



VOLUME II

ISSUE NO. 8

DECEMBER, 1981



Our November meeting proved to be most interesting. One attendee discussed his three UFO sightings and another reported on strange animal deaths. The three UFO sightings, with diagrams, are presented on the following pages.

The facts surrounding the animal deaths are as follows.

Mary (fictitious name) is a staff member of the African Lion Safari in Rockton (outside of Cambridge). She reported on the following events.

For the past four years, animals have been found dead, with two puncture marks, each puncture mark 6" apart. These holes are perfectly round, the hole diameter being the size of an index finger. These hole marks are extremely clean, and do not go all the way through, each being about 2½" deep. No scratch marks or any other marks have been found on the animals. These marks appear on various parts of the body, neck, shoulder, etc. When bodies have been picked up, no blood was found on the animal or ground. The animal should have bled, but did not. This year six animals were found in this state. The animals involved were thallow deer, sika deer and moufalon deer. The animals found dead have been babies, with the exception of one adult. The animals were fine when the staff left between 5:30 P.M. and 6:30 P.M., but when staff arrived at 8:45 A.M. the next morning, the animals were found dead. The animals were always found near the fence, where bushes were located. They were never found in wide open spaces. No tampering of the fence was ever found, no struggle, no broken branches were found. Mary and various staff members have seen these animal deaths and Mary witnessed the last one this year. The deaths occurred in the spring, April, May, then a lull, then again in mid July and the end of July




In the area where the dead animals were found, the staff saw cut marks on the Caribou, on the shoulder area.

Forty baboons have disappeared this year. No bodies were ever found, they simply disappeared.

In the monkey compound the fencing consists of 6' of chain link, 6' to 8' of fibreglass on top of the chain link and above that, 18" of electric wire. One evening, (week of November 16th) they found 60' of the fibreglass fencing down. There had been no wind that evening. No tracks, tire marks, etc., were found. The fence was quite sturdy. They found this a complete unexplainable mystery.

Also at the November meeting Dave Stiller gave us a little commentary on his UFO follow up. Dave, Sid and Cecilia trekked up to the Huntsville area, near the Muskoka river. The purpose of this journey was to see the landing sight of the craft mentioned in Oscar Magocsi's book "My Space Odessey in UFO's". On one occasion Oscar accompanied them on their visit up north to the landing sight. They went up a total of three times this summer and camped on Oscar's property. They did not see anything unusual in the sky during their visits.

(3)



"If I hear 'Have a nice day' one more time, I'm going to kick one of them."



Update

On Saturday morning, November 28th, upon arriving to work an employee found a dead sika deer. The deer was laying along side the fence. No tracks of any kind were found around the deer. The dead deer had two holes on the left side of its' neck, 5" to 6" apart. They did not know what caused its' death, the only marks they found on the deer were the two puncture marks on its' neck. The employee told Mary, but when May requested to see the dead animal, permission was refused and she was asked not to repeat the information.

Seasons Greetings to Everyone!

Bonnie Wheeler


Bonnie Wheeler, President,
Cambridge UFO Research Group.



Date of Sighting: July, 1978
Date Witness Interviewed: November 27, 1981
Time: 8:00 P.M.
Duration: 10 seconds
Location: R.R. #2 Petersburg, Ontario

Erhardt and his friend were outside flashing lights on and off to fill in time. Suddenly a round, orange object appeared in the sky. It was the size of a dime at arm's length. It was at a distance of about three miles, $\frac{1}{2}$ mile high. It didn't appear to be moving, It was at an elevation of about 20° . It glowed orange. The sky was clear, temperature about 70°F . The area was rural, isolated. No noise was heard. The object disappeared into thin air after about 10 seconds. Their reaction was one of astonishment.

Conclusion: Unidentified






Date of Sighting: September, 1977
Date Witness Interviewed: November 27, 1981
Time: 9:30 P.M.
Duration: 30 seconds
Location: R.R. #2 Petersburg, Ontario

Erhardt and his siter were watching TV, when his sister yelled for Erhardt to look outside. They ran to the door and saw a huge, dark object, with coloured lights. The object was dark black and oval shaped. The object had blue, white and red pulsating lights around the centre. It was 250 to 300 feet long. It was 200 feet away and moving very slowly, about 15 mph. It was flying at about 100 feet off the ground and at an elevation of 45°. The object moved in a straight line and made no noise whatsoever. They could see a seam around the centre of the object and the lights flashed continuously. The evening was clear and calm, temperature 80° F, stars were visible. This area is out in the country, rural and isolated. There is a 60' mud bottom lake nearby. During the sighting Erhardt was not scared, but felt he was being watched or scanned. The object disappeared from view behind a line of trees and they did not see it again.

Conclusion: CE I






Date of Sighting: November, 1977
Date Witness Interviewed: November 27, 1981
Time: 10:00 P.M.
Duration: 10 minutes
Location: R.R. #2 Petersburg, Ontario

Erhardt and his Dad were in their house when his Dad noticed an unusual light in the sky. They ran up to the third floor and out on the balcony. They saw a saucer shaped object high in the sky. It had a green glow about it and was quite small. It was three miles away, about $\frac{1}{2}$ mile up and at an elevation of 20° . The object was not moving and all they noticed was a steady green glow. The sky was clear, stars visible, temperature 40°F . The area was rural, isolated. The object simply disappeared into thin air. During the 10 minutes they watched the light, it did not move. No noise was heard.

Conclusion: Unidentified





Date: December 1, 1981

Time: 6:30 P.M.

Duration: 5 minutes

Location: Wilmot Line and Erb Street, Waterloo

Joanne was driving to a friend's home, when she noticed two bright lights in the sky, one light above the other light. She thought that at first, they were tower lights, but she drove past the tower and the lights were still in the same location in the sky. The lights were stationary. The two lights were round and very bright. They were in the north west portion of the sky. Big flashes of greenish, yellow, light fanned out downward from each light. These flashes seemed to come at one second intervals. Joanne stopped her car, rolled down her window and watched the lights. The lights were stationary for two minutes and then moved. One light moved ahead of the other, one moved under the first light, then they moved together and then moved in a straight line and then moved closer together. During this time, both lights were sending out flashes of green light, sometimes together, sometimes separately. The lower light then shot out a beam of bright, white light, which then sparkled. No noise was heard.

The sky was partly cloudy, temperature 5°C . No stars, etc. were visible. Area rural and isolated. The lights were round, each being about the size of a quarter held at arm's length. The elevation was about 45° .

When the lights moved closer together, they picked up speed and became a brighter white. They moved out of Joanne's view very quickly.

Comments: Joanne called the Waterloo Regional Police, who in turn, gave her my telephone number. I checked with the Waterloo/Wellington Airport concerning helicopters, etc., in the area at that time, but they had nothing on record. I checked with our astronomer and nothing astronomical fit the above description.

Conclusion: Unidentified Nocturnal Light.

Legal battle for secret UFO reports

By Ward Sinclair
Washington Post

WASHINGTON — The U.S. government says it keeps no records on unidentified flying objects, because they don't exist. But 131 secret documents about UFOs in the files of the National Security Agency are the subject of an intense legal battle.

Would the documents disclose startling details about the flying saucers, or UFOs, that more than 10 million Americans claim to have seen? Would disclosure compromise the agency's sophisticated eavesdropping techniques?

Apparently only NSA can answer those questions and it isn't talking. NSA, in fact, refuses to talk and its reticence is being challenged in the federal courts.

Eleven months ago, U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard Gesell held that the documents were so sensi-

National security

tive that their public release might endanger national security. Gesell did not review the documents. His decision was based on a 21-page top-secret affidavit given him in chambers by NSA.

The battle has reached the U.S. Court of Appeals, where a small organization known as Citizens Against UFO Secrecy (CAUS), arguing for release of the NSA documents, told a three-judge panel that the government cannot have it both ways.

If UFOs do not exist, lawyer Peter Gersten told the court, then Uncle Sam has nothing to hide. If they do exist, then we may be in big trouble — and we ought to know about it. But NSA's lip stays buttoned.

The suit brought by CAUS under

the Freedom of Information Act is another in a series of challenges to the powers of spy outfits such as NSA, the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency to withhold virtually anything they want under the guise of national security.

"The government position is that UFOs are not a threat and that the government does not study UFOs," Gersten told the appeals panel. If the panel does not order disclosure, he said, Gesell at least should be directed to review the 131 UFO documents and decide for himself just how sensitive they really are.


Arguing for NSA, lawyer Cheryl Long said there is no way the documents, no matter what they show, could be released without exposing and compromising the intelligence-gathering techniques of the agency, which include global electronic snooping and code-breaking.

Appetite for government documents was whetted by the 1978 release of Air Force and CIA reports on UFO sightings that were deemed to have no national security implications. Ground Saucer Watch, a Phoenix-based UFO monitoring organization, forced the release through freedom-of-information suits.


Those documents revealed that in October, November and December of 1975, reliable military personnel saw unconventional and unexplained aerial objects hovering around nuclear weapons storage sites, aircraft alert areas and missile control complexes at installations across the northern United States.

In some instances, as radar sightings of the objects were made, Air Force fighter planes were sent in unsuccessful pursuit, although the records gave no indication that the fighters fired on the intruders.

TORONTO STAR 15 NOV. 81



"You're wasting your time.
Canada is tightening up
on foreign takeovers."







Pat De la franier of the Stratford UFO Research Team, Don Teskey and Dag Balzer of the Cambridge UFO Research Group, drove to the APRO Convention in Cleveland, Ohio, the weekend of June 5-7, 1981. Pat's commentary and pictures concerning this Convention are attached on the following pages.

THE OUTCASTS

by Ben Wicks



B.C.





APRO UFO CONFERENCE

On June 5, 6 and 7th, 1981 I attended the AERIAL PHENOMENON RESEARCH ORGANIZATION (APRO) UFO Conference with Don Teskey and Dag Balzar of the CAMBRIDGE UFO RESEARCH GROUP. The Conference was held in the beautiful Marriott Inn-Airport, 4277 West 150 Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44135.

The theme of the Conference was "The Case For Aliens" dealing with seemingly disparate facets of this aspect of the UFO mystery. Some of the questions that were dealt with were:

- * If these Extraterrestrial visitations, how can there be so many?
- * What possible motive could ETs have in the mutilation of cattle and other animals?
- * Why are most crashed disc reports 20 years or more old. Are there no recent ones?
- * Abduction cases are on the increase. Does this indicate an increase in the phenomenon or merely in the willingness to report and why is the same thing done over and over again?

