

\$3.00

MUTUAL UFO NETWORK UFO JOURNAL

October 2001

Number 402



High school students at a flag pole
in prayer, a scene repeated many
times in the wake of the Sept. 11
World Trade Center disaster.
Our heartfelt condolences to the
families of the innocent victims
throughout the world.

One nation, with liberty and justice for all.

Table of contents

October 2001

Number 402

MUFON

UFO Journal

(USPS 002-970)

(ISSN 0270-6822)

Post Office Box 369

Morrison, CO 80465-0369

Tel: 303-932-7709

Fax: 303-932-9279

International Director

John F. Schuessler

Editor:

Dwight Connelly

14026 Ridgelawn Road

Martinsville, IL 62442

Tel: (217) 382-4502

e-mail:

mufonufjournal@hotmail.com

Columnists:

Walter N. Webb

George Filer

Jenny Randles

Staff Artist

Wes Crum

MUFON on Compuserve

"Go MUFON"

to access the Forum

MUFON on the Internet:

<http://www.mufon.com>

MUFON e-mail address:

mufonhq@aol.com

MUFON Amateur Radio Net:

40 meters - 7.237 MHz

Saturdays, 7 a.m. CST or CDST

In this issue

Crop circles—Facts & opinions by Dr. Eltjo Haselhoff..	3
MUFON Forum	7
Encyclopedia Project by Ron Story.....	8
Illuminated object in Georgia by Tom Sheets.....	10
Filer's Files by George A. Filer.....	11
UFO Press	14
View from Britain by Jenny Randles	20
Calendar	21
New MUFON by-laws ready for vote	21
The Night Sky by Walter N. Webb.....	23
Director's Message by John Schuessler.....	24

Change of address and subscription inquiries should be sent to MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369.

Copyright 2001 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 2001 by the Mutual UFO Network, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369" is included.

The contents of the *MUFON UFO Journal* are determined by the editor, and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Mutual UFO Network. Opinions expressed are solely those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the editor or staff of MUFON.

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., Morrison, CO. Membership/Subscription rates are \$30 per year in the U.S.A., and \$35 per year foreign in U.S. funds. Second class postage paid at Versailles, MO.

Postmaster: Send form 3579 to advise change of address to: *MUFON UFO Journal*, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369

MUFON's mission is the systematic collection and analysis of UFO data, with the ultimate goal of learning the origin and nature of the UFO phenomenon.



Crop Circles

The facts & the fictions

By **Eltjo Haselhoff, PhD.**

Dutch Centre for Crop Circle Studies

At the end of every summer season, many newspapers report about crop circles appearing worldwide in farm fields and other land areas. Crop circles are large, geometric patterns in which the crop has been pressed flat against the soil.

This past summer was a relatively quiet period—not a lot happening that was worth mentioning in local newspapers—so reporters were forced to find alternatives to write about. Basically these articles all had the same set-up. They told about the appearance of one or more crop circles in a farm field, and almost without exception it was mentioned that the landowner had never seen anything similar on his property before.

The next section in the article elaborated on the alleged mystical properties of these formations, and the awesomely large pictograms that often appear in the South of England. A favorite ingredient was a discussion about flying saucers and entities that tried to communicate with the inhabitants of planet Earth.

The Doug & David dog and pony show

However, without exception, at the end of the story two elderly British gentlemen were brought on stage (Doug Bower and David Chorley) who claimed in the early nineties to have created all British crop circle formations with the aid of simple tools: just some planks and ropes. Sometimes an additional account about man-made formations was added, which was usually the end of the story.

Consequently, most people simply shrug their shoulders when they hear the words “crop circle,” and reject the whole story as if it were just a fairy tale. The crop circle phenomenon has manifested itself for so long that few have never heard about it. It is fascinating to see how many have very explicit opinions about it, whereas at the same time almost nobody has any detailed knowledge about the phenomenon.

The first records of crop circle appearances go back to the Middle Ages, and in the seventeenth century accurate descriptions of the phenomenon were recorded. For example, the British scientist Robert Plot suggested in the year 1677 that crop circles were the

effect of air streams originating from the upper layers of the atmosphere. In his theses, Plot also referred to square and hexagonal imprints in the fields.

One year later, a pamphlet was produced in England with an account about crop circles appearing in a field of oats. This event was attributed to the work of the devil, who “cut them [the stems] in round circles, and plac’t every straw with that exactness that it would have taken up above an Age for any Man to perform what he [the devil] did that one night.”

Since the beginning of the 20th century until the end of the seventies, over one hundred documented accounts of crop circle appearances have been recorded. The number of crop circle appearances has strongly increased since the end of the seventies (since then, about ten thousand events were reported worldwide) and it continues to manifest itself stronger and stronger, in almost all countries of the world.

“Why, then, do they only appear in grain fields, and solely in the summer season?” is an often heard, so-called “critical,” question, which, however, only reveals ignorance. Crop circles are reported throughout the year, in basically all types of crop (including potatoes, carrots, maize, mustard, grass, heather and trees), and also appear in sand, ice, and snow. There are even reports of circular imprints on the sea floor.

These facts, in combination with the extremely complex shapes the phenomenon can take, make the expression “crop circle” in fact quite unsuited. But the terminology has settled down to such an extent that it will probably continue to be used for a long time.

The crop circle phenomenon is almost always attributed to creative pranksters who use garden rollers, planks, or other simple tools to flatten the crop. The public opinion has been formed, and anyone who dares to doubt the validity of these generally accepted explanations will be burnt on the stake (at least psychologically) and runs a serious risk of being publicly declared nuts.

Did not want to believe

To date, crop circle research can be compared with Galileo’s first telescope. His fellow scientists refused to have a look through the instrument, because they did not want to believe that such an instrument allowed you to see the moon larger than its normal size.

And, in fact, it does not take much more than some careful observations in order to conclude that some pranksters with planks and ropes, in many cases, cannot possibly cause the formation of a crop circle. This, however, has little to do with the enormous complexity of the patterns that appear. People are capable of doing many things.

The real and the counterfeit

But the statements made by human crop circle makers who proved to be capable of creating large and complex figures in the fields have no value. The fact that you can make counterfeit pearls does not mean that real pearls don't exist. The mysterious properties of crop circles take place on an entirely different level.

One example is a formation that was found in 1997 near Etten-Leur, in the Netherlands (see photo at right). From the air, the formation did not look very impressive. It almost seemed as if the farmer had harvested some of the crop for personal use. The formation, in a field of carrots, had a slightly irregular shape, with long tracks that went across, with a few sharp bends. Seen from the ground, the formation was absolutely *bizarre*.

The earth was very soft, and it was impossible to walk in the field without leaving deep imprints. Inside the formation the leaves of the carrot plants lay withered against the ground, almost as if they were cooked. The leaves had a dark green color, much darker than the leaves outside the formation, which had a fresh green color, standing firmly upright. But the most peculiar thing was the lay of the leaves inside the formation.

In one half of the pictogram it was laid to the left, in the other half to the right, while on the imaginary boundary between the two halves there was a long row of carrot plants with half of the leaves laid to the left, the other half of the leaves *of the same plants* laid to the right, while each plant had a little tuft of leaves in the center, still standing upright.

Have a look at the photograph. At the right, the leaves are bent away from the reader, left on the photo the leaves are bent towards the reader, and in the middle one can see how the leaves of a single plant seems to be "combed" in a parting, with a little upright tuft in the middle. You don't need to be a rocket scientist in order to conclude that nobody had set foot inside this formation. Anyone who doubts this statement should put a bunch of carrots on the floor, stand on it, and see what happens.

No trace of human presence

In a circle in a potato field which appeared near Sevenum (Netherlands) in 1999, within the circle all plants had fallen flat against the ground. The soft and brittle soil immediately showed any trace of human presence. In this case it was clear that nobody had entered the formation before I did. The simple explanation of "hoaxers with a plank and a rope" does not apply here. And similar events occur every year!

Particularly the spring formations in oil seed rape are most impressive in this context. The stems of oil seed rape are very brittle (similar to thin celery stems), so



Etten-Leur "crop circle" in field of carrots.

that it is impossible to step on them without all stems snapping off. Nevertheless, every year formations appear in oil seed rape in which the stems are bent all the way to the ground without any mechanical damage to the plants.

These are simple observations which can be made by anyone, but which totally escape the attention of the general public. The keen observer can make many other curious observations, varying from an extremely complex (yet very smooth and regular) lay of the crop, entire formations consisting of plants bent halfway rather than bent from the ground, thin rows of standing plants along the edges of the tractor tracks, to unidentified substances such as perfectly round, microscopically small spheres of silicon dioxide, or abnormally high concentrations of meteoritic dust.

A totally different aspect

A totally different aspect of crop circles that consistently seems to escape public awareness is the incredible geometric complexity of apparently simple formations. For example, in 1998 a formation appeared near Melick (the Netherlands) consisting of some circles with rings, connected by straight paths (see diagram on the following page). This kind of formation first appeared in 1990 in England, and is still found today throughout the world.



At a first glance the formation may seem "interesting" or "strange" (which are most speculative statements), but not particularly complicated compared with other "state-of-the-art" formations of these days. Nevertheless, a mathematical analysis reveals a breathtaking complexity of this design, as the dimensions of the three rings around the small circle are not arbitrary. It

appears that between the central circle and the inner edge of the first ring one can *exactly* fit an equilateral triangle. Between the first and the second ring one can *exactly* fit a square, and between the second and the third ring one can *exactly* fit a regular pentagon.

Further analysis shows, that *all* inner- and outer edges of the three rings can be constructed from the center circle, with the aid of similar, basic geometric shapes. All rings are related to the dimensions of the center circle, by an equilateral triangle, a square, a regular pentagon, a regular hexagon, a hexa-gram (Hebrew star) and two regular pentagrams (star-shaped pentagons). The critical reader may suggest that, if you try long enough, you will always find a geometric figure that "fits" in the design of an arbitrary pictogram.

And this is true, of course, so it is essential to always make an estimate of the probability of chance—the possibility that all of this is just a coincidence—taking into account the accuracy with which the measurements were made. In the case of the Melick Rings, this chance was equal to *one in 46 million* (which is smaller than the chance that you flip a coin to "tails" 25 times in a row).

Consequently, it can be excluded that the formation was made by the two boys, who, some weeks after the formation was found, declared with a lot of turmoil that they did it all for fun, and that they were surprised themselves how well their creation had turned out. Of course, their account was believed unconditionally by almost everybody, except by those with some knowledge of mathematics, who had discovered that it really



wasn't all that simple. And indeed, Doug and David withdrew their statement soon afterwards—in all silence, of course.

The mysterious character of crop circles is not limited to their appearance. The scientific world has performed research on the plants in which the formations appear. The pioneer and most prominent of these researchers is the American biophysicist William C. Levegood. His name is often mentioned in connection with the crop circle phenomenon, and sometimes he is presented as an absent-minded professor performing incomprehensible experiments.

Simple, routine tests

In reality, however, the experiments performed by Levegood are based on simple and routine biophysical tests. This makes the results even more remarkable. It appears, for example, that the germination and growth behavior of seeds sampled from the crop circles is often completely different compared with normal standards.

At this point, one should be aware that the speed with which a seed germinates and the young seedlings grow are not random events, but well-known and well-documented processes.

When temperature, humidity, and light conditions are known, it can be exactly predicted how fast the seed-

lings grow from the seeds. Any deviation of, say, more than ten or twenty per cent is abnormal. These deviations can be observed when crop circle seeds (that is, seeds sampled from the flattened plants inside the formations) are used for these germination experiments, together with control seeds (seeds taken at the same time, but from the undisturbed plants, far away from the imprint).

