

MUTUAL UFO NETWORK

UFO JOURNAL

APRIL 1998

NUMBER 360 \$3



SKYLINE OF DENVER, COLORADO

WITH ROCKY MOUNTAINS IN THE BACKGROUND

SITE OF MUFON 1998 INTERNATIONAL UFO SYMPOSIUM

**MUFON
UFO Journal**

(USPS 002-970)
(ISSN 0270-6822)
103 Oldtowne Rd
Seguin, TX 78155-4099
Tel: (830) 379-9216
FAX (830) 372-9439

Editor:

Dwight Connelly
14026 Ridgelawn Road
Martinsville, IL 62442
Tel: (217) 382-4502
FAX (217) 382-4502
e-mail: bookdc@ccipost.net

Editor in Chief:

Walter H. Andrus, Jr.

Columnists:

Walter N. Webb,
John S. Carpenter,
T. David Spencer,
John F. Schuessler

Art Director:

Vince Johnson

MUFON UFO Hotline:
1-800-UFO-2166

The Internet: mufon.com
or

<http://www.mufon.com>

MUFON on Compuserv:
"Go MUFON"
to access the Forum

e-mail address:
mufonhq@aol.com

MUFON Amateur Radio Net:
40 meters - 7.237 MHz

Saturdays, 8 a.m. EST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

April 1998

Number 360

| | |
|--|----|
| Mexico City video analysis by Dr. Bruce Maccabee..... | 3 |
| Review of Dr. David Jacobs' <i>The Threat</i> by Greg Sandow..... | 10 |
| American documents—part 4 by Gildas Bourdais..... | 14 |
| The Russian Roswell by Anton A. Anfalov & Philip Mantle..... | 17 |
| Current cases by David Spencer..... | 20 |
| May Night Sky by Walter N. Webb..... | 22 |
| Calendar of events..... | 22 |
| Director's Message by Walter H. Andrus, Jr. | 24 |

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.

Copyright 1998 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 1998 by the Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Texas 78155" is included.

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

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

The *MUFON UFO Journal* is published monthly by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas. Membership/Subscription rates are \$30 per year in the U.S.A., and \$35 per year foreign in U.S. funds. Second class postage paid at Seguin, Texas.

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

An analysis

Mexico City video

By Bruce Maccabee Ph.D.

"\$H@& (Expletive deleted.) It's just a model hanging on a string ... a stupid hoax!!"

That was my immediate reaction as I watched the beginning of the Aug. 6, 1997, Mexico City video for the first time back in early November. Its wobbling and rotating saucer seemed just as big as life—but not as real. What immediately popped into my mind was a "vision" of a 1950's movie portrayal of flying saucers—the movie with rotating saucers that crash into the U. S. Capitol building (Invaders from Space?! I was disgusted!!!

Five seconds later I was no longer disgusted. Instead, I was surprised. During the first seconds of the video I had envisioned a small model saucer rotating and wobbling as it was hanging from a string. Then it abruptly moved to the right.

"That's no hanging model," I thought as it accelerated without any swinging back and forth characteristic of the pendulum motion of a small model at the end of a string.

As the video continued, I watched carefully for any evidence of swinging. There was none. I then reversed the video and watched the image of the Unidentified Object (UO) as it moved to the left toward its starting position. Suddenly it stopped moving, as if running into a brick wall (crash dummies inside?). I ran it back and forth several times. Each time I became more convinced that the acceleration was very rapid, perhaps even "instantaneous."

Suffice it to say that I watched the rest of the video with more respect. I then got out my ruler and started making measurements. I wanted to know just how fast it had accelerated. Thus began my investigation into one of the most interesting UO videos I have ever seen. In late November, I posted initial results of the investigation on the internet. This report provides some corrections and updates to those initial results.

History of the video

Jaime Maussan, a TV journalist in Mexico City (who has collected numerous videos related to the Mexico City solar eclipse sightings of 1991), received the video and a letter from an anonymous source on Sept. 26. He watched the video and wasn't impressed because it was too clear, too obvious.

"It had to be a hoax," he told Michael



Bruce Maccabee

About the author

Dr. Bruce Maccabee, a Research Physicist at the Naval Surface Weapons Center, holds the B.S. in physics from Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in physics from American University. He was a member of NICAP from 1968 until its demise, and has served as MUFON's State Director for Maryland, as well as Consultant in Photo Analysis and Laser Physics. In 1979 he and several colleagues established the Fund for UFO Research. He has analysed numerous photos and videos, has written numerous articles, and co-authored *UFOs Are Real: Here's the Proof* with Ed Walters.

Lindemann during an interview at the World UFO Congress in Brazil in December 1997, (published on the internet: cninewsl@aol.com). The video has a date stamp on it: Aug. 6, 1997. There are the voices of two men who were talking during the sighting. The conversation, which provides no details of the sighting, is as follows (translation by Carlos Guzman, MUFON State Director for Mexico, D.F.):


1st voice ".....(expletive deleted)"
 2nd voice "I can't believe it(expletive deleted)"
 1st voice "It looks just perfect"
 2nd voice "Are you recording, Carlos?"
 1st voice "Yes, the light is on."
 2nd voice "..... (expletive deleted)"
 1st voice "The disc looks great."
 2nd voice "It's not a plane, that (expletive deleted)"
 1st voice "I can't see it now. It moves behind the building, wait."
 2nd voice "By the other side?"
 1st voice "It isn't any more." (i.e., it's gone.)

