

MUTUAL UFO NETWORK

UFO JOURNAL

MARCH 1996

NUMBER 335 \$3



Military Cameramen Speak Out on "Autopsy" Film

First Publication Anywhere!

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE MUTUAL UFO NETWORK SINCE 1967

CONTENTS

MARCH 1996

NUMBER 335

SANTILLI'S CONTROVERSIAL AUTOPSY MOVIE	Kent Jeffrey	3
UFO'S AND MAINSTREAM SCIENCE	Bernard Haisch, Ph.D.	14
SCIENCE IS NOT ALWAYS WHAT SCIENCE PROGRAMS DO: A RESPONSE TO NOVA'S PROGRAM ON UFO ABDUCTIONS	Budd Hopkins	17
IS ANYBODY OUT THERE?	Ohio University, Scripps-Howard News Service	20
READERS' CLASSIFIEDS		21
THE APRIL NIGHT SKY	Walter N. Webb	22
CALENDAR		22
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE	Walter Andrus	24

COVER

Photo: Courtesy of Dan McGovern

First Lieutenant Dan McGovern on September 8, 1945, at ground zero in Nagasaki, Japan, with Bell and Howell movie camera in hand. At the scene just four weeks after the atomic bomb was dropped, McGovern shot thousands of feet of 16mm color film.

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

(USPS 002-970)
(ISSN 0270-6822)
103 Oldtowne Rd.
Seguin, TX 78155-4099
Tel: (210) 379-9216
FAX (210) 372-9439

EDITOR

Dennis Stacy

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Walter H. Andrus, Jr.

COLUMNISTS

Walter N. Webb
John S. Carpenter
T. David Spencer

ART DIRECTOR

Vince Johnson

Copyright 1996 by the Mutual UFO Network. All Rights Reserved.

No part of this document may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the Copyright Owners. Permission is hereby granted to quote up to 200 words of any one article, provided the author is credited, and the statement, "Copyright 1996 by the Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155," is included.

The contents of the MUFON UFO Journal are determined by the editors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Mutual UFO Network. Opinions expressed are solely those of the individual authors.

The Mutual UFO Network, Inc. is exempt from Federal Income Tax under Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. MUFON is a publicly supported organization of the type described in Section 509 (a) (2). Donors may deduct contributions from their Federal Income Tax. Bequests, legacies, devises, transfers or gifts are also deductible for estate and gift purposes, provided they meet the applicable provisions of Sections 2055, 2106 and 2522 of the Internal Revenue Code. MUFON is a Texas nonprofit corporation.

The MUFON UFO Journal is published monthly by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas. Membership/Subscription rates: \$30 per year in the U.S.A.; \$30 foreign in U.S. funds. Second class postage paid at Seguin, TX.

POSTMASTER: Send form 3579 to advise change of address to: MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155-4099.

Santilli's Controversial Autopsy Movie

A Comprehensive Review

By Kent Jeffrey

To paraphrase Sir Winston Churchill, Never in the history of human deception have so many been fooled so much by so few. The claimed 1947 "alien autopsy" footage, acquired and marketed by Merlin Productions, a small London video distribution company owned by Ray Santilli, has now been seen, and in many cases believed, by tens of millions of viewers in over 30 countries worldwide.

Through a selective presentation of the facts and selective editing, programs like Fox network's "Alien Autopsy: Fact or Fiction" have misled the public by giving the impression that a number of interdisciplinary experts, including pathologists and film-makers, feel that the Santilli footage might be genuine. The waters have been further muddied by Fox's mingling of facts and witness testimony from the actual Roswell case with scenes from the alleged alien autopsy film.

Since the existence of alleged 1947 Roswell footage was first announced in January 1995 on a British television talk show, there has been an overwhelming amount of circumstantial evidence in the form of inconsistencies, contradictions, lies, and false claims to indicate that the alien autopsy film is a hoax. Furthermore, there has not been one shred of evidence to indicate that the film is genuine. While volumes could be written on the subject, the objective here is to outline some of the more significant problems and discrepancies and to bring to public attention two very reasonable and important offers of verification that could quickly and conclusively settle the matter of the film's authenticity, once and for all. Among the more significant discrepancies are the following:

- Problems with the alleged body and autopsy procedures are noted by leading medical experts.
- When polled, special-effects artists unanimously believed the body to be a special-effects dummy.
- False claims have been made by Santilli concerning authentication of the alleged original film.
- A mysterious "collector" cited by Santilli as the reason for the film's unavailability is a business partner of Santilli's.

- "Security markings" disappeared from the film after being labeled phony by military experts.
- "Hieroglyphics" on the supposed debris spell out two slightly disguised English words.
- Santilli changed his story about how he acquired the film after he was caught in a gross "inconsistency" on a French TV program.
- Three highly qualified former WWII military cameramen have pointed out major flaws in both the film itself and the story surrounding it.

A QUESTIONABLE AUTOPSY

As I pointed out in a previous article on the film ("The Purported 1947 Roswell Footage," *MUFON Journal*, June 1995) the anthropomorphic aspect of the alleged alien is implausible. This contention has since been supported by a number of prominent medical experts. In a July 23, 1995, article in a British newspaper, *The Observer*, anatomist Dr. Paul O'Higgins, of University College London, stated, "I would think the chances that an alien which evolved on another world would look so like us would be astronomically remote."

Beside the anthropomorphic aspect of the body, other serious problems exist from a medical standpoint. Dr. O'Higgins also stated, "To judge from the film, the autopsy was carried out in a couple of hours. Yet these were alien creatures. They represented an unparalleled opportunity to science. We are expected to believe we casually cut them up in an afternoon? I would have taken weeks to do such an autopsy." Houston pathologist Ed Uthman, quoted in the November/December *Skeptical Inquirer*, states, "The most implausible thing of all is that the 'alien' just had amorphous lumps of tissue in 'her' body cavities. I cannot fathom that an alien who had external organs so much like ours could not have some sort of definitive structural organs internally."

Particular aspects of the alleged alien's external body shape, such as the protrusions of certain underlying muscles and bones, like the clavicle, imply a corresponding human internal structure. Yet what was removed from the body cavity looks entirely *nonhuman*. (This incongruity in itself is a serious flaw.) In effect,

what we have is a hybrid that is basically human on the outside and nonhuman on the inside — an entity that is half human, half something else. While such creatures exist in mythology — minotaurs, centaurs, mermaids, werewolves, etc. — they do not exist in reality.

A NOT-SO-SPECIAL EFFECT

The humanlike qualities of the supposed alien suggest that it is either a doctored human corpse or a dummy patterned after a human body. Movie special-effects experts who have examined the alien autopsy video, however, feel that the scene was faked by using a special-effects dummy. Special-effects artists, including Trey Stokes, whose credits include *The Abyss*, *The Blob*, *Batman Returns*, *Robocop II*, etc., and Cliff Wallace of *Creature Effects*, Pinewood Studios, London, have pointed out that the posture and weighting of the corpse on the table in the film is inconsistent for a body in the supine position and that it was therefore apparently made from a body-cast taken in the upright position. A multitude of special-effects techniques noticeable in the film are described by Trey Stokes in an excellent article, "How to Build an Alien," available on his Internet Web page (<http://www.trudang.com>).

Trey Stokes has also published on his Web page the opinions of 15 of his movie industry colleagues about the claimed alien autopsy footage. All 15 have either spoken directly to Stokes or gone on record with their opinion about the footage. Among the group are several Academy and Emmy award winners, including Stan Winston (*Jurassic Park*), who after some misunderstanding following his interview on Fox, clarified his position about the footage in a recent *Time* magazine article — "Do I think it's a hoax? Absolutely." The result of Stokes's survey was unanimous — all 15 special-effects experts felt the film was a fake. Not one felt that there was even the slightest possibility it was real. Many, according to Stokes, found the footage so laughable that they couldn't believe that anyone in the business would take it seriously enough to even do a survey about it.

SPECTACULAR CLAIMS

Another indication that something is very wrong with this entire affair is the gross inconsistency between the scenes initially described by Santilli and what was eventually delivered. Back in January 1995, we were told that the footage included an autopsy scene with President Truman. Truman was described as standing with other individuals behind a glass window, his face so clearly visible that it would be possible to lip-read his words. Author and crop circle researcher Colin Andrews, one of those who has been in direct contact with Ray Santilli, described the scene in the winter 1995 issue of the *Circle Phenomenon Research International Newsletter*. When Andrews asked Santilli what impressed him most about the film — "what had convinced him that it was authentic" — Santilli responded, "I had no doubts when

I saw President Truman." According to the research director for the British UFO Research Association (BUFORA), Philip Mantle (who has also been in close contact with Santilli), Santilli told him that "if it wasn't Truman, it was a damned good actor."

The most spectacular claim of all was that of the debris-site footage. On January 20, 1995, I spoke to a movie producer, who has a serious interest in the 1947 Roswell event, just hours after he had spoken with Ray Santilli. Santilli had given a detailed description of the debris site. According to Santilli, the terrain was somewhat hilly. The craft was visible, not in one piece, but in a number of large pieces, necessitating the use of a large crane. Also, numerous soldiers in uniform were visible, in some cases clearly enough for their faces to be seen. Santilli described the debris site in detail to others, including Philip Mantle, Colin Andrews, and Reg Presley, a friend of Colin Andrews' with an interest in crop circles. Presley, who was the lead singer of a popular 60s British rock group, the Troggs ("Wild Thing"), and who has also been in close contact with Ray Santilli, made the initial announcement of the Santilli film's existence on British television.

Because such scenes as that of President Truman and the debris site would be extremely difficult and expensive to hoax, there seemed at first to be a real possibility that the footage might be genuine. Unfortunately, the spectacular claims about these scenes have turned out to be false, apparently blatant lies. No one has ever seen anything of either scene. What has been seen is rather unspectacular, and would have been relatively easy to hoax. Special-effects expert Trey Stokes estimates that the entire "alien autopsy" production could have been accomplished for as little as \$50,000.

THE NONEXISTENT FILM

Ray Santilli first claimed that he obtained "15 10-minute reels" of film from the cameraman. Later he changed his story to "22 3-minute reels." In his January 20, 1995, conversation with the previously mentioned film producer, Santilli claimed that the footage was "1947, 16mm nitrate" film. Kodak, however, has never produced 16mm nitrate film. Santilli told Colin Andrews that the prestigious *Royal Society* in London had agreed to assist using their high-tech computer enhancement facility. When officials at the *Royal Society* were questioned about the matter, however, they knew nothing about it.

There have been other false and misleading claims regarding the alleged "original film" and its authentication. For example, Santilli has submitted film with the appropriate edge code for 1947 (a square and a triangle), but it has been either blank leader film or film with unidentifiable images — both of which are meaningless for verification purposes. The criterion required by Kodak for a valid test is that the film submitted have clearly identifiable images from the actual "alien au-

topsy" footage that has been shown worldwide. This is a very reasonable request since, otherwise, the sample provided could be any piece of 1947 film.

In a pre-taped interview broadcast on Channel Four in Britain on August 28, 1995, Santilli was asked, "Are you going to provide proper film extract which can be properly tested by Kodak which has proper images on it?" Santilli replied, "I'll provide you with the film, I'll provide you with what I can, which will be a film with image, and the only way that I can do that is by securing some film from the collector that bought the first autopsy, which is currently en route to us." The announcer then went on to lament the fact that despite Santilli's assurance, nothing had been provided since his interview.

A couple of months after the British broadcast, in a live interview on the Seattle television program "Town Meeting" (November 10, 1995), Santilli was blatantly attempting to convey the false impression that original film (with suitable images) from the alien autopsy footage had been submitted worldwide. On the program he stated, "Film with image and not leader tape has been given, and...that film has been given to the English broadcasters, the French broadcasters..." When asked specifically about Kodak, he stated, "It has been submitted to Kodak by the broadcasters."