It appears that in many cases the crop circle seeds do not germinate, or germinate very slowly, while in the first two weeks after germination the seedlings reach only a fraction of the length of the controls. This is not an effect of mechanical damage to the plants, because

there is none, as explained earlier (this is always carefully verified during germination trials).

Even more interesting are the cases where crop circle seedlings show the opposite behavior, and grow up to five times *faster* than the controls. This anomaly, which outruns all endeavors of bio-engineering, seed-improvement, and the use of fertilizers, is not yet understood (whereas the one who would understand it could make a fortune out of it, for obvious reasons).

Various other biophysical anomalies have been determined by Levensgood in over ninety per cent of many hundreds of investigated formations from all over the world. Levensgood's findings are not limited to his laboratory reports only, and were published by *peer-reviewed* scientific journals.

Peer review

Articles that are submitted to these journals will not be published before a group of objective authorities (peers) have checked the article for inconsistencies, shortcomings or other scientific errors, and given their approval for publication. Consequently, the publication of a *peer-reviewed* scientific article means that the findings cannot simply be ignored, because they were seen and approved by the established scientific community.

It also means that legitimate criticism to the publications can no longer be made by newspaper articles or on the Internet. The discussion needs to be made on a scientific level by those who are qualified to judge, and popular magazines, television and the Internet are not suitable media for formal, scientific communication.

Nevertheless, some people are not aware of this, and do not hesitate to dismiss Levensgood's findings as the results of a wild fantasy, wrong methods, or even deliberate fraud. As long as these arguments are not published in peer-reviewed scientific literature, it is a waste of time to pay too much attention to them.

Another phenomenon that seems to be closely connected to the crop circles are the *flying balls of light*. Over the years, numerous eyewitnesses have seen these luminescent spheres in and around the crop circles. Estimates for their dimensions vary from the size of an egg to the size of a football, while they emit a bright white, sometimes slightly amber in color.

Sometimes they are hanging still, but most of the time they fly around in the air. The statements by the eyewitnesses are backed up by many photographs, and, more interesting, by about a dozen video recordings, such as those made by crop circle researchers Steve Alexander, Foeke Kootje, Constantin and Dominick von Dürckheim, Bert Janssen, Stuart Dike, and others.

Particularly in England, the light phenomena are often seen shortly before a crop circle appears, and there are even people who claim to have witnessed these balls of light actually create a crop circle!

Formation examined

One such formation, of which the creation by a "ball of light" was allegedly witnessed by a Dutchman

in 1999, was thoroughly sampled for biophysical research. A total of fifteen-hundred stems were collected from accurately determined positions, labeled, air-dried for three months, and then extensively examined. One of the experiments that was performed was a measurement of the *node length* of all samples.

The "nodes," little knuckles in the stems of corn-type plants, known to anyone who has once had a wheat stem in his hands, often appear to be much longer in stems taken from crop circles in comparison with the controls taken from the standing crop.

There are natural, biological mechanisms (e.g. *gravitropism*) that may be responsible for such a node lengthening effect; however, the amount by which these biological processes increase node length is limited to some 10 or 20 per cent. In crop circles the increase can be significantly more.

According to Levensgood, the stronger node lengthening could be the effect of a rapid heating by electromagnetic radiation. He reached this conclusion after he noticed that ordinary stems, after a short time in a microwave oven, revealed similar modifications (including node lengthening) as found in many crop circle samples. The fifteen hundred nodes of the formation investigated here were measured with the use of a computer program that I developed, and which automatically analyzed digital photographs of the samples.

Node length doubled

With the aid of this useful tool, the node length could be determined with an accuracy of a tenth of a millimeter, while this approach eliminated all experimenter's bias (so producing the perfect *blind study*). It was found that the average node length in the center of the circle was more than twice the length of the controls in the standing crop, which is much more than can be explained by biological mechanisms.

Even more remarkable, however, is the *perfect symmetry* of the graph of the experiment. Exactly the same symmetry was found in three other cross-sections through the circle. This was an extraordinary finding: the node lengthening had exactly the same symmetry as the formation itself: circular. This is a strong indication that whatever mechanism created the crop circles also caused the node lengthening effect.

If this formation had just been made by flattening the crop with a plank, as many want us to believe, there would be no reason that the nodes in the center of the imprint would swell more than the ones at the edges. How can a plant know that there is a circle in the field, and how does it know where its own position in that circle is? Obviously, the plant does not know, so there must be another explanation. And that explanation has been found.

A small, spherical radiation source

Using a simple electromagnetic model, the amount of node lengthening was determined that would be expected when a small, spherical radiation source at a height of several meters above the field would be responsible for the node swelling effect. It turned out that

the measured values for the average node length corresponded *perfectly* to these theoretical values if the radiation source would be at a height of four meters and ten centimeters (in perfect agreement with the statement by the eye witness).

Identical findings were done in other crop circles (two in England and one in the USA) which had been investigated earlier by the American BLT team. Also in these cases, the measured node lengths perfectly matched the electromagnetic radiation pattern of a small, spherical source. These findings were compiled in an article which concluded that "balls of light" with an electromagnetic character must be involved in the creation of crop circles.

This was published in the peer-reviewed scientific journal on plant physiology and biophysics *Physiologia Plantarum*. Thanks to this publication, the hypothesis that the flying balls of light are somehow responsible for crop circle formation is no longer just a hypothesis, but a scientifically confirmed and accepted fact, and all future discussions about this theory have now been promoted to a scientific level.

Consequently, another step forward has been made with respect to the unraveling of the crop circle mystery. And a mystery it remains, since many questions are still unanswered (the question where these "balls of light" come from being the number one, of course). Anyone claiming the opposite immediately reveals that he is not knowledgeable of the facts.

More research to be performed

In order to find an answer to all the remaining questions about the crop circle phenomenon, much more research will have to be performed. However, this research cannot be carried out by the handful of scientists and hobbyists who are dealing with the phenomenon today, with limited finances. Funds will have to be raised for the involvement of more highly educated specialists and the financing of advanced equipment and laboratory work. Less won't do. But such a large-scale approach can certainly be justified.

After all, it has been demonstrated literally thousands of times that the plants and the seeds inside crop formations show strong biological modifications, such as changes in the chemical composition of the seeds. These seeds, however, are harvested just like the rest, because a combine harvester does not know the difference between a crop circle seed and a normal seed.

In our food chain


Consequently, the manipulated seeds entered our food chain a long time ago. And this situation has continued. Think about that the next time you eat bread or a slice of pizza. Isn't it the responsibility of *all of us* to figure out what exactly is happening to our farm fields? The answer to this question is obvious.

However, first it will be necessary for the general public to become aware of the true characteristics of the crop circle phenomenon. It is obviously much easier to accept, without further thinking, that we have all been fooled by creative hoaxers for hundreds of years. But

anyone who takes the trouble to verify the facts (rather than simply denying them as many skeptics do) will soon discover that the truth is quite different.

It is important to be critical. As long as all sorts of fairy tales about the crop circle phenomenon are swallowed without further thinking, any attempt to serious research will be apt to fail.

This article was published earlier in the magazine *Prana*, September 2000, Ankh-Hermes Publishers, Deventer, Holland.) All backgrounds of this article and much more scientific research to the crop circle phenomenon can be read in Dr. Haselhoff's *The Deepening Complexity of Crop Circles, Scientific Research & Urban Legends*, Frog Ltd., Berkeley, USA, to be reviewed in the *Journal*.



From "Filer's Files" and "The Alien Jigsaw" "NEW PLANETARY SYSTEM." The University of California at Berkeley announced that astronomers have discovered a planetary system with two giant planets centered on a star that is similar to our sun in chemical composition. The findings indicate smaller planets similar to Earth may be located in orbits inside these giant planets.

The astronomers believe many stars may have solar systems similar to our own. Assuming the inner planets actually exist they are likely to have water and life may flourish there. The newly found solar system is orbiting Ursae Majoris, only 45 light years away, about 200 trillion miles from Earth. "Of all the solar systems that have been found, this is the one that looks the most like our own," said Debra Fischer, an astronomer. "Nothing else is even close."

Regarding the above discovery—Could there be a relationship to the following? From *The Alien Jigsaw Researcher's Supplement* (c) 1994, "July 1993 : We go on the deck. I ask him [the Being] 'Are you from the Pleiades?' The Being adamantly replies, 'NO.' I ask him where he is from. We look in the sky to see the Big Dipper. He says, 'See the Ursa Major?' I reply, 'Yes.' The Being then tells me, 'The star cluster to the right and below. The one with the triangle to the left and the little stars in between, ...we're from that one. The fourth planet from our sun.'

"I asked him what his planet is like. He said sadly, 'I don't know, I've never been there. I was born on our ship.'" Erik Wilson, July 1993, Portland, Oregon <http://www.alienjigsaw.com>

—Katarina Wilson

MUFON cap

MUFON has a new black cap with white MUFON logo to match the new field investigator black t-shirts (the caps also look great with the white t-shirts). Screen printed is \$8 + \$3 S&H. Embroidered is \$15 + \$3 S&H.


THE UFO ENCYCLOPEDIA PROJECT

25 years (1976-2001)

By Ron Story

My work on The UFO Encyclopedia Project (1976-2001) has given me an opportunity to view the past 25 years of UFO history from a unique perspective.

First, I was privileged to meet and/or work with a number of special individuals who have since passed away. The significance of their contributions was my first thought when I was officially contracted to prepare an update to my original *Encyclopedia of UFOs* (1980). Then I wondered just how many of my original contributors are no longer with us.



I was saddened to count seventeen people, whom I would like to honor here. In alphabetical order they are: Charles Bowen, Walter Raymond Drake, René Fouéré, Daniel Fry, J. Allen Hynek, Donald Keyhoe, George King, Desmond Leslie, Coral and Jim Lorenzen, Aimé Michel, Thornton Page, K. Gösta Rehn, Carl Sagan, Leonard Stringfield, and Brinsley LePoer Trench.

All had different points of view, and even this small sampling represents practically the full spectrum of UFO beliefs—which is exactly what The UFO Encyclopedia Project has always been about. In fact, the new *Encyclopedia of Extraterrestrial Encounters* broadens the spectrum even further, as we shall discuss shortly.

My own interest in the subject began in 1957 when I was 11 years old. It was a frightening experience. And even after more than four decades have passed, the memory of that night remains one of the clearest of my life. I was living in Mill Valley, CA, having moved with my parents from Joplin, MO, in 1955. I stayed up late to watch one of the horror films on TV that were so popular back then. Before the movie began, a news bulletin interrupted the regular programming.

A reporter from a San Francisco television station was interviewing a farmer somewhere in the state. They were standing in front of a farmhouse pointing to some tree branches that had been broken, as a large glowing ball, about the size of a large automobile had settled down between the tree and the house a few nights before. Out of the object came two “men” wearing what looked like silvery ski suits.

The witness said the visitors spoke in English, but their voices sounded “mechanical,” as though they were tape-recorded. They said something like “Don’t worry, we won’t hurt you. We are friends.” When asked where they were from, they answered “Venus.”

The UFO-nauts were described as having blond,

shoulder-length hair and were both about five feet tall. The witness said he was so scared, he was shaking.

The conversation was cut short because the farmer’s dog started growling at the spacemen. They reacted by simply turning around and walking back to their ship, which shot straight up into the night sky until it disappeared from sight. The reason for the news bulletin was that the object had returned again that night. This time the golden globe landed on top of the barn, stayed a few minutes, and then, in the farmer’s words, “just went out like turning off a light.”

After hearing this—especially in the manner it was presented, as a factual event—I’m sure my hair was standing on end. As an impressionable 11-year-old, I didn’t need much convincing—yet there was more.