Negative first impression

Jaime had not heard of anything particular happening on Aug. 6, so his initial impression was that he should ignore this video. But after he watched it several times more he decided to air it on his TV program "Tercer Milenio" on Sept. 27 and 28. Then on Sept. 29 he located the buildings in the video and determined where the videographer had been on a balcony on the fourth floor of an office building. This is in the western part of the federal district of Mexico City (an area called Prolongacion Bosques de La Reforma).

Although the videographer has remained anonymous, Jaime told Lindemann that since the Sept. 29 showing he has found more than a dozen witnesses by walking around the streets in the area asking people if they saw something unusual in August.

Several children claim to be able to draw the UO. One lady who was close to it claimed to have



This is a composite of four video frames which shows the movement of the UO prior to its disappearance behind one of the buildings.

been burned, like a sunburn, as it hovered overhead for a short time before moving away. Another claimed to have been under it and felt a downward force. This lady said that it turned away much faster than it appears on the video. Several said they saw lights on the bottom.

Michael Hesemann also interviewed witnesses on Dec. 3 while in the company of Alejandra Dehesa, a Mexican journalist who works for a different news agency (a rival of Maussan). They located the buildings which appear in the video and then walked around asking people if they had seen, or knew someone who had seen, the UO. Ultimately, by this manner they located and interviewed 7 witnesses and learned of 5 others who were not available to be interviewed at that time.

A restricted building

They learned that the office building where the video was shot has restricted entrance (a security system with guards; Hesemann was not allowed to enter) and hence the videographer must have worked for one of the companies in the building. There is no TV production company, computer company, or video laboratory. According to Hesemann, the witnesses came from "all levels of society, with no connection at all."

Yet another witness investigation has been carried out by Lee and Brit Elders, who have located a number of other witnesses. If it can be proven that these witnesses are not part of a rather large scale conspiracy, i.e., if the testimony is not a hoax, then this video will be important evidence of another reality right here on earth.

The MUFON representative in Mexico City, Carlos Guzman, has also investigated this sighting and

has provided numerous photographs, maps and an aerial survey photo, which show a typical urban setting with a few high rise apartment and office buildings interspersed between the typical one or two-story homes and stores in the area.

Analysis of the video

The analysis of the video has been a joint project by me and Jeffrey Sainio, MUFON photo/video analyst. (Jeff has previously presented several papers at MUFON symposia in which he has discussed the analysis of UFO photos and videos.) We have attempted to determine characteristics of the image of the UO and to use these characteristics to assess the likelihood of one of the following hoax hypotheses:

(A) a full sized model; (B) a small mechanized model that is near the camera; (C) some arrangement using optical/photographic methods; and (D) a complete electronic fabrication. These methods are discussed in more detail at the end of this article.

A black and white copy

The video analysis reported here was made possible by an unknown source in Mexico City who supplied a good copy of the video to a friend who subsequently sent it to me. This version, which is devoid of color for some reason, has a black and white direct copy of the video, a 1.6x magnified and slowed-down (half speed) negative version of the video (bright is changed to dark and vice versa), and a 7x magnified slowed-down video of the UO alone. I subsequently learned that the magnified versions were created by Jim Diletosso of Village Labs in Phoenix, AZ, who also sent me a color copy. The color copy shows that the UO image has no color.

The video begins with a "wide angle" shot, and then, over the next 3 seconds, zooms in on the UO. Once zoomed in, it stays that way. The initial wide angle shot shows numerous nearby and distant buildings. The nearby buildings are noticeably darker than the bright sky background. The distant structures have low contrast with the sky, a fact which is consistent with the known very hazy conditions for Aug. 6 in Mexico City.

The distance to the second building that the UO went behind is estimated at about 500 m or 1,800 ft. away. That would place the UO at a greater distance such as 600 m or 2,000 ft. The UO image is generally well centered in the video. The camera jiggle is obvious and looks as one would expect for a hand held camera. The jiggle is much more noticeable after zoom.

The UO started to move about 9 seconds after the start of the video. Its acceleration was abrupt (see below). The cameraman apparently panned with the moving UO until it was out of sight, about 24 seconds after the beginning of the video. The rightward motion was at a roughly constant rate (see below) and so was the pan motion (with jiggling). After the UO disappeared behind the second, higher building the cameraman kept the camera running for another 11 seconds (total video time is 35 seconds) and continued to pan to the right as if he expected to see the UO appear from behind the second building. This would be a logical thing to do, considering the previous steady rightward motion.

Motion always steady and slow

The motion of the UO was always steady and rather slow. It did not simply "hover for many seconds and then zip away at high speed," as reported in the *MUFON UFO Journal* article of November, 1997. The center of the UO was initially stationary while it rocked back and forth in such a way as to make it appear to be rotating about a vertical axis, a motion similar to that of a precessing gyroscope (i.e., a spinning top with its spin axis tilted from vertical and the spin axis rotating about a vertical axis through the support point).

The 7x video blowup shows periodic left-to-right motion of numerous diffuse (not sharp) dark areas or dark spots which seem to be on the rim of the UO. If these are fixed to the surface, then they suggest rotational motion, counter-clockwise as seen from above. This could be rotation of the whole UO or rotation of only an outer rim or ring.

If the UO or part of it was rotating, then perhaps the rotation was related to the periodic tilting or "precession," as in a gyroscope. (In a gyroscope the precession rate is related to the spin rate and the torque acting on the spinning mass of the gyroscope.) On the other hand, the UO might not be rotating at all, and the dark spots might actually be some structural features which moved along the rim or edge of the UO, thereby

giving the appearance of overall rotation. Whatever the case, this "rotation" and wobbling continued throughout the video (see below).