JUNE 5th FRIDAY

We arrived at the Marriott Inn by late afternoon and checked in. As soon as we were settled in, we went in search of the information table to be registered. Stanton Friedman and Bill Moore were there selling their books. Bill is the co-author of "The Philadelphia Experiment" and "The Roswell Incident." Betty Hill was also there talking to various people and I had a chance to meet and talk to her. (See picture # 2)

The evening get-together started at 7:30 p.m. and it was a time for everyone to meet each other as well as renew old friendships. I saw Leo Sprinkle again and chatted with various speakers and guests present. I met a young lady named Alice Rose who is actively involved in finding a cure for cancer. Although she is not really interested in UFOs, an inner feeling lead her to the Conference. She was extremely interested in the psionic machine that Ivan Boyes operates and insisted that I give her his address so she could correspond with him.

I eventually ended up in Leo Sprinkle's room with three other ladies (one of which was Alice Rose) and was a casual observer as Leo hypnotized Alice (See Picture # 9). It was quite an interesting experience to watch the hypnosis.

JUNE 6th SATURDAY

The lectures started early in the morning, after the customary introductions, with Dr. Robert Creegan. His presentation dealt with "The Nature of Truth" and "A Search For Magic". I did not record Dr. Creegan's lecture so cannot present it here.

He was followed by Dr. Van Arsdale who presented two models for UFO reality based on his research. Dr. Van Arsdale was the investigator connected with "The Colorado Ranch Case".

Everyone left for lunch and lectures resumed at 1 p.m. with Bill Moore, co-author of "The Philadelphia Experiment," and an investigative journalist.

Bill had some useful advice for UFO investigators. "One thing wrong with ufology is we have too many egotists running around thinking they know it all. Not so! We've got to respect that we're dealing in a multi-faceted discipline and we've got to learn to respect each other's area of concern and refer people back and forth. If I don't have time to do an investigation justice, I have no business dealing with it at all. If I'm going to do it, I've got to persist and see it through; otherwise, I have an obligation to refer it to someone who can do it justice." And Bill certainly did justice to "The Roswell Incident".

Bill talked to seventy witnesses - twenty four of which were first hand; in other words, people who were there at the time. The remainder were involved one way or the other. They didn't know each other at the time Bill interviewed them, yet in each case Bill was given approximately the same story.

In brief, it involved the sighting on July 2nd, 1947 of a flaming, bright circular object which passed low over the city of Roswell, New Mexico. The object travelled in a Northwest direction, and at some point 75 miles Northwest of Roswell over a remote desert area, an explosion occurred. There was also a thunderstorm in the area - one that was very violent with lots of lightning but very little rain. It is possible that the object may have been hit by lightning but that is only conjecture.

The ground was covered with debris over 3/4 of a mile long in a fan shape, approximately 50 yards to approximately 400 yards wide. Parts of the local plant life were torn out of the ground. Upon investigation, a witness found unusual debris which appeared to be metallic, but wasn't.

The pieces were very thin (about the thickness of foil on a cigarette package), yet they were extremely strong. They couldn't be cut, dented or creased. The material was similar to Seran Wrap - sort of a plastic metal.

Bill said there had been another crash with alien bodies at the same time as the Roswell incident 125 miles West at Magdalena, 25 miles Northwest of Socorro. The object was hauled away by the military and the witnesses were told to be quiet.

Bill outlined the evidence that he has compiled so far that the Roswell crash and retrieval actually did happen. He stated there had been a new release on Junly 7th, 1947 by the Air Force saying they had recovered the wreckage of a flying disc. Later this report stated that it was only a weather balloon. He received photographs of the crashed object from people who saw it and handled it, and he found more witnesses to back up the facts. Virtually all the people involved in the Roswell Incident have been named. Bill said that one of the problems of crashed UFOs in the past have been the practice by investigators of 'no names'. In the Roswell incident Bill named all his sources, and some of the witnesses have been contacted by other investigators and even the media to be interviewed. As Bill says "If we're going to get anywhere, we have to name names. We have to allow anybody access to the data."

More information on the Roswell crash can be found in William Moore's book, "The Roswell Incident".

Following Bill Moore was abductee, Betty Hill. Betty looked back on her experience as well as the twenty years since her initial incident. She touched on the deliberate attempts by the scientific establishment to discredit her as well.

Betty recounted briefly her capture on September 19, 1961 as she and Barney were returning home from the Canadian border on U.S. 3 through the White Mountains in New Hampshire. She stated that the weather was beautiful. "We had been driving along for about thirty miles with a strange object following us. When we came to an area called Indian Head in a national forest this object came out over the road and stopped in midair. At this point Barney took the binoculars and got out of the car to get a good look in an attempt to identify it."

As Barney stood looking up, he could see human figures standing in the window of the object looking down at him, and one figure said something to him which he could not remember later. The craft began to descend and Barney panicked. He ran back to the car and went speeding down the highway.

"We heard a series of beeping sounds," Betty said, "and the craft moved over the top of the car. I looked out and all I could see was this black 'thing' over us. Then nothing. Afterwards we could remember being off of Route 3, and being in the woods but we had no idea how we got there. We found our way back to Route 3, heard another series of beeping sounds and drove home."

When they arrived home they discovered that the trip had taken two hours longer than it should have. They had a strange feeling that they had been contaminated and took long showers.

Later Barney became disabled and wasn't responding to medication so

he went to see Dr. Benjamin Simon, a psychiatrist and hypnotist, to see if it was emotional in basis. They were hypnotized separately and their sessions recorded.

Under hypnosis Betty and Barney recalled their lost time. "The beings and craft were blocking the highway. They came up to the car in two groups and took us to the UFO. I was put in the first room, Barney in the second. We were both physically examined. They checked our eyes, ears, nose and throat and scraped our skin. They tested my nervous system and inserted a needle like instrument in my navel which caused pain. In Barney they were interested in his bone structure, his feet and the end of his spine. There were eleven beings on board the craft, but only one spoke my language and I referred to him as the leader. I talked to the leader and asked for something to take home so he gave me a book. Then he showed me a map when I asked him where he was from. I studied this map. I was told the heavy lines were trade routes and the broken lines were expeditions."

As Betty and Barney were about to leave with the book, one of the crew spoke to the leader in worried tones. The leader took the book away from Betty and told her she wouldn't need it because she wasn't going to remember the event. They left and watched the craft take off from the safety of their car. The craft was surrounded by a fiery mass and suddenly it was gone.

After the incident Betty discovered that there were many UFO sightings in New Hampshire. Observers reported them on a regular basis, especially in a place known as 'the landing area'. Betty and Barney started to investigate their own sighting and received a radar report showing an unidentified craft leaving the capture area at 2:45 a.m. They went back and located the exact area of capture, and took measurements. They found the craft had been 60 to 65 feet across. Marjorie Fish was also researching Betty's star map.

After their encounter had become known, Betty and Barney had to take refuge on a nearby Air Force Base to get away from the Press. At that time they saw their second UFO, and from that time on whenever they went out, they would see a UFO. Betty took a map and began pinpointing the location of the sightings and after awhile realized that there was an area where the UFOs were coming back night after night. This was the area known as 'the landing area'.

Betty then showed some slides of the area which is seven miles square, with 3 rivers, lake and swamps. She said there are two sets of power lines, railroad tracks and farmland in the area. It is a free area in aircraft navigation. It has geological faults, magnetic deviations and a large bed-rock deposit of quartz. She also showed slides of the abduction area and the night lights seen by her and Barney over the years.

Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle spoke after Betty Hill and presented a paper entitled "UFO Activity and Human Consciousness". One interesting discovery he touched on was the fact that many UFO investigators have some contactee or abductee aspect in their background.

William James Herrman talked about the personal impact of UFO abduction. I did not record his lecture so cannot say much about it.

Dag Balzar and I were forever inquiring from other photographers about camera film and lens setting, as well as experimenting on our own settings

as we shot our way through the Conference. Both of us are very amateur photographers.

After the last lecture of the day everyone went their own way for the evening. Some got together in various rooms to talk, while others (myself included) decided to explore the hotel's tavern and disco. Dancing with wild abandon was a good way to counteract a long day of sitting.

Afterwards I ran into Henry McKay and talked to him for awhile before I finally turned in for the night.

JUNE 7th SUNDAY

Earl Neff of the CLEVELAND UFOLOGY PROJECT was the first speaker of the day. He discussed "UFO Art Through the Ages" and showed many excellent slides with his presentation.

P. Wayne Laport spoke on the "Anatomy of a UFO Window" basing his observations on an area around Charlotte N.C. where many UFO sightings have occurred in the past.

Next was Peter Jordan who talked on the cattle mutilation mystery. I have parts of his talk on tape if anyone is interested in hearing it.

Jim Lorenzen dealt with the major objections of skeptics to the Alien Hypothesis. During Jim's talk I met Harry Lebelson, Contributing Editor to OMNI MAGAZINE. He seemed very interested in Tom Grey and the lights over Lake Ontario and hopes to come up this way to observe them for himself.

Stanton Friedman was the last speaker of the Conference, and unfortunately, the crowd had dwindled considerably by the time he lectured. I had heard his lecture before so I did not bother to tape the whole thing. I do not have space left in the newsletter to include it even in part - Stanton is long winded.

We left Cleveland at 4:30 p.m. and headed back via Route 90 to Toledo then on to Detroit-Windsor and finally home. It was a most enjoyable weekend and I hope another conference will be held next year.

KEY TO PICTURES ON FOLLOWING TWO PAGES

1. Stanton Friedman - lecturer
2. Betty Hill - abductee
3. R. Leo Sprinkle - hypnotist of UFO abductees
4. Henry McKay - MUFON Representative for Ontario
5. Dr. Robert Creegan
6. Stanton Friedman while lecturing
7. Stanton and friends in lobby at start of Conference
8. Bill Moore and Betty Hill talking in Lobby
9. Leo Sprinkle hypnotizing Alice Rose
10. Leo Sprinkle and Henry McKay studying a photograph of UFO





6



9




7



10




8



Cambridge U.F.O. Research Group

The Marcen Journal, Volume II, Number III, had another informative article, this one about UFO Retrievals. I have attached the article, as it is data we should be aware of.

PAYLOV



"Hairy earthling wants 2 bucks for parking."

UFO activist J. Allen Hynek says he probably wouldn't report a UFO sighting unless there was a witness to verify it. "People would probably think that I'd been involved in this so long it finally got me."

MARCEN LOOKS AT UFO RETRIEVALS

As the focus of sensational UFO stories began to shift from Close Encounters of the Third Kind to Retrievals of the Third Kind or the recovery of actual UFOs and occupants in 1978 and 1979, MARCEN began to debate the merits of pursuing such events: Were they just legends that reappear from time to time and get dusted off like an old pair of shoes to be worn again? Are they part of an elaborate hoax? Is the government allowing out just a measured amount of information about the retrievals to prepare us for some more spectacular announcement? or is it all just myth?