The following morning a news item appeared in the *San Francisco Chronicle* about a commercial airliner that was hit by something invisible while in flight. The damage was minor, and the plane landed safely, but something had happened that was considered very mysterious. This one-two punch left an impression of some significance. Perhaps a seed was planted that would grow into a sympathetic attitude towards ordinary people who reported extraordinary things.

About ten years later, I had the opportunity to witness a “UFO” of sorts myself while on a summer vacation trip to my home state of Missouri. There I photographed a mystery “ghost light” variously called the “Hornet Ghost Light” or “Ozark Spook Light.”

After returning to the university that fall, I discussed the matter with my astronomy professor (now retired), Dr. Raymond E. White. My idea was that a spectrograph of the light might reveal important clues to its nature and origin. Dr. White told me that unfortunately the astronomy department had no interest in such things, but he recommended that I pay a visit to Dr. James E. McDonald in the Institute of Atmospheric Physics, which I did.

What resulted was: (1) An investigation of the light by McDonald and myself to the extent of our time and resources. (What we found was interesting, but that is another story.) (2) In the course of working with McDonald, I became more interested in UFOs. When I asked Dr. McDonald about the subject, he answered intently that it was “a very serious problem.” In fact, after reading the reprints of his lectures that he gave me, I saw that he considered UFOs to be “the greatest scientific problem of our time.”

My thought then was: If this guy thinks there’s something to the UFO mystery, then that’s good enough for me. I had seen how scientific and methodical he was in going about his investigation of the “ghost light,” which

made me think he was just as scientific in his investigations of UFO sightings and photographs. At the time, McDonald was the most notable—and vocal—scientist to take the subject of UFOs seriously. He participated in Congressional hearings and addressed scientific groups all over the country, emphasizing the importance of the UFO “problem,” as he called it.

He was, in the opinion of many, the most important spokesman for UFO reality—and possible extraterrestrial visitation—during his time. Unfortunately, we lost Dr. McDonald in 1971, when he took his own life (due to personal reasons unrelated to UFOs).

Largely due to McDonald’s influence, I began reading the books of Coral and Jim Lorenzen. After the publication of my first book, *The Space-Gods Revealed* (Harper & Row, 1976), I interviewed the Lorenzens for a sequel, *Guardians of the Universe?* (St. Martin’s Press, 1980).

Thus began an association that would lead directly to The UFO Encyclopedia Project. As I became more involved in UFO research, it occurred to me that a comprehensive A-to-Z encyclopedia was sorely needed.

Upon making arrangements with the Lorenzens for complete access to APRO’s case files, photographs, and needed information on how to contact their members, contributors, and advisors, it then became feasible to undertake such a project. My publisher was just as enthusiastic, and The UFO Encyclopedia Project was born.

As it turned out, far more was involved than I had imagined. In addition to the resources of APRO, the encyclopedia project became a cooperative effort with MUFON (with generous help from Walter Andrus), CUFOS (involving personal meetings with Dr. J. Allen Hynek), and NICAP (which led to the expert assistance of Richard Hall, Walter Webb, et al).

Then, of course, there were more than 100 other contributors to which we owe the final result. So, after three years of intensive research and information gathering, we produced the first UFO encyclopedia, which was entitled *The Encyclopedia of UFOs*. Completed in 1979, it was published by Doubleday in the U.S. and by New English Library in the U.K. in 1980.

It was gratifying to read Jerome Clark’s review in *Fate* magazine, which said in part: “...by any standard *Encyclopedia* is a magnificent achievement. It is, as all of us who awaited its appearance hoped it would be, the essential UFO reference work.” (*Fate*, September 1980)

In the original *Encyclopedia*, we covered most of the classic cases, leading personalities, and other topics that would represent the state of our knowledge on the subject. In the Preface, I wrote: “*The Encyclopedia of UFOs*, in its attempt to represent accurately the state of

About the author

Ronald Story is a research specialist for MUFON, having been an honors graduate in philosophy from the University of Arizona. In addition to the books mentioned in the article, he is the author of *UFOs and the Limits of Science* (Morrow/NEL, 1981). He may be contacted through his Web site: www.RonaldStory.com

A review of *The Encyclopedia of Extraterrestrial Encounters* is scheduled for the November issue of the *Journal*.



Ron Story

our knowledge on the subject of UFOs (which includes UFO lore and personalities well known in the field), has been compiled as an album or mosaic of contributions from virtually every element within the multifaceted UFO field. Voices from all along the UFO spectrum of beliefs have their say....”

And so it is with the 2001 update, *The Encyclopedia of Extraterrestrial Encounters* (henceforth abbreviated “2001 EEE”), although the spectrum has widened, which leads me to the inevitable comparison between then and now.

Even in 1976-1980, it was impossible to include everything—given limited space—that arguably had some relevance in an encyclopedia of the subject. There were, perhaps, 100,000 cases on file in various depositories throughout the world. There were hundreds of additional topics that might have been covered, as well as significant personalities, and so on. Today, it is mind-boggling how much UFO material can be found on the world-wide web: millions of words and thousands of images on hundreds of Web sites across the limitless cyberspace of the Internet.

No single-volume book could ever capture it all, even if time and space were not considerations. Therefore, the problem of selection of material was even more difficult, not to mention severe time and space limitations placed on me by the publisher. Nevertheless, I think we have produced a unique volume of material that gives the optimum quantity and quality of information and potential insight into the subject that is still affordable—and thus accessible to all—without having to read it on a computer monitor.

For those who do like the portability and search-and-find capabilities of the computer, an enhanced CD ROM version of the 2001 EEE is in the works.

Concerning the UFO phenomenon itself, I found that the spectrum of ideas and beliefs has also widened considerably. If one lays the original *Encyclopedia* alongside the 2001 EEE, the differences become immediately apparent.

About 50 entries from the original have been revised and adapted for the new book. Considering there is a whole new generation of readers since the original *Encyclopedia*, I thought it made sense to include enough background to enable the new generation to gain a well-grounded perspective.

On page 2 of the original is a one-and-a-half-page entry on ABDUCTIONS by Coral Lorenzen. She began:

“With ever-increasing frequency, UFO researchers are encountering witnesses who claim not only to have sighted a UFO and its occupants, but to have actually been taken aboard the ‘craft’ by force. In some, if not most such instances, the abductees were apparently physically examined by strange, exotic instruments. Even more bizarre are the claims of telepathic communication and even the ‘taking of thoughts’ or information from the abductee.”

Nowadays, what was once considered “bizarre,” by one of the most liberal UFO organizations at the time has become the central focus of UFOlogy. In the 2001 *EEE*, we have devoted the first eight pages to the topic of abductions, not to mention countless other tie-ins throughout the book, including a full ALIEN GALLERY specially prepared by Seattle-based artist, David W. Chace.

Back in 1980, traces of material from possible UFO-landing sites were considered the best physical evidence we had of UFOs. Today, we have alleged alien implants that are being subjected to laboratory analysis. So far, none of these has proven to be definitive, but only time will tell.

Photographs of UFOs were always considered as important evidence for UFO reality, and with advances in technology we now have video tapes in addition to motion picture film. In some cases, these pictures are even claimed to be of the aliens themselves. Unfortunately, it is still impossible, in most cases, to identify with certainty what is actually being photographed. The ad-

vance in technology is a double-edged sword: on the one hand, we can obtain better pictures; but on the other, it is also easier nowadays to perpetrate convincing hoaxes.

There has been progress in the search for extraterrestrial life. For one thing, we now have the first probable example of an alien life form in Mars rock #ALH84001. Astronomers are also discovering extrasolar planets at a record pace. There are now about 50 known planets around other sun-like stars, and now another multi-planet system, possibly similar to ours, has been found. Forty-one of these extra-solar planets were discovered in the past five years. These discoveries point to the ever-increasing likelihood that other life does indeed exist in the universe. With the next generation of space telescopes, who knows what will be discovered?

The further exploration of Mars is another area of future science, not science fiction. Possibly as soon as the year 2020, astronauts may land on Mars and begin ongoing exploration, which may include extraterrestrial archaeology, if artifacts are found.

Until then, when we know for sure—either from direct contact, proof of alien visitation, or by whatever means—I suggest we take the most prudent course possible and not rule out anything.

What lies ahead we do not know, but UFOs and ETs always seem to appear in parallel with every important change on Earth. When we know why, then we will have arrived.

Statement of ownership, management, and circulation

1. Publication Title: MUFON UFO Journal
2. Publication No. 002-970
3. Filing Date: Oct. 19, 2001
4. Monthly
5. No of issues published annually: 12
6. Annual subscription price: USA \$30, Foreign \$35
7. Complete mailing address of known Office of Publication: B-W Graphics, Inc., 101 Westview, Versailles, MO 65084-1839
ph: (573) 378-6363
8. Complete address of the Headquarters: Mutual UFO Network, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369
9. Full names and complete addresses of publisher and editor: Publisher: John F. Schuessler, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369; Editor: Dwight Connelly, 14026 Ridgelawn, Mar-

- tinsville, IL 62442-2514
10. Owner: MUFON/Mutual UFO Network, Inc. P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369 A Texas Nonprofit Corporation TI No. 37-0990161 and exempt from Federal Income Tax under Sections 501 (c) (3) and 509 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.
11. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding one percent or more of the total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities: NONE
12. For completion by nonprofit organizations authorized to mail at specific rates: Has not changed during preceding 12 months.
13. Publication Name: MUFON UFO Journal
14. Issue Date for Circulation Data Below: September, 2001.
15. Extent and nature of circulation:

	Average No. copies each issue during preceding 12months	Actual No. of copies published nearest to filing date
a. Total No. copies (net press run).....	2898	3125
b. Paid and/or requested circulation		
1) Sales through dealers & carriers (not mailed).....	0	0
2) Paid or requested mail subscriptions.....	2764	2985
c. Total paid and/or requested circulation.....	2764	2985
d. Free distributions by mail (samples, complimentary, and other free copies).....	73	73
e. Free distribution outside the mail.....	0	0
f. Total free distribution (sum of 15d & 15e).....	73	73
g. Total distribution (sum of 15c & 15f).....	2837	3058
h. Copies not distributed.....	61	67
i. Total (sum of 15g & 15h).....	2898	3125
Percent Paid and/or Requested circulation.....	97%	98%

16. Publication of Statement of Ownership will be printed in the October 2001 issue.



Filer's Files

By **George A. Filer**
Director, MUFON Eastern Region

Unless otherwise noted, these reports represent raw data which has not been verified by official investigations.

Has ET phoned us?

CHILBOLTON RADIO TELESCOPE — Two new incredible Crop Circle formations or glyphs that appeared in Southsea, Hampshire, next to the radio telescope indicates extraterrestrial contact to some people.

The first glyph appeared on Tuesday, Aug. 14, 2001, that shows a framed alien face with large dark eyes and a small mouth.

According to an employee at the Chilbolton Observatory, on Monday, Aug. 20, a second glyph appeared with a complicated binary code that seems to be a reply to a message broadcast from the Arecibo Radio Telescope in Puerto Rico on Nov. 16, 1974. At that time astronomer Frank Drake and Carl Sagan sent a strong signal into space towards M-13, a star system 25,000 light years away.

That radio signal depicted a stick drawing of a human and the Earth's location in the solar system. A possible alien answer to the radio signal in a pictogram has caused a heated controversy. Some say aliens made the glyphs. Others claim hoaxers using boards to knock down the wheat made the glyphs for an upcoming television program.

The glyph is very complex, and supposedly tells us the aliens have large heads in comparison to bodies smaller than ours, provides their DNA, and indicates that they apparently live on Mars and Jupiter if you assume they are in our solar system. The glyphs are composed of hundreds of little cells acting as pixels in the wheat.