Extensive checking, however, has revealed that no broadcaster, either French, English, or any other nationality, or the Eastman Kodak Company, has ever been given a single frame "with image" of the alleged alien autopsy footage. Furthermore, the only way that anyone has ever seen the alien autopsy sequence is on video. So far as is known, no one has ever seen it projected from 16mm film.

KODAK'S UNACCEPTED OFFER

Eastman Kodak in Rochester, New York, has been standing by since July 1995 with an open offer to authenticate the film's date of manufacture. I confirmed this fact in a recent telephone conversation with Tony Amato, the Kodak motion-picture product specialist who would oversee the authentication process. Amato told me that Kodak has received repeated promises during the last six months from Santilli through an intermediary in the United States that film meeting the required criteria was "on its way."

According to Tony Amato, while the short-term loan of a complete reel of film would be desirable, Kodak would be willing to work with as little as two or three frames. The only "damage" to the film would be a small punch-hole in one frame -- not much of a sacrifice, especially considering the increased value authentication would bring. (With 16mm film, one frame represents 1/24th of a second — less than 1/25,000th of an 18-minute sequence.)

Amato explained that since the chemical composition of Kodak film has changed through the years, the approximate date of manufacture of a given piece of film

can be determined by analyzing its exact chemical makeup and matching it with records of the chemical formulas for Kodak film from different years. Because Kodak never releases the formulas for any of its film, authentication of the film's date of manufacture by any other laboratory or institution would be of questionable value. Any film received by Kodak for testing would be returned intact (with the exception of the one small punch-hole in one frame) within a couple of weeks.

THE "COLLECTOR"

In the August 28, 1995, British television interview (quoted previously), Santilli referred to "the collector that bought the first autopsy." The alien autopsy film's being in the possession of a wealthy collector has been given as a reason for its unavailability. Thanks to the admirable efforts of the investigative team at Television France One (TF1), the only network in the world to do a true investigation into the matter of the Santilli film, we now know not only the name of the mysterious, so-called collector, Volker Spielberg, but also some things about Spielberg's background and business activities. Spielberg, like Santilli, is in the video distribution business. He has a small office in Hamburg, Germany, but presently resides in Austria.

During a live interview on TF1's October 23, 1995, "Jacques Pradel" special about the alien autopsy footage, Ray Santilli, when pressed about providing the original film, danced around the issue and reiterated that matters were out of his hands. TF1 then showed video clips of Volker Spielberg's business office in a small cottage in Hamburg, Germany, and his apartment in Austria with his name visible on a common doorbell marker. It was then announced that TF1's background check revealed that Volker Spielberg was in fact *not* a film collector. At this point, Santilli became noticeably angry and accused TF1 of violating their agreement to keep certain aspects of the film story confidential. The announcer, Jacques Pradel, responded by pointing out that Santilli had failed to live up to certain promises he had made (such as providing the original film).

TF1 also played an excerpt from the recording of a September 28, 1995, phone conversation between TF1 investigator Nicolas Maillard and Volker Spielberg. Maillard, whose demeanor was very courteous throughout the conversation, noted the potential importance of the supposed film that Spielberg possessed and asked for his cooperation in submitting it for verification. A partial transcript of Volker Spielberg's remarks follows.

"I want to be left alone. I'm a collector, I want to be out, and I want to have no contact with nobody regarding this matter because this is my personal thing ... Simply I'm not interested. You see, the whole matter is of no interest to me, I have made up my mind. I have my belief and that's it. And I got what I want. I'm happy and that's it."

"What have I to do with this? As to my knowledge, I'll keep all the cans, yes, as to my knowledge, that's all I can tell you. Well, as to my knowledge I am, uh, possess all the film reels. Whether this is true or not, that's not up to me to judge, but that is my belief, yes.

"I don't want to support any f__kin' TV or radio station in this particular matter, no!...Come on, I've done my job, and all I can tell you is I'm happy, I got what I want, and that's it. I haven't bartered for any broadcast of public, and for any f__kin' papers and all that's going on worldwide. I'm not happy about it anyway. But, that's a different story. I have to accept that and I have to admit it's much too late to stop it, but no, I just want to be, if I may say so to you, left alone, okay ..."

When asked by Maillard if he didn't think this was something that should be shared with all humanity, Spielberg's answer was resoundingly clear!


"No, no, I don't think so, I have a totally different opinion, f__k the world, I mean, the world is full of egoism and so am I ..."

During the weekend of October 28, 1995 (a week after the "Jacques Pradel" show), TF1 investigators learned of a confidential meeting in Hamburg, Germany, between Ray Santilli, Volker Spielberg, and one or two other individuals. As it turns out, Santilli and Spielberg are apparently friends, as well as business partners, and have worked together before. Reportedly, the primary topic of discussion at the Hamburg meeting was a future CD-ROM project involving the music of Frank Sinatra.

THE MISSING SECURITY MARKINGS

One of the more bizarre aspects of the alien autopsy story is the relatively short videotape that has come to be called the "tent footage." Unlike the other alleged autopsy film, the tent footage has not been publicly distributed or marketed. Videotape copies, however, were reportedly given to Philip Mantle, Reg Presley, and Colin Andrews in January 1995. The tent footage depicts some kind of emergency medical procedure or autopsy being carried out on an alleged alien in what appears to be a tent or barn. The picture quality is very poor, supposedly due to poor lighting, making it difficult, if not impossible, to accurately distinguish features. The alleged alien is different from the alien in the other autopsy footage in that it appears to have skinny limbs and to be much taller. This discrepancy has not been explained. With respect to the circumstances surrounding the scene, Colin Andrews wrote in his newsletter, "Santilli verified that the photographer does indeed claim that this was an emergency procedure carried out in a barn at the crash site after discovering that one of the two aliens was in fact still alive."

In the July 30, 1995, edition of the British newspaper *Sunday Times*, an article titled "Film that 'proves' aliens visited earth is a hoax," by investigative journalist Maurice Chittenden, described the tent scene and some unusual security markings that appeared on the bottom



Alleged security marking.

right-hand side of the screen throughout the film — markings that disappeared after their authenticity was challenged:

RESTRICTED ACCESS
A01 CLASSIFICATION
SUBJECT 1 of 2
JULY 30th 1947

The *Sunday Times* article points out, however, that "restricted access" is not a recognized U.S. military code and that the A01 classification had been dismissed as "pure Hollywood." Even more telling is the month-day-year format of the date. The U.S. military always uses a day-month-year format. Therefore, the date should have read "30 July 1947."

Chittenden revealed that "later, when film of the same autopsy was shown to John Purdie of Union Pictures...the coding had disappeared." Chittenden also reported that conflicting explanations were offered for the discrepancy. A British business associate of Ray Santilli's, Gary Shoefield, stated that no footage marked "Restricted Access" had ever been released. However, when Santilli was contacted, he claimed that he had found the markings on one of the film canisters and had decided to run them on the film. Yet, a month earlier in an email letter to researcher James Easton, Santilli had indicated that the markings had been on the film since before he obtained it from the cameraman. Santilli wrote to Easton, "On part of the tent footage there is a date board...It could be the date of process (developing), we don't know."

Last summer, a reception was held in movie producer John Purdie's London office for the "commissioning editors" of Channel Four television. Philip Mantle, who attended the reception, said that Santilli and a business associate, Chris Carey, brought along and showed a videotape copy of the "tent footage," which was — unlike copies of the tent scene shown before or since — of very good quality. According to Mantle,

the two supposed doctors working on the alleged alien were not wearing surgical masks, and their faces were clearly visible.

By way of contrast, the quality of the tent scene video delivered to TF1 and other television networks that paid big money for the broadcast rights was of such poor quality that it was considered unusable. Unlike the copy shown in Purdie's office, the faces of the medical personnel were no longer recognizable. This is significant. If a time-period film is hoaxed, it is important that there be no recognizable faces, especially if it's going to be shown on worldwide television. If one actor were recognized, it would all be over. (This is almost certainly why the observer behind the glass partition in the other autopsy sequence was inappropriately wearing a surgical mask.)

In addition to *The Sunday Times*, a number of other mainstream British newspapers have run stories declaring the alien autopsy film a hoax. Interestingly, one British paper, *The Mail on Sunday*, made a rather curious discovery while researching the film. Reportedly, a routine check of their database revealed that Santilli had contacted the paper four years earlier claiming to have information on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Shroud of Turin.

DEBRIS REFLECTING SUPER (UN)ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY

Instead of the originally described dramatic scene with hilly terrain, a crane, a craft broken into large pieces, men in uniform, military equipment etc., the Santilli film "debris site" consists of the tops of two adjacent, small, wooden tables upon which lies some very unimpressive-looking material — not much for the remains of an extraterrestrial spacecraft that would reflect an unimaginable degree of technological sophistication and whose remains were reportedly scattered over a three-quarter-mile-long area. What's shown, is, in fact, laughable.

The camera focuses first on a couple of slabs of material (approximately two by three feet and three inches thick) with embedded six-fingered hand prints — obviously to underscore the polydactyl quality of the aliens. Billed by Fox as possible alien "control panels," the slabs look more like pieces from the pavement in front of Mann's Chinese Theater (formerly Grauman's) in Hollywood.

Next we are shown an I-beam, complete with symbols. Although quite different from the I-beam described by Jesse Marcel, Jr., it was undoubtedly inspired by it. While a true I-beam is a structural member with an I-like cross section designed to maximize strength, it is obvious that the cross section of this I-beam does not meet that criterion. Instead, the beam looks suspiciously like a prop fashioned in a sheet metal shop.

Quite possibly, the most damning evidence against the Santilli film yet comes from the symbols on the I-

beam. Commenting on those symbols, Cliff Wallace of *Creature Effects* at Pinewood Studios, London, pointed out that special-effects people sometimes leave a subtle clue as a kind of signature to their work. As could be seen in the British documentary (though the point was ignored by Fox), the clue in this case is hardly subtle. The symbols, supposedly from an alien alphabet, spell out the words "VIDEO O TV." Although the "E" and the "T" are disguised (embedded in a hieroglyph), the outlines of the letters are present.

In essence, six characters from the Roman alphabet, four readily recognizable and two disguised, correctly spell out two words in the English language — words that are related to both the subject at hand and to each other. This is hardly chance. The difficulty in creating even a remote resemblance to an English word — any English word — using characters from an alphabet derived independently of the Roman alphabet, such as the Arabic alphabet, illustrates that point.

With such convincing evidence for a hoax and so much money having changed hands — far more than with the hoaxed Hitler Diaries — one has to wonder why no police agency has investigated the alien autopsy affair. On May 31, 1995, I faxed a letter and material on the alien autopsy film to the "Serious Fraud Office" of Scotland Yard, presumably the most appropriate agency to handle such a case.

In response, I received a polite letter dated June 19, 1995, from a Martin Pinfold at the Serious Fraud Office, stating that this was not "a matter suitable for investigation by this office." In a follow-up phone call, I was told that before they could act, "there had to be a victim in the U.K." Astoundingly, then, in the eyes of Scotland Yard, it's acceptable to run an operation out of London, victimizing people in the United States and elsewhere, as long as no British citizen is affected.

THE CAMERAMAN

In the 1995 Fox documentary "Alien Autopsy: Fact or Fiction," the interview with Ray Santilli begins with the announcer stating, "*Ray Santilli owns a small music and video distribution company in London. He was acquiring some 1950s rock and roll footage when an elderly American cameraman he had been dealing with said, 'By the way, I have something else to show you.'*" Santilli then continues, "*And, you know, we looked at it. It was just the most incredible piece of film, and obviously my first impression is this can't be real.*" The program continues with the announcer telling about the purchase of the "alien autopsy" film and Santilli recounting the cameraman's story.

In a July 1995 email exchange, Ray Santilli wrote researcher James Easton, "I have spent some time with the cameraman and now have a full and detailed statement which I am sure you will find very interesting." The statement, reportedly transcribed by Santilli's secretary from a recording, recounts the

same basic story Santilli has told in numerous interviews, but in more detail.