The field seemed to be crowded already with quite a number of individuals pursuing the retrieval story ranging from the well-respected old-time ufologist--Leonard Stringfield in Cincinnati, Ohio, to the new to the scene and of questionable reputation, Walter Todd Zechel of no fixed address.

Was there room for more researchers chasing these elusive events? MARCEN thought so in May 1979 when it started making phone calls and within a week had recordings of retired military officers swearing to their veracity as they related incredible tales of UFO encounters and recoveries and within a week we were receiving phone calls from individuals as far away as Panama and Australia and the log of recoveries began to grow.

MARCEN investigators began running up astronomical telephone bills as the tally of recoveries expanded.

Are the fantastic stories we were told to be believed? This will be discussed further in the article on UFO disinformation in this issue but we decided to put no credence whatsoever in any event that was not substantiated by at least three witnesses, who's military background could be verified.

Using the above criteria up to publication of this issue we have data on 23 alleged UFO recoveries along with the recovery of an even 100 bodies of the occupants of the alien aircraft.

In order of Recovery dates according to our information they are:

July 22, 1947	Roswell, New Mexico	No bodies, UFO exploded in air
February 13, 1948	Aztec, New Mexico	12 bodies
July 7, 1948	Mexico 30 miles south of Laredo, Texas	1 body
1952	Spitzbergen Island, Norway	2 bodies
August 14, 1952	Ely, Nevada	16 bodies
September 10, 1952	Albuquerque, New Mexico	3 bodies
April 18, 1953	Southwest Arizona	No bodies
May 20, 1953	Kingman, Arizona	1 body
June 19, 1953	10 miles north of Laredo, Texas	4 bodies
July 10, 1953	Union of South Africa 100 miles from Johannesburg	5 bodies
October 13, 1953	Dutton, Montana	4 bodies
May 5, 1955	England near Brighton	4 bodies
July 18, 1957	Near Carlsbad, New Mexico	4 bodies
June 12, 1962	Near Holloman Air Force Base New Mexico	2 bodies
November 10, 1964	Fort Riley, Kansas	9 bodies
October 27, 1966	Northeastern Arizona	UFO got away 1 body
1966-1968	Five crashes reported in the	3 bodies

(Continued on Page 10)

	Indiana-Kentucky-Ohio area with one UFO removed intact	
July 18, 1972	Sahara Desert south of Morrocco	3 bodies
July 10, 1973	Northwestern Arizona	5 bodies
May 12, 1976	Australian Desert	4 bodies
June 22, 1977	Northwestern Arizona	5 bodies
April 5, 1977	Southwestern Ohio	11 bodies
August 17, 1977	Tobasco, Mexico	2 bodies
May 1978	Bolivia	No bodies

If these incredible stories are to be believed and the officers of MARCEN have mixed feelings on this point, we can see that the incidents have continued right up to the present. We can also see that with a couple of minor exceptions, the crashes and recoveries through the 1950s were all concentrated in the southwest United States near defense installations and in the areas where nuclear weapons were being tested. This was also the area and time frame of the heavy concentrations of UFO reports in the form of green fireballs.

The stories we have uncovered are not just of someone stumbling onto a crashed UFO and then calling the authorities to cart it and its bodies away.

In the incident of October 27, 1966, we were told of U.S. Army units on maneuvers who happened upon a parked UFO and cut off a number of small occupants on their way back to the craft. As the tale goes, all the aliens got away to the UFO and flew away except one aggressive little fellow that put up such a fight that seven infantrymen finally had to hold it while a medic injected a tranquilizer which killed it unintentionally.

In another of the crashes and recoveries on July 10, 1973, we were told that one alien was alive after the crash and attempts were made to revive it with oxygen, which only hastened its demise.

In the July 1977 incident in Southwestern Ohio, we were told that U.S. Army and National Guard troops were called in and in the ensuing skirmish 11 aliens were killed and there were 11 Army casualties resulting in deaths and injuries. The only independent substantiation we have for this episode is the fact that the Army issued press releases at the time that an Army unit was struck by lightning while camped overnight. We were told the aliens used as weapons a small box that emitted a ray of light that apparently was some sort of laser or charged particle beam that was capable of killing in some cases and inflicting temporary paralysis in others. The entire episode is denied by the Pentagon.

UFO DISINFORMATION

There is probably more UFO folklore and mythology in existence today than anything similar since the demise of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Most serious ufologists acknowledge the presence of the folklore but most are at a total loss to explain its origin.

A prime case in example currently is the repetitive stories of crashed UFOs and their supposed retrieval and study by the Air Force. MARCEN finds it extremely difficult to accept or believe any of these tales yet the same stories keep popping up often virtually unchanged over a twenty year or more period. Officers of MARCEN have now personally talked to several hundred persons claiming to have witnessed UFO retrievals, or at least some phase of the retrieval operation.

The credibility of the "witnesses" interviewed is high enough in most cases and the details of the stories consistent enough that if we were in court dealing with a capital murder case, someone would likely hang.

Still, MARCEN cannot unconditionally accept any of these stories without ourselves seeing more tangible proof and we do not think this is because of our innate skepticism.

The unresolved questions that bother us most are: how did all of the stories get so consistent; how are all of the details so fresh in the minds of persons who supposedly experienced the events 30 to 35 years ago; and why are so many former military persons involved?

One can easily jump to the quick conclusion that these witnesses have been programmed to give out the manufactured stories in measured doses periodically. But who did the programming and why?

There are many ufologists who feel that some clandestine bureau of the government somewhere periodically manufactures fictionalized UFO information so absurd that when it is disseminated, the public becomes quickly convinced that there is nothing factual about the UFO phenomenon at all, or at least this is Agency X's goal.

This may sound good in theory but after pouring over thousands of pages of FBI and CIA UFO related documents released through Freedom of Information actions, MARCEN is unable to find any evidence of any government generated confusion or coverup as has been charged. There is much evidence of considerable government interest in UFOs that it did not previously admit, but we can find nothing to indicate any action taken to suppress data from the public on any scale or that the government agencies involved ever did anything with the data they collected other than read it with interest and then file it. Of course the proponents of government conspiracies argue that none of the "really good" material has been released or ever will be released.

In February 1958, a hoax was perpetrated on ufology when a letter typed on the official letterhead of the U.S. Secretary of State was sent to the late George Adamski claiming government knowledge of UFOs and signed by a supposed State Department official named R.E. Straith. More letters followed to other ufologists and it ended with the FBI investigating a number of prominent ufologists of the time. No results of the investigations were ever made public and no one was ever known to have been prosecuted.

This past summer a new flood of hoax letters started making the rounds of the field. Typed on faked letterheads from various U.S. Air Force installations, the letters purported to confirm the existence of special units to retrieve crashed UFOs and that there are underground warehouses of UFOs at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio.

MARCEN was one of the recipients of these letters and believed that not even the most gullible could accept them for anything more than they were-crude hoaxes, yet we have received quite a few letters, including a few from experienced ufologists, expressing some relief that the letters might be accurate.

Since the latest hoax letters and a number of accompanying nasty slanderous anonymous letters usually signed "a concerned ufologist", speculation has been rife within the field concerning the identity of the author or authors. Originally thought to be the work of the ufologist to whom the fake letters were addressed, this theory has been pretty much discarded as various recipients engage in accusing each other and sundry other persons. Marcen's director was even accused at one point by a notorious UFO skeptic of having written the letters to generate publicity for MARCEN.

As we analyze this situation at MARCEN, the only possible beneficiary of the hoax letters and accompanying anonymous letters would be a person or persons intent on destroying the UFO movement as we can not see any possible positive benefits accruing to anyone in the field from the misguided missives. The only result was and can only be the generation of confusion and distrust within the ranks of the field and this can only serve the ends of forces wanting to destroy credible ufology.

By late summer 1979 the phony Air Force letters had stopped but hoax letters on the letterheads of the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal, the arch skeptics challenging all of Forteanism began circulating. These letters purportedly contained confessions that the CSICP was working for the CIA and other transgressions equally dire.

Again we are confronted with an action that can only serve to confuse anyone seriously studying the field and to bring discredit to all within it as ufologists are accused of trying to discredit their nemeses-the skeptics.

From the volume and diversity of the subject matter, points of origin of the mailings, and the number of recipients of the crackpot and hoax letters and the time frame during which they have continued, it is hard to believe that one psychopath or other demented individual could be solely responsible. Logic points to some well oiled organization of whatever size bent on deliberate deception and confusion to cloud any truth that might exist.

Adding to all of the confusion for quite some time and prime spreaders of disinformation have been the contactees who claim to regularly meet with perfectly human appearing aliens bearing messages of salvation for mankind. Claiming for many years to be disciples of the "space people", the contactees have acquired many cult like followers and regularly profess claims so unbelievable that the public is again led to believe that all ufologists are crackpots.

Not helping the credibility gap at all are the fictionalized stories published under the guise of truth and fact by some pulp newsstand UFO magazines. The most notorious of these, the now bankrupt "Official UFO" last year had the town of Chester, Illinois being totally destroyed by a UFO attack. Other equal absurdities permeated the pages of the rag until it mercifully folded.

Rumors have been rife for some time that at least one well known UFO skeptic regularly writes articles for the sensational magazines under assumed names with the explicit purpose of creating myths that will pass into the folklore of ufology-further destroying its credibility.


Unfortunately MARCEN cannot answer the questions raised by this article and more speculation will not help to uncloud the issues raised. We are simply pointing out all of this to illustrate the handicaps one must overcome in trying to make sense of a puzzling phenomenon.

Be it government agency, a group of oversexed and undersatisfied skeptics or a group of well meaning individuals creating mythology to write about and line their personal coffers, they-whomever they are, are succeeding admirably. Ufology as a serious study has little credibility left.


ADDENDUM:

After this article was completed, we received some incredible sounding information that ties into this subject. According to the contents of a government memo that we were shown, but have been unable to verify the complete authenticity of yet, the Air Force and CIA have been funding for a number of years a project named BLUE FOG. We have been aware for some time that in government project naming the word Blue is utilized to designate projects pertaining to UFOs. It would appear that if this memo is authentic, there may have been an ongoing project to create a smokescreen about UFO information.

There are a few ufologists besides MARCEN aware of this project at this time and most have been quick to jump on the handwagon saying "see we told you so". MARCEN believes it more prudent to be more cautious and to expend necessary efforts to try to verify the authenticity of the memo or to expose another piece of UFO disinformation.



"MUST BE RELATIVES!"