Nancy Talbot from the BLT Team called to inform me that the two new crop circle formations or glyphs next to the radio telescope had been investigated by a scientific team. The investigators indicate they did not find evidence for authenticity, nor did they find evidence the glyphs were a hoax. It was reported in error that the field was surrounded by a fence. There were no visible changes to the plants, such as node enlargement or expulsion cavities. The glyphs also had a grid line 3 to 4 inches thick that underlaid the crops that could be used to help create the design.



George Filer

Bruce Maccabee wrote, "At my suggestion Paul Vigay has compiled a graphic representation of the number of agriglyphs per month for the last several years. It shows that the foot and mouth disease restrictions on entering fields had little or no effect on the numbers. Very heavy fines are given to those who enter fields without permission.

Experts on both sides are withholding judgment until further scientific analysis can be made of the alleged alien message and its authenticity. Early indications are that the glyph contains information that could only be known by a high order of intelligence.

Perhaps aliens have attempted to reach various governments who have ignored them, and they prefer to openly communicate. There are many possibilities and its too early to rule out alien contact.

Radio show host Whitley Strieber claims he was warned the glyphs were coming, and there are rumors it is part of a TV show. I would recommend we withhold judgment until scientists can closely examine the glyphs to determine how they were made. See:

www.cropcircleconnector.com/http://www.earthfiles.com/earth271.htm

West Virginia object hovers in barn over a cow

WAYNE — The witness reports, "I went out to my barn before going to work to check on a couple of my cows and check their water on Aug. 1, 2001, at 6:00 AM. This is a big barn, with two sliding doors on the front, each about 15 feet tall and 7 feet wide. I leave the doors open during the summer so air can circulate.

"When I walked into my barn an object about the size of a tire, but square, and angled down on all of its sides, was floating over the top of a cow. It looked about 8 inches thick, and maybe 3 feet wide, and it was black with some kind of gray markings on it. The thing actually looked kind of beat up.

"When I walked in, the thing just floated there for a couple of seconds, and then flew over my head and out the door. It didn't fly real fast over me, but I don't know where it went once it got outside, and it didn't make any noise. I looked a good while for it, but I never saw it again. I went back inside the barn to check on my cattle that go in and out for water and food. I checked on the cow that had the object over it.

"She looked and acted all right, but I found a place on her ear that looked like she had been poked with a needle or something. There was just a tiny bit of blood there, and her eye on that side of her head had like a broken blood vessel in it. I told my wife what I saw, and she told me that I was crazy, so I thought I would tell you. I was also late for work because of this strange thing. Thanks to Peter Davenport NUFORC www.ufocenter.com

Wisconsin UFO splits

CALUMET — John B. reports, "We saw three flashing lights on Aug. 30, 2001, at 8:30 PM that were lined up in a row. They were flashing in sequence. Two

flashes, pause, three flashes, pause, four flashes, pause, and then repeated. The front light was amber and the others were white.

"At first, it looked like they were all connected. Using binoculars, it looked like only the front light was attached to the next segment and the other segments were separate. The object was cigar-shaped and had some sort of windows in it. Suddenly, the rear lights split apart and flew in different directions.

"Then, as it got further away, it "realigned" into one cigar-shaped craft that was headed toward Outagamie County Airport. My wife called the airport, and the tower had not seen anything as I described on radar. I also saw them on Aug. 27, when we saw only two similar lights.

Wisconsin pursuit?

SHEBOYGAN — Steve Oplatek on Aug. 29, 2001, decided to step outside his house to smoke at 8:40 PM. "I noticed six large aircraft flying west with strobe lights at a fair rate of speed," he reports. "I heard jet engine noises and noticed that slightly ahead of the aircraft were another set of moving lights. The second set consisted of two lights that were orange in color and steady; they did not blink like a strobe.

"After further observation, it appeared to me as if the aircraft were pursuing the orange lights. I got this impression because the aircraft were maneuvering a lot compared to the orange lights. After 2 to 3 minutes the two orange lights started to separate, one took a slight turn to the North, while the other one continued west.

"The aircraft then split up into two elements consisting of three planes each. It looked like the aircraft were trying to surround the orange lights, perhaps in a dog fight. This sighting lasted about five minutes. Six aircraft in such close proximity to Sheboygan is unusual!" Thanks to Jenny Hoppe, who announces the launch of "UFO Wisconsin," their very own UFO Reporting Center at <http://www.ufowisconsin.com>.

California triangle

VISTA — On Aug. 21, 2001, the witness reports seeing "lights on each side of a flying triangle craft at 7:01 PM. First a bright light came out from behind a cloud like a slow moving plane, but it was not a plane because there were no red and green navigation lights on each side. There was no sound; it was just a white dot.

"Then a minute later another bright dot appeared, and behind it was a triangle-shaped craft with three lights on each side. They all went behind a hill and that was it. I didn't see them leave."

Two hours later another witness was standing at the very edge of Cardiff State Beach at 9:00 PM. when a dim pattern of lights in the sky caught his attention, and at first he thought it might be a formation of planes. The witness states, "Through some low clouds, the craft appeared, and it turned out that the light pattern was just one side of this triangular object. The main body of the

object was black with rows of lights on each side of the triangle, with three bright lights on top at each corner-top and bottom.

"The object moved slowly south out of a low cloud, stopped, and rotated about 60 degrees. The flying triangle wobbled as it rotated. During the entire event, there was no sound louder than the crashing of the waves on the beach. I would estimate the object to be 2000 feet above the water and 2500 feet off of the beach.

"The flying triangle was 450 feet or more in width. I saw this object fairly clearly, and it was large enough in my field of view that I could see many details." Thanks to Peter Davenport NUFORC

Nevada light descends toward witnesses

PAHRUMP — On Aug. 24, 2001, the witnesses drove 60 miles southwest of Las Vegas and stopped on a bluff overlooking Pahrump at 9:30 PM. They observed an orange light hovering above the city. The reporting witness stated, "We watched for several minutes, and as we were observing this light it started towards us, and in a few seconds was above our car.

"We were somewhat startled at this, as there was no noise or any other signs of a propulsion engine. We watched as this light appeared to be descending upon us. Being a little intimidated by this, we got in our vehicle and sped off. The light did not follow us, but left us wanting to know what it was." Thanks to Greg Bearden.

Canada cylindrical Object

KANATA, ONTARIO — There was a clear blue sky on Aug. 25, 2001, as the witness and his wife drove north and noticed a high flying jet plane leaving a contrail at 10:02 AM. One minute later they saw another craft moving northeast without making a contrail. It was moving just too fast and too high to be a glider or small airplane, they stated.

"It looked like a perfectly cylindrical metallic object with a quasi-transparent dome shape attached to the top, similar in texture to what you can see when the moon is barely visible during the day," said the witness.

"There was a variable haze surrounding the fast moving object. As the object came overhead, I laughed to myself and realized the shape of the object was just like a UFO portrayed in a B movie." Comparing the UFO with a helicopter flying over, the witness felt the UFO was the size of a big commercial jet. He is an amateur astronomer and has a Masters degree in engineering.

FAA radar confirms New Jersey objects

CARTERET: NEWARK AIRPORT RADAR INFORMATION — The National Institute for Discovery Science (NIDS) on July 25, 2001, sent a FOIA request to the FAA requesting radar tapes (Tracon) for the July 14-15, 2001, time frame around the Carteret UFO inci-

dent. NIDS also requested the tower voice tapes for the same time period from Newark International Airport.

By far the most noteworthy aspect of this communication is the large number of objects detected that DO NOT have transponders (all commercial aircraft have transponders) in the airspace around Newark International at the same time that an estimated seventy eyewitnesses on the New Jersey Turnpike and a further fifty (estimated) witnesses from Staten Island reported unidentified lights in the same area of sky.

A request to randomly check for aircraft without transponders at the same time on a DIFFERENT night produced the result that there were NO objects without transponders in the air around Newark International airport on that second, randomly chosen, night.

This "control" study lends support to the notion that such a large profusion of objects without transponders in the air around one of the busiest international airports in the world is unusual.

Most were moving relatively slowly, around 60 mph. One was moving at 250 mph, and a high-speed craft flew through the area at around 600 knots (690 MPH). Speeds varied from 580 to 620 knots (670 to 720 MPH), faster than any normal jet traffic.

Numerous slow moving targets were also reported that flew slower than any normal aircraft traffic from 50 to 80 knots.

The fact that multiple objects without transponders were in the same airspace while more than one hundred eyewitnesses on the ground were watching several unidentified objects over Carteret might be of interest. Thanks to NIDS and MUFON's Director, John Schuessler. See report at: http://www.nidsci.org/news/newjersey_contents.html

Editor's Note: Peter Davenport also requested a similar FOIA from the FAA.

Indiana object photographed

INDIANAPOLIS — Tom Sheets ISUR received the following report from Angela Clark about her sighting on Aug. 7, 2001, at about 5:30 PM. She let the family dog out into the backyard and noticed an object in the sky in the vicinity of some clouds. She continued to watch as the object suddenly darted straight down and made a quick 90-degree turn to the right, suddenly stopping to hover over some adjacent homes.

I phoned Angela, and she described the object as appearing oval shaped, metallic colored, and lighter on top and darker on the bottom. It had a wobbly spin while hovering, and there was a slight haze around the craft. She estimated the distance at 1/4 mile, altitude at 2500 to 3000 feet, and actual size as similar to 3 or 4 automobiles (HUMVEES) grouped together.

Angela is a former police officer, skydiver, and military dependent. The witness stated she then ran into her computer room and grabbed her digital camera, returned, and snapped a photo of the hovering object. (See www.filersfiles.com) At that point the object

slowly began to move upwards, then quickly accelerated upwards and out of sight so fast she could not track it.

Angela forwarded a copy of the photo to ISUR and me for preliminary inspection. The photo indicates a bright sunny day, with a few cumulus clouds. The glare of the sun is evident on the clouds and on the hovering object.

The object appears to be oval shaped, but could be capsule shaped and hovering beyond and over some homes. Angela is currently a homemaker studying for a medical certification. She is an excellent witness.

The case has been turned over to Indiana MUFON, State Director Jerry Sievers, for a local in-depth investigation. Thanks to ISUR isur@america.net, and Tom Sheets tangosix@webtv.net, ISUR Board, SD MUFON of Georgia. See the next item.

Ice cream truck in the sky?

INDIANAPOLIS — Angela R. Clark, who reportedly photographed a UFO on Aug. 7, 2001, has an even stranger follow-up report.

She writes, "When I was 8 or 9 years old I saw my first UFO. A few days after that sighting my best friend and I were out playing at night when we heard some strange 'music' that sounded like an ice cream truck. We looked above the treetops and saw an ice cream truck that was flying. I have been terrified of those trucks ever since!"

"Last night, I went outside about 12:45 AM, and it started to rain, with lightning. That's when I heard it. I heard ice cream truck music!!! My husband, the skeptic, heard it too. I came inside and got in bed as my husband was turning off all the lights.


"ICE CREAM TRUCK MUSIC ... was right outside of my 2-story window. It was so clear and distinct you would think that it was literally outside of the window. My husband looked at me and said, 'Did you hear that?' It doesn't make sense that an ice cream truck would be out at 1:00 in the morning, during a storm! What the heck is going on?" Thanks to Angela and to Jim Osborne, MUFON Investigator.

Flying triangle in New Hampshire

On Aug. 20, 2001, at about 10:00 PM, on a star-lit night, the witness reports seeing a flying triangle-shaped object with a bright white light at each point. The witness states, "I couldn't make out any actual outline of the object or judge its distance or size. My best guess would be the size of a football field about a quarter to a half-mile away."

At first, it was stationary, says the witness, "but then started to move slowly down toward the tree line and disappeared. The duration of movement was 15 to 20 seconds. The flying triangle made no sound, and this exact object was also seen in February of 2001 in approximately same location."