Santilli's "detailed statement," titled "The Cameraman's Story," however, is inherently implausible. The cameraman told of being stationed in Washington, D.C., and being flown by way of Wright Patterson to Roswell (after having been told initially that he was to film the crash of a Russian spy plane). Because the trip was a distance of over 1600 miles — an all-day trip, even by air, in 1947 — it would have therefore been impossible for him to have arrived much sooner than 10 to 12 hours after the crash was discovered. Yet the cameraman described filming the initial approach of soldiers to the downed spacecraft and the "screams of the freak creatures that were lying by the vehicle," screams that got "even louder" as they were approached. The idea is preposterous that the military would have waited for a lone cameraman to fly more than halfway across the country before they made a move or started filming.

One almost humorous aspect of the American cameraman's story is that it was told in British English. While the nuances may not be readily apparent to those who speak the "King's English" (the language would, naturally, seem normal to them), they are obvious to Americans. Certain expressions are a dead giveaway, such as "I joined the forces," "I fast learnt," "Assistant Chief of Air Staff" (a Royal Air Force term), "no messing," "the decision was taken," "a flattop," "a further three weeks," etc.

Apparently, Santilli's cameraman really got around. Not only did he film the monumental recovery operation at Roswell, he also claimed to have filmed the first atomic bomb (Trinity) test. Also, according to his statement, just prior to being called to Roswell, he "had not long returned" (more British English) from St. Louis, Missouri, where he had filmed the McDonnell Aircraft Company's new ramjet helicopter, the XH-20, nicknamed "Little Henry." Unfortunately, there's a major problem for the cameraman here. On October 16, 1995, Nicolas Maillard of TF1 received a faxed letter from the public relations department at McDonnell Douglas (successor of the McDonnell Aircraft Company), confirming that McDonnell used *their own employees*, not military cameramen, to film all tests, including those of the XH-20 ramjet helicopter, "Little Henry." The letter gave the names of the two McDonnell employees who would have shot the Little Henry tests — Chester Turk, who shot motion, and Bill Schmitt, who shot stills.

Santilli has given the name of the cameraman as "Jack Barnett." In January 1995, he confided the name to Philip Mantle, Reg Presley, and Colin Andrews. On June 22, 1995, Philip Mantle, by prior arrangement with Santilli, received a telephone call from the alleged cameraman, who identified himself as Jack Barnett.

Ray Santilli promised TF1 that they would receive a call from the cameraman, Jack Barnett, in early September 1995, but the call never came. Santilli did,

however, agree to relay a list of questions from TF1 to the cameraman. On September 14, 1995, approximately three days after the list was submitted, TF1 received a fax from Ray Santilli with the answers from the supposed cameraman. Two of the answers were of particular interest. TF1 asked, "What tests of the ramjet 'Little Henry' did you film in St. Louis in May 1947?" The answer, "*Initial experimental tests*," reiterated the cameraman's claim that he had filmed McDonnell Aircraft Company's testing of its "Little Henry" ramjet helicopter — a claim that we now know is impossible since McDonnell used its own employees to film such tests.

The cameraman's answer to a question by TF1 as to "why the army didn't use color film for such an event" was also very telling. "*I was given instructions to leave immediately to film an aviation crash of a Russian spy plane. I did not have time to order either colour film stock or special camera equipment. I used standard issue film stock and a standard issue Bell and Howell.*" Hypothetically, such an answer could explain why the cameraman didn't use color film at the initial crash scene. However, such an answer in no way explains why he didn't use color film for the autopsies — which he claims took place a month later in July in Fort Worth, Texas.

THE STING

It is important to keep in mind that in television interviews, radio interviews, personal interviews, and Internet postings, Ray Santilli has repeatedly told of how the cameraman, after having shown Santilli the Elvis film, announced that he had "something else" to show him — the now-famous "alien autopsy" footage. Santilli has repeatedly and unequivocally claimed that the cameraman from whom he acquired the 1955 Elvis footage was the same cameraman from whom he purchased the alien autopsy footage.

The big break in the investigation of the alien autopsy film came at the end of September, 1995, when TF1 reporter Nicolas Maillard located Cleveland, Ohio, disc jockey Bill Randle, the real source of the early Elvis Presley footage — footage which Santilli said had been sold to him by the cameraman during a trip to the United States in 1993. As it turns out, the purchase of the Elvis film actually took place in Bill Randle's office on July 4, 1992, in the presence of Gary Shoefield. In a November 28, 1995, phone conversation, Bill Randle told me that as soon as Santilli purchased the film (after hours of negotiations), he immediately turned around and sold it to Gary Shoefield, who was representing the British film company Polygram. The transaction took place right in Randle's office.

The footage, to which Santilli purchased the rights, is the first-known film of Elvis Presley live on stage and is part of a larger documentary that was a joint effort between Bill Randle and Universal Pictures in 1955. The footage sold to Santilli is relatively short and includes



Combat cameraman Dan McGovern on August 17, 1943, in front of a B-17 bomber just after returning from a mission over Germany, where he shot some of the footage used in the wartime documentary *Memphis Bell*, and where his aircraft was almost shot down.

segments from two concerts — an afternoon performance at a Cleveland high school and an evening show at a local Cleveland auditorium. Both performances took place on Thursday, July 20, 1955, and featured the Four Lads, Bill Haley and the Comets, Pat Boone, and the then-unknown Elvis Presley. Both performances were filmed by a freelance photographer who had been hired by Bill Randle — a photographer named *Jack Barnett*.

We now know the origin of the name “Jack Barnett” — the name Santilli told to Philip Mantle, Reg Presley, and others as the name of his alleged cameraman. The *real* Jack Barnett was born of Russian parents on January 1, 1906, and died in 1967. Although he was a newsreel cameraman on the Italian front during WWII, he was never in the U.S. military.

Armed with this new and very telling information, the plan of TF1 was to confront Santilli during a live interview on the October 23, 1995, “Jacques Pradel” special. While every effort was made to keep the discovery of Bill Randle confidential, Santilli may have been tipped off prior to the show. He seemed relatively poised after a pre-taped interview of Randle was played, and immediately offered a new story — fundamentally different from what he had told previously. His initial remark was reminiscent of the classic “I’m so glad you asked”

response politicians give when they are asked the question they least want to hear. Santilli opened with, “Well, firstly, I’m very pleased that you have found Bill Randle...” (If Santilli was so pleased, why did Bill Randle have to be *found* in the first place?)

At that point, Santilli described a new and changed scenario in which the person from whom he had purchased the Elvis footage was not really the military cameraman after all. He now claimed that he had met the real cameraman *after* he purchased the rights to the Elvis footage from Bill Randle in Cleveland during the summer of 1992 (previously Santilli had given the year as 1993). Everyone, including the host, Jacques Pradel, seemed incredulous. With time running out, the show then went into its concluding segment, playing the Volker Spielberg tape, at which point Santilli, as previously mentioned, became noticeably upset.

THREE REAL MILITARY CAMERAMEN

Among the unsung heroes of the innumerable battles of this century are the men who recorded those battles for posterity, the combat cameramen. As the pictures they took reveal, whether at the front lines with the soldiers or marines, on the decks of ships amidst sailors manning guns, or in high-flying aircraft with the pilots and bombardiers, they were right alongside those whose actions they recorded — often taking the same risks and suffering the same high casualty rates. During the course of investigating this film, I was fortunate enough to be put in touch with three such men, Joe Longo, Bill Gibson, and Dan McGovern, all former WWII combat cameramen, and all of whom have remained active in the professional photography business to this day. Additionally, all three have been extremely helpful and accommodating in the effort to investigate the Santilli film.

An entire volume could be written about the exploits of these three retired combat cameramen. Joe Longo is president of the International Combat Camera Association, an organization consisting of several hundred former combat cameramen from throughout the world. He served as a combat cameraman for the Air Force in the Pacific theater during WWII, then again during the Korean Conflict. After leaving the military in 1956, he went to work as a cameraman at the Lookout Mountain Air Force Station in Southern California. In his job there, he worked on classified research projects with the Atomic Energy Commission, as well as the X-15 project. In the early 1960s, he shot the famous scene of test pilot Scott Crossfield’s X-15 falling away from under the wing of a B-52 bomber, firing its rocket engine, on its way into space, 50 miles up.

Bill Gibson has the unusual background of having served as a combat cameraman in all three branches of the armed services. In April 1942, he photographed the launching of 16 B-25s on their way to the famous “Doolittle Raid” over Tokyo. The scene of the heavily

laden bombers lumbering off the deck of the aircraft carrier *Hornet*, barely making it airborne, is one of the more famous of WWII. Years later, he would photograph another famous launching, that of *Apollo 11* on its way to the moon.

Not long after the Doolittle Raid, Bill Gibson's ship, the *Hornet*, was torpedoed and sunk. Gibson along with other survivors was rescued by another American ship, the *USS Hughes*. After the war, Gibson photographed the early American V-2 launches at White Sands, as well as the balloon launches and recovery operations of Project Mogul. In the late 1940s, he worked on two Air Force classified UFO-related projects, Grudge and Twinkle. In the late 1960s, he was a consultant to NASA, designing the camera that brought us man's first steps on the moon. As if all that were not enough, he was assigned to the White House for an eight-month period during which he covered President Truman. No stranger to world figures, Bill Gibson's assignments also included Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, Ronald Reagan, and George Bush, as well as Winston Churchill, Albert Schweitzer, and Wernher von Braun, with whom he became close personal friends.

Retired Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Daniel A. McGovern served during WWII with the Eighth Air Force in the European theater, where he was a combat cameraman on B-17 bombers flying highly dangerous missions over Germany. He shot much of the footage used in the famous wartime documentary *Memphis Belle*. On one mission, flak (antiaircraft artillery) blew a hole in the B-17 at his station only moments after he had stepped away. Another time he survived a crash landing in southern England after his aircraft had been downed by flak.

After the Japanese surrender in August 1945, McGovern was the first American military cameraman to photograph the devastation on the ground at both Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Just four weeks after the atomic bombs had been dropped, McGovern was on the scene at both cities, where he shot thousands of feet of 16mm color film. The historical footage was classified shortly after it was shot. Much of it has still never been seen by the public.

Like Bill Gibson, in the late 1940s, McGovern worked on the classified projects Twinkle and Grudge, where he was the project officer. For a six-month period, the Air Force, using cameras on the ground and aboard jet aircraft, attempted to capture on film the UFOs that were frequenting an area of New Mexico between Kirtland AFB and the White Sands Missile Range. Although no UFOs were successfully recorded on film, a number were sighted visually, including several by McGovern. According to a written statement by Colonel McGovern, "...the objects came from below the horizon, at high speed, at an angle of some 45 degrees and at an altitude of some 70,000 or 80,000 feet, changed their direction from a vertical climb to horizontal, then the



Lieutenant Colonel Dan McGovern at the time of his retirement in October 1961 at Vandenberg AFB, where he was commander of the photographic squadron.


brilliant white light emitted from the UFOs disappeared in the skies."

McGovern remained in "specialized photography" during his 20-year career in the military. When he retired in 1961, he was stationed at Vandenberg AFB, California, where he was the commander of the Photographic Squadron. After his retirement from the military, he became the civilian chief of the photographic division for the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards AFB, California.

A PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENT

Part of the modus operandi of the military is regimentation, discipline, and strict adherence to prescribed procedures. That is the way it has to be. The mission of the military demands it. Military photographers are no exception. They receive much the same training and are subject to the same rules and regulations as other soldiers. Dan McGovern, Bill Gibson, and Joe Longo all viewed the alien autopsy footage, as well as photocopies of film box labels furnished by Santilli to TF1, supposedly supplied by his cameraman. The three former military cameramen all noted a number of significant discrepancies — some of which are described below — in both the film itself and the story behind it.