NUDIST COLONY

"BETTER NOT LOOK -
THEY'RE PRETTY
GRUESOME"



"NOT MANY OF THOSE ANTIQUES
AROUND ANY MORE"






"LOOK EVERYBODY! -
A FLYING SORCERER!"



The December, 1981 issue of UFO Journal, Cleveland, Ohio, had an update on the fight re release of secret UFO documents in the U.S. This is attached. The subscription details of the Journal appear below the article.

FUNKY WINKERBEAN

by Tom Batiuk



From the Editor

by Robert S. Easley

PHENOMENA, NOTES AND COMMENTARY:

Citizens Against UFO Secrecy (CAUS) is still fighting to obtain classified UFO documents and reports. The latest battle occurred recently in the U.S. Court of Appeals, where CAUS is trying to get 131 secret documents about UFOs from the National Security Agency (NSA).

About a year ago U.S. District Judge Gerhard A. Gesell ruled that the documents were so sensitive that their release might endanger national security. Judge Gesell's ruling came not from reviewing all 131 documents but rather from a 21-page top secret affidavit given to him by NSA.

CAUS attorney Peter A. Gersten told the three judge appeals panel that the government cannot have it both ways. "The government position is that UFOs are not a threat and that the government does not study UFOs", he said.

It is the contention of CAUS that if UFOs do not exist, then the government has nothing to hide. On the other hand, if UFOs do exist, then the world may be in big trouble - and the people should know about it!

Cheryl M. Long, attorney for NSA, stated that there is no way the documents could be released - no matter what they show - without exposing and compromising the intelligence-gathering techniques of the NSA.

Gersten plans to continue his fight against NSA, and intends to file another freedom of information suit against the U.S. Air Force this month in the hopes of gaining more information on a series of still unexplained 1975 UFO sightings over Strategic Air Command bases.

In 1978 Ground Saucer Watch (GSW), a Phoenix, Arizona UFO group, successfully obtained Air Force and CIA reports on UFO sightings through freedom of information law suits.

It is my own contention that information on UFOs - no matter how it was obtained or by what means - should not be withheld from the American public. We should have a right to know just what the hell is going on in the skies, not only over America but over the entire planet. As tax-paying citizens, we should not have to fight for this information!

Perhaps we should all write to our Congressmen and Senators and demand that this information be released. With congressional elections coming up in November of 1982, they just might be receptive to this idea rather than getting their constituents mad. In any event, it wouldn't hurt to write them all a letter and let them know how you feel on the matter of government secrecy involving UFOs.

The UFO JOURNAL is published by the United Aerial Phenomena Agency (UAPA) monthly at \$6.00 per year (\$7.50 foreign) or \$11.50 for two years (\$14.50 foreign). UAPA is a non-profit organization dedicated to the better understanding of the UFO enigma. All correspondence and manuscripts are welcomed, but must be accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope if desired to be returned. Address all correspondence to: UFO JOURNAL, 3403 West 119th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44111.

Spot a UFO? Blame an earth tremor

By John Picton Toronto Star

That light in the sky you saw last night wasn't a flying saucer. It wasn't marsh gas, the heebie-jeebies, or any of the other familiar explanations.

Chances are that "UFO" was caused by a mysterious process on earth that scientists are just beginning to observe and understand.

Blame an earth tremor.

That's what Michael Persinger, a psychologist teaching at Laurentian University in Sudbury, and Brian Brady, a geologist at the U.S. Bureau of Mines in Denver, believe.

Fed into computer

"More than half the UFO sightings are because of earthquake lumination," Persinger told the Sunday Star.

Of the remaining sightings, he says: "The concept of explaining all UFOs is out of date, anyway. The average person must realize that not all sightings are from the same

source."

He adds that such sightings may be a warning of earthquakes to come weeks, months or even years later.

Persinger, who majored in geophysics, began studying unusual phenomena in 1971, feeding all the data he gathered into a computer.

"When we did an analysis, the trend jumped out with unbelievable intensity," he says. "It went back to the 19th century in England and the U.S. when these lights were called devil stars and comets and aero ships."

One area he's researched, one he says proves his theory, is the New Madrid region where the borders of Illinois, Missouri and Arkansas come together.

The most severe earthquakes in North American history occurred there in 1811-1812. In 1958, earth tremors were recorded there again, and "there was an eight-fold increase in the number of luminosity reports in the region in the

previous six months."

Over a fault line in the earth's crust running from Quebec City to Chicoutimi, there were as many as 30 UFO sightings reported between 1975 and 1979 — "and there was a marked increase in the number of luminosity reports."

Intense as lightning

Persinger and Brady have discovered that when quartz-bearing rock breaks up, balls of light are produced — short-lived, but as intense as lightning.

Laboratory experiments showed the luminescence from a single crack would last only for microseconds, but in that time it might streak away, hover, and then move again in the characteristic movements of UFOs.

The movements are explained by complex theories of ions, electrons and electro-magnetic fields.

The Chinese already call such luminosity "earthquake lights."

One case the scientists studied

was a series of sightings made from an aircraft flying a midnight run from Wellington to Christchurch, New Zealand, on Dec. 30, 1978.

The crew had spotted brilliant and mysterious lights in the sky a few days before and a TV crew was on board in case they happened again. About 25 minutes out of Wellington, the light appeared and seemed to follow the plane's flight path, sometimes hovering and then speeding away.

The position and altitude of the lights from blips was confirmed by blips on radar screens.



On the ground, researchers looked for rational explanations — fishing boats, meteors, secret aircraft, sightings of Jupiter or Venus, city lights or simply a hoax. None seemed reasonable.

The sightings remained a mystery until Brady laid a geological map alongside the flight path of the plane and realized it had been flying parallel to one of the earth's great fault lines, the Alpine Fault.





An interesting article appeared in the October, 1981 issue of Astronomy, concerning two recent conferences which examined the question of extraterrestrial life. One conference was sponsored by NASA, the other was Mufon's convention. John Dowdell kindly provided me with the article and it is attached herewith.



ASTRONOMY FORUM

Parallel Universes: A Tale of Two SETIs


Recently, two conferences near San Francisco examined the question of extraterrestrial life. NASA sponsored one of the meetings at the Ames Research Center, at Moffett Field, analyzing prospects for "Life in the Universe." Two weeks later at the Airport Marina Hotel, the Mutual UFO Network conferred on "Intensifying the Scientific Investigation of the UFO Surveillance."

Only a few social scientists were at either meeting, and, as far as I know, I was the only person — scientist or layman — present at both. Between all the people attending the two meetings, there appeared to be no overlap. It was as if two parallel universes existed side by side, with neither aware of the other. What is the reason for a near-total separation between two groups which seem at first glance to be interested in the same "far out" subjects?

There were enough similarities between the two meetings. Both followed the same format, with an organized presentation of reports from a schedule prepared in advance and listed in a printed program. Both lasted two days and had about 30 speakers. Both were national in scope, drawing speakers and audiences from as far as New York and Hawaii. And each one was the latest in a series extending back a number of years: it was MUFON's 10th annual meeting, and NASA had sponsored at least half a dozen previous symposia on SETI (Searching for Extraterrestrial Intelligence), plus two or three on related topics like extra-solar planetary detection.

The elder statesman of each field is a physical scientist, and each addressed his respective meeting

calling for new approaches to the challenges confronting their groups. At the MUFON meeting this scientist was J. Allen Hynek, astronomer emeritus of Northwestern University, while MIT physicist Philip Morrison was similarly prominent at NASA's SETI conference. Both men had given impetus to their fields over twenty years ago, when they noted possible sources of highly significant data. Hynek, as the scientific consultant for the Air Force's Project Bluebook, had found some UFO reports which



could not be satisfactorily explained. Morrison had suggested that radio waves of 21 centimeters wavelength might be used by other civilizations to beam communications.

Neither group has conclusive evidence that would convince a skeptic or nonbeliever that the phenomenon actually exists.

Despite these similarities there were differences between the two groups. The SETI conference was by invitation only and was attended by two hundred scientists. The MUFON conference was open to the public, attendance was several times larger,

and the audience consisted largely of people without Ph.D.s.

Although laymen were not invited to the SETI conference, scientists could have attended the UFO meeting if they had wanted to. There are several reasons why they did not; before discussing them, it may be helpful to examine the contrasts in more detail.

While it is often assumed that UFOs and ETI are the same or similar, there are important differences. UFOs supposedly are here, on or near Earth, while ETI as currently envisioned is very far away — tens of light-years or hundreds of trillions of miles beyond our Solar System. In addition, UFOlogists are primarily concerned with specific events occurring now. While SETIists, too, are concerned with the present — detecting electromagnetic signals arriving from other planets — the desire to find likely sectors of the sky in which to seek such signals encourages them to consider a broad range of phenomena associated with planetary formation and evolution of intelligent life.

The methodology of the two groups is very different. The SETIists' is basically simple: use radio telescopes to seek and send signals. Though additional sophisticated equipment could be employed, it exists now within its present technological capabilities.

UFOlogists, conversely, have not developed a straightforward plan for analyzing their elusive quarry. What seemed 30 years ago to be a relatively simple phenomenon now appears more complex. Metallic saucers or cigars suggestive of interplanetary spacecraft are only one manifestation of the phenomenon as currently perceived by UFOlogists. Changes in shape, size and color, along with purported paranormal effects, have

undermined the tenability of the "simple" spacecraft hypothesis. Consequently there are at least eight theories about UFOs, but no satisfactory plan for studying them.

SETI and UFOlogy also differ with respect to their data. Although neither field has the hard evidence of what they believe to exist, there are literally tens of thousands of UFO reports, some by presumably credible observers, including astronomers, aviators, meteorologists, air traffic controllers, police — and even a former president, Jimmy Carter. In contrast, there have been

UFOlogists see little chance of federal funding in the immediate future, or even on the horizon. Therefore their only hope is to develop popular support through public meetings, television interviews, and so forth.

no verified claims for detection of ETI. *Science* magazine (Feb. 3, 1978, p. 485) reported that at least 10 organized searches for ETI — some with the largest radio telescopes — have been conducted, but the results have all been negative.

The logic of the two groups is also contrasting. SETIsts use deduction while UFOlogists employ induction. SETIsts start with the hypothesis that intelligent life exists elsewhere in the universe, and look for extraterrestrial radio signals as evidence to support their hypothesis. Conversely, UFOlogists start with reports of strange phenomena and seek a theory to explain them.

In a sense, SETIsts also employ inductive methods in that they generalize from the observation of one case: life on Earth. From this single case, they go on to assume that life also exists elsewhere. By the same token, some UFOlogists say that intelligent life probably exists elsewhere and perhaps has developed technically to a degree that it can send space vehicles to visit us here. Nevertheless, while both groups use some elements of both processes, the primary emphases of the two groups are in the opposite directions.