Distance and size determined

On a 14" diagonal monitor, using the direct video, the image size after the zoom is completed is about 27 mm wide and 8 mm high. By comparing the scene in a video frame with the aerial survey photo, I have determined that the field of view of the camera is about 12 to 13 degrees wide. The UO image is about 1/10 of this or about 1.2 to 1.3 degrees or about 0.022 radians (angular size in radians = size/distance). Assuming the UO was 50 m farther than the second building, which it disappeared behind (550 m away), it was about 600 mm from the camera (it could have been farther). At this distance, 0.022 radians corresponds to a size of 13 m or about 43 ft.

Analysis of the movement of the UO

The acceleration to the right is what initially caught my interest. To make a quantitative estimate of the acceleration, I measured frame by frame the spacing between the right end of the UO image and the left edge of the building image, thereby removing the camera jiggle from the measurement of UO position as a function of time. The several sets of data I obtained by hand measurement are presented in Figure 1 (next page).


Because of what I had seen while running the video, I was not surprised to see that the UO accelerated rapidly. However, I was surprised to see just how quickly the UO reached a steady speed to the right. The data in Figure 1 suggests that the acceleration occurred over a period of time no longer than two video frames, or 2/30 sec. However, because of difficulty in making accurate position measurements in the presence of electronic noise and the oscillation (tilting) of the UO image, I could not rule out the possibility that the acceleration took as little as 1 frame time (1/30 sec) or even 1 field time (1/60 sec).

In standard video format a "frame," or complete picture, is completed every 1/30 sec. Each frame is composed of two "fields," each taking 1/60 sec. Hence there are 30 frames or 60 fields per second. The first field is made up of odd horizontal scan lines, 1,3,5, etc., and the second field consists of the the even lines, 2,4,6, etc., so that after the second field there are a total of 460 lines making up the complete frame. Hence each field is itself a picture of the scene, but at lesser vertical resolution than the complete picture or "frame."

Jeffrey Sainio used computer-aided methods to produce more precise data. He obtained the horizontal position data for 20.45 seconds of the video,



Jeffrey Sainio



starting after the camera zoomed in on the UO, by measuring its position relative to the building, field by field (60 fields per second and 2 fields per frame), for 1,227 fields, an effort that required many, many hours of work.

Figure 2 shows its horizontal position relative to its initial position, i.e., the distance moved, rather than the separation between the UO and the building (shown in Figure 1). The horizontal position as a function of time is in relative units ("cursor units," vertical scale) vs time (in units of 1/60 sec). (The data points are close together and therefore make a thick line.) The "hole" in the graph corresponds to the time when the UO was apparently behind the building. The slope of the graph is proportional to the velocity.


The graph shows that the UO accelerated quickly, in a fraction of a second, to a constant velocity and held that velocity until it disappeared behind the first building. By the time it reappeared, the veloc-


ity was slightly lower (the slope was not as steep; compare to the slope the thin line projected along the direction of the initial slope). The rightward motion continued at a constant rate until the UO disappeared for the second and final time, 27 fields (nearly 1/2 second) after the end of the graph.

A close-up of the horizontal acceleration to the right is presented in Figure 3, which shows about 100 data points. Jeff obtained these data by using a special process that measures image shift from field to field in order to reduce the effects of electronic noise.

I have drawn a thin sloping line through the data. Note that the data suggest the acceleration took place in 1/60 sec. Further analysis is being done on this acceleration.

Measurements made using the direct video monitor show that the time from acceleration to the time when the leading edge of the UO image contacts the building image is about 45 1/2 frames or 1.52 sec





(± 0.1 sec). During this time the UO image moves about 2.15 times its own length. It then requires 21 frames or 0.7 sec to travel its own length and disappear behind the building. The total distance moved from the start of motion to complete disappearance is therefore 3.15 times its length, and it does this in about 66.5 frames or 2.22 sec.

Assuming a size of 43 ft, the speed was about 60 ft/sec or 42 mph. If the speed change from zero to 60 ft/sec occurred in 1/15 sec the average acceleration during this 1/15 sec would have been about $60/(1/15) = 900 \text{ ft/sec}^2$, which corresponds to 28 "g's" or 28 times the acceleration of gravity (32.2 ft/sec^2 or 9.8 m/sec^2). If the speed change occurred in 1/30 sec the acceleration was about 56 times that of gravity. Finally, if the speed change occurred in 1 field time (1/60 sec), as suggested by Figure 3 above, the acceleration was about 112 times that of gravity.

If you think of your own weight as caused by "1 g" of gravitational force, you can try to imagine what it would feel like to suddenly weigh 28 times or 56 times or 112 times your own normal weight. (Time for a crash diet!) The less steep slope of the graph after the UO reappeared from behind the building means that while it was (apparently) behind the building it slowed its rightward velocity to about 0.66 of the initial velocity. Assuming it was 43 ft wide, this final horizontal velocity was about 40 ft/sec or about 27 mph.

At the same time that the UO accelerated to the right, it also accelerated and then moved upward at a constant speed. A graph of the height vs time shows a continual climb until a few seconds after it reappeared from behind the building, at which time it abruptly stopped its continual climb and began a very slow climb upward. Again assuming a 43 ft wide UO, the upward speed was about 20 ft/sec or about 13 mph.


Except for the growth in image size during the initial zoom, the size of the UO image changes very slightly (a few percent) during the first 17.65 seconds of the video. The slight changes are consistent with what one would expect if the UO traveled along a straight or nearly straight trajectory that was essentially perpendicular to the line of sight toward the building. Then, during the last 2.8 seconds before the UO disappears (for the last time) behind the second building, the image shrinks by about 20%.

The shrinkage is consistent with the assumption that during this time the UO was moving away from the camera, an assumption that is supported by the decrease in contrast of the UO image relative to the sky. (Under hazy conditions the contrast with the sky background diminishes as distance increases.)