From the standpoint of appropriate military procedures applicable at the time and which would have definitely been followed, the scenario recounted by



Bill Gibson (left) and Joe Longo (right) as civilian cameramen working for McDonnell Douglas in the late 1970s. This specially modified B-25 bomber was used by McDonnell Douglas to photograph other aircraft in flight.

Santilli's alleged cameraman makes no sense. The cameraman claims that he was stationed in Washington, D.C., and flown on June 1, 1947, to Roswell, New Mexico. McGovern, Gibson, and Longo point out, however, that there were qualified cameramen with top-secret security clearances stationed at military installations all over the country, including New Mexico. Cameramen, both "motion" and "still," from a local military installation such as Roswell or Alamogordo — not from Washington, D.C. — would have been dispatched immediately to the scene.

According to Santilli, his cameraman claims that he processed the film himself and that authorities in Washington did not bother to collect all the reels. Our three cameramen consider this claim total nonsense. On top-secret projects, a cameraman *never, under any circumstances*, processed the film himself. Additionally, military regulations required that all film, developed or undeveloped, had to be accounted for — not just every reel, but every frame of every reel. To ensure compli-

ance, either the length of the film on a reel was physically measured (e.g., 99 feet, 10 frames) or a machine called a "frame counter" was used. Furthermore, according to Santilli's cameraman, there were only three autopsies. The footage he allegedly kept covered a major part of one of those autopsies. On that basis alone, it is inconceivable that the authorities overseeing the operation would have overlooked so much missing film.

Three basic types of film were used by the military in 1947, 16mm color, 35mm black and white, and 16mm black and white. For very special or important projects (as the autopsy of an alien would have been) 16mm color film was used. Furthermore, McGovern, who filmed a number of autopsies, was very positive that *all* medical procedures were shot in color. He also stated that for important medical procedures, two cameras were used, both in fixed positions. The first camera was mounted on a tripod sitting on a "riser" (for extra elevation) adjacent to the operating or autopsy table. The second camera was overhead, mounted on the ceiling.

Our three cameramen pointed out that a “motion” picture cameraman would almost always be accompanied by a “still” photographer. The two would work together as a team. During an autopsy, every step of the procedure would be carefully photographed by the “still” photographer, who would invariably be visible in the “motion” picture. (Medical people have also stated that still pictures definitely would have been taken.) In the Santilli alien autopsy film, there is no evidence whatsoever that stills were taken.

Even the technique of Santilli’s cameraman, according to our three cameramen, was inconsistent with the highly standardized procedures and methods used by military cameramen at that time. McGovern, Gibson, and Longo are in a position to know — all three trained other military cameramen. All three consider the quality of the camera work in the Santilli film appalling and, for a myriad of reasons, not even close to meeting military standards. As Joe Longo put it, “If anybody in my unit shot film in that manner, he’d be back scrubbing pots in the kitchen.”

According to the box label submitted by Santilli, the film used was Kodak “High Speed Super-XX Panchromatic Safety Film.” According to McGovern, Gibson, and Longo, with a Bell and Howell Model 70 (the camera used by the alleged cameraman), the depth of field should have been very good when using this film. Consequently, even with the apparent mediocre lighting conditions in the Santilli autopsy film, the picture quality should have been excellent. Our cameramen all agreed that using the Bell and Howell Model 70 and Super-XX film, with the focus set at 25 feet and the aperture at F-8, under normal indoor lighting, everything from about a foot and a half to infinity would be in focus. This should have been the case with the Santilli film, but it obviously was not. McGovern concluded that the Santilli film was “deliberately blurred so that no subject is visible in detail.”

McGovern, Gibson, and Longo also noted problems with the labeling on the film box. For example, the seal with the eagle — probably placed there to give it an official look — was something none of them had ever seen. In their experience, of the thousands of boxes of film ordered by the military from Kodak, none were stamped with seals. One of the Santilli labels reads “Reel # 52; Truman; 85 Filter 2/3 stop; Force X 2 stop - Possible.” All three cameramen noted that an “85 filter” was used only with color film. The “2/3 stop” indicates the amount of light that would be blocked by the filter and “Force X 2 stop” indicates the amount of additional exposure time required to compensate for the resultant loss of light. In effect, it is a prescription for underexposing and then compensating by overdeveloping the film — a procedure that would unnecessarily increase the graininess and lower the resolution of the picture.

An additional discrepancy concerning the labeling on the film box was caught by McGovern. McGovern, who was born and received his early education in Ireland, noticed immediately that the writing on the box was in European-style handwriting — something that would have been most unusual for a cameraman who was supposedly born and raised and had spent most of his life in Ohio.

AN OFFER BY COLONEL MCGOVERN

Even if, despite all the previously mentioned discrepancies, business partners Ray Santilli and Volker Spielberg submit a suitable sample of film to Kodak and, against all expectations, the film is authenticated as 1947 vintage, it would still be necessary to authenticate the ultimate source of the film — the cameraman. Without the cameraman, this film is like a loose piece of celluloid floating in the wind, not anchored to reality. No matter how convincing, no laboratory test anywhere would in itself constitute complete authentication of the film and what it purports to represent.

On the basis of the information that has been made available to him, Dan McGovern, like his colleagues, Bill Gibson and Joe Longo, feels the Santilli film is a fraud. However, McGovern is willing to keep an open mind and to give Santilli the benefit of the doubt. Just as Kodak has offered to authenticate the film, Colonel McGovern has offered to authenticate the cameraman. McGovern would require the cameraman’s full name and serial number so that he could verify his military service with the Air Force Records Center in St. Louis, Missouri. Colonel McGovern, a man of his word and a man who has held a top-secret security clearance, would reveal only his conclusion. He would keep all other information, including the cameraman’s identity, strictly confidential, revealing it to no one. The secret of the alleged cameraman’s identity would surely be safer with McGovern, who has no axe to grind, than it would be with the two foreign businessmen who are now supposedly aware of it and who would have much to gain by revealing the name, since the value of their film would soar with confirmation of the cameraman.

Aside from the cameraman’s name and serial number, the only other requirement of Colonel McGovern is that the cameraman make one 15-minute phone call to McGovern. At the time of his retirement, McGovern was one of the highest ranking photographic managers in the military. Considering his experience, he is probably the most qualified person available to evaluate the alleged cameraman. In short, authentication by him would be of extreme value because no impostor in the world could fool Colonel Dan McGovern. Furthermore, Santilli’s alleged cameraman, who was stationed in Washington D.C. in June 1947, would surely enjoy talking with McGovern because, in addition to a common background and probable common acquaintances, they have something else unique in common. In June 1947,

Colonel Dan McGovern was a "motion picture project officer" for the Air Force — *stationed in Washington, D.C.*

THE KODAK-MCGOVERN CHALLENGE

Many have now charged that the "alien autopsy" film is a fraud and the marketing scheme surrounding it an absolute scam. It is possible, however, to quickly and easily lay all doubt to rest, once and for all. Two very reasonable offers of verification have been made — Eastman Kodak to verify the film, and Colonel McGovern the cameraman. Verification by either would increase the monetary value of the film exponentially. Both Mr. Santilli and Mr. Spielberg have stated unequivocally that they believe the film genuine. If that is truly the case, they would have nothing to lose and everything to gain by submitting the film for verification. As experienced businessmen, they are certainly fully aware of that fact. Let them then stand behind their word and, as any reasonable person or businessman would do under such circumstances, accept either Kodak's offer or Colonel McGovern's, or, preferably, both.

Unfortunately, that is not likely to happen. We will almost certainly never see the acceptance of either offer. If past actions are any indication of future actions, as surely as the sun rises and sets, Santilli and Spielberg will continue to make excuses, false claims, and abundant promises with regard to authentication, but they will *never* follow through. They unquestionably have little choice. To prove an article genuine, in reality, it has to be genuine. To prove you are telling the truth, in reality, you have to be telling the truth. One cannot deliver what does not exist. A pattern of continually maneuvering to conceal or withhold critical evidence, as we have seen in this case, leads only to one inescapable conclusion — *there is no cameraman and there is no film.*

According to a well-known story, it was once pointed out to nineteenth century showman and circus owner Phineas T. Barnum that customers were angry with him because they found out after having paid their admission that the "freaks" in his show were hoaxes. Barnum's legendary reply was that he was not concerned about losing business because "there's a sucker born every minute." Whether or not this particular anecdote is true, we should not forget that such a mentality is widespread in today's world. Trickery and deceit are abundant. We cannot always assume the same high standards of honesty and integrity in others that we may exhibit ourselves or find in those to whom we are close. The individuals who have created, marketed, and profited from the "alien autopsy" film are more than just aware of P. T. Barnum's philosophy. They have put it into practice on a grand scale. Barnum would be smiling.

ADDENDUM

A letter, including a copy of this article, has been sent to the chief executive officer of the Fox Entertainment Group, Rupert Murdoch. The letter requests that the Fox network, in the interest of honest journalism, refrain from airing any future version of "Alien Autopsy: Fact or Fiction," until Ray Santilli has accepted both Eastman Kodak Corporation's offer to authenticate the film and Colonel Dan A. McGovern's offer to authenticate the cameraman. The chief executive officers of the other major television networks in the United States, as well as several in Europe, have also been sent a copy of this article and the letter to Rupert Murdoch.

This article (*IRI Bulletin #5*) and the letter to Rupert Murdoch are available on the International Roswell Initiative (IRI) Internet Web page: <<http://www.roswell.org>>. Additionally, any meaningful response from Fox will be posted on the Web page. Rupert Murdoch can be reached at Fox Entertainment Group, P.O. Box 900, Beverly Hills, CA 90213. The International Roswell Initiative can be reached at 3105 Gables Drive, Atlanta, GA 30319 USA. (Phone/Fax: 404 240-0655 / Email: Roswelldc@aol.com)

I would like to thank Bob Durant, Steve Gill, Gayle Nesom, Joanne Pianka, and Rebecca Schatte for their input and many helpful suggestions. All are excellent writers in their own right. Finally, I would like to thank Bill Gibson, Joe Longo, and Dan McGovern. Because of their help in this quest for the truth, we may all better see the alien autopsy footage for what it is.

A Journal First!

We are pleased that Kent Jeffrey, coordinator of the International Roswell Initiative (IRI), selected the *MUFON UFO Journal* as his first choice for publication of the above material. Following its appearance here, the article will be reprinted either in part or in its entirety by UFO organizations in 13 other countries — Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, England, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Spain, and Sweden. Graham Birdsall will announce the testimony of the three military cameramen uncovered by Jeffrey and associates at a UFO conference in Leeds, England, on March 2nd. A press release aimed at major news outlets will attract even more worldwide attention. The article will also be posted on the World Wide Web at <http://www.roswell.org>.

IRI is a serious grassroots organization with the goal of getting to the truth about the 1947 Roswell UFO incident. It has already collected over 20,000 signed copies of a declaration requesting an executive order to declassify any government-held information on Roswell or the UFO phenomenon in general. IRI can be reached by phone or fax at (404) 240-0655 or by e-mail at RoswellDec@aol.com.

UFO's and Mainstream Science

by Bernhard Haisch, Ph. D.

The *Journal of Scientific Exploration (JSE)*, which I edit, is a peer-reviewed research journal in which scholarly investigations on phenomena not part of the currently accepted scientific paradigms may be published. UFO's fall in this category, or more to the point, UFO's certainly fall outside the realm of mainstream science. Is there any possibility of changing this situation? The purpose of this essay is to present some ideas along these lines to the community of UFO investigators and supporters.

By way of introduction I am not myself a UFO researcher, but as editor of this unconventional journal I have been exposed to enough data and met enough serious investigators to become supportive of the need to carefully study whatever this phenomenon, or perhaps phenomena, may be. My profession is that of astronomer and by most criteria, apart from editing *JSE*, I am an insider in the scientific mainstream: author of research papers, principle investigator on NASA projects, associate editor of a leading journal in astrophysics.