Thus the two fields have differing blends of theory, method and data. SETIsts have a theory (intelligent life has evolved elsewhere in the universe) and a method and equipment for seeking it (radio

telescopes with computer analyzers), but lack evidence for ETI. In contrast, UFOlogists have plenty of evidence, at least "soft" data, but no single satisfactory hypothesis and no simple plan of investigation.

These contrasts were evident in the topics presented at the two conferences. The SETIst concern with finding likely locations for intelligent life, and specific means of communicating with it by radio, were indicated by papers with these and similar titles: "Climatological Stability," "Biochemical Keys to the Emergence of Complex Life," "Detecting Planets in Binary Systems with Single Aperture Interferometers."

MUFON, exploring the implications of UFO reports, presented a workshop with UFO witnesses, a film of a New Zealand sighting, and lectures on such topics as "Parallels with Other Altered Consciousness States," "The Religious Dimension to the UFO Phenomenon," and "Analysis of Sound Impulses Recorded During a Period of UFO Activity in Bugg Creek, Alberta."

The two groups also differed on the possibility of connections between UFOs and ETI. UFOlogists discussed this issue but SETIsts did not. UFOlogists, in fact, are quite interested in propulsion systems and the chances that probes from other planets may be visiting us. One of the major addresses at the MUFON meeting examined the "Case for the Extraterrestrial Origin of Flying Saucers," and another report dealt with UFO propulsion systems which, the speaker suggested, might make interstellar travel possible.

Both groups seek friends and funds, but take opposite approaches to publicity. UFOlogists see little chance of federal funding in the immediate future, or even on the horizon. Therefore their only hope is to develop popular support through public meetings, television interviews, and so forth. The cover of the MUFON symposium program displayed the prominent caption; "Stressing Public Education of the UFO Phenomenon."


In contrast, SETIsts work quietly to build a theoretical framework and to enlist the support of other scientists. Believing that federal research money is almost within grasp, SETIsts feel that the public spotlight would hinder their cause, not help it. However, SETIsts have been considerably more successful than UFOlogists in gaining the support of scientists and the government. To put it another way, in the study of unconventional celestial

phenomena, SETIsts are the "haves" and UFOlogists are the "have-nots."

Most of the speakers and audience at the SETI conference were professional scholars and scientists; most at the MUFON meeting were not. Moreover, every speaker on the ETI Program was affiliated with a well-known university or research institute: Harvard, MIT, University of California, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Scripps Institute of Oceanography, and Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Although there were eight Ph.D.s on the MUFON program, their affiliations were not as prestigious.

Were these two meetings really representative of the two groups? Yes — if anything these meetings minimized the usual differences. The MUFON program had a higher percentage of Ph.D.s than are generally involved in UFOlogy, while previous NASA SETI conferences have included Nobel laureates Joshua Lederberg, who investigated the organization of genetic material in bacteria, and Charles Townes, who developed the laser and maser.

A status difference also exists between the elder statesmen of the two fields. While UFOlogist Hynek is considered a capable scientist from a respectable university (Northwestern), Morrison of M.I.T. has greater prestige. Among other prestige indications, he was chosen to give the Jacob Bronowski memorial lecture, and an entire



NOVA program shown nationwide on public television was devoted to his speech.

Government support is another indicator of the relative success of the two fields. NASA sponsored this and previous SETI conferences, has a SETI program at Ames Research Center, published *The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence* (NASA SP-419, 1977), and in 1978 asked Congress for two million dollars for SETI.

In contrast, the government's

attitude toward UFOs has been negative. NASA hasn't sponsored any conferences on UFOs, and rejected Jimmy Carter's request to investigate them. A NASA administrator stated that UFOs are not a matter for serious scientific discussion, and the same conclusion was reached by the Air Force sponsored Condon Report conducted at the University of Colorado in the 1960s.

Why this difference? Why are scientists inclined to support SETI and avoid UFOs? There are several reasons. First, it is easier to deal with radio signals than with little green men and people who claim to have seen them. Radio signals can be listed on a computer printout and analyzed by established research techniques. Most UFO reports lack scientific rigor. The underlying concern is control, a crucial element in scientific research. SETI, as envisioned by radio astronomers, would give them control over their research. Special equipment would be required to detect a signal from outer space, and even then, deliberate efforts would be necessary to find it among all the other radiation picked up by the sensitive equipment. The scientists could define what constitutes acceptable data, gather it under conditions they themselves determined, and analyze and evaluate it as they saw fit.

In contrast, UFOs are not easily controlled. They may appear anywhere, anytime. They are visible to the unaided eye, and are reported by all kinds of people. The reports might, or might not, be truthful.

SETI is also compatible with present theories and methods. No basically new techniques need be invented and no new cadres of specialists will be required. Receipt of radio signals from an extraterrestrial civilization would not necessarily overthrow established concepts about the universe and how it works. Today's scientists could use the same kind of equipment to do the same kind of work they do now as they search for ETI.

Furthermore, SETI has had less of the ridicule, sensationalism and unfavorable publicity which afflict UFOs. Even Senator Proxmire's Golden Fleece Award to NASA created less stir than a routine UFO flap would have aroused. Lack of sensationalism allows scientists to look for ETI at their own pace, under conditions chosen by them rather than by public pressure. In order to keep the situation this way, NASA and scientists interested in SETI are maintaining a low profile while they seek federal funding.

Even though SETI has the support of NASA and an impressive array of scientists, its financial position is insecure. In 1978 Congress rejected NASA's appeal for SETI funds, allocating not a single cent to it. Despite this setback, SETI is on the verge of being accepted as a respectable, even fashionable, scientific endeavor. Yet the proximity of success leads SETIists to be cautious. Having only recently risen above the tawdry realm of comic strips and science fiction, SETI is concerned with presenting a dignified image. SETIists do not want their image tarnished by any connection with the "lunatic fringe."

UFOlogy is thus not an ally but a threat. UFOs represent a potential source of embarrassment for SETI.

Believing that federal research money is almost within grasp, SETIists feel that the public spotlight would hinder their cause, not help it.

The situation is reminiscent of the familiar fear held by many upwardly mobile people that their recently acquired respectability will be jeopardized by association with less sophisticated relatives and former friends. SETIists feel they have nothing to gain from UFOlogists, and much to lose.

This then is another reason, along with tremendous interstellar distances, why the SETI conference did not examine the possibility that ETI may be any closer than the distant stars, and particularly that ETI may be visiting us here and now. By keeping ETI far away, its seekers may avoid undue public attention which might attract the lunatic fringe.

SETIists downplay anything which might suggest a link between ETI and UFOs. SETIists seldom discuss UFOs, and, when they do, emphasis is placed upon the virtual impossibility of interstellar travel due to the vast distance and the tremendous times needed to traverse them. SETIists feel the safest assumption is the ET beings are similar to us, and that physical laws as we now understand them are

applicable throughout the universe.

UFOlogists, on the other hand, are not as committed to established scientific theories. They are, in fact, inclined to think these may be wrong or, at the very least, inadequate — and that interstellar travel is indeed somehow possible. For people who believe UFOs are real, the extraterrestrial hypothesis is the most popular, though not the only one. Parallel universes, time travel and psychotronic manipulation are among the alternative explanations.

Thus, what appeared at first glance to be parallel approaches to ETI actually differ in important respects. At least in part, the differences can be explained by the contrasting positions of their advocates with respect to mainstream science and federal funding. For established scientists, SETI could provide a long term project which could begin immediately, use present personnel and equipment, and be guided by scientists. Then if the effort was successful in finding signals from another planet, its findings would stand a chance of fitting into our present concepts about life and the universe. SETI, despite its exotic trappings, is actually a moderate, middle-of-the-road scientific activity. It does not imply, at least as it is now envisioned, a confrontation with today's science or scientists.

UFOs are more troublesome. Starting from data that is soft and comes from outside established scientific frameworks, their ultimate implications are unpredictable. UFOs seem to violate basic laws of physics. If the claims made about them turned out to be correct, present assumptions about time, space and matter might have to be radically altered. While most scientists are open to refinements of existing theories, they would be less enthusiastic about abandoning these concepts completely, particularly if the case were to depend on messy data reported by laymen. Thus, most scientists, if they are interested in unconventional topics at all, would prefer to search for ETI rather than for UFOs.

David W. Swift
Department of Sociology
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, HI

Shuttle: Another Giant Step or a Military Tool?

On April 12, 1981, *Columbia* lifted from the Kennedy Space Center — a spectacular event for the hundred thousand who watched and heard it. The 18-story-high structure

thundered off the pad and shook the Earth for miles. It climbed slowly at first, then picked up speed, billowing smoke and steam. Brilliant flames longer than the ship itself



Richard Heiden, a subscriber from Milwaukee, Wis. has the following comments concerning some of the articles in past newsletters.

The following paragraphs (in dark type) may be published if you want; in particular, I hope that the one about Frank Stranges gets an airing.

I have some comments and questions on the past three issues. March 1981 (II:5): Larry Fenwick and Joseph Muskat's report on the Toronto abduction case is most interesting, but I would like to point out one possible error. The time comparisons with the Kansas and Nebraska sightings of Aug. 2, 1979, do not seem to take into consideration the different time zones.

June 1981 (II:6), p. 3, April 2, 1981, case: I realize you publish primarily for a Canadian (if not Cambridge-area) readership. But the size comparison to "a 50¢ piece held at arm's length" does not mean much to us foreigners. (I remember a couple of years ago FSR published a letter from the U.S. in regard to a case where comparison was to a florin or some such coin.)


Sep. 1981 (II:7): I see that Dr. [sic] Frank Stranges is one of your exchange editors and contributors. A list of this contactee's alleged degrees was given in the HEFLEY REPORT (now defunct). Not a single one of the colleges was included in directories of universities, and for those institutions where Stranges gave a city, they don't even have a phone listing! Now different sets of credentials are claimed in the Sachs and Story UFO encyclopedias. Story presented them with an air of skepticism, but Sachs apparently swallowed them at face value. Perhaps if you publish this letter, Stranges could be persuaded to tell us where he actually got his doctorate.






**Cambridge
U.F.O. Research
Group**

The latest issue of the CUFORN bulletin had an article in it concerning a meeting arranged to discuss MUFON's July, 1982, Convention in Toronto. The proceedings of the meeting in CUFORN's bulletin are attached.



'I've been down here before! Watch out for the little guy in the fur coat.'



'We flew over one of your cities on the way in . . . very impressive!'