Thanks to Peter Davenport Director National Reporting Center www.ufocenter.com



Roswell, Inconvenient Facts and the Will to Believe by Karl T. Pflock, Prometheus Books, 59 John Glenn Drive, Amherst, NY 14228-2197, 6X9 hardback, 331 pages, \$25.00.

Reviewed by Dwight Connelly

This book presents a very important investigation of the Roswell incident by an experienced ufologist.

Pflock has served as deputy assistant secretary of defense, CIA intelligence officer, Marine Corps officer, congressional staffer, and New Mexico state section director for MUFON, so he brings impressive credentials to the task.

Although the author plays the unfamiliar role of debunker in this particular case, he does so in a professional manner, laying out the evidence—pro and con—and drawing conclusions which readers may accept or reject. He is so thorough, in fact, that much of the material could well be interpreted as pro-Roswell.

Despite the professional approach taken by Pflock, this book will upset many ufologists because the author concludes rather firmly that there is nothing to the Roswell case that cannot be explained by Mogul balloon debris, unreliable witnesses, researchers with too much will to believe, and media overkill. Not liking the message, some readers will, unfortunately, attack the messenger.

Pflock explains his position early: "I am a pro-UFOlogist....convinced by the data that there is something more to UFOs than mistakes, hoaxes, delusions, weather balloons, and tub-thumping by hucksters to keep the book, television, and lecture-circuit pelf flowing....How is it possible that someone who takes UFOs seriously, even thinks some of them were vehicles from another planet, can also be convinced the event that leading ufologists and thousands of UFO buffs have considered and continue to consider 'the most important case in UFO history' is bunk? This is a question I hope to answer to everyone's satisfaction in this book."

This account will not answer that question to "everyone's satisfaction"—an impossible task for any author writing about this topic—but Pflock has produced a book that every person interested in Roswell—pro or con—should read. Roswell believers who feel that this book destroys an important UFO icon should keep in mind that there were excellent UFO cases before Roswell became synonymous with saucer crashes, and there will be excellent UFO cases in the future.

The legitimacy, integrity, and value of ufological research does not rest on Roswell, despite the hype it has

had over the years. In fact, many mainstream ufologists have put the Roswell case in what some would call a "gray basket," meaning that Roswell is a case which has featured some convincing elements—there seemed to be some smoke; perhaps there was a fire—as well as some elements that were quite troublesome, such as a dwindling supply of reliable witnesses.

In recent years it has become difficult to place Roswell among the top UFO cases as more and more "witnesses" proved to have more imagination than integrity, and this book will do much to make the "gray basket" a lot grayer for some readers.

But others will read this book, thank the author for isolating and discarding most of the poor evidence, and continue to concentrate on some of the still unexplained elements in the Roswell story. The fact that both the good and the bad evidence is presented so thoroughly is a credit to Pflock.

Unlike such cases as Delphos, KS, there is seemingly little physical evidence in the Roswell case, although there is a great deal of testimony about physical evidence. The best physical evidence may well be indirect: i.e. the photos taken by J. Bond Johnson of Brig. Gen. Roger Ramey and other individuals in his office which show the debris allegedly recovered at the crash site.

Pflock believes the debris shown in the photos matches that of Mogul service Flight 4 balloons and other equipment, but others are still not convinced, suggesting, for example, that the material is too clean to have been lying out in the desert for days. And if it was only a Mogul balloon, why was such undistinguished debris flown to other bases?

Perhaps more significant than the debris in the photo is an intriguing piece of paper in the hand of Brig. Gen. Roger Ramey, commanding general of the 8th Air Force. The printing on this paper has been enhanced by the Roswell Photo Interpretation Team (RPIT) and others, and seems to clearly include words related to the "crash" incident, as reported in articles by Dr. Donald R. Burleson in past issues of the *Journal*.

Although all the researchers do not agree as to what the writing on the paper says, or the significance of such words as "disc," "Roswell," "Ramey," "weather balloons," and possibly "victims," the reports thus far are certainly of great interest.

Pflock does not rule out the possibility that analysis of this small piece of evidence may yet yield additional clues, noting that "something interesting and perhaps surprising eventually may be teased out of the Ramey message." But he contends that "very preliminary results" by other researchers show that RPIT's interpretations are "off the mark." However, until this piece of evidence is dealt with to the satisfaction of most researchers, Roswell is unlikely to be written off.

Since the Roswell case is based primarily on witness testimony, Pflock looks at this in some detail, and clearly shows that some formerly key witnesses lack credibility.

Frank Kaufmann, perhaps the most quoted witness, has claimed knowledge of a crashed disk, bodies, and crates being loaded onto aircraft, as well as inside information regarding radar sightings, among other things. Pflock convincingly demonstrates that Kaufmann's testimony is very unreliable.

Glenn Dennis, another key player, is also shown to be less than stellar as a witness. It was Dennis who told the story of the Army inquiring about small caskets or body bags, suggesting that small deceased aliens had been recovered.

It was also Dennis who claimed that a nurse friend at the base hospital had examined several small mangled bodies, been transferred to England, and died in a plane crash. Extensive investigation of this story shows rather clearly that there was no such nurse.

Jim Ragsdale, who claimed to have seen a crash site, complete with craft and bodies, also proves to be an unreliable witness.

Gerald Anderson, who surfaced after broadcasts of *Unsolved Mysteries*, and who is allegedly one of four "first-hand witnesses" to alien bodies, was also shown to be unreliable. Robert E. Smith, who also came forward after broadcasts of *Unsolved Mysteries*, fares no better.

It is now generally agreed by most serious researchers that Kaufmann, Dennis, Ragsdale, and Anderson are indeed unreliable. However, some of the other witnesses may have been unfairly discarded by Pflock.

Maj. Jesse A. Marcel, Sr., who retrieved and described some of the debris from the crash site, is one of the most credible key witnesses, but his testimony that some of the debris was unexplainable is considered suspect by Pflock.

This is apparently because he gave false information concerning his prior military activities, education, and awards to reporter Bob Pratt in a taped interview, suggesting that he may have had a tendency to allow his imagination to override the facts.

However, Marcel served in a very important position as intelligence officer for the 509th Bomb Group, the only unit in the world equipped to deliver nuclear weapons, and apparently was well respected by his superiors and colleagues. It would seem his testimony deserves serious consideration.

It would also appear that Pflock may have overreached a bit when he concluded that Col. William Blanchard, commander of the 509th Bomb Group and Roswell Army Air Field was "a loose cannon," basing this on comments from an unnamed officer who supposedly knew him.

This, according to Pflock, was the reason Col. Blanchard approved the press release which said that the Army had captured a flying disc. The release said nothing about aliens or extraterrestrial origin, but did say that "the rancher (Mack Brazel) stored the disc until such time as he was able to contact the sheriff's office."

Were Col. Blanchard, Maj. Jesse Marcel, Sr., and

Sheridan Cavitt (the officer in charge of the Roswell AAF Counter Intelligence Corps, who also visited the debris field) fooled by pieces of a Mogul balloon array, something they had apparently not seen before, but also something that was made up of parts that would not be highly unusual (although Pflock describes them as "unique")?

Or was an actual disc—and possibly even bodies—recovered, perhaps at the same site or perhaps at a different site? What was the "disc" reportedly stored by Brazel? Did Blanchard approve the press release after meeting with Marcel and Cavitt without seeking guidance from higher authority?

And what of Cavitt's later statement that he knew immediately that the debris was from a weather balloon? Didn't Col. Blanchard believe him? If Col. Blanchard did receive approval from his superiors, why would a higher authority approve such an announcement, then quickly change the story?

Was this press release meant to be local only, and got out of hand? It is interesting that 1st Lt. Walter Haut, the base public relations officer who apparently prepared the release for Col. Blanchard, recalled nothing out of the ordinary about the release when interviewed in 1992, and assumes it was thrown away. As a former Air Force public affairs specialist, I find it extremely difficult to believe that a news release on such a topic, which generated so much activity, and which had to be corrected, would have been so easily forgotten by the man who wrote it.

Whatever the case, it seems unlikely that the release was occasioned because Col. Blanchard was a "loose cannon," especially since he later became a four-star general and vice chief of staff of the Air Force. Pflock attributes these promotions to Col. Blanchard being a protégé of Gen. Curtis LeMay, but this seems like quite a stretch. If Pflock's version is accurate, we should worry a great deal about this nation's military.

Also written off by Pflock as merely a "practical joker" is Oliver "Pappy" Henderson, a pilot who flew many missions in World War II, received several awards and commendations, and who was selected to fly VIPs over the Crossroads nuclear weapon test site in 1946.

Henderson told his wife, daughter, and at least two others that he had transported wreckage to Dayton, OH, and observed small beings with large heads. According to his widow, Sappho, he did not tell her about the experience until 1980 or 1981, after seeing a newspaper story about Roswell, stating something to the effect of, "I guess now that they're putting it in the paper, I can tell you about this. I wanted to tell you for years." He died in 1986.

In any case, today's investigator of Roswell is left with too few reliable witnesses who claim to have seen aliens, a crashed disk, or anything other than the so-called debris field—which consisted of material that the author is certain came from the 657-foot Mogul balloon and equipment array.

It is in his interpretation of the debris field, however, that Pflock will no doubt receive the most criticism, since he admittedly places little value on parts of the testimony by some witnesses. Among these is MSgt. Lewis Rickett, who said that some of the debris, such as a large piece of metal, had unusual characteristics.

Pflock deals with the Rickett testimony fairly extensively, and concludes that Rickett, who was not interviewed for the first time until 1983, provided confused, contradictory, and incorrect information in some of the interviews between 1983 and his death in 1992. Pflock says that in Rickett's later years "when most of the interviews took place, Rickett was in poor and failing health."

But does this negate all of his testimony? There are aspects of Pflock's descriptions of Rickett's roles that seem contradictory, and the author has had to rely on interviews by others, since he never personally talked with Rickett.

There is other witness testimony dismissed by Pflock, but not by other researchers, including that of CIC member Charles Shaw. The roles of Col. Marcellus Duffy and Dr. Lincoln LaPaz are also a matter of dispute.


Another controversial element is what some witnesses thought were strange symbols or "hieroglyphics" on some of the pieces reportedly found in the debris field. According to Pflock the symbols were decorations on the tape used to reinforce parts of the Mogul components, as described by Mogul project engineer C. B. Moore.

Mack Brazel, who found the debris field on the Foster ranch, described "tape that had some sort of figures on it," according to his neighbor, Mrs. Loretta Proctor, and said that these were "kind of purple." Mrs. Proctor thought the figures resembled "hieroglyphics." Some researchers have rejected the tape explanation, however.

The two Marcells report seeing the symbols, but disagree on their location, with Dr. Jesse Marcel, Jr. recalling that the embossed pink or purplish-pink characters were on an I-beam fragment, while Maj. Jesse Marcel said his son "didn't have that right to begin with....[The writing] was on a beam." Interestingly, none of the symbols or tape seems to be present in the photos of the debris.

In looking at the alleged intimidation of witnesses by the military, Pflock concludes that either it did not occur or was magnified and embellished by witnesses, most of whom were reporting many years after the fact about incidents that allegedly involved relatives or acquaintances.

Pflock suggests that minor intimidation—"It would be better if you did not discuss this"—could be explained by the need to keep the supposedly top secret Mogul project from unwanted scrutiny, even though those running the Mogul project seemed not to care whether the balloon arrays were recovered or not, since the materials themselves were not secret. Moreover, the military



actually provided unnecessary publicity to the Mogul project following the "corrected" press release.

Pflock also looks at the alleged government documents which seem to support the crash of a saucer at Roswell, such as the MJ-12 "Eisenhower briefing paper," made public in 1987. These are bogus, he says, and notes that most of the MJ-12 documents have involved either William L. Moore, co-author with Charles Berlitz of *The Roswell Incident*, or Tim Cooper. Both of these individuals appear to be unreliable, according to material presented by Pflock.