The field of astronomy is supported by hundreds of millions of dollars in government research funding every year, billions if one tallies such major missions as the Hubble Space Telescope. For the recent meeting of the American Astronomical Society in San Antonio, the head of NASA, Daniel Goldin, flew down from Washington just to address us astronomers. Is there any chance that even a fraction of such support and respectability could ever come to ufology?

At the moment, no, not a chance. But as I was listening to Mr. Goldin speaking it occurred to me that some of the points he was making might be worth passing on.

Goldin made it clear that NASA's job is not to support astronomers (although it does that pretty abundantly, a situation I greatly appreciate!). Nor is NASA's job to employ engineers and astronauts to keep the shuttle flying. NASA's job, said Goldin, is to serve the American people. He mentioned a talk he had given in Bozeman and the excitement that the Hubble pictures elicited there among the ordinary men and women of Montana, far removed from NASA centers. People want to know about the universe. And people especially want to know whether there are other worlds capable of sustaining life. The fact that the announcement at the same astronomical society

meeting of the discovery of two new planets orbiting the stars 70 Virginis and 47 Ursae Majoris made the front pages of major newspapers underscores this point.

The search for the origins of life and for other planetary systems is now a cornerstone objective for NASA. Goldin discussed visionary plans to image other solar systems using huge space-based interferometers in the new millenium. He challenged us astronomers to find ways to photograph clouds and mountains on earth-like planets in other solar systems, which must be one of the most scientifically ambitious statements ever made by a head of NASA. This, in his view, is what the American people want from NASA; and I have no doubt that he is correct in his assessment.

I pose to you that there is a lesson here for ufology. If various public opinion polls are to be believed there may be more Americans who believe there is something going on having to do with UFO's than not. It even seems probable, though I do not know this to be the case, that there are more people who "believe in" UFO's than have heard about Hubble. If that is the case, Goldin's lesson for NASA would apply here too. If the American people truly want the UFO problem officially investigated, the government will do that by and by. That does not automatically mean NASA of course. Many appearances to the contrary, UFO's may have nothing to do with outer space as astronomers view the universe.

How would one bring about government-sponsored research analogous to that of astronomy or the other sciences. As Goldin urged us to do on behalf of NASA's research: write, call, visit your representatives and senators. Constituencies count. No doubt about it. NASA funds astronomical research because the American people want this; even if most of it is too esoteric for public consumption, the highlights such as Hubble images and first extra-solar planets do make the newspapers and people read with interest about what their tax dollars are paying for.

Bernhard Haisch is the Managing Editor of the *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, P.O. Box 5848, Stanford, CA 94309. E-mail: <haisch@jse.com>

The public climate is in fact more and more receptive to new ideas and is certainly keenly interested in the possibility of other intelligent life in the universe, including the possibility of evidence for such right here under our noses.

But there is a second key ingredient that really needs to come first, and all the grassroots lobbying will come to naught until this second point that Goldin made to us astronomers is translated into action in the wilds of ufology. Given a mandate to support such research, who decides what exactly will be *done*. Goldin reminded us astronomers that it is our responsibility to come up with NASA's marching orders for the start of a new century. The community of astronomers must reach consensus on prioritizing projects, and he made it clear that those of us whose projects may not make the cutoff, owing to fiscal limitations, are still obligated as members of the research community to support those that are selected. Community consensus and support of an agreed-upon plan, even by those who lost in the proposal competitions, is essential. Without that, the money would eventually stop flowing.

And there is the roadblock for ufology. There, in my view, is the principal reason civilian government money has never started flowing, or even trickling. The field is as far from consensus as it could be. There are many possible factors in this ranging from sincere and professionally motivated difference of opinion, to lack of understanding of scientific methods, focus on personal aggrandizement rather than objectivity, paranoia, etc. To be fair to the principles of objectivity and comprehensiveness one must also acknowledge the possibility that the disarray of ufology may be partially driven by official or semi-official disinformation, or even, taking the view of the respected researcher Jacques Vallee, by the UFO phenomenon itself.

But even if those darker possibilities were true, it would still be possible to press ahead if a leadership and a position could be agreed upon, at least a tentative one, a provisional one to get started, one that can be re-evaluated after things get going. One has a better chance of arriving at a destination even if one drives the car in the wrong direction and has to turn around, than if no one is ever selected to start the car and pull out the driveway!

Lest I leave the wrong impression, this is not a solicitation for anyone's vote for this astronomer to lead the charge. I have no desire to become a ufology leader, nor am I here to recommend to you in whom such leadership should be vested. My message is a simple but absolutely realistic one as evidenced by

Mr. Goldin's address. Astronomy is doing reasonably well even in today's budget climate because it is meeting a demonstrable desire of the American public and has the professional structure, stature and behaviour to effectively translate that mandate into funded programs.

The public climate is in fact more and more receptive to new ideas and is certainly keenly interested in the possibility of other intelligent life in the universe, including the possibility of evidence for such right here under our noses. It is conceivable that this could be turned into a public mandate for government-sponsored UFO research. But that can only happen if ufologists can somehow follow the successful example of the astronomical community.

This is difficult. Ph. D.'s in ufology are not conferred by respected institutions as they are in astrophysics. But there are things that can be done to start the process. Genuinely scholarly papers can be written, which the *Journal of Scientific Exploration* would consider, for example. Note that I am not trying to solicit papers; the Journal is highly selective and turns down more articles than are accepted. Journal articles are one way to interest mainstream scientists. In fact, eliciting the interest of mainstream scientists is a key factor in raising the level of UFO respectability. This is extremely difficult in the present environment of disarray, but this could change.

A 1977 poll of American astronomers, published in *JSE*, showed the following. Out of 2611 questionnaires 1356 were returned. In response to whether the UFO problem deserved further study the replies were: 23% certainly, 30% probably, 27% percent possibly, 17% probably not, 3% certainly not. Interestingly, there was a positive correlation between the amount of reading done on the subject and the opinion that further study was in order. Professional researchers would be likely to lose interest if there were a complete lack of credible data. This shows a surprisingly high level of potential interest that could be brought into the open if a proper professional structure could be provided. Scientists value their reputations more than anything, and the perceived danger of tainting one's hard won reputation by association with a disreputable activity is a major obstacle.

There is also a kind of non-linear downward spiral. Scientists are both very busy and put off by the appearance of much of ufology. As a result most scientists never look at UFO evidence, which leads to their conclusion that there is no evidence. Given the proper environment this could presumably be turned into a favorable upward non-linearity: Given "evidence of evidence," credibly, soberly presented, the interest of scientists can be piqued, which would presumably lead to the "discovery" by scientists that there is evidence.

Evidence needs to be properly analyzed and then properly presented using techniques and venues as close as possible to those of mainstream science. The disparity of the evidence appears to be confusing enough without layers of unproven theory and conspiracy.

Two other obstacles are irrationality and paranoid claims. One cannot avoid the possibility that, as Vallee argues, the element of irrationality may be the actual key and purpose of the phenomenon so as to force a change in human consciousness. This would not be welcome news for the apparently large constituency of nuts-and-bolts saucer enthusiasts, nor presumably for those who take all abduction reports at face value. And this would be very difficult for science to deal with because it is at first glance a frontal assault on science itself. But consider the advent of quantum mechanics and relativity in the early 1900's. These were frontal assaults on the prevailing classical physics that must have looked like madness to many physicists of the day. We do not read about them of course. The textbooks discuss the Einsteins and Plancks and other geniuses who prevailed, not the army of "ordinary physicists" whose careers and worldviews looked to be shattered by what must have seemed irrational to them. But life went on and science even advanced!

Scientists are also certainly not used to the possibility that a phenomenon under investigation may be subject to clandestine manipulation. This may be the greatest obstacle because of the, in my view, small possibility that there may be some truth to it. It is not hard to imagine that there may be a great deal of classified information, but that would not by itself imply any greater comprehension concerning the nature of the phenomenon by those holding — and withholding — the data. The *Journal of Scientific Exploration* is publishing formerly classified information concerning multi-million dollar remote viewing (ESP) programs funded by the CIA and other intelligence agencies over the past 20 years. Projects that were highly secret a decade or two ago are now a matter of public record.

This demonstrates two things directly analogous to the UFO situation: yes, there really were classified ESP programs as claimed; but no, the vaunted government agencies were not able to come to deeper conclusions regarding the nature of that phenomenon than was then or is now publicly available. (The two public reports — by Utts and by Hyman — on this 20-year effort disagree on the strength of the evidence for remote viewing. The view of the three leading figures in this program, Puthoff, Targ and May, with all of whom I have had in-depth discussions, is that there

were astonishing successes in a fraction of the cases. Unfortunately there was no way to distinguish in advance what would be signal from what would be noise, hence the program could not achieve its required operational intelligence potential.)

Only in the unlikely circumstance that the most paranoid vision of government conspiracy with non-earthly intelligences should prove to be true would the existence of classified programs obstruct a successful, open, funded research initiative—either by blocking outright the establishment of an open research program, or by turning it into a sham to further cover "the top secret truth." In any case, nothing would be gained by letting suspicions of this sort stop the attempt to establish an open research program. Indeed, such efforts would perhaps point to valuable indicators of opposition, if such there were.

It seems from my unique vantage point as both scientist and editor of *JSE*, that substantial evidence exists of "something going on." But in the real world of competition and politics and entrenched positions that by itself will not move the UFO debate off square one. Evidence needs to be properly analyzed and then properly presented using techniques and venues as close as possible to those of mainstream science. The disparity of the evidence appears to be confusing enough without layers of unproven theory and conspiracy. Somehow out of organization of evidence there could arise not the truth — that is too much — but there could arise a consensus on simply what to do next, who would plan it, who would execute it, how would money be spent in a responsible, accountable, way if made available. The outcome would not be "the answer," but merely and sufficiently the input for the next logical follow-on. If such a scientifically-oriented process could be started, scientists could be attracted: grassroots political lobbying could then point to realistic funding opportunities that a representative or senator would be willing to vote for and tout at the next election as his or her contribution to the legitimate needs and wishes of the public.

Even if the UFO phenomenon should turn out to be deeper than we imagine, even should it prove to transcend science as we know it, the scientific approach is the only feasible way in the real, political, economic, technological world we live in to give us some chance to control our dealings with this phenomenon, rather than letting the phenomenon entirely control us... if such it is.

Quo vadis, ufology?

SCIENCE IS NOT ALWAYS WHAT SCIENCE PROGRAMS DO: A RESPONSE TO NOVA'S PROGRAM ON UFO ABDUCTIONS

by Budd Hopkins

Readers familiar with the writings and lectures of the late Dr. Allen Hynek may recognize in the above title an expanded version of one of his most quoted bon mots, "Science is not always what scientists do." After viewing the recent *Nova* program which systematically and outrageously distorted the UFO abduction phenomenon and my work in the field, it's fair to say that *Nova* has abandoned its right to be thought of as either objective, balanced, or scientific. However, I suppose it's a perverse sort of honor to find my work trashed by people with the same intolerant mindset as those who also trashed the research of Dr. Hynek, Dr. James McDonald, and so many others who have labored in the same unfashionable vineyard.

What *Nova* presented in its luridly titled program, "Kidnapped by Aliens?", was a mangling of the truth, a polemic having absolutely nothing to do with scientific investigation. Typically, on a show filled with hostile authority figures with little or no acquaintance with the data, astronomer Carl Sagan stated that he believed all abduction accounts are delusions or hallucinations. So far, *Nova* appears unconcerned that Dr. Sagan has yet to mount a serious investigation into even *one* abduction report. Should we be concerned with a program so obviously biased? After all, my informal inquiries reveal that TV critics, media professionals and especially scientists almost universally view *Nova* as a slick operation pandering to the same sensation-seeking audiences as commercial TV. This *Nova* UFO program was designed to air during sweeps week, the period when the ratings war is at its hottest. Consequently, before they plunged in the knife later in the show, the producers began it in the most sensational tabloid style imaginable, with eerie music, foggy re-enactments and spooky lights, suggesting that *Nova* was now going head-to-head with *Hard Copy* and *Entertainment Tonight*.