MUFON HOLDS PRE-CONVENTION MEETING

The date was September 19; the place-the residence of MUFON's Canadian Director, Henry McKay; the purpose- to get suggestions for topics for the 1982 MUFON International Symposium to be held in Toronto July 2-4, 1982 at the Westbury Hotel.

The first item discussed was that we need Canadian speakers for this symposium. Henry McKay told us that no one has agreed to speak at the Symposium yet. This is contrary was the statement made in the previous Bulletin, in which we said that Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle had agreed to speak.

McKay gave the 18 persons present an overview of what was to be discussed at the Conference of the Center for UFO Studies late in September. Gordon Melton of Fate magazine was one speaker. Another topic was the presentation of new evidence concerning the Paul Trent UFO photograph at McMinnville, Oregon in 1950.

Project URD was also a topic at CUFOS's Conference. The initials stand for UFO Research Data. This would co-ordinate in-the-field data gathering with computer analysis of the data. It has also been proposed for adoption by Sweden's Bertil Kuhlemann to the Second London International UFO Congress last May. URD's field investigator's manual has been completed. The Project would include the use of two punch cards for easy conversion into computer language. Punch Card or Form A notes general information about a sighting, while Form B is for specific data about the UFO stimulus itself. The computer that would be used would be an IBM 360/175.

We were told that there would be three other speeches of major importance at CUFOS: information from analysis of the multi-image Oregon photograph(not the McMinnville One), along with speeches by Alan Holt of Project VISIT(Vehicle Internal Systems Investigation Team) by John Timmerman of CUFOS Board of Directors.

There were some good ideas for the convention next July, some of them submitted by CUFORN's Joe Muskat and Larry Fenwick, along with McKay. Among them were that there would be small seminars held in rooms adjoining the hotel's main lobby. These might include a MUFON link with the organization's ham radio network. A film such as Strange Harvest could be shown, if MUFON would pay the plane fare for the woman who narrates the film. That movie is about cattle mutilations.

Four names were mentioned as potential Canadian speakers at the convention. These were Terence Dickinson of CUFORN, astronomy columnist for the Toronto Star; Stanton Friedman, ufologist and nuclear physicist who might talk about the Zeta Reticuli incident or the Roswell Incident; Hugh Cochrane, who could have a workshop concerning anomalies in the Great Lakes area, and Jack McDonald, an expert who could speak about the validity of PSE and polygraph devices in close encounter investigations.

One of the most interesting ideas was the linking up of former abductees to an EEG machine while they were questioned, and observing the readings on the EEG device.

Advertising the Symposium in ethnic newspapers in Toronto was mentioned as a potentially valuable way of getting a larger attendance at the Symposium.

CUFORN's Gabriele Raimondo has volunteered to be a translator for those delegates who speak Spanish or Portuguese. According to Henry McKay, the translators will have at least one meeting in advance of the Symposium to decide on procedures for translation. It is hoped that there will be five or six such translators available in July.

The featured speaker at the meeting at McKay's was Mr. X, former publisher of Pes Bureaux Bulletin. He gave us a detailed progress report on the movement of the UFO reports from the files at the National Research Council's non-meteoritic section to the Public Archives. The files are in eight boxes. The person he spoke to in Ottawa about this move was Tom Hillman.

He asked those present if any of them would spend some money to get the copies of microfilms made from the files. He said the federal government would be sending cost estimates to him and he would inform anyone interested as to the amount they would have to pay. The price would come from the Public Records Office. Joe Muskat of CUFORN asked Mr. X to put his name down as one who would be willing to pay for a copy of the microfilms. There would be 4 or 5 such reels. Mr. X estimated that there are 2,500 reports in the files. So far, Joe Muskat, Dave Haisell, X, Stan Friedman and one other person are listed. Any CUFORN member who wants to get on the list should contact CUFORN headquarters or Mr. X. This is expected to cost about \$500 unless more people sign up, in which case the price will come down considerably.

It was a pleasure to meet MUFON members at McKay's. Former field investigator Gene Duplantier and his wife were there, as were Dr. George Owen and his wife Iris. Other than your Editor and Joe Muskat, only Jacquie Amiot of CUFORN represented CUFORN at the meeting. Many others promised, but for one reason or another did not attend. If you say you can attend a meeting, try to fulfill your promise. If you are at all unsure, do not commit yourself. This has happened all too frequently in regard to CUFORN meetings recently. We expect a large attendance and six persons show up.

UFO PHOTOGRAPHS--FOOD FOR THOUGHT

From the A.P.R.O. Bulletin, Vol. 29, No. 5, June, 1981--Charles Fiorita, a resident of the state of Missouri, received an interesting phone call a few years ago from an unnamed man in Rochester, New York. The man had read about Charles and his wife's many encounters with UFOs when he obtained a copy of the Moberly, Missouri Monitor-Index.

The man questioned Charles for 25 or 30 minutes, asking for specific details about one UFO he had seen. He then stated that he worked in the Research Department of the Kodak Company. He asserted that Kodak had more than 5,000 photographs of UFOs at its Rochester Research Center. If this is true, UFO researchers everywhere would like to look at Kodak's photographs.

-- ANNOUNCING --



THE MEIER INCIDENT

THE MOST INFAMOUS HOAX IN UFOLOGY



61981

By

Kal K. Korff

WITH THE
EDITORIAL ASSISTANCE
of WILLIAM L. MOORE

128 pages, illustrated
softbound

\$6.50 + \$1.00 additional
postage and handling

Alleged

Pleiadean spacecraft

10% commission to CUFORN for all sales.
Korff book-\$1.00 commission per copy.



Edge enhancement

showing supporting
string or wire

In late 1979, an association of investors known as Genesis III Productions, Ltd. released to the general public an elaborately illustrated privately published book entitled UFO...Contact From the Pleiades, Volume I. The book concerns a Swiss citizen named Eduard "Billy" Meier who claims not only to have taken hundreds of clear photographs of UFOs, but to have actually travelled to other planets aboard a flying saucer, travelled back into time, and personally experienced hundreds of "contacts" with beings from the star cluster known as the Pleiades. Genesis III has gone on to state that personal interviews with Mr. Meier, a "scientific analysis" of various metal and crystal samples, and a series of computer evaluations of the Meier photographs have all testified to the substance of Meier's claims.

Extensive investigations conducted by author Kal Korff with the aid of numerous other UFOlogists, strongly suggest that Meier's claims, and subsequently those made by Genesis III on Meier's behalf, may well be fraudulent in nature. The results of these investigations and the subsequent conclusions drawn therefrom have now been made available in this new book by Korff, written with the editorial assistance of well-known author William L. Moore.

It is the hope of the author that this new volume, through its exposé of previously unpublished and little known facts about this alleged hoax, will help set the record straight.

-----PLEASE USE ORDER BLANK ON REVERSE-----

---ALSO AVAILABLE---

-QUESTIONS and ANSWERS by the ROYAL ORDER OF TIBET (VOL. I), compiled by "Professor G(eorge) Adamski" and originally published by him in August of 1936. This 67 page photocopy reprint provides a rare and unusual insight into the personality and early philosophy of the man who was later to become one of the first, and certainly the most controversial, of the so-called UFO contactees. \$5.50 + 50¢ postage.



WILLIAM L. MOORE, PUBLICATIONS & RESEARCH, POBX 1845, PRESCOTT, AZ 86302

BOOK LIST AND ORDER BLANK: Order from address above, include postage.

- THE ROSWELL INCIDENT, by Charles Berlitz and William L. Moore (Grosset & Dunlap, 1980) Story of the 1947 crashlanding of a flying saucer in New Mexico and its subsequent recovery by U.S. military units. (168 pp., hardcover. Autographed by Moore. A few 1st editions still available, specify.) \$10.00 plus \$1.25 postage.
- THE ROSWELL INCIDENT: UPDATE & CONCLUSIONS (May '81) by William L. Moore, and THE ROSWELL INCIDENT: BEGINNING OF THE COSMIC WATERGATE (June '81) by Stanton T. Friedman. Two recent papers on the controversial 1947 New Mexico flying saucer crash case. 40 pages total (photocopy). \$8.00 + 50¢ postage. (NOTE: A \$2.00 donation will be made to the Fund for UFO Research for each set of papers sold.)
- THE PHILADELPHIA EXPERIMENT: PROJECT INVISIBILITY, by William L. Moore in consultation with Charles Berlitz (Grosset & Dunlap, 1979) The story of a Top Secret U.S. Navy wartime project that may have succeeded...too well! (178 pp. hardcover. Autographed by Moore.) \$10.00 plus \$1.25 postage.
-A few paperback copies available at \$2.50 + 50¢ postage.
- THE MEIER INCIDENT: MOST INFAMOUS HOAX IN UFOLOGY, by Kal Korff with the editorial assistance of W.L. Moore (Town Scribe, 1981) An interesting exposé of the so-called Billy Meier...UFO Contacts from the Pleiades case. Well worth reading. (124 pp. illustrated) \$6.50 plus \$1.00 postage.
- THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF UFOs edited by Ron Story (Doubleday, 1980) Hundreds of contributors, over 500 pages well illustrated. \$12.00 plus \$1.25 postage.
- THE WIZARD OF ELECTRO-GRAVITY, paper by William L. Moore (reprint of May, 1978 Saga UFO Report article with additional material). The story of scientist and inventor T. Townsend Brown, founder of NICAP and the man who may have discovered the secret of flying saucer propulsion. Interesting and informative. \$1.00 postpaid.
- TAKE ME TO YOUR LEADER, by James T. Milton (Esoteric, 1979). Interesting personal views and comments on various UFO-associated personalities from the 1940s to the present. (90 pp. softcover. Autographed by the author.) \$3.50 plus 50¢ postage.
- THE ZETA RETICULI INCIDENT, by Terence Dickinson (Complete with 1981 Update). 36 pp. (32 in full color) reprint of December, 1974 Astronomy magazine feature with later comments by Carl Sagan, etc. Covers Marjorie Fish's work on the Betty Hill star map, lists all Sun-like stars in our local neighborhood, etc. Excellent work on one of the most documented of the UFO abduction cases. \$2.50 plus 25¢ postage.
- 4 Scientific Papers, by Nuclear Physicist Stanton T. Friedman: "The Case for the Extraterrestrial Origin of Flying Saucers" ('79), "Science Fiction, Science and UFOs" ('77), "A Scientific Approach to Flying Saucer Behavior" ('75), and "Fiction, Fact and Flying Saucers" ('79). \$3.00 + 50¢ postage.