For example, says the author, the Schulgen intelligence collection memorandum of Oct. 30, 1947, given to researcher Bruce Maccabee by Moore in 1986 and widely accepted as legitimate, was later found to be a heavily modified version of the original document.

In 1997 researcher Robert Todd, who is relied upon extensively by Pflock for research on Roswell, reportedly located the original document in the National Archives and discovered that it did not match the one provided by Moore. The doctored document provided by Moore included material not in the original, as well as key deletions, all of which suggested a tie-in with Roswell. The original document suggested no tie-in.

On the other hand, Pflock believes that 41 "relevant, extensive, authentic" formerly classified official United States government documents released under the Freedom of Information Act of 1975 indicate the government had no knowledge of any crashed disk prior to 1955. This, of course, would include the Roswell incident of 1947.

These documents, says Pflock “were publicly available before the crashed-saucer revival began in the late 1970s, and most had been released by the mid-1980s, well before Roswell was resuscitated by Kevin Randle and Don Schmitt in 1991.” (Randle later split with Schmitt, stating that he questioned some of Schmitt’s research and conclusions regarding Roswell.)

It would be interesting to know precisely when each of these documents was actually released to researchers. If MJ-12 documents can be faked, then so can documents released by the government under the Freedom of Information Act.

If there has been any sort of cover-up of crashed discs—whether Roswell in 1947 or even as far back as 1941 at Cape Girardeau, MO—then it stands to reason that the government is not going to release documents which blow the cover.

There also remains the question of who among even the top military officers actually had a “need to know.” A 1947 Secret letter from Gen. Nathan Twining, commander of Air Materiel Command at Wright Field, said that “due consideration must be given” to the possibility that the flying saucers were “the product of some high security” government project. This suggests that even Twining might not be in the loop if the project was of “high security.”

Other Roswell items are also briefly noted by the author. One easy target is the late Lt. Col. Philip J. Corso, author of *The Day After Roswell*, whose credibility had already plummeted before Pflock’s book was written. Likewise, the alien autopsy film, which has had few supporters among mainstream ufologists, is dismissed by the author as a hoax.

Pflock discusses in some detail the congressional inquiry into the Roswell incident spearheaded by the late Congressman Steven Schiff. Pflock, a friend of Schiff, played a leading role in getting this inquiry launched.

While there will be disagreement with the author regarding some of his material, as well as some of his conclusions, this remains an unusually well-researched book on an extremely difficult topic. Included is a helpful index, as well as a 93-page appendix containing copies of documents, witness affidavits, transcripts of interviews, technical reports, and press reports.

This is probably the most balanced book ever published by Prometheus Books, and no ufology library will be complete without it.



Abduction In My Life by Bruce S. Maccabee, Ph.D. 2001, Wildflower Press, P.O. Box 1429, Columbus, NC 28722 800-366-0264 or <http://www.5thworld.com/> ><http://www.5thworld.com> \$15.00

Reviewed by Katharina Wilson

Abduction In My Life is a novel based on generally accepted facts derived from years of abduction research from various researchers. It is also a “book within a book,” and the book “within” is definitely not fiction. *Abduction In My Life* seems to cry out for its

own category, and perhaps Nonfiction /Fiction or “Faction” might best describe it.

The novel is about a science fiction writer who is happily married with one son. He is the person telling the story, and from here on, I will refer to him as the author. He is a “virgin” to the UFO phenomenon and all that it encompasses. He is completely oblivious to the fact that anything remotely associated with the subject could ever be “real.” As far as he is concerned, it is a subject for “crackpots” and the delusional.

All of that slowly begins to change when a friend tells the author about a sighting of a red light he had. It occurred some 30 years prior on a cold Vermont night while he was working in a sugar maple orchard with another man.

After their sighting, the men noticed that one of them was missing some clothing and, well, there were other odd things that just did not seem “right.” The author tells his friend he will try to help him figure out what happened.

He decides that in order to help his friend, he needs to understand what it is he is getting involved with, so he checks out a book at his local library. The book he checks out is actually the nonfiction book you will read while reading the novel—and it is an extremely informative book!

He brings the book home, begins to read it, and hides it from his family while trying to finish it. As he reads the book you get a clear picture of what this man thinks about the UFO phenomenon. He has to force himself to read it, and slams it closed on occasion while cursing the author of the book, a man named Mac Sargent, Ph.D.

This nonfiction book introduces the author (and the reader) to the history of the UFO phenomenon. It covers BMI’s (Battelle Memorial Institute’s) Special about Projects Sign, Grudge and Blue Book, Kenneth Arnold’s sighting, the Condon Report, and much more. He learns about scientific skeptics like J. Allen Hynek, and debunkers like Dr. Donald Menzel.

In short, the nonfiction book he reads begins to slowly change his attitude about people who say they have seen a UFO, and it helps him to better help his friend who had the sighting nearly 30 years ago. It will be easy for a lot of people who have studied the UFO subject to look back and see themselves in this same position some 10, 20 or even 30 years ago.

The author eventually finds contacts to help his friend and the man who was with him when he saw the red light. He becomes more and more involved, but still tries to reject some of the information he feels forced to consider: The government and the (Army) Air Force hid the truth from the American public.

He tries to rationalize this while he attempts to understand the implications of the many detailed reports he has read. Just when he thinks his mind has absorbed about all it can take, his wife drops a “bombshell” on him.

Because she discovers the book her husband has

been hiding from her, she feels it is "okay" to mention a few things about her past. Doing so leads the author's family on a journey of self-discovery and forever changes their lives.

From the book:

"Whoa, baby," I said. "Things aren't that bad." And then I told a big lie. "It's not like the world is coming to an end." I knew it was a lie because the world—our world—was coming, had come, to an end. The future would not be like the past. I just sat there holding her to me. I couldn't think of anything else to do or anything profound to say so I just reassured her."

If the readers of this book choose it because they enjoy fiction, they are in for a really big surprise, because even the fictional portion of the book is based on fact. Speaking as someone who has experienced this phenomenon firsthand, Maccabee has definitely done his homework on the abduction aspects of the phenomenon.

I'm not sure which book I actually enjoyed the most. Because I have never reviewed fiction before, and do not normally read fiction, I found myself leaning towards enjoying the nonfiction book more at times. When the nonfiction book ended, however, the fictional book really took off, and I found myself getting more into that part of the book.

The last two chapters of *Abduction In My Life* are terrific. In "Question Everything," Maccabee forces the reader to consider some interesting concepts relating to spirituality, religious beliefs, evolution and philosophy. There is also a discussion about "societal infrastructure" and how the ET presence could affect human life one day. The Epilogue is a "wrapping up" of the novel.

Maccabee weaves the "abduction novel based in fact" in very well with the "nonfiction history of the UFO phenomenon." I learned a great deal from the nonfiction book within this novel. It is a great review for people interested in ufology, and I came across a lot of information I normally would not have read had it been presented in another book that was only about UFO sightings.

This is probably what is most important about "Abduction In My Life." If marketed properly, it will introduce people to certain aspects of the UFO phenomenon who would not normally read a book about abductions or UFO sightings only. They don't have to know the novel is based in fact, and they will learn a great deal about how our government, the (Army) Air Force and the media kept the public from learning the truth about UFOs for over fifty years.

My only criticisms about the book rest with the publisher and editors. In my opinion, they did not do justice to Dr. Maccabee by leaving out his biography. Maccabee, of course, has been active in UFO research since the late 1960s when he joined NICAP. He is the author of about three dozen technical articles and more than 100 UFO articles. He is co-author of *The Gulf Breeze Sightings*, and is the author of *The UFO/FBI*

Connection. He is MUFON State Director for Maryland, and in 1979 led the establishment of the Fund for UFO Research.


My second criticism is that there are more editing mistakes than I would like to have seen. A "few" editing oversights are always going to occur in the publishing of a book, but there were more than a "few" in this book.

My third criticism is the book cover. The copy I received had two different variations of the title. "Abduction In My Life" was printed on the front cover and "Abducted In My Life" was printed on the spine of the book.

If this was the publishers'/editors' fault, they should have paid extra to have new book covers printed. If this was the printer's fault, which I doubt because (speaking from experience), printers only print what you give them to print, then they should have refused the covers and waited for them to print the correct covers.

On a more positive note, I highly recommend "Abduction In My Life." You will learn a great deal by reading this book, and you will learn about a scientist who has been a friend to ufology for many years. *Abduction In My Life* has an index, a great "Bibliography and Footnotes" section, and a great price at 15.00.

It is a book you will enjoy even if you think you know it all, and it is a book that will make a great gift for friends and family members who just aren't convinced that any of this is real. Boy, are they in for a surprise!



Flying Saucers 101—Everything You Ever Wanted to Know About Unidentified Flying Objects by Harold E. Burt, 2000, UFO Magazine, Inc., P.O. Box 66970, Los Angeles, CA 90066, 888-UFO-6242, 6X9 soft cover, 431 pages, \$19.95.

Reviewed by Dwight Connelly

When I first saw this book at the MUFON Symposium this past July, I was impressed as I made a quick perusal of its title, cover, range of content, index, and size. When I talked with author Harold Burt I was also impressed. It was while actually reading the book that problems arose.

The main problem is that there are simply too many significant conclusions which are not backed up—not a good characteristic for a book which seems to suggest it is a legitimate and reliable introduction to UFOs.

For example, under "Who Gets Picked to be Abducted?" is the following statement: "Abductions are not random. They run in families and they stay in families for generations. For instance, if one parent is an abductee then all that parent's children will also be. However, an adopted child will not be. People who are abductees are picked up very frequently. The average is a hundred times a year."

Whoa. These may be, in part, tentative theories of some researchers, but many top abduction researchers and abductees would disagree. No evidence. No references.

Under "How Many People Are Being Abducted?" the author states: "Abductions are occurring in every country on our planet." Source? Unless the author has a legitimate example from every country in the world, which is very doubtful, then this is speculation.

Under "Does Our Government Have Any of the Advanced Alien Technology?" we find: "Yes. And some of it is already in your hands. As attested to by many scientists and military people like Col. Philip Corso, many of the things we commonly use today in fact come from recovered alien technology. Things such as fiber optics, solid-state computer circuits, and night vision scopes and goggles."

Time out. The late Col. Corso is controversial at best, and I would judge that few mainstream ufologists find him credible. Who are the "many scientists" and other "military people"? Again, speculation. Where is the evidence?

Under "Are There Really Alien Bases on Our Planet?" the author says, "It appears the answer is yes. Many of them are jointly owned by aliens and human personnel said to be part of the U.S. armed forces. They are primarily underground, but the aliens themselves have many that are under water in oceans and deep lakes." Said by whom? Where is the evidence, other than unverifiable stories from alleged contactees?

In the chapter "Best Cases," the author says, "Contactee cases are just as real as plain sightings of craft." Maybe, but we really don't know that, do we—unless we are the contactee.

Under "Remote Viewing" the author states, "Remote viewing is the ability to leave your body and travel to other places and 'see' what is there. It is also known as astral projection and soul travel." Interesting definition.

Then, "We as humans have the ability to project ourselves beyond our physical bodies....Many of those we would call alien beings cannot do this projection, even though they are technologically more advanced than humans." Source? Evidence?

Under "A One-light-year Limit," we find: "All races are allowed to develop space travel on their own, up to a limit of one light year. This corresponds to the distance of travel that can be achieved when a society discovers how to use Element 115." Source? Evidence?

In discussing crop circles the author says, "When carefully measured, the geometrical designs are accurate to within an eighth of an inch! This is true even if the formation is a thousand feet long! For example, a 100-foot circle will have an accurate and identical radius on all sides to within the thickness of a single stalk of grain."