By assuming the acceleration occurred in much less than a second, and by assuming a particular distance after the acceleration ended, one can use the following two equations to calculate the component of velocity away from the camera, V_a : (1) $S_i(t) = S_a/F/D(t)$, where $S_i(t)$ is the image size as a function of time, t , after acceleration ends, S_a is the actual size of the object (e.g., 43 ft), F is the effective focal length of the camera (unknown) and (2) $D(t) = D_0 + tV_a$, where D_0 is the distance when the acceleration ended. The image size at $t = 0$ is 86 units (relative size) and at $t = 2.8$ seconds is 70 units.

Hence equation (1) at $t = 0$ yields $S_a/F/D_0 = 86$. Then at $t = 2.8$ equation (2) is $70 = 86/(1 + 2.8V_a/D_0)$, which yields $V_a/D_0 = (86/70 - 1)/2.8 = 0.082$. The actual value of V_a depends upon the assumed distance, D_0 . If $D_0 = 2,000$ ft, its speed was about 164 ft/sec (112 mph). The clear implication of these calculations is that the UO traveled away much more rapidly than it moved to the right (at 27 mph).

FIGURE 4 MEXICO CITY UFO
OSCILLATION AND SINE WAVE COMPARISON



The UO must have made a sharp left turn (at East Gate?) at the same time that it accelerated away. The turn angle is estimated at nearly 80 degrees. So here we have one of those (nearly) "90-degree turns" people have reported for years!

Periodic wobble and rotation

The wobble motion has been carefully measured by Jeff Sainio. Figure 4 shows the periodic up-down motion of one end of the UO image as a function of time with a sine wave superimposed.

Although the data are noisy, it is nevertheless impressive to see that a single sine wave equation can fit the whole series of 18 $3/4$ cycles without being affected by the accelerations that occurred. (There are several cycles missing in the middle when the UO was behind the building.) The period of the oscillation is 1.065 sec (a frequency of about 1 Hz). To fit the whole curve, the phase of the sine wave was set at 173 degrees.

The previous graph shows that the wobble motion is constant. This suggests continual rotation of the major symmetry axis of the UO about a vertical axis through its center. The 7x blowup, which shows the UO image field-by-field, provides evidence of another, more basic sort of rotation. This is the rotation of the object about its major symmetry axis. The moving dark areas suggest a rotation speed of about $1/3$ of a revolution per second ($1/3$ Hz) about the symmetry axis.

The two rotations taken together make it appear that the UO was rotating about its symmetry axis at $1/3$ Hz while its symmetry axis was rotating around a vertical axis at 1 Hz, just like a spinning, tilted top that is precessing about a vertical axis drawn through the support point of the top (e.g., the point on the table the top spins upon).

The UO's appearance of being like a precessing top is seductive, but neither torque free precession nor torque driven precession of a rotating object seems consistent with the apparent precession rate (1 Hz) being larger than the spin rate (113 Hz). Of course, there could be within the UO a rapidly spinning object—a source of high speed angular momentum—which is not visible from the outside, or the precession might be caused by a torque due to magnetic fields and/or gravity or something else.

Considering the hoax hypothesis

In general there are three possibilities for any UO sighting: it is a hoax, a misidentification, or the "real thing" (a True UFO—unexplainable as a conventional phenomenon). The possibility of a misidentification seems unlikely here because of the shape. It wasn't a bird or a plane or Superman (well, maybe Superman).

One can barely imagine that this was just a misidentified blimp or an oddly shaped motor-driven balloon of some kind that just happened to be "passing by." Yet, this is the only conventional (i.e., not a True UFO), non-hoax hypothesis that could be consistent with witness testimony about seeing a real object. However, this hypothesis must be rejected because of the video evidence which shows anomalous accelerations of the UO.

How about a full-scale hoax?

What if it were a full-scale hoax involving a large object, 43 or more feet in size, designed to look like a True UFO that could fool unsuspecting witnesses? This could be a motorized blimp or simply a wind borne or tethered balloon of an odd shape.

However, even with the most advantageous combination of assumptions about mechanical capa-

bilities of such a blimp/balloon, one cannot explain the initial "instantaneous" acceleration to a constant velocity at the beginning of the video, the sudden stop in its vertical ascent, the rapid "right angle turn" with large acceleration just before it went away, and the lack of effect of these accelerations on the continuous rocking motion.

Finally, it is hard to imagine that the unsuspecting witnesses would not realize they were just seeing (and hearing?) some motorized blimp or a balloon dragged by the wind.

Alternative hoax hypotheses that do not involve a full scale model are based on the assumption that the witnesses "don't count." Either they were all delusional or part of the hoax conspiracy. One possibility is that a several-inch-sized, motorized MUFO (model UFO) was videotaped inside a room in "real time" while the MUFO was moved past a window with a camera looking through the window at the background scene.

A flat model needed

In order to make the MUFO appear to go behind the real building "out there," it would be necessary to have inside the room a flat model of the building which would be slightly closer to the camera than the model itself so the model could move behind it.

Of course, the edges of the model building would have to be perfectly aligned with the edges of the real building as seen from the camera, and this alignment would have to be maintained throughout the video despite the camera jiggle, something that would be difficult to do. There are many other details of this hypothetical MUFO method which would make it both time consuming and expensive, although probably not impossible.

An alternative is a "rear screen projection" method in which a stationary view of the whole background scene from farthest left to farthest right is projected onto the front side of a large screen (i.e., the projector is on the same side as the video camera that records the scene). This screen is assumed to be translucent rather than opaque. There is also a projector on the opposite side of the screen ("rear projection") which creates a movable and dynamic image of a UO on the other side of the screen.