But for anyone interested in truth, we must care about *Nova's* misrepresentations. The show undeniably reaches many public television viewers and is still regarded by those outside the scientific and intellectual communities as a *science* program. Its deceptions, unfortunately, will mislead a large, ultimately world-wide audience now, and in later reruns and videotape sales.

The main reason for the program's destructiveness is its message, implied and delivered directly, that all abductees all — are weak-minded patsies, delusional, or victims of repeated hallucinations. In other words, liars

aside, *all* who report such experiences are, to some extent, mentally abnormal.

What evidence does Dr. Sagan, for example, present to buttress his sweeping — and to the abductees, damning — indictment of their ability to separate fantasy from reality? None. None whatsoever. For a man regarded within popular culture as a kind of Pope of Science to offer such a wholesale denigration of UFO abductees with no supporting evidence is worse than irresponsible. In the psychological literature there is only one report of an in-depth, blind study of the mental health of abductees — the 1983 report by Dr. Elizabeth Slater — and it shows that Dr. Sagan's opinion is totally unsupportable.*

Did *Nova* make any effort to find out if there is *any* evidence supporting Sagan's "diagnosis" of the abductees he'd never met? More to the point, how many abductees on the show did *Nova* ask to submit to psychological tests, psychiatric interviews and the like? To my knowledge, *none*. John, a former counselor and one of the abductees who appears at length on the program, informed *Nova* by letter that he would present himself for any type of test, medical or psychological, that they wished to administer. If *Nova* were trying to do an objective, scientific study as they claimed, they should have instantly accepted John's offer. Instead, they chose to ignore it. When one considers the destructive conclusions *Nova* presented about the abductees they showed on camera, they cannot argue that they refused John's offer out of concern for his reputation. There seems to be only one reason to decline the opportunity of conducting psychological tests: the fear that the results might destroy their theories and thus expose *Nova's* deceptions.

Having declined to employ any scientifically valid testing, the producers went on, in effect, to have John diagnosed on the air by "experts" who'd never met him. This was the program's basic modus operandi: material that I presume was carefully preselected was presented for negative comment to experts ignorant of the mass of UFO abduction case material and who were given no opportunity to interview the witnesses. Their comments therefore have the same degree of validity as the diag-

* Slater, Dr. Elizabeth et al., *The Final Report on the Psychological Testing of UFO "Abductees"*, Washington, D.C., Fund for UFO Research, 1983.

Producer DiIanni assembled an emasculated case in which only the vaguest, most tenuous aspects of the family's testimony were presented. Having thus suppressed all of the strongest evidence, Nova went on to slander my view of the case's validity .

noses issued by pop psychologists on daytime radio and TV after two- or three-minute conversations with the caller, a practice *Nova's* producers would otherwise be the first to condemn.

But even worse is the show's blatantly dishonest presentation of a family case to which they devote a great deal of airtime. The young mother of two small children had written a letter to me, and with her permission I presented a copy of it to producer Denise DiIanni of the *Nova* staff. In her letter the young woman said this about her abduction experiences: "My memories are real and I have not had to use hypnosis to remember them." From a lifelong series of encounters she records the following details: "The 'little men' as I used to call them would enter my bedroom from the same place in the wall . . . (They) were small, had large heads with large dark eyes that seem to look right through me." Describing painful physical procedures, she added, "The tears would roll down my cheeks into my ears, an uncomfortable feeling. I was unable to wipe my tears away . . ." She described the alien figures as moving in unison, and in another encounter she described "being slowly lowered into my mattress, so slow that I would think 'hurry up, I just want to feel my mattress under me and go to sleep . . .'" On another occasion she saw her brother being taken in broad daylight: "He looked so tired and was slumped over . . . I remember being very worried that he was too little to get into that object in the sky."

In these accounts and in later, face-to-face interviews with the *Nova* crew present, she described many more experiences from childhood to the present, *all recollected without hypnosis*. What's more, her husband vividly described watching their little son being floated out of the house by the aliens while he lay paralyzed on the floor of their front hall. With *Nova's* camera recording it all, he lay down exactly where he remembered having fallen and described where each alien had been standing. He explained that the master bedroom was on the other side of the wall he was leaning against. Desperately trying to alert his sleeping wife, he showed us how he tried in vain to move his leg enough to bang against the wall to summon help.

His testimony was the most vivid and important of our visit to their home. It corroborated his wife's account and explained their powerful fear for their children's

safety. *But all of this eyewitness testimony and dramatic film footage was suppressed by Nova. All of it.*

In its place, *Nova* producer DiIanni assembled an emasculated case in which only the vaguest, most tenuous aspects of the family's testimony were presented. Having thus suppressed all of the strongest evidence, *Nova* went on to slander my view of the case's validity with the following summary: "Budd Hopkins thinks *this* [portentous pause] provides compelling evidence: Children pausing at drawings of aliens, *dreams* of strange events that feel real, and images of traumatic sexual assault, *remembered under only hypnosis!*" (My emphasis.)

Through "creative editing" I'm portrayed as trying to ascribe an abduction memory to an innocent child. In addition to the anguished father's eyewitness account of lying paralyzed while he watched the aliens taking his son out of the house, the child's mother had included in her letter the following account of what they went through when their boy was three years old:

"My husband and I saw blinking lights in my son's bedroom . . . We continue to have problems with our son at night . . . When his dad gets him dressed in the morning he will ask questions [such as] 'How do they come through the walls? How do they park it there, there's no road there . . .' He talks about tables with no legs, 'but those are the kind you don't eat on.' He tells me how chilly it was outside last night."

There is, of course, much more, all of which was known to Ms. DiIanni. But in her script I am portrayed as suspecting the boy's possible abduction solely because of one piece of evidence: a child "pausing at a drawing of an alien." As *Nova* well knows, no one on earth would ever describe that isolated, ambiguous reaction as "compelling evidence" — unless their goal was a conscious attempt to make the individual look like a fool.

I won't devote much time to demonstrate the ways *Nova* edited my hypnotic sessions to make it appear that I'm leading the witness, though I must provide at least one. For many years I've used what I call the "body inventory" method to avoid leading hypnotic subjects. When the witness describes being stretched out on an examination table, I say that we will now explore all the sensations that he/she feels from the feet, systematically up through the body, to the top of the head, I explain that the subject might feel a different sensation in some part of the body: pleasure, pain, an itch, a tickle, heat, cold, etc. — *or* that that part of the body may feel perfectly normal. I begin with the feet, proceed to the ankles, shins, calves, then the thighs, the sexual organs, the lower abdomen, the stomach and chest, the arms and hands, the head, and then the eyes, the nose, inside and out, the mouth, inside and out, and the ears, inside and out. The purpose is to *avoid* leading the subject to any one particular part of the body by naming most all of them at the very outset. *Nova*, of course,

didn't devote even three words of explanation to this painstakingly slow and objective process — it can take up to a half hour — but suddenly cut in as I direct the subject's attention to her "female parts . . ." To put the least damaging interpretation on *Nova's* deceptive editing, its result is to suggest that I'm leading the witness directly into sexual recollections or fantasies, something that a full transcript of the session would clearly refute.

When I was originally approached by *Nova's* Denise DiIanni, I was told that she would only deal with people who agreed to show their faces on national TV. I explained that of the more than 500 likely abductees I've worked with one-on-one, only about 15 would agree to appear on national TV. Unfortunately, among the 97% who declined to appear were *all* the police officers, the (7) psychiatrists, the scientists, Ph.D.'s, business executives, psychologists, physicians and even a NASA research scientist with whom I'd worked; in short, the people with the most to lose by subjecting themselves to potential public ridicule. Obviously, this reluctant 97% included the most highly credentialed and scientifically sophisticated abductees, the very individuals one would think *Nova* should be most interested in interviewing if the program were to have scientific relevance. I asked if some of these highly credible people might be allowed to discuss their abduction experiences on camera, backlit or in silhouette, but *Nova* declined, refusing to interview anyone outside the self-selected 3%. This decision alone demonstrated to me Ms. DiIanni's preference for potentially sensational TV footage over any attempt at scientific depth or inclusiveness.

The very brave handful who agreed to appear on national TV were mainly young and independent and for the most part not subject to the career risks of corporate politics. None were offered, and none requested, financial remuneration. All agreed to appear as a way of helping other abductees, in much the way a few rape victims will also come forward publically, despite potential humiliation. Rape victims are guaranteed to receive sympathy. However, the abductees on "Kidnapped by Aliens?" were subtly but thoroughly discredited, beginning with that lurid title and the question mark that cast doubt on their testimony before it was even heard. Their bravery and generous spirit of cooperation was rewarded by *Nova's* implication that all of them were either deluded, hallucinating, or simply weak-minded because, as *Nova's* experts said, such experiences simply cannot happen. At one point, physicist Paul Horowitz, who apparently has no idea of the range of evidence supporting UFO reality, categorically stated that UFOs don't exist and have never landed!

Nova interviewed me at length in my studio, and, knowing all the fashionable theories debunkers use to discredit anyone reporting an abduction experience, I chose to stress the reports that fell outside these con-

People who trust Nova will also unknowingly accept falsehoods such as the following, as true: Nova said that after the film Close Encounters appeared, the number of UFO sightings increased, an example of the media generating "false reports." But in fact during that time, the number of new sightings actually decreased.

ventional explanations. I dealt with the huge number of abduction accounts that surface *without the use of hypnosis*, knowing that *Nova* was sure to deride the process. True to form, the program implied over and over with sledgehammer thoroughness that hypnosis should be thought of as the *generating cause* of these (automatically false) abduction accounts. My discussion of contradictory data — the mass of non-hypnosis abduction reports — wasn't even mentioned on the program.

I showed producer DiIanni a collection of photographs of the physical marks and scars that are the common sequelae of UFO abductions, and urged her to interview some of the people bearing the more dramatic wounds. Since these individuals were among the 97% unwilling to run the risk of ridicule by appearing on camera, *Nova* not only refused to film them in shadow, but *the slides of their wounds and marks which I was asked to lend to Nova were never shown*. Also suppressed were the photographs I submitted showing ground traces and alterations of the soil caused by UFO landings. *Nova* staffer Liesl Clark, in charge of the program's Internet Web, informed me that to show such physical evidence would be "to open a can of worms." She was right about that.

So, after being told that the abduction phenomenon was merely an artifact of hypnosis, the public was also deliberately denied any chance to see, to hear about and to consider photographic evidence of reported alien physical procedures and UFO ground traces. Thus, another of the debunker's false but favorite myths was reinforced: "There is no physical evidence."

It's one thing, of course, to disagree as to the meaning and the degree of probative weight to ascribe to physical evidence, but it's another thing to suppress that evidence altogether.

Knowing that "sleep paralysis" is one of the most posterous general explanations of abduction reports yet offered, I described to *Nova's* representative the existence of hundreds of accounts of abductions that took place in the daytime with all of the participants fully awake, and I cited examples. Since this fact also wasn't mentioned during the program — which naturally restricted itself solely to those cases which more plausibly fit the sleep paralysis theory — the public was misled

yet again: "It's always hypnosis, there's never any physical evidence, and like sleep paralysis, it always happens at night." Ms. DiIanni knew that thousands of case reports prove all of these statements false, but chose to suppress that information, too, on her show.

Though it's been painful having to spend so much time describing *some* of *Nova's* many systematic deceptions, distortions and omissions, the denigration of thousands of decent, mentally sound people who have reported UFO abductions cannot be left unchallenged. Not once did any of *Nova's* on-camera, debunking consultants admit that any of these people might simply be telling the truth. I was not naive enough to think that *Nova*, having produced an earlier program opposing the reality of UFOs, would now turn around and proclaim the reality of UFO abductions. I was naive enough, however, to credit the producers and Ms. DiIanni in particular, with sufficient honesty to make a very small admission: that despite all the debunkers' theories, all the data has not been explained and that an intriguing mystery does remain. In my wildest imagination I never thought they would have the arrogance to imply that *all* abduction experiences can be explained away by these (mutually contradictory) debunking theories, or that in doing so *Nova* would be so unscrupulous as to deliberately suppress all evidence to the contrary.