It would be interesting to know the source for this information. How does one accurately measure a 1000-foot crop circle down to an eighth of an inch? If one wants to indicate that most crop circles are authentic, there is scientific evidence to do so (see the research by BLT and Eltjo Haselhoff).

Burt also claims, "Often, thin metallic disks about the size of a quarter are found in crop circles. They have also been found near cattle mutilations. When these disks were analyzed by metallurgy labs at the University of Michigan and at MIT, they were found to be composed of a combination of titanium, silicone, and oxygen. Both labs concluded that no industrial match can be found on this planet." References?

He goes on to say, "Not only that, but when the disks were touched by any metal object such as tweezers or pen, the immediately turned into a clear liquid." This time there is a footnote reference: Ted Oliphant, MUFON lecture, Orange County, CA, April 22, 1998. And what reference did Mr. Oliphant provide during his talk? Statements by speakers are not necessarily evidence, even, unfortunately, at MUFON gatherings.

These are only a very few of the many examples of the author going well beyond available evidence and presenting highly questionable material as fact.


While the title of this book suggests that it would be useful as a textbook for those studying the UFO phenomenon, the opposite is true. This book would, unfortunately, be a detriment to the study of ufology, filled as it is with speculation, lack of evidence, sensationalism, and half-truths. It is closer to science fiction than to a serious look at ufology.

This is too bad, since Burt has obvious ability as a writer. His informal style provides enjoyable reading, and I'm sure he wants to be accurate. When, and if, he decides to write another book, I hope he will allow one or two respected members of the UFO community to look over the manuscript.

I would have thought that Bill Birnes, Burt's agent, and Nancy Birnes, his editor at *UFO Magazine*, the publisher, would have provided the solid guidance that Burt deserves.

MUFON 2001 Proceedings available

The MUFON 2001 International UFO Proceedings, featuring Symposium papers by Dr. Robert Wood, Stanton Friedman, Dr. Eric Davis, Daniel Sheehan, Steven Greer, Dr. Barry Downing, Budd Hopkins, Ryan Wood, Dr. John Mack, Bob Pratt, Dr. Roger Leir, and Ann Druffel is available from MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369. The 8x11 216-page softback book is \$25.00 plus \$2.50 postage & handling.



View from Britain

By Jenny Randles

Current research in the UK

Research is something that is often overlooked because it is a long and lonely process. It tends to take second place to the drama of case investigation, but whilst it may lack the glamour it can be more productive in the long term. Better answers may ultimately emerge this way than by investigating 100 additional lights in the sky.

I thought this month that I would review some of the research projects that are ongoing in the UK. Whilst this is by no means all that is happening over here, these give a flavor of the UFOlogy that is taking place.

Retrospectives

Retrospective investigation is a buzz word in British UFOlogy right now. This involves UFOlogists taking an old case and treating it to a massive shakedown whereby every lead conceivable is followed through. UFOIN, the UFO Investigators Network (a team of British net-based researchers working together in a loose union) defined this as an aim when formed two years ago and has been actively chasing a number of famous cases. Once such case is Britain's best known car stop (in Sopley, Hampshire during November 1967), when a car and a truck were both allegedly halted by a hovering UFO, but the diesel engine truck only lost electrical power.

A vast amount of research has gone into this case, uncovering many little-known angles and hunting down and interviewing witnesses who seem not to have given their story in the past. Paul Fuller, Andy Roberts and David Clarke have been the mainstays of this case. It is fair to say that what they have found has not strengthened the once highly considered events.

Much the same sort of thing has been happening with regards to the famous radar-visual case at Lakenheath in Suffolk in August 1956—one of the few that really impressed the Condon team and was considered a genuine UFO even by them. This new work began in 1996 when by chance I found some of the crews of British Venom fighters sent up to intercept the radar tracked object. Their story contradicted some of the popular legend-based largely on just the American side of the story—and has led to a long, ongoing and deeply productive re-investigation that has revealed new twists and turns all along the way.



Jenny Randles

The research into Lakenheath will hopefully be published soon, but has already been put back several times because new things have been uncovered and required further in-depth study. All I can say is that this retrospective has uncovered a great deal of new information that leaves all previous summaries of the case trailing.

How it will affect people's judgement of what took place in 1956 remains to be seen, but without doubt we are starting to see the case far more clearly than we have done at any time before, thanks to this new retrospective research approach.

Pattern Recognition:

Another area in which research is proving popular in the UK is what we might call pattern recognition. That means taking a large number of cases and seeking clues from within them resulting from patterns spotted in the data.

Some years ago the late Ken Phillips, wonderful British researcher, started this program with what he called 'the Anamnesis Project. Working with a European scientist, Dr Alex Keul, a life profile of close encounter witnesses was compiled, and many of these could be cross referenced in such a way that certain consistencies started to appear.

One example was the prevalence of migraines amongst close encounter witnesses. This stood out as a factor that must indicate some connection with the events being reported, as did their tendency to have life-long track records of psychic experiences as well as UFO encounters.

I have done some research on these lines with alien contact/abductee witnesses, following on from these pioneer studies. This has revealed further clues, such as the extraordinary early life recall of close encounter witnesses; that is, often being able to remember events when they were just a few weeks old, whereas most people do not have any memory at all earlier than the age of about 3.

All of these patterns provide important clues that can be back-referred to our theories about UFO origin. They must tell us something that either support or do not support each theory, hence the value of research projects such as these.

Another project was started by the late Ron West and is being continued by people like Omar Fowler and Victor Kean. This is to produce a massive data base of sightings of triangular UFOs. These have become by far the most common type of UFO seen in the UK in recent years. This project, known as FT (Flying Triangle), has started to reveal trends. For instance the apparent focusing of cases around power stations.

How you interpret evidence of this sort is quite another matter, but having the evidence to interpret in the first place is really what is important, and amply justifies the advantages of doing this work.

Artful moves

Another interesting group of British research projects revolves around art. This ranges from the Bacup UFO team headed by Roger Markham (also working to cre-

ate a UFO monitor, conference centre and exhibition in this Pennine hill town—known locally as UFO Alley, owing to the high level of activity reported there). They are collating examples of UFO-related art work purely on a cultural basis.

Rather more specific is the research being carried out by Gary Anthony, who is seeking all known cases of UFOs and aliens that have been seen with symbols on the side of their craft or on their uniforms in some way. The aim is to look for any patterns that might emerge and what this might tell us.

After all, if we are being visited by aliens from some other civilisation, then presumably they do have some kind of language—and perhaps the cosmic equivalent of a Rosetta stone is out there somewhere in the evidence right now. To decode this could unlock many secrets. Or, of course, this research might reveal that the true origin of these symbols is the human unconscious.

Either way this is information that can only help UFOlogy to progress.



Oct. 27, A 2001 Space Odyssey: Explorations into the ET Question. Annapolis, MD (near D.C. & Balt.). Speakers: Dr. Tom VanFlandern, Dr. Paul LaViolette, Richard Hall, Rob/Sue Swiatek, Anna Jamerson, and Dr. S. Peter Resta (organizer). email: SPR100@aol.com

Nov. 3, Missouri MUFON, "Flying Saucers Hidden History 2001," St. Louis. Stanton Friedman, Richard Dolan, Dr. Carol Rosin. Contact Bruce Widaman at 800-489-4UFO, or P.O. Box 643, St. Charles, MO 63302

Nov. 9-11, Journeys Beyond 2001 Mobile Conference, Mobile, AL; confirmed speakers: Dr. John Mack, Dannon Brinkley, Stanton Friedman, Budd Hopkins, Dolores Cannon, Nancy Talbott, William Henry, Bruce Moen, Paul Anderson, and Pat Fitzhugh. www.journeysbeyond.com or call Pat Crumbley at 251-626-6131 for free program guide or write 7262 Highpointe PL E, Spanish Fort, AL 36527. e-mail pat@journeysbeyond.com

Nov. 12-17, Palenque 2001, The Emergence Conference: "De-coding the UFO Enigma," Palenque, Mexico. Presenters: Antonio Huneus, John Keel, Jaime Maussan, Christopher O'Brien, Christopher Powell, David Perkins, Lyssa Royal, Dr. Leo Sprinkle, Tata, Nancy Talbott, Tracy Torme, and Alonso Mendez Toporek. Toll free 877-620-8715 or outside U.S. 719-256-5186. www.emergenceconference.com

Nov. 17-18, Third Annual International UFO & New Age Symposium of Eastern Europe, Balkans, & Istanbul. Tel: +90 - 216 - 369 92 48 or E-mail : ufotr@netone.com.tr

Feb. 2-8, Caribbean cruise, featuring Budd Hopkins, Bruce Maccabee, Peter Robbins, and Kenny Young, 877-685-4450 or <http://home.onlineagency.com/adventurecruises/Page60562.asp>

New MUFON By-laws ready for vote

During the year 2000 a team rewrote the MUFON bylaws, making them extensive and complex. At the time it was thought that the membership would accept this new level of control and direction. Unfortunately, this was not the case. While fewer than two dozen members voted against the bylaws, many people expressed concern about their complexity. For your reference, those bylaws were published in the August 2000 issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal*.

The MUFON Board of Directors, at the annual board meeting in California in July, responded to the member concerns and agreed to delete everything from the bylaws that wasn't needed for the State of Texas paperwork. That has been done and the bylaws are ready for ratification.

To simplify the voting process the board agreed to accept **voting by exception**. That means that to vote for the bylaws, the members need to do nothing. A vote **not to accept** the bylaws must be sent to MUFON at P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369 by **DECEMBER 15, 2001**. This method of voting is now successfully used by many corporations to streamline the process.

BYLAWS OF THE MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC. (MUFON) A NONPROFIT CORPORATION

ARTICLE I: NAME, OBJECTIVES AND GOVERNANCE

Section 1: The name of this organization shall be MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC., and/or the acronym MUFON.

Section 2: Purpose and Mission:

- The purpose of MUFON is to resolve the mystery known as unidentified flying objects (UFOs) and all of its related ramifications in a scientific manner.
- The mission of MUFON is the systematic collection and analysis of UFO data, with the ultimate goal of learning the origin and nature of the UFO phenomenon.

Section 3: Incorporation:

- The Mutual UFO Network has been incorporated in the State of Texas as a non-profit corporation under Charter Number 379001 on April 9, 1976.
- The Texas Registered Agent is Thomas P. Deuley, 2827 Sir Philip Dr., San Antonio, TX 78209.
- The stated location of the principal office of MUFON is 10143 West Chatfield Ave., Unit No. 4, Littleton, CO 80127.
- The mailing address for MUFON is Post Office Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465.
- Ownership: The names Mutual UFO Network, Inc., MUFON/Mutual UFO Network, Inc., MUFON, Mutual UFO Network UFO Journal and MUFON organization, are the sole property of the MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC. Any and all trademarks, patents, intellectual property rights or data gathered or dis-

seminated under the MUFON name is the sole property of the MUFON organization.

- MUFON shall be governed by its Articles of Incorporation and these Bylaws.
- The annual corporate meeting will be held in June or July of each year in conjunction with the annual MUFON International UFO Symposium. Special meetings may be called at any time.

ARTICLE II: MEMBERSHIP

- Anyone is eligible for membership in MUFON, with membership levels established by MUFON policy.
- The Board of Directors shall determine the amount of annual dues payable, and may adjust the annual dues as necessary.
- Membership privileges may be terminated for failure to remit annual dues and/or for unlawful, unethical or abusive behavior.

ARTICLE III: FINANCIALS
Section 1: Fiscal year - The fiscal year of MUFON shall be July 1 through June 30.