Because the screen is translucent, some of the UO image "leaks through" the screen. Thus the UO image can be videotaped along with the front projection of the real scene. The UO image is then moved sideways to create periodic tilting, rotation, acceleration, steady motion to the right, etc., while the handheld video camera follows the image, thereby recording (a photograph of) the real scene with the supposed UO moving against the sky background.

It would be necessary to place an opaque mask with the shape (outline) of the buildings at the rear of the screen to block the UO image from the rear projec-

tor at the locations where it seems to be behind the building. This method, while perhaps not as difficult as the MUFO method described above, would still require considerable effort and equipment.

An electronic fake?

Finally one must consider the "all out electronic" fake. In this case one might imagine that the cameraman videotaped the background scene with a handheld camera to make it look as if he were following the path of a True UFO that hovered for a few seconds and then moved across the scene.

Then the computer graphics geniuses would create a classic UFO shape and make it appear to rotate and oscillate (tilt) at a steady rate. Then they would have to analyze the random camera jiggle motion of the background scene on a field-by-field basis. An alternative would be to have the cameraman videotape the scene with the camera on a tripod, and then the computer geniuses would add a synthetic camera jiggle later on.

Then, on a field-by-field basis, they would have to place the EUFO (electronic UFO) image "on top of" the background scene (hazy sky) in such a way that the EUFO would appear to move in a manner consistent with the motion of True UFOs. Finally, after about 1,440 fields of EUFO video had been generated in this way, the geniuses would be finished, since the last 11 seconds of the video doesn't show the EUFO.

Considering the number of possibilities for faking this video in a studio, I would have to say that if Stephen Spielberg had given me this video I would have asked if he had been talking to George Lucas recently! On the other hand, if the witnesses are credible, these methods can be tossed out the window.

Estimate of the situation

As of the time of this writing (early February) there is no firm conclusion. There may be other hoax hypotheses that should be considered. Investigation of the video and of the witnesses continues, with a major effort to determine which hypotheses can be rejected. If it turns out that all hoax hypotheses can be rejected, then this will become one of the most spectacular True UFO sightings ever recorded on video.

MUFON 1997 SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS "Fiftieth Anniversary of Ufology"

Thirteen Papers - 300 pages
Price: \$25.00 plus \$1.75
for postage and handling, in U.S. funds

ORDER FROM:
MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Road
Seguin, Texas 78155-4099

The UFO PRESS

David Jacobs' *The Threat. The Secret Agenda: What the Aliens Want, and How They Plan To Get It* (Simon & Schuster, \$23)

Reviewed by Greg Sandow

Nobody who knows David Jacobs, a sensible history professor at Temple University, will be surprised to learn that his publisher made up this lurid title. But it exaggerates only one thing: Jacobs hasn't figured out exactly how the aliens will carry out their final plan. He thinks he knows what it is, though, and that's news.

To my knowledge, no other reputable UFO researcher has ever gone that far. And Jacobs' findings aren't any fun. There is an alien threat, he's concluded, and the aliens are going to take over. They plan to replace us with alien-human hybrids. These are the very hybrids that, according to Jacobs and his abduction research colleague Budd Hopkins, abductees have given birth to and been commanded to hug during their abductions.

Just how crazy is this? The first thing to understand is that *The Threat* is a sequel to Jacobs' 1992 book, *Secret Life*. His premise there was that we can learn exactly, what the alien abductors do if we carefully put together everything abductees tell us under hypnosis. However, there's one little catch: we can only trust what abductees say if we ask the right questions. And our list of proven alien traits can only include things we've heard independently from more than one abductee.

Given those cautions, Jacobs wrote in *Secret Life*, abductions don't have to be mysterious. He collated abductee accounts, and, in meticulous detail, told us what's going on. To anyone who thinks abductions are nonsense, *Secret Life* had to be the greatest nonsense of all (or at least the greatest nonsense until *The Threat*) because Jacobs wrote with real certainty. He could just as well have been describing a tribe on a Pacific island, or some neighbors whom he didn't know well but had been observing for years.

In a world where abductions aren't accepted as reality, even by many UFO researchers, this caused obvious problems. But I thought *Secret Life* was brave, and even necessary. Someone who thought abductions



David M. Jacobs

David M. Jacobs

Dr. Jacobs is associate professor of history at Temple University, and has been a UFO researcher since the 1960s. In 1973 he completed his doctoral dissertation in the field of intellectual history at the University of Wisconsin on the controversy over UFOs—only the second Ph.D. granted involving a UFO-related theme.

His previous books are *The UFO Controversy in America* (1975) and *Secret Life: Firsthand Accounts of UFO Abductions* (1992). He is also the author of numerous papers on UFOs. Dr. Jacobs will be one of the featured speakers at the June 1998 MUFON symposium in Denver.

are real had to sit down and say, "OK, let's figure out what's going on."

The Threat, methodologically speaking, just continues this research. In *Secret Life* we learned that the aliens use us to breed hybrids. (Budd Hopkins has been saying that, too, of course.) Now, with more information, Jacobs tells us that breeding hybrids is the center of the alien plan, and that the aliens have now bred several generations of them.

Replace us with hybrids?

They plan, as I've said, to replace us with those hybrids, and this is going to happen soon, maybe within a few years, but certainly within a generation or two. As I've also said, many people will think this is worse nonsense than *Secret Life*. But put aside Jacobs' conclusions for a moment, and think about his method.

If abductions are genuine (which of course is quite a stretch for many people), why can't we figure out what they're all about? Maybe, as some claim, abductions are too magical or too paranormal for us to comprehend; maybe the aliens think in ways that we could never grasp.

