concepts of his work, viz. "The intercepts of our aircraft by UAP." (20) He states that the phenomenon appears to follow these guidelines: "Limited contact", "Low impact", and "Little damage". Also is the fact that UAP approaches and impacts coming toward the front of the airplane can cause great alarm in the flight crew and also other risks because of emergency procedures and injury to passengers that have occurred (as a result of evasive maneuvers). It is clear that the action of the UAP is premeditated.

We have five cases of quasi - collisions, eight cases of surveillance, a case of avoiding pursuit and five cases involving EM effects. Most of the UAP approach toward the nose of the aircraft. There are also 7 cases with persistent maneuvers by the phenomenon.

As for departures, most UAP ascend, supporting what has been verified by my colleague Angel Diaz, i.e., the UAP chooses the most convenient direction to escape, that is by ascending. A climbing escape has these advantages: 1) given the great power and "lift" of these objects they are quickly beyond the visual area of the intercepting aircraft, 2) the UAP are placed out of reach of potential fighters who are sent up after them .

This attitude demonstrates two things: that the UAP dominate the flight in the upper atmosphere and know our reactions.

EPILOGUE

It is essential to raise awareness among authorities in order to prepare airmen for any situation arising from a meeting with unconventional objects or phenomena. Considering all in-flight UAP reports made by Argentine pilots, events in which there were alterations in instrument functioning and near misses have been scarce, but this does not exempt us from understanding the phenomenon of close encounters in the air. Prevention should be our chief concern in those circumstances.

CONCLUSIONS

- 1) It is undoubtedly clear from these reports that UAP have an unusual operational capacity of supremacy during a meeting with conventional aircraft.
- 2) Pilots must be aware of the possibility of such facts, and maintain an extreme calmness and self-control as was exhibited by the pilot Jorge Polanco in the Bariloche, Argentina case of July 31, 1995 (highlighted in the French COMETA report). In addition, pilots must be made aware of the possibility of such sightings and close encounters.
- 3) UAP seem to be characterized by the following premises: a) Contact is limited, b) impact is low, c) damage is minimal (or the least possible damage) and d) the UAP demonstrate a superiority over terrestrial technology. (21)

REFERENCES

1. Anganuzzi, H., Historia de los Platos Voladores. Editorial Plus Ultra, Buenos Aires – 1977 – pg. 99
2. Codovni, listado 1965 / “Ocurrió”, 4/12/1965 / Revista Gente, año 1 nro 19, 2/12/1965 / Crónica, 26/11/1965
3. La Gaceta de Tucumán, 19 de junio de 1968
4. Reynoso, Luis, “Tras las Huellas de los Ovnis”, Ediciones Edovni (Rosario – 1988 – pp. 130-131)
5. Varios medios de prensa / Revista Más Allá nro 35, diciembre de 2000
6. Revista Leoplán, 2 de octubre de 1963

7. Revista Siete Días Ilustrados, 8/8/1967
8. Revista La Nación, 7 de abril de 1974 / Hugo Frontroth falleció en el mes de junio de 2013
9. Ovnis: peregrinos del silencio, R. Banchs, ediciones Cefai, marzo de 1991
10. Crónica, 18 de noviembre de 1965
11. Diario La Voz del Interior, Córdoba, 18 de marzo de 1974
12. Norte, 25 de septiembre de 1984
13. <http://prensa.cancilleria.gov.ar/noticia.php?id=22727829>
14. Machain, Federico, “He visto un Ovni en mi pantalla de radar”, Lo mejor de Cuarta Dimensión nro 2, Cielosur Editora, Bs. As, 1978
15. La Gaceta de Córdoba, 3/1/1963 / Revista Gente, año 1 nro 19, 2/12/1965
16. Diario La Razón, 14/5/1971
17. Reyes, M. entrevista al V.H. Ricciardelli, 2003
18. Diario “El Territorio”, diciembre de 1974
19. Web: www.carlosferguson.com.ar
20. and 21. Trabajo presentado en el “Primer Simposio Nacional de Ovnología en Santiago del Estero” (Rep. Argentina) en agosto de 1987. / “Encuentros entre pilotos y Ovnis en Argentina” – Ferguson, Carlos – Editorial Dunken, Bs. As., 2012 – p. 201