People who trust *Nova* will also unknowingly accept falsehoods such as the following, as true: *Nova* said that after the film *Close Encounters* appeared, the number of UFO sightings increased, an example of the media generating "false reports." But in fact during that time, the number of new sightings actually *decreased*. For my part, *Nova* often referred to me as "a therapist," though they are well aware that I've never made that claim and have never charged an abductee a penny for any help I've given.

But the acceptance of false information isn't the worst result of *Nova's* deceptions. Far more damaging is the fact that anyone currently thinking of going public with a personal abduction account will be extremely hesitant to do so. Any physicians, policemen, psychiatrists, scientists, military officers or the like who have experienced UFO abductions will now have even more reason to keep silent. Having seen how *Nova* distorted and dismissed other abductees accounts, few of these potentially valuable new witnesses will agree to step forward. In the light of all this, it's fair to

describe *Nova* as having both tampered with evidence and intimidated future witnesses.

On top of everything, Ms. DiIanni's show was hyped for all the sensationalism and controversy that *Nova* could squeeze out of the subject, going so shamelessly low as to beg the on-camera abductees to appear in advertising spots without first informing them how they would be treated on the program. It was as if innocent people were being asked to sell tickets to their own public humiliation. What *Nova* produced was not a science program but a kind of middle-brow Jenny Jones or Geraldo. Denise DiIanni and executive producer Paula Apsell and all those responsible for the final edit of this show should be ashamed of themselves.

For reprints of this article on the *Nova* program, write to: Budd Hopkins — Intruders Foundation, P.O. Box 30233, NY, NY, 10011


Is anybody out there?

Half the adults in the United States believe there may be life on other planets and that the federal government could be covering up evidence about alien beings who visit Earth, according to a survey conducted by Ohio University and Scripps-Howard News Service. But people who attend church are less likely to believe in UFOs than the general public.




Here are some of the results of a nationwide survey of 1,006 adults when asked their opinions about UFOs:

"... Flying saucers are real and the federal government is hiding the truth about them from us."



Likely to believe in UFOs and a government coverup:



Margin of error is plus or minus 4 percent

ALSO WORTH NOTING

- ▶ Men are more likely than women to believe in UFOs.
- ▶ Belief in aliens who visit Earth runs highest in the Northeast and in major urban areas.
- ▶ Belief in UFOs is least likely among Americans aged 55 and over, those with postgraduate degrees, and self-identified Republicans.

Source: Ohio University, Scripps-Howard News Service

San Antonio Express News, January 20, 1996.



READER'S CLASSIFIEDS

ALIEN ABUCTION SURVIVAL GUIDE

Michelle LaVigne lays out the terrain for her fellow travelers on this bizarre road. A unique view: for therapists, investigators and experiencer families also. \$11.95 Tradepaper. Order from Wild Flower Press, PO Box 726, Newberg, OR 97132. Credit card orders: 800/366-0264.

THE ANOMALIST 3

Quality, illustrated paperback, expanded to 176 pages, still only \$9.95 + \$2.50 p/h. Articles by Michael Grosso, Hilary Evans, Peter Jordan, Doug Skinner, Martin Kottmeyer, Donna Higbee & others on ghosts, death anomalies, mystery cats, human invisibility, UFO flaps, Mars rocks on Earth & more. Checks payable to Dennis Stacy, Box 12434, San Antonio, TX 78212.

FREE CATALOG!

400 books, tapes, including: *The Miami Contacts* (videotape); *Alien Update* (Good); *Divine Encounters* (Sitchin); *The Cosmic Connection* (Hesemann); *Cosmic Voyage* (Brown); *A Common Sense Approach to UFOs* (Betty Hill); *Other Worlds, Other Lives* (Steiger). Also, 1,200,000 books, tapes on all subjects. 1-800-905-UFOS.

VIDEO/AUDIO TAPES on UFOs, crop circles, aviation mysteries, NDE, Face on Mars & other fascinating topics. Free list & sample newsletter from The Eclectic Viewpoint, Box 802735-M, Dallas, TX 75380. Future lecture hotline (214) 601-7687.

THE UFO, BIGFOOT & Loch Ness Monster Museum has moved north and will reopen soon in the S.F. area. Data, photos, etc., sought. We also do photoanalysis (& get second opinions) & field research. Crop circles, alien photos, Area 51, Roswell also. Erick Beckjord, Box 9502, Berkeley, CA 94709 (415) 974-4339, e-mail: ufomuseum@aol.com.

OVER \$3000 WORTH of new books, 1991-1995. Will sell at slightly more than half price. Mary M. Williams, Regional Director. Box 915, Beckley, WV 25802. Send request for specific titles & SASE.

GULF BREEZE UFO SPRING CONFERENCE on the beach of the beautiful Gulf of Mexico, March 15-17, 1996. Confirmed speakers: Whitley Strieber, Dr. John Mack, Edith Fiore, Ph.D., Michael Lindemann, Michael Grosso, Ph.D., Barry Downing, Ph.D., & Stanton Friedman. Information (904) 432-8888 or Fax: (904) 438-1801 or write Project Awareness, PO Box 730, Gulf Breeze, FL 32562.

FLYING SAUCER DIGEST

Recognized as the number one UFO news magazine throughout the world. First in UFO reports for over 29 years. Free 10 different UFO maps & 5 unique UFO publications with 5 issue \$10.00 subscription to Flying Saucer Digest magazine. Send to UAPA-M, Box 347032, Cleveland, Ohio 44134.

COOL UFO SHIRTS!

"I Survived Earth! We Are Not Alone." Grinning "grey" alien on white silkscreen T-shirt. Sizes S,M,L,XL, 100% cotton, \$10.50 + \$3.00 s/h to Jiminy Productions, Ltd., PO Box 16706, West Palm Beach, FL 33416. Check or MO, 1-2 weeks for delivery.

UFO CHRONOLOGY MAP

Large wall chart with instant index & guide book, featuring classic UFO cases, spectacular landings, fantastic alien encounters & most dramatic UFO sites. Just \$9.95, postage free. Also free: 3 large classic UFO illustrations, plus two UAPA magazines, a \$9.00 value. UAPA-B, Box 347032, Cleveland, Ohio 44134.

TRIFIELD NATURAL EMF METER

Reads small changes in DC magnetic field (to 1/2% of Earth's field), also radio/microwaves & DC electric field. Squelch-controlled sound & needle readout, battery & AC adapter, \$190 ppd. (\$215 with sensitivity to 1/20% of Earth's field). Bill Lee, 801-4879492 for info.

RENNES-LE-CHATEAU SOLVED

Historical secrets deciphered from 17th-century paintings by Poussin and Tonniers. Mary Magdalene married Jesus and traveled to France with sons. Three color prints, 36 figures, 185pp text on PC 3.5" 720k disk. Limited edition. U.S. orders \$29.95 + \$3.00 s/h. J. McCampbell, 12 Bryce Court, Belmont, CA 94002. Free details.

INTERNATIONAL UFO CENTER: The world's largest supplier of UFO products has ready its 1996 catalog. We are now printing our own T-shirts, hats, coffee mugs, tote bags & sweatshirts. Gone are the days of back orders for these items. Many, many new designs and products for 1996. Send \$1.00 to: IUFOC Box 7, Yalaha, FL 34797.

THE EXCYLES

Mia Adams' true story about her contacts with extraterrestrials & romance with an intelligence agent. Included is the agent's report outlining the agendas of alien confederations on Earth & the intelligence agencies network created to deal with them. Send \$16.95 + \$2 s/h to Excelta Publishing, PO Box 4530, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33338.

GREENVILLE UFO CONFERENCE

Second annual UFO & Alien Abduction Research Conference, May 4-5, 1996, Holiday Inn. Confirmed speakers include Budd Hopkins, David Jacobs, Jesse Marcel, Jr., Yvonne Smith, Katharina Wilson, Kim Carlsberg, and Darryl Anka. For ticket info & registration, call or write Shannon Kluge, 102 Woodridge Circle, Greenville, S.C. Ph: (803) 675-9328.

DON'T LET SUN SHINE ON UFOs

If you want to believe in UFO-abductions, Roswell crashed saucers, Alien Autopsies & Government cover-up, do NOT DARE to read Skeptics UFO Newsletter (SUN), ufology's unique publication. For sample copy, send \$2 to Philip J. Klass, 404 "N" St. SW, Washington D.C. 20024-3702.

THE AGENDA

The Bible tells us exactly why UFOs are here, what their agenda is, and what God has planned for them. Read The Agenda by B. Fox, PO Box 6057, Walker Branch, Roswell, NM 88201. \$10.00 plus \$2.50 shipping.

NOTE NEW AD RATES!

Effectively immediately: 50 words or less for \$20 per issue, add \$10 for box and bold heading. Send ad copy & check, made out to MUFON, to Dennis Stacy, Box 12434, San Antonio, TX 78212. Must be MUFON member or Journal subscriber.

The NIGHT SKY

Walter N. Webb

April 1996

Bright Planets (Evening Sky):

Mercury, not usually very observable, has its best evening appearance of the year the last half of April. Look for it then at dusk low in the WNW some 25° below Venus. It is to the right of the lunar crescent on the 19th and only 2° below the Pleiades cluster at month's end.

Venus (magnitude -4.5) is at its highest and best in the western evening sky in fact its best appearance in a 16-year span. The imposing planet won't even set until about 11:30 PM daylight time. Venus passes only 1° from the Pleiades on April 2 and 3 and then proceeds past another star cluster, the V-shaped Hyades, a week or so later. From the 19th to 21st, our planet neighbor is joined by the crescent Moon which itself crosses the Hyades on the 20th.

Bright Planets (Morning Sky):

Jupiter (-2.3), in Sagittarius, rises in the ESE shortly before 2 AM daylight time in midmonth. The giant planet can be seen below the quarter Moon on April 10.

Saturn (1.1), in Pisces, emerges in the E during the latter half of April about an hour before sunrise. But the ringed world lies very low in the sky and is difficult to see.

Total Lunar Eclipse:

The full moon disappears into Earth's shadow on April 3. Although no one in North America will see the entire eclipse, those in the eastern states will be able to observe the event's total phase soon after the Moon rises. But even there the sky won't be dark enough to distinguish the eclipsed Moon until nearly an hour or so later. The farther west one is, the fewer phases of the eclipse will be seen after moonrise. Totality extends from 6:26 to 7:53 PM (EST). Our satellite leaves the umbral shadow completely at 8:59 PM (EST).

Meteor Shower:

While the Lyrid meteors peak about the mornings of April 21 and 22 (15 per hour), the shower is visible all night long. Its bright, white, swift members radiate from the tiny constellation of Lyra the Harp. However, a crescent Moon creates some excess light until late in the evening. The Lyrids have been observed for nearly 2,700 years.

Moon Phases:

Full moon—April 3



Last quarter—April 10



New moon—April 17



First quarter—April 25



The Stars:

The celestial symbol of spring, Leo the Lion, is nicely placed in the heavens due S at 10 PM daylight time. The regal animal's outline can be clearly visualized—a backwards question-mark shaping the lion's head and mane, the star Regulus marking his heart, and a right triangle to the E indicating his rear haunches and tail.

This month the Big Dipper hangs upside down in the N. In actuality the dipper's bowl forms the body of the Great Bear Ursa Major; the three stars in the handle outline the creature's long tail. (Real bears, of course, don't have long tails!)

To the E of both Leo and Ursa Major are other prominent springtime patterns, such as kite-shaped Bootes the Herdsman (Arcturus is its bright orange star) and Virgo the Maiden (containing bright bluish-white Spica). Vega, in Lyra, rises low in the NE.