Section 2: Bank account:

- A banking account, or accounts, convenient to the principal office, will be maintained for organizational funds.
- Savings or investment accounts may be opened by authorization of the Board of Directors.
- The International Director has the authority to pay normal expenses incurred for the operation of MUFON. Expenditures of more than \$5,000 for any single item requires the prior notification of the board of directors.
- Signature authority – Authorized signer(s) on MUFON account(s) will be approved by the Board of Directors.

Section 3: Annual Financial Report – At the conclusion of each fiscal year, the International Director, Treasurer and Office Secretary will prepare an Annual Financial Report for submittal to the Board of Directors and to government agencies as required.

Section 4: Audit - The Corporation's books of account shall be audited from time-to-time by auditors named by the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE IV: CORPORATION OFFICERS

The Corporate Officers of MUFON shall be: (1) International Director (President), (2) Corporate Secretary, and (3) Corporate Treasurer. The corporate officers may succeed themselves for an unspecified number of terms.

ARTICLE V: POWERS AND DUTIES OF CORPORATE OFFICERS

Section 1: International Director

- The International Director shall be the Chief Executive Officer of MUFON.
- The International Director is responsible for the administration and operation of MUFON.
- The International Director is duly authorized to conduct MUFON business and to sign checks or drafts upon MUFON funds.
- The International Director may hire office staff as required to conduct MUFON business.

Section 2: Corporate Secretary:

- The Corporate Secretary shall keep the true complete records of the proceedings at all corporate annual meetings.
- The Corporate Secretary may delegate duties to the

Office Secretary.

Section 3: Corporate Treasurer:

- The Corporate Treasurer shall keep the true complete records of all financial transactions and may delegate duties to the Office Secretary in that regard.
- The Corporate Treasurer is authorized to sign or countersign MUFON checks.
- The Corporate Treasurer will approve and sign the Annual Financial Report before it is submitted to the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE VI: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1: Composition – The Board of Directors shall consist of the Corporate Officers as set forth above, plus four other members.

Section 2: Election – New directors will be elected to a board position by a majority vote of the board of directors.

Section 3: Term – Board members will serve for a term of three years. Board members may serve more than one term if re-elected.

Section 4: Meetings – A duly held meeting will consist of a quorum of at least four board members.

Section 5: Duties of – Directors will set policy and direction of the organization, set membership fees, revise the bylaws and conduct other business as necessary for the organization.

Section 6: Removal – In addition to the criteria set forth under Article II, a board member may be removed for failure to participate in three consecutive board meetings.

ARTICLE VII: TRUSTEES

The Trustees of the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., a Texas Non-profit Corporation, shall be the International Director, Corporate Secretary, and Corporate Treasurer.

ARTICLE VIII: COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS, DIRECTORS AND TRUSTEES

As a nonprofit corporation, the Board of Directors has the authority to hire and compensate specific officers and other personnel for duties performed.

ARTICLE IX: AMENDMENTS

Amendments to these Bylaws may be proposed and set by the Board of Directors

ARTICLE X: OTHER

Section 1: Liability of members – No member of this corporation shall be personally liable for any of its debts, liabilities, or obligations, nor shall any member be subject to any assessment.

Section 2: Property/assets – No member shall have any right, title, or interest in any of the property or assets including any earnings or investment income of this corporation.

Section 3: Dissolution – In the event of dissolution of the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., any remainder of its net assets after discharge of its just debts and other legal and moral obligations shall be paid to such other nonprofit professional, scientific, educational or charitable institutions having similar purposes and objectives as MUFON as directed by the Trustees of the Corporation.

New MUFON t-shirts

The new field investigator t-shirt has the MUFON logo over the left chest pocket area and MUFON Field Investigator on the back. It comes in S, M, L and XL in two colors. The white shirt has a blue logo, and the black shirt has a white logo. White shirts are \$12 + \$3 S&H. Black shirts are \$15 + \$3 S&H

November 2001

Bright Planets (Evening Sky):

Mars (0.3 magnitude), in Capricornus, stays low in the SSW at dusk and sets in the WSW about 10 PM. Use binoculars or a telescope on Nov. 25 and 26 to find the 6th-magnitude planet **Uranus**. The tiny greenish object is about 1 degree above Mars.

Jupiter (-2.6), in Gemini, now rises in the NE about 7:30 PM in midmonth and moves westward across the southern sky during the night. The giant world begins retrograding on the 2nd (an illusory westward orbital motion).

Saturn (-0.9), near the Hyades in Taurus, rises in the ENE about 5:30 PM in mid-November. The planet is visible the rest of the night. Look for it about 1 degree below the gibbous Moon on the 3rd. The full moon occults (covers) Saturn for about an hour in the eastern half of North America on Nov. 30, beginning about 7:15 to 7:45 PM (EST), depending upon one's location.

Bright Planets (Morning Sky):

Mercury continues its fine appearance near **Venus** low in the E early in the month. Binoculars will help find the dim orange object less than 1 degree to the left of much brighter Venus (through Nov. 7). Venus (-3.9) rises about 5:30 AM in midmonth.

Jupiter and **Saturn** can be seen in the SW and W, respectively, at dawn

Leonid Meteor Storm:

The stage is set on Sunday morning, Nov. 18, for the greatest Leonid "meteor storm" in North America since 1966. Predictions for a peak rate range from about 2,000 to 4,000 meteors per hour (!) across the U.S., with highest numbers favoring the East Coast.

The spectacle occurs on a weekend without Moon interference. Although the shower maximum is forecast to occur around 5 or 5:30 AM (EST), observers would do well to begin watching the sky as early as 2 or 3 AM, to note the build-up of meteors, and then continue observing into morning twilight. (Twilight starts about 5 AM in midnorthern latitudes.)

The very swift and bright bluish Leonids appear to radiate from Leo the Lion's Sickle, which is located in the SE sky at the times indicated. If the forecast is correct, the entire heavens could be ablaze with meteors during the peak interval, coming at an average rate of up to one per second!

Nearly half the Leonids leave behind "trains," glowing wakes that may persist for some seconds. Another peak is expected later in the day over Australia and Asia. Check the news and Internet for possible revisions to these predictions.

The Stars:

As the Summer Triangle settles into the W and the first winter stars appear in the E, two deep sky objects attract our attention in the middle of the heavens.

Almost directly overhead look for a faint oval patch of light amid the stars of Andromeda the Princess. You are seeing the most distant object detectable with the naked eye—our sister spiral galaxy in space, the Andromeda Galaxy.

Binoculars will assist in locating it. Even though it requires two billion years for its light to reach us, this spiral assemblage of billions of stars is one of the nearest of all galaxies.

Some 25 degrees NE of the Andromeda spiral are two blobs of light close together—the Double Cluster of Perseus. The pair makes a special treat in binoculars or a telescope. Being within our own galaxy, these twin clusters of hundreds of stars are much closer than the previous object. The light from the clusters takes a mere 7,000 and 8,000 years to reach Earth.

Moon Phases:

Full moon—Nov. 1

Last quarter—Nov. 8

New moon—Nov. 15

First quarter—Nov. 22

Full moon—Nov. 30

Two full moons in one month, with the second full moon called a "blue moon." The last time this occurred was March, 1999.

Report from MUFON radio net

Hi MUFON HQ et al. Just for your info, the MUFON net is still alive and well. For instance, last Saturday we conducted the net at the time and frequency advertised in the *MUFON Journal*.

The following HAMS checked into the net: N2IXW, KB8ERL, K1RVB, KC0KZE, W1RV, WB9NLI, W0UKA, KC0IJN as well as myself W0AXK. We discussed Mars tubes and face, crop circles, a personal UFO sighting report, the National Airlines Flight 727 that disappeared for 10 minutes, UFO websites, the ARUFON net, etc.

Regards, Bob Schultz, MUFON net coordinator

MUFON Merchandise

Wear official MUFON T-shirts (royal blue printing on white cotton), sizes S, M, L & XL. Two styles of baseball caps (royal blue with white logo or dark blue with blue logo on white front). T-shirt price \$12.00 and baseball caps \$8.00. S/H for each is \$3.00 or if both ordered together is only \$3.00. MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369. (Check, money order, travelers check, or cash, all in U.S. dollars.)

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

By John Schuessler
MUFON International Director

Hope For The Future

Our hearts are shocked and grief-stricken by the shameless acts of terrorist violence on September 11, 2001 against innocent victims in New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington, D.C. Our thoughts and prayers go out to those who died and we seek comfort for those who have lost loved ones. We offer our support to the nation and urge its people to meet this challenge with faith, hope and courage.

As far as we can ascertain no MUFON members were lost during these horrible events. However, people from more than 40 countries, including the United States were lost. This wasn't just an attack on America, it was an attack on freedom loving people everywhere. Hate and evil invaded our way of life in a way that no one could imagine possible; but what it did was to unify and galvanize us all in the quest for justice, unity among all peoples and nations, and to strive for world peace.

God Bless America!

UFO Reports Persist

In spite of the horrors of Sept. 11, 2001 and the days that followed, UFO reports continued unabated. In addition to all of the reports received by **George Filer**, the MUFON Eastern Regional Director, MUFON headquarters continued to receive UFO reports by telephone and via the MUFON web site. We received three reports on Sept. 11, one each on the 12th, 13th, 14th, and 15th. On the 16th we received five reports, and they have continued, day after day.

The media, government officials and most of the nation was focused on the terrorist activities, so vividly shown on television and in the newspapers. Nevertheless, the UFO reports persisted. MUFON's mission "to systematically collect and analyze UFO data with the ultimate goal of learning the origin and nature of the UFO phenomenon" is as important and vital today as it was before the attack on this nation. We thank all of our wonderful MUFON volunteers for their continued efforts to fulfill the MUFON mission.

Give the MUFON UFO Journal as a Gift

We urge all of our readers to give a gift subscription of the *MUFON UFO Journal* to a friend or relative.

The *Journal* has a thirty-two year history of covering the UFO phenomenon in a responsible manner, and it remains one of the few UFO magazines to be published on a regular monthly basis. That means the material is current and vital to the ultimate solution of the UFO mystery.

In addition to bringing the facts about UFOs to a whole new audience, each gift subscription will help MUFON to succeed and grow during the trying times ahead. We appreciate your support.

Gift from UFO Video Coordinator

John Stewart, the MUFON UFO Video Coordinator, has supplied copies of a number of classic UFO videos for the MUFON historical archives. John has been buying, selling, trading, and collecting UFO videos for over 20 years. Many MUFON members have requested information on where to obtain UFO videos, but prior to this time we did not have a source to offer them. Now this information is available on the Internet at www.ufovideocoordinator.com. MUFON appreciates this valuable gift.

MUFON Field Investigator's Examination

In order to be promoted from Field Investigator Trainee status to the position of Field Investigator, every member must undergo field investigator training based on the MUFON Field Investigator's Manual and then take a written examination.

The manual, which provides the guidelines for proper UFO investigations, is available from MUFON headquarters for \$25 plus \$3.50 p&h. When ready to be tested, the trainee may request a copy of the exam also from MUFON headquarters.


Keeping with MUFON's goal of continuous improvement, **Kathleen Marden**, Director of Field Investigator Training, has responded to trainee comments about the examination and has revised the complete exam to make it clearer and easier to use. MUFON thanks Kathleen for revising the exam and for overseeing this process.

New Field Investigators

Kathleen Marden has announced the following Field Investigator Trainees have completed the Field Investigator's Exam and are now MUFON Field Investigators: **Dr. Joseph T. Ryan**, Bellevue, WA and **G. E. Tucker, Ph.D.**, Belchertown, MA.

New State Officers

Texas State Director **Kenneth Cherry** has named **Cathy** and **Larry Mathews** of Kingwood, Texas, as Co-Assistant State Directors for Southeast Texas, replacing **Bill Eatwell**. Bill has served MUFON in many ways over the past decade and we thank him for his loyal service.



John Schuessler