Maybe, too, they're fooling us, planting false memories in abductees. But then maybe none of this is true. Maybe the aliens are beings like us, no matter how advanced their science might be. And if that's true, why can't we try to understand them? And we'd better try, if they're abducting us.

Jacobs is the first researcher who has tried in any systematic way to do that. Reject what he's concluded, if you like, but don't damn him for trying. Along the way, he comes up with fascinating details. To anyone who doesn't buy the Hopkins/Jacobs abduction accounts, these may not mean much, but for people who have followed the story with even mild interest, Jacobs fills important gaps.

Take, for instance, the reports of aliens forcing abductees to have sex with each other. Why would they do that if their goal is to breed hybrid babies? In

fact, Jacobs tells us, they compel the male to withdraw before he ejaculates, so they can catch his sperm. The sex between abductees only happens, Jacobs now says, when the aliens can't get a male abductee to ejaculate any other way.

Unusual implants

Jacobs also unveils another alien technique: the aliens implant women not just with fetuses, but with "extrauterine gestational units," sacs of some kind that cradle the baby inside the woman. Thus, even women who have had hysterectomies can bear hybrids for them.

The aliens, says Jacobs, may themselves be a failed attempt at breeding hybrids, or at least the little gray ones might be. Aliens, he reports, have let this slip to abductees. Now they can't reproduce, so they've come to us for our unwilling help. The current hybrids come in many flavors, from mostly alien to almost wholly human (in appearance, anyway). This, says Jacobs, is because the aliens first breed hybrids, then breed us with the hybrids, creating successive generations that look more and more like us. He thinks this explains all reports of humans seen in abductions, from the fabled "Nordics" (late-generation hybrids, he says, are often blonde) to Leah Haley-style accounts of military personnel working with the aliens, or staging abductions on their own (they're simply hybrids wearing uniforms).

Human emotions?

The hybrids, being partly human, have human emotions. They get bored on the aliens' ships, doing the aliens' work. One of them, speaking to an abductee, unhappily compared himself to a robot. Some of them tattle on the aliens, revealing formerly secret details to abductees. This, in fact, is how Jacobs says he got some of the data that tells him the aliens' ultimate goals.

Sometimes the hybrids fall in love with their human partners, or, as they put it, with their "projects." Sometimes, though, they grow unstable (as an alien once supposedly admitted), and then they get abusive, the result, Jacobs says, of frustration, sexual and otherwise. *The Threat* has lurid passages about male hybrid abuse of female abductees, strongly X-rated stuff involving rape and beatings.

And watch out; the hybrids walk among us, though apparently they don't live among us yet. Sometimes they're given a few hours to wander here on earth, where they meet their "projects" for impromptu abduction dates, and ask questions about things they see humans doing. Sometimes they take abductees to abandoned military bases, or unused parts of active installations. (This sounds dicey. Why would they do that?)

There's a hierarchy among the aliens. Anyone who's read the standard Hopkins/Jacobs abduction stories knows that the abductors come in two flavors: small

aliens who do the grunt work, and big ones who supervise. But above the tall aliens are insect-like alien commanders, who wear robes and give the final orders.

Alien hierarchy described

When the aliens take over Earth, the hierarchy will run like this: insectoids, then grays, then hybrids, then abductees, and then, way down on the bottom, the rest of humanity, who may be kept in special preserves as breeding stock in case the hybrid program runs into unexpected trouble. This sounds as if most non-abductees are going to be killed or otherwise removed from the scene, unless these preserves encompass most of the planet.

Jacobs doesn't clarify this rather crucial detail. But he does talk about "The Change," his term for the alien takeover—modeled, apparently, on how he says the hybrids and aliens speak to abductees—which might be accompanied by the catastrophes the aliens supposedly predict to abductees.

So much for major revelations. The book also has something else that's new: a long, thorough chapter on Jacobs' way of working, the most substantial discussion I've yet seen in print from any abduction researcher about the methodology of abduction research. How do we know that abductees aren't simply suffering from disassociative fantasies? How do we know they aren't prompted under hypnosis with leading questions, or that they're not confabulating? ("Confabulation" is a technical term that means, very simply, "making things up.")

Skeptics, of course, have made these charges, and Jacobs answers them and others in great detail. Are abduction stories caused by media contamination? If they were, says Jacobs, he would be getting reports of the dancing fat blue aliens in the film of Whitley Strieber's *Communion*, and he never has.

Not a false memory syndrome

Are abduction reports an example of false memory syndrome? No, says Jacobs, because, unlike people with this syndrome, who believe in sexual abuse that never happened, abductees consciously remember their abductions without being prompted by a therapist or investigator, and don't only report childhood events. They're also physically missing when they say they've been abducted, and can sometimes provide independent confirmation, such as from another abductee who was abducted at the same time.

I do think Jacobs should present more proof of what he says. How many cases can he cite of abductees who truly disappear, and what proof does he have? But from now on, any skeptic who writes about abductions without addressing Jacobs's arguments will stand revealed as irresponsible.

For the first time, too, at least in print, Jacobs

takes issue—again in careful detail—with John Mack, Edith Fiore, Richard Boylan and other researchers who believe the aliens are benevolent. Jacobs, by the way, doesn't rule out alien benevolence. He's willing to concede that the alien plan might be in our best interest. He just doesn't see any evidence that this is so.

But now we come to the biggest challenges—and the biggest problems—in the book. I said earlier that, in Jacobs' view, you have to ask the right questions to get accurate results when you question abductees under hypnosis. This is something he, Budd Hopkins, and John Carpenter have all maintained for many years, but never fully explained in any of their books.