CALENDAR

March 16-17 — The Meadowlands UFO Conference & Metaphysical Expo, Holiday Inn Harmon Meadows, Secaucus, New Jersey. Please call 800-741-5795 for tickets and information.

April 12-14 — Eighth Annual Ozark UFO Conference, Inn of the Ozarks Conference Center, Eureka Springs, Arkansas. For further information write to: Ozark UFO Conference, #2 Caney Valley Drive, Plumerville, AR 72127-8725 or call (501) 354-2558.

April 19-21 — The Seventh UFO/ET/Humanoids/Visitors/Alien & Abduction Congress in Trenton, NJ at the Days Inn on Route 206 (Bordentown, NJ). For further information contact Pat J. Marcattilio at Tel: 1-609-888-1358.

April 20 — BUFORA presents "A Day of Abductions," Pennine Theater, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, England. For information write to BUFORA (Abduct), 1 Woodhall Drive, Batley, West Yorkshire, WF17 7SW, England.

May 4-5 — 2nd Annual UFO & Alien Abduction Research Conference, Holiday Inn, Greenville, South Carolina. For further information, call coordinator Shannon Kluge at (803) 675-9328.

June 12-22 — Star Knowledge UFO Conference and Sun Dance, Yankton Sioux Reservation at Marty, South Dakota. For info write to P.O. Box 3497, Warrington, VA 22186.

July 5-7 — Twenty-seventh annual MUFON International UFO Symposium, Holiday Inn Four Seasons/Joseph H. Koury Convention Center in Greensboro, North Carolina. For advanced registration write to MUFON 1996 UFO Symposium, P.O. Box 5149, Greensboro, NC 27435-0149.

July 27-28 — Great Plains UFO Conference, Howard Johnson Convention Center, Sioux Falls, South Dakota. For information call 603-497-2633 or write P.O. Box 84131, Sioux Falls, SD 57118.

October 12-13 — The UFO Experience — North Haven, Connecticut at the Holiday Inn. For further information write Omega Communications, P.O. Box 2051, Cheshire, CT 06410-5051.

October 11-13 — Australian UFO Symposium in Brisbane, Queensland, hosted by Glennys M. McKay. Details in future issues of *Journal*.

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE - *Continued from Page 24*

M. Schmidt, J.D. (Rochester, NY) will serve as state director until a replacement is secured for Dr. Levine. Our sympathy is extended to the surviving members of his family. We are indebted to **Ray Cecot** for notifying MUFON and sending newspaper clippings.

MUFON NATIONAL UFO HOTLINE

MUFON has been introducing its National UFO Hotline 1-800-UFO-2166 or 1-800-836-2166 to the public. Designed to obtain UFO sighting reports from police agencies nationwide, we are now prepared to expand its coverage. All State Directors were advised by a letter nearly a year ago to utilize this number for filing hot UFO cases that came to their attention. A letter announcing the 800 number was mailed to all sheriff's offices and police chiefs in Texas during the spring of 1995 as a means of testing and evaluating the effectiveness of the system.

The majority of our calls, to-date, have been from people who called the 800 directory and asked for "UFO" to report sightings or to seek UFO information.

To send letters to every police department and sheriff's office throughout the U.S.A. would obviously be both expensive and time-consuming. We would like for every State Director, State Section Director, Field Investigator, and Field Investigator Trainee to notify your local sheriff, police chief, and state highway patrol office of MUFON's 800 number via a postcard that they may post on their bulletin boards or at the dispatcher's desk.

Presently, we are attempting to answer all calls "live." An answering box records the calls received late at night or early mornings. These sighting reports will be mailed or telephoned to the nearest State Section Director, State Director, or Field Investigator for a personal interview. Brief replies to these cases under investigation may be made to MUFON on the 800 number. (The answering box is limited to three minutes.) However, this number is not to be used for other MUFON communications. The MUFON business office number is (210) 379-9216. Please advise Walt Andrus by postcard or letter to which agencies you filed the UFO hotline number 1-800-UFO-2166. Your help is sincerely appreciated. (To date only a few people have complied.)

SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS COVER DESIGN CONTEST

The theme for the MUFON 1996 international UFO Symposium is "UFOLOGY: A Scientific Enigma." We endeavor to depict this theme in the cover artwork. Obviously, this requires considerable ingenuity and something unique in design. The 8 1/2" x 11" size will be printed in black on a light pastel color leatherette stock. Since small and intricate details do not print well on a leatherette stock, please take this into consideration

in your design. The winning design may also be used on the symposium program in Greensboro, NC. The deadline for submission is April 15, 1996. The winner will receive an honorarium of \$100 cash plus \$100 worth of MUFON publications of your choice. Here is an opportunity to express your talent. Good luck.

FIELD INVESTIGATORS EXAMS

Anyone who has purchased and studied the 4th edition of the *MUFON Field Investigator's Manual* is eligible to take the exam via mail when they feel they are ready. The 100-question test may be secured from MUFON headquarters in Seguin and returned to this office for grading. In localities where field investigator training classes are being conducted, the instructor may order sufficient quantities of the test and administer the exam at the completion of the training classes. For current members, the new manual may be purchased for \$25 plus \$3.50 for postage and handling from MUFON in Seguin.

MUFON MOTTO CONTEST

Believe it or not, MUFON is now in its twenty-seventh year and does not have a motto describing our goals and purpose. Yes, we are endeavoring to resolve the UFO phenomenon in a scientific manner, but we need a serious and "catchy" motto to use in the *Journal*, stationery, symposium programs, etc. It should be short, but yet very meaningful, such as "Scientific Resolution of the UFO Phenomenon." A prize of \$100 in MUFON publications will be awarded to the winner. The deadline for submission of your motto is June 1, 1996. Put on your "thinking-cap" and come up with a unique and exciting motto for MUFON. (MUFON could also be used in the motto if this would make it more attractive.)

WALL CLOCKS

MUFON recently purchased thirty quartz wall clocks (battery operated) for sale in the UFO Information Center. The black wall clocks have a white face with black numerals and the MUFON logo and name prominently displayed on the front. The clocks are eleven inches in diameter and are very fitting for any appropriate room in your home, your UFO study and library, or your business. The clocks are being sold for \$20 at the Center, but are also available by mail for an additional \$3.50 for shipping and handling.

"ROSWELL" FILM TO BE SHOWN IN DENTON, TEXAS

The MUFON North Texas Section is sponsoring the uncut 16mm film "Roswell" on Saturday, April 20 at the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas in the Lyceum theater in the University Union Bldg. from noon to 5 p.m. Jeremy Kagan, producer, writer and director of "Roswell" will also speak, relating additional information obtained on the case since the film was released. Of necessity, there will be an admission charge.

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

Walter Andrus

NEWS FROM AROUND THE NETWORK

MUFON 1996 UFO SYMPOSIUM

MUFON's twenty-seventh International UFO Symposium will be held July 5, 6 and 7, 1996, at the Holiday Inn Four Seasons/Joseph H. Koury Convention Center in Greensboro, North Carolina. The symposium co-hosts are MUFON North Carolina and FSG (the Full Story Group in Greensboro). **George E. Lund, II** will serve as host chairman; **Nick Summers**, coordinator; **Kent Senter**, treasurer; **Mike McCurry**, vendors coordinator; **Nick Summers**, advance registrations; **Robert Hair**, registration desk; **George Fawcett**, advance publicity; **Fred Chaffee**, press room manager; and **Natalie "Ginger" Richardson**, mistress of ceremonies.

The following speakers have been confirmed: **Carlos A. Guzman**, Mexico; **Chris Styles**, Canada; **Philip Mantle**, England; **John S. Carpenter**, **Jeffrey W. Sainio**; **John W. White**; **Kevin D. Randle**; **Budd Hopkins**; **Bruce S. Maccabee**, Ph.D.; **Vincent F. Di Pietro**; **John E. Mack**, M.D.; **Whitley Strieber**, and **J. Antonio Huneus**.

Advance registration is \$55 per person before June 29th and \$60 after June 29, 1996, or at the door. Each of the five sessions is \$15 per session at the door. Advance tickets for the reception on Friday evening, July 5 from 6 to 9 p.m. is \$10 per person. Advance registration may be secured by writing to MUFON 1996 UFO Symposium, P. O. Box 5149, Greensboro, NC 27435-0149 and making a check payable to "MUFON 1996 UFO Symposium." (Credit cards are not accepted.) For vendor table information please write to Nickolus Summers, P. O. Box 5149, Greensboro, NC 27435-0149, or call (910) 273-7618.

The cost of rooms per night at the Holiday Inn Four Seasons is \$72 flat for a single, double, triple or quad plus applicable taxes. The Holiday Inn Four Seasons is located at 3121 High Point Road, Greensboro, NC 27407. The Reservations telephone number is (910) 292-9161, 1-800-242-6556 or FAX (910) 292-0819. Please advise the reservation desk that you are attending the MUFON UFO Symposium in order to obtain the special rate of \$72. Your reservations must be made no later than June 3, 1996. After that date, they will continue to take reservations only as rooms are available. The hotel rates are designed for family accommodations. Please make your reservations early to guarantee a room for the symposium.

NEW OFFICERS

The new Representative for Belize, a Central American nation, is **Sharon Matola**, B.A., who is also the zoo director for Belize City. **William M. "Bill" Hopkins**,

B.S. (Blythewood) became the South Carolina State Director at the recommendation of **Richard M. Coffman**, M.A. (Columbia) who will be the Assistant State Director. Former Assistant State Directors in South Dakota **David** and **Ann Deg** (Sioux Falls) have been promoted to Co-State Directors. Canadian National Director **Michael J. Strainic** has upgraded **John MacLean**, B.A. (Dollard des Ormeaux) to Provincial Director for Quebec.

Six new State Section Directors have accepted leadership roles: **Jimmy R. Green** (Tupelo, MS) for Lee, Itawamba and Pontotoc Counties; **Sam Klahn** (Spencer, IN) for Owen, Monroe, Greene, and Brown Counties; **Robert J. Gorsiske** (Racine, WI) for Racine, Kenosha, and Walworth Counties; **Kim L. Cameron**, B.S. (Kerrville, TX) for Kerr, Gillespie, and Bandera Counties; **Beverly M. Fox** (Roswell, NM) for Chavez County; and **Yvonne L. Hermsen**, B.S. (Brookings, SD) for Brookings, Moody, Lake, Kingsbury, Hamlin, and Deuel Counties.

NEW CONSULTANTS AND RESEARCH SPECIALISTS

New Consultants joining MUFON this month are **William B. Lee**, Ph.D. (Salt Lake City, UT) in Physics; **Harold S. Harsin**, M.D. (Lebanon, IL) in Medicine; **Charles F. Gritzner**, Ph.D. (Brookings, SD) in Geography/Anthropology; and **Douglas C. Ginas**, M.D. and D.O. (Albertville, AL) in Medicine. Six new Research Specialists volunteered their expertise this month: **Robert C. Greenwood**, M.S. (Shelton, CT) in Psychology; **James P. O'Rourke**, M.S. (Worcester, MA) in Electrical Engineering; **John C. Grentzner**, M.S. (Chicago, IL) in Management of Public Service; **Tanya Harter-Pierce**, M.A. (Stateline, NV) in Clinical Psychology; **Charles W. Johnson**, Ph.D. (New Orleans, LA) in Sociology; and **Oscar Perez**, M.A. (El Paso, TX) in Counseling.

GARY LEVINE IS KILLED

On February 12, 1996, MUFON lost another state director, **Gary Levine**, Ph.D., in an automobile accident. Dr. Levine joined MUFON in 1974 as state section director and was promoted to state director for New York in August 1978. He also served as a consultant in science and technology. The 58 year old social sciences professor at Columbia-Greene Community College died Monday after his car collided with a pickup truck as he was leaving the college. Gary lived in Coxsack, New York, with his wife, Jia, and is survived by two sons from a previous marriage. Assistant state director, **Dana**

Continued on Page 23