881

WILLIAM L. MOORE, PUBLICATIONS & RESEARCH, POBX 1845, PRESCOTT, AZ 86302

Please send the following items to: Name _____
Address _____
State & Zip _____

- (A) _____
- (B) _____
- (C) _____
- (D) _____

\$ I am enclosing \$ _____ for books,
plus \$ _____ for postage. (Maximum
for postage is \$2.00)

Stars and Scopes Forever

Light from the edge of the universe falls on earth, photon by photon; to catch it, you need only cast a big enough net. The 200-inch mirror of the Hale Telescope on Mount Palomar, the most powerful in the world, can see a quasar at 10 billion light-years, an average-size galaxy at something less than 5 billion. Build a 300-inch telescope, and you can almost see the most distant quasars 18 billion light-years away; build one with a 400-inch surface, gathering photons from an area smaller than a backyard pool, and you can look beyond those quasars to what may be the primal blackness of eternity. Now, aided by new computer technology and advances in glass and ceramics, scientists at the University of Texas and the University of California are preparing to do just that.

It means looking not just out in space, but back in time as well; the light scientists hope to catch dates from when the stars were young. Preserved in their spectra are the fossil records of the universe: a catalog of the elements that were present at the creation and, just possibly, clues to how the universe was formed and how it might end.



Mirror: The new telescopes will work on the same principle as Mount Palomar and all other big observatories: a curved mirror will gather light and focus it at a point several meters in front, where electronic sensors or photographic film will record the image. In theory, a mirror can be made in any size. In practice, however, the larger a glass mirror gets, the more unwieldy it becomes. The Soviet Union's 236-inch mirror, the largest in the world, turned out to be a disappointment because it was not properly ground. A 300-inch mirror would not only be difficult to grind and polish—but would have to be 4 feet thick just to support its own weight.

The Texas astronomers, led by astronomy professor Harlan Smith, devised a clever alternative: a mirror of flexible, 4-inch-thick fused silica (a kind of artificial quartz), which will be supported from behind by movable pads, like a giant hospital bed. Laser sensors will continuously map its shape, and a computer will direct the minute corrections necessary to keep it perfectly focused. Nicknamed the "Eye of Texas," the instrument could be operating at UT's McDonald Observatory in 1986—provided a backer comes along with all or part of its \$45 million cost. That's not cheap—but it's a lot less than the \$750 million price tag of the Space Telescope, which NASA will launch into earth orbit in 1985, and only about a tenth of what a conventional, thick-mirror telescope the same size would cost.

University of California physicist Jerry Nelson has solved the mirror problem in a different way. He intends to join 36 movable, hexagonal glass tiles, each about 3 inches thick and 6 feet across, to form a paraboloid surface with the light-gathering capacity of a 400-inch reflector. "It's hard to take credit for it," Nelson says. "People have been segmenting bathroom floors for hundreds of years." A much simpler multiple-mirror telescope—using only six segments to create the equivalent of a 176-inch surface—has been working since 1979 at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory in Arizona. The California telescope will be built—at about the same cost as the Eye of Texas—atop 14,000-foot Mauna Kea, an extinct volcano on Hawaii. Being close to the equator, it will give scientists a look at the neglected southern sky; being so high, it will minimize atmospheric distortion, and being isolated, it won't be troubled by artificial background light. The major problem will be acclimating technicians to the thin atmosphere; they may have to stargaze in oxygen masks.

Engineers have come up with tricks of another kind to make the new telescopes affordable. They will keep focal lengths as short as possible—the 400-inch Mauna Kea telescope will have almost the same focal length as Mount Palomar's 200-inch reflector—so that the instruments themselves, and consequently their expensive protective domes, can be relatively compact. Computers provided an inexpensive solution to an age-old astronomical problem: how to compensate for the earth's rotation, so that a distant, fixed star can be kept in view for the half hour or so that most observations require. The traditional approach was an "equatorial" mounting, which rotated the

Space Telescope: Pretty pictures from the past




Ziggy Kaluzny

Smith with UT model: A Texas-size eye

telescope slowly about an inclined axis—setting up enormous shifting stresses that could only be overcome by making the mounting massive, and massively expensive. The new telescopes substitute brains for brawn. They will have a much lighter and cheaper mounting that swivels on its own vertical and horizontal axes—known as the "altitude-azimuth" system—and tracks stars by computer.

Visible Spectrum: Astronomers say the need for big telescopes is in no way diminished by the imminence of the Space Telescope—an unmanned electronic observatory with a 94-inch reflector. Their capabilities are not the same. The Space Telescope—operating beyond the earth's masking atmosphere—will provide the clearest and sharpest images of stars ever seen by man. "If you want a pretty picture," says Nelson, who supports the Space Telescope, "it will wow us all." But it is limited by the size of its reflector. "For things like spectroscopy"—analyzing the chemical composition of distant stars—"you need light," says Nelson, "and you get more light [with 400 inches]." The Mauna Kea observatory will work around the clock, searching for infrared radiation when the sun is up and switching to the visible spectrum at night. Along with the Eye of Texas, it will see objects a billion times more sharply than the unaided eye can, and provide the most detailed map ever of the last frontier.

JERRY ADLER with STRYKER McGUIRE
in Austin and SHARON WALTERS
in San Francisco



Everyone has, by now, read the UFO incident wherein an unidentified flying object struck a police cruiser, driven by Val Johnson, near the town of Stephen, Minnesota.

Chris Rutkowski, editor of The Swamp Gas Journal, in Manitoba, has prepared a special report on the case and it is attached.

**INTELLIGENT LIFE
BELIEVED TO EXIST
ON EARTH**

Special Report: Stephen, Minnesota; Not Proof, But...

A main issue under examination at the Manitoba Conference on Ufology, on March 16, 1980, was the Val Johnson UFO incident which occurred on August 27, 1979. The case has received wide publicity, and has been noted in most ufozines (it was discussed in SGJ #6), so it will not be repeated again here. But, briefly, it involved the apparent impact of a U.S. police vehicle with an unidentified flying object, near the town of Stephen, Minnesota. The incident was supported by various physical evidence in the form of dents, impact marks and broken glass.

Frankly, it is one of the most puzzling incidents in the history of ufology. This strong statement is partly because of the fact that the case involves a man who has been described as "the perfect witness". Val Johnson is a Deputy Sheriff in Marshall County, Minnesota, and is a trained observer as well as an experienced police officer. The physical evidence suggests that something very strange happened to him in the early morning on a lonely stretch of road near the Red River. The time sequence of events is very firmly established by both tape recorded and written logs of his actions that morning. The physical traces were examined and measurements were made immediately after the encounter by trained police investigators, and Mr. Johnson was taken to a hospital by ambulance directly from the site.

At MCU, the case was discussed and reviewed in detail by all participants, as presented by guests Val Johnson, Everett Doolittle and Greg Winskowski. Doolittle was the first individual to reach the site after Johnson radioed for help, and Winskowski conducted the initial police investigation. Many fascinating points were noted, as given in the following paragraphs.

The Physiological Effects

When Val Johnson was found by Everett Doolittle, he was slumped forward over the steering wheel, and in mild shock. A bruise later appeared on Johnson's forehead, presumably caused by impact with the steering wheel. He was dazed, and said that "everything was in slow motion". He had an intense pain ("excruciating") in his eyes, and having done some welding in his career, knew what welders' burn was like and compared his pain to this. "It was as if someone had hit me in the face with a 400 pound pillow", he said of the sensation of his head. However, he stated repeatedly that the only pain he experienced was from his eyes. This is extremely interesting in the light of dental examinations he had one week previous and one week after his experience. At the first, he had an extensive series of x-rays taken, in preparation for major dental work. His bridgework, including the caps on his front teeth, was intact. At the second examination, the examining dentist found that Johnson's bridgework was broken at the gums. Yet, no swelling or pain was felt.

The Physical Evidence

When Everett Doolittle arrived on the scene, Val Johnson's police car was front-end-first in the left-hand ditch, with its rear end sticking into the left-hand lane of the road. The "impact point" was determined by the location of the broken glass of the headlight, on the road, 953 feet from where the car was found. From that point, "yaw marks" (described by Doolittle as faint skid marks caused by putting a car out of gear without applying the brakes) travelled in a straight line for 854 feet down the road. These became dark skid marks from there to where the car stopped moving, going in a straight line for most of the remaining length, turning abruptly at the end toward the ditch.

The right member of the left pair of headlights was broken. There was a round dent, approximately one inch in diameter, directly over the master brake cylinder, on the hood. This dent appeared as if a hammer had struck the hood at an angle that could be anywhere from 45 to 75 degrees from the horizontal. A photograph taken with a UV filter showed that there was a deposit left on the flat bottom surface of the dent.

The windshield of the car had an interesting pattern of breakage, in the shape of a teardrop (point up). This was located on the driver's side. There were three main impact points visible, though the lowest of the three was largest and most complex. Testing of the glass by the Ford Motor Company suggested that there were signs of both inward and outward motion of the windshield. They were apparently unfamiliar with the breakage pattern. It is fairly obvious, though, that even a small stone would have been driven through the windshield, even at relatively low speed, so it is hard to interpret the shattering as an actual impact. However, it was noted at the Conference that the analytical findings bear some resemblance to those of a shock-wave-induced breakage.

The roof light which was affected had its glass knocked out. The police radio antenna on the center of the roof was bent about 5 inches up from the roof, at about a 45 degree angle. The CB antenna on the trunk was bent near its tip, at an angle near 90 degrees, 3 inches from the top.

An interesting observation made by the police investigators was that all the damage on the vehicle occurred in a straight path no wider than twelve inches in diameter. Because of this "linear" formation, it was suggested that an object had struck a glancing blow to the car, initially impacting the headlight, rolling over the hood, up the window and over the roof. However, at the Conference, it was realized that this scenario could not account for all the damage in the form it was observed. An object hitting the car at the front would not have the capability to re-direct its force downward further up the hood, graze the window and still have enough force to bend the antennas.

The antennas are spring loaded, so anything bending them would have to have been travelling extremely fast to create the shape they are now in. It was also proposed that the antennas were bent by a strong deceleration, causing them to whip forward. But the design of the antennas is such that they can withstand a strong deceleration without acute bending. Any deceleration of

sufficient strength to bend them backwards as they moved forward, would certainly have killed the occupant. Most curiously, the insects adhered to the antennas were not wiped off from the impact, as might be expected.

The battery of the car can no longer hold a charge. It has been proposed that the headlight and roof light were imploded by a high-energy electrical source. Ball lightning was suggested as a cause, but it could not have created the dent in the hood, nor the impacts on the window, let alone the bending of the antennas. The electric clock in the car was found to be missing 14 minutes. Strangely, Val Johnson's mechanical wristwatch was also lacking 14 minutes. This is indeed odd, because both were synchronized with the clocks in the police station earlier in the night, and all time checks after that agreed, as late as 01:00, only a short while before the incident.