Jacobs calls this approach "competent hypnosis," something which, he says, John Mack doesn't practice, despite his credentials as a psychiatrist. If you don't use competent hypnosis with abductees, says Jacobs, your results will be worthless. You'll do exactly what the skeptics charge: you'll fall into a web of confabulation and fantasies, and you won't know how to separate them from reality.

To avoid falling into this trap, you can't take literally anything that abductees say, especially at the beginning of your work with them, or at the start of a hypnosis session. You have to question them carefully, to distinguish fact from fiction. But here, of course, we have big potential trouble.


Setting abductees straight

If abductees (their minds clouded by the aliens) don't accurately report what happens to them, abduction investigators have to set them straight. But what's to prevent the investigators from substituting stories of their own? Jacobs, to his credit, answers this objection.

He says you just rely on logic, persistence, and common sense. To give one simple example, he cites abductees who say they meet very tall aliens, much taller than they are. Well, he asks, how do the abductees know how tall the aliens are? An investigator needs to determine that. But he or she can't ask leading questions, even something apparently harmless, like "Are you sure the aliens were tall?" That conveys a strong suggestion that the investigator doesn't believe the abductee, and invites the abductee to change the story.

Instead, Jacobs will encourage the abductee to tell him more details. "Where are you," he might ask, "when you see these aliens?" Invariably, he says, abductees who describe giant aliens turn out to be lying down when they see them. They're lying on the aliens' notorious cold metal examination table, looking up at beings standing over them.

So the aliens weren't tall at all; they were just seen from below. The abductees were making an honest, if befuddled, mistake, and it's easy, at least in prin-



ciple, for an investigator to find out the truth. Multiply this example by every detail of an abduction account, and you'll have an idea of Jacobs' method, which is Budd Hopkins', too.

Drawing the line

This draws a strong line between them and, let's say, Kevin Randle and Russ Estes, who, in *Faces of the Visitors*, their new book on reported encounters with aliens, write about 150 abductees and contactees they've interviewed. These people say they've seen a wider variety of alien types than Hopkins and Jacobs report. Jacobs, however, would reply that these people aren't remembering correctly, and that Randle and Estes are wrong to take their accounts at face value.

The Threat presents Jacobs' reasoning (and his investigative techniques) more thoroughly than anything else I've seen in print. We need to study them. If abductees really get abducted, is it true that they don't describe their abductions accurately? Is it true that "competent hypnosis," as practiced by Hopkins, Jacobs, Carpenter, and a few others, can sort out the truth, and that any investigators who don't practice it are misleading themselves, abductees, and the rest of us?

Not unreasonable

This isn't *a priori* unreasonable, especially since it's generally accepted that abductions take place in an altered state of consciousness. We need to study Jacobs' method before we can criticize his results. Even if we end up accepting this methodology, however,

ADVANCE REGISTRATION FORM (Please print or type)
MUFON 1998 INTERNATIONAL UFO SYMPOSIUM
Renaissance Denver Hotel, Denver, Colorado
June 26, 27 & 28, 1998

Name of Registrant _____

Address _____ City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Name of Spouse/Guest _____

(Please note: All spouses/guests pay registration and reception fee to attend.)

RECEPTION (Friday Evening 6-9 p.m.) \$25.00 each x _____ = \$ _____

REGISTRATION (Saturday & Sunday) \$75.00 each x _____ = \$ _____

(Registration after June 10, 1998 is \$85.00 per person.)

Total amount of check enclosed with registration form: \$ _____

Please make a personal check or postal money order in U.S. currency and mail to:

MUFON COLORADO 1998 UFO SYMPOSIUM

P.O. Box 914

Wheat Ridge, CO 80034

there's one more thing to ask about *The Threat*. How many reports does Jacobs base his troubling conclusions on?

Here the book itself is misleading. In an early chapter, Jacobs gives detailed histories of 11 abductees. It's easy to assume that these are his main sources for the data in the book, but that's only partly true. Some are, but some are not, and Jacobs also discusses reports from some 27 other people (more in total, Jacobs told me, than he quoted in *Secret Life*). But this important statistic is overshadowed by the initial emphasis on the 11 he singles out.

We still have to ask, however, if enough abductees have told Jacobs about the really striking stuff: the provocative behavior of the hybrids, or, most crucially, the aliens' intentions and the approaching culmination of their plan. Is Jacobs relying on just a few reports, or does he have more that he doesn't quote?

I called Jacobs to ask him that. He told me that he keeps detailed files of abductee interviews, thanks to which he can state in *The Threat* that he's heard 400 accounts of physical exams by the aliens, and 180 stories about abductees meeting hybrid children. (The totals are greater than the number of abductees he's talked to, so some have reported more than one exam, or more than one meeting with a hybrid child.)

So he could tell me that 10 people have told him about what he calls "independent hybrid activity," or in other words about meeting hybrids in ordinary earthly settings. Of these 10, he mentions six in the book. So he does have reports besides the ones he quotes.

Crucial count missing?

But when I asked him how many people had told them that hybrids or aliens had revealed details of the final plan, he didn't know, because he hasn't kept data on that.

I can't fault his honesty, since he answered all my questions as fully as he could. Besides, in the book he's careful to say (in a footnote) that one abductee had taken cocaine before experiencing what she reported as a dramatic, five-day abduction, something he could have left out if he wanted to present everything only in the best light.

A small percentage

But he couldn't supply all the information I wanted. And it's clear that the most dramatic reports in *The Threat* come from a minority of abductees. Jacobs has worked, in all, with 120 abduction experiencers, so his accounts of hybrids on the loose, for example, come from only eight percent. Other dramatic data in the book might come from an even smaller group. Does this make it unreliable?