The CB radio in the car, although it was said not to have been in the best working order before the incident, was described as being "even worse" after it.

Allan Hendry, of the Center for UFO Studies, sent a gauss-meter to the police investigator, in order for them to test for changes in the car's magnetic pattern. These results were, apparently, negative.

There was evidence of dust particles in the shattered glass, and it was suggested that this dust was the residue found in the round dent in the hood.

The Psychological Effects

When Val Johnson called for help, his voice was described as being "weak", and like "someone coming out of a daze". He had been, apparently, unconscious for 39 minutes, from the time he heard glass breaking and felt a light "hit" him, to the time he woke up, opening one eye to see the red "ENGINE" light on his dash. During that period, the car had travelled in a straight line for 953 feet, before veering to the left over the left lane into the ditch. He does not remember applying the brakes, yet the skid marks belie the fact that they were, indeed, applied.

At MCU, Mr. Johnson was asked what he thought had happened to him that morning. He said that he believed he "had seen something (he) wasn't supposed to see". Questioned on this, he could only speculate that he had stumbled upon somebody doing something that wasn't meant to be observed, and that his powers of observation were effectively neutralized. He was also asked if the method of regressive hypnosis had ever been suggested to him. He replied that the National Enquirer (a sensational gossipzine) had asked him to submit to a regression, and pay him for the exclusive rights of the results. He had rejected their offer. He was then asked if he would agree to a hypnotic regression with a clinical hypnotist for research purposes, not for publication. He said no, and added that he was not curious about what had happened to him that morning. Everett Doolittle said after this that their file on the case is now closed, and that their investigation is now terminated after reaching no conclusions. They stated that their investigation was over, and that the matter is now in the hands of the

ufologists. They will not subject Johnson to either a polygraph or a regressive hypnosis, as they feel it is not necessary for their investigation. All three were asked if the Air Force, CIA or FBI had approached them, and they all answered to the negative,

Val Johnson was asked if he had since experienced any other unusual incidents: dreams, MIB, psi phenomena, etc. He revealed a highly interesting thing; from time to time, he will find himself thinking three words, which somehow are sticking in his mind. The words stay with him "like a McDonald's commercial", and he can find no reason for thinking them. The three words are: "I AM COMMITTED". (He said that if he ever saw that light again, he'd stop the car and "yell for help!")

Discussion

This case was reviewed in detail, and photographs of the car were examined closely. Addition evidence was brought forth, and theories were presented to try and account for all the evidence. Guy Westcott, a NOAP investigator, stated that he had found a "burn mark" in the field beside the road, while he was examining the site. This mark, about 6-7 feet in diameter, had no vegetation on its surface, and bore some resemblance to a fertilizer burn. Val Johnson said that a representative from the USDA (Agriculture Rep) expressed a personal interest in the case, and had taken infrared aerial photographs of the site. These showed that the ditches on either side of the site had a "different" chlorophyll absorption than the surrounding fields.

After much debate, it eventually was concluded by the MCU participants that the incident was inconsistent with the theory of the car having been struck by an object of some sort, including ball lightning. The idea of hits by multiple objects was considered and found marginally tenable. However, there are 39 minutes to account for, a complex sequence of impacts by several objects, or even some effects caused at a short distance by unknown individuals, can be included in the list of possibilities. It is easily demonstrable that something very unusual happened that morning, and that at the present time, there is no adequate explanation for the effects noted in the case, based on the proposed theories. Many questions still remain unanswered, and they may remain unanswered for some time to come. The Stephen, Minnesota, incident is listed in UFOROM files as "unknown".

The Swamp Gas Journal
Box 1918
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada R3C 3R2

©1980 by Chris Rutkowski

POLICE VEHICLE WHEN OBJECT LIGHT FIRST SIGHTED

Marshall County # 5

2km

Magnetic North.

IMPACT WITH CAR AND OBJECT

MINNESOTA #220
← HEADLIGHT BROKEN

POLICE CAR WHEN BRAKES APPLIED

← WINDSHIELD BROKEN AND BRAKES APPLIED BENDING ANTENNAS.

← FINAL POSITION OF CAR.

5km.


OBJECT

TREE LINE

RIVER

POWER LINES.

Minnesota #317 WEST



NEW BOOKS

UFO ABDUCTIONS edited by D. Scott Rogo, Signet Books, New York, N.Y., 1980, 243 pages, \$2.25, paperback.

Since 1977, when his *The Haunted Universe* was published, D. Scott Rogo has been focusing his parapsychologist's eye on

UFOs and Fortean phenomena. *UFO Abductions*, a follow-up to his and Ann Druffel's *The Tujunga Canyon Contacts* (reviewed in September 1980 FATE), is a collection of "True Cases of Alien Kidnappings," as the subtitle tells us.

Some of the selections are uninspired. Do we really need to read yet again about Travis Walton, Antonio Villas-Boas and Herb Schirmer? The last story is reprinted from Ralph Blum's *Beyond Earth: Man's Contact with UFOs*, probably the most widely-read UFO book of the past 10 years. By now the literature has no shortage of CEIII material, much of it little known; it's too bad that Rogo's anthology is a bit top-heavy with the overly familiar. (Let me take this opportunity to suggest two excellent, undeservedly obscure UFO articles to future anthologists: Isabel Davis' "Meet the Extraterrestrial" [*Fantastic Universe*, November 1957] and Anthony Nugent's "Quicksilver in Twilight: A Close Encounter with a Hermetic Eye" [*Spring*, 1978, published at Box 1, University of Dallas, Irving, Tex. 75061]. The former is a delightful, no-nonsense dissection of the claims of the 1950's contactees, the latter a dazzlingly imaginative Jungian interpretation of the 1973 Pascagoula, Miss., abduction story.)

I suspect that many ufologists will pass *Abductions* by after scanning its table of contents, but that would be a mistake. The book's real value lies in Rogo's commentary on the various issues related to the abduction controversy. Rogo is far better read in the literature of psychology, parapsychology, hypnosis and altered states of consciousness than just about anybody in ufology. His observations are provocative, pointed and stimulating.

He believes, as I do, that most abduction accounts — even those "recalled" under hypnosis — are "real" events, not vivid confabulations as some writers have speculated. The accounts are too similar; some, as Rogo shows (pages 106-07), are practically identical (even when the claimants could not possibly have been aware of the other stories); and some have physical evidence to back them up. In one instance, a case I personally investigated, a couple who were hypnotized separately and told to forget what they "remembered" while in

the hypnotic state related complementary experiences (see pages 191-209), even describing identical humanoids aboard the UFO.

Rogo zeroes in on the much-overrated "imaginary abduction" experiments of Alvin Lawson and William McCall. These experiments, often cited as evidence that abduction narratives are psychological, not ufological, phenomena, supposedly demonstrate that "imaginary" accounts are indistinguishable from the "real" ones. Rogo rightly finds this a highly questionable conclusion.

Rogo makes a few questionable statements of his own, such as that close encounters vary from culture to culture, an assertion for which there is no real evidence. He also contends that abductions occur during moments of crisis in the lives of percipients. Again the evidence is flimsy and dependent on some awfully subjective judgments, but at least it is something akin to a testable hypothesis and ufologists should keep it in mind the next time they commence an investigation of an abduction claim.

Rejecting the literal-minded interpretation that these are extraterrestrial kidnappings, Rogo theorizes that "a UFO abduction experience is a 'dream,' which has been extracted from the unconscious mind of the UFO witness by *The Phenomenon* [the hypothetical source of UFO phenomena] and which is then beamed back to him in the form of a UFO abduction. The events actually take place. That is, UFO abductions are physically real events. But they are dramas materialized into three-dimensional space for us . . . They are dreams that *The Phenomenon* has made come to life in very frightening vividness."

I'm not sure I agree. But right or wrong, these are fascinating speculations. Rogo is just about the only writer currently on the scene with anything interesting or original to say about the abduction mystery. *UFO Abductions'* major flaw is that Rogo is the editor, not the author. — *Jerome Clark.*

UFOs: INTERPLANETARY VISITORS by Raymond E. Fowler, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1979, 365 pages, \$4.95, paperback.

Prentice-Hall has rescued this fine book from vanity press oblivion (Exposition Press published it originally in 1974) and now it should get the wide reading it deserves. The author's speculations about the nature, motive and origin of UFOs are often naive but his coverage of UFO reports, many of which he has investigated personally, is interesting and valuable.

OBSERVING UFOs by Richard F. Haines, Nelson-Hall Publishers, Chicago, Ill., 1980, 279 pages, \$21.95 hardcover, \$10.95 paperback.

Perhaps it's the exigencies of mass marketing. Maybe it's the nontechnical backgrounds of the authors attracted to the subject. Most likely it's the traditional desire to include every aspect of a multifaceted phenomenon between the covers of a single

book. Whatever the reason, virtually all UFO books from large publishing houses restrict the technical level of their discourses to the level of the lay reader. While closing chapters call for the involvement of the scientific community, the literature reflects mostly the concerns of amateur journalists.

For this reason Richard Haines' *Observing UFOs* is going to catch the unwary buyer off guard. First, it's not the generalized overview of UFO cases most readers expect when they purchase a book on ufology. While Dr. Haines does devote some space to star and airplane IFOs, witness reliability and report consistency, polygraph testing and hypnotic regression, he is more concerned with the very specialized question of human visual perception of distant objects and light sources. Although it is subtitled "An Investigative Handbook," Haines warns that the book will not recount UFO stories. It also doesn't discuss UFO theories, physical trace analyses, photographs, radar or IFO sources.

Instead Haines, a NASA research scientist, has set out to fill a gap in the UFO literature: the absence of a detailed discussion of the role visual perception plays in UFO sightings. A summary of the limitations of the human eye in detecting motion is particularly striking. Did you know that vertical object movement appears faster to the eye than horizontal movement even if both are moving at the same speed?

Observing UFOs is for the serious UFO researcher who wants to apply what is known about visual perception to his investigations. The real significance of the work, however, may be that it addresses a scientific audience in a duly dry, scholarly style. Not just another lightweight effort by yet another technically untrained UFO author, it is a needed and welcome contribution to the literature of ufology. — *Allan Hendry.*

1980 MUFON UFO SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS edited by Walter H. Andrus, Jr., and Dennis W. Stacy, Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Tex. 78155, 1980, 178 pages, \$10.00, paperback.

MUFON's annual symposium proceedings are always a welcome contribution to the literature and this one is no exception, although it is far from the best in the series. The organization's directors have yet to realize that someone can have a Ph.D. after his name and still spout nonsense, as at least one paper here embarrassingly demonstrates.