It's hard to say. Jacobs admits he's heard about

the alien plans from only what he calls "a select group of people." But he feels sure that he can tell which abductees give reliable reports, and that it's the reliable ones who contribute the most important information in his new book.

That, however, doesn't help us much. On anything as important as the future of humanity, we can't take what he says on faith (though someone should mount a detailed study of his reasons for deciding which abductees to trust). Jacobs does say he's never heard reports of any other alien agenda. Others, of course, say they have: there are abductees who think the aliens are friendly, and researchers who agree with them. We need to understand whether these accounts are fantasies, as Jacobs has decided.

Reports on plans heard by accident

Jacobs notes that he hears reports of the aliens' plans only by accident. He can imagine asking abductees to search their memories, but then he'd have to ask leading questions under hypnosis, which would make the information unreliable. And when the aliens' intentions do come up, he says, "The abductees don't know the importance of what's being said to them. They go right by it, and go on to other things. It's frustrating!"

This, to me, suggests first that the abductees aren't slanting their reports or consciously making them up; if they were, wouldn't they emphasize really juicy evidence for a hostile alien invasion? Their reticence also suggest that Jacobs isn't letting his abductees know how important any given piece of information is, which might encourage them to make things up to please him. Besides, the aliens and hybrids might not talk about their ultimate intentions very often. And if that's true, most abductees would never hear about them.

We're left, in the end, with a challenge. Jacobs, along with his colleagues Hopkins and Carpenter, says that he can sift truth from the fantasy and confabulation that clouds abductee reports. He and his colleagues say that abductees confirm each other.

Do we believe them? Do we believe Jacobs when, for instance, he tells us that abductees who help the aliens with their work always say they do it wearing blue uniforms? This is a detail that was never published, to my knowledge, until Hopkins printed it in *Witnessed*, his book about the Linda Cortile abduction case.

Yet Jacobs says his abductees consistently report it. If we think they're doing that without being prompted, or without hearing about the blue uniforms from conversations in abductee support groups, then we're pretty well forced to say that Jacobs might be on to something. And if he is, we'd better take *The Threat* seriously.

Part Four—American documents

Roswell: some contradictions

By Gildas Bourdais

Editor's Note: This paper was presented at the *Primer Forum Mundial de Ufologia* in Brazil last December. Mr. Bourdais is from France.

The U.S. Air Force has now published two thick documents on the Roswell case, a rather odd fact to begin with, since it maintains the opinion that there is no UFO at all. If this is true, why so much hassle to demonstrate that there was no UFO crash in Roswell?

In the first book, of about 800 pages (there is no pagination), called "*The Roswell Report. Fact versus Fiction*," released around September 1995 (18) (Doc 13), the authors explain the Roswell crash as the fall of a Mogul balloon train on the Foster ranch, although they don't bring any definitive proof of that. The bulk of the report is made up of technical documentation on balloons of the time, which is certainly a valuable historical documentation, but does not bring much light to the Roswell case. The argumentation offered is:

1) Col. Blanchard, commander of the atomic bombers in Roswell, announced the recuperation of a flying disk by Maj. Jesse Marcel, his officer in charge of the security of the base, in his famous press release of July 6, 1947, because he was "overexcited" by UFO stories appearing in the press for a couple of weeks. So, explains the USAF report, he mistook the remains of a Mogul balloon train for those of a crashed flying saucer.

2) Maj. Marcel and Col. Blanchard were confused because the Mogul balloon train was somewhat different from ordinary weather balloons—it was a cluster of weather balloons (Doc 14) which carried radar reflectors (sheets of aluminium stuck on paper and mounted on balsa wood frames) of a special type, a bit larger than the ordinary ones (Doc 15). They were more fragile too, so that it had been necessary to reinforce them with sticking paper. They were made by a toy manufacturer who used paper adorned with flowers. Abstract designs of flowers, explained professor Charles Moore, who was responsible for the launching the balloons in White Sands, caused Marcel and Blanchard to mistake them for extraterrestrial writings! (Doc 16).

Note that the abstract designs have been drawn by Charles Moore from memory, just like the son of Jesse Marcel did for the I beams (Doc 17). There is no record of them from that time which would prove their peculiar aspect.

3) The Air Force report assumes that it was the

Mogul flight number 4, but they have no proof, not one piece of paper mentioning for instance the recuperation of that balloon train by the launching team of White Sands. Only the date of launching is known, June 4, and there was no radar tracking of the flight, so that the exact place of its fall is not known. It might have been on the Foster ranch, but there is no proof of that.

Note that the flight number 4 was made of ordinary balloons in neoprene, like weather balloons. Note also that all the other Mogul flights have been discarded after discussion. Flight number 4 is the only candidate left for the "explanation" of the Roswell case!

4) Some of the balloon debris was shown to the press by Gen. Ramey in Ft. Worth, but its real nature was concealed because the Mogul project was highly classified. It was identified as a weather balloon. The pictures made in the office of Gen. Ramey show without doubt the debris of a balloon and radar reflector, but it could well have come from a Mogul balloon train, since it was made up of balloons of the same type (Doc 18).

Three USAF witnesses on the debris

Can we believe this explanation of the Air Force? If there were not hundreds of testimonies contradicting this story, it might well be acceptable, although the officers of the atomic bombers look very bad: they are the real dummies of the story! But at closer look, it appears that the only "proof" of the Mogul story resides in three witnesses who seem to describe Mogul remains. These are:

—the rancher Mac Brazel, who described the debris on the Foster ranch, as reported in the article of the *Roswell Daily Record* of July 9;

—Irving Newton, the weather officer at Fort Worth, who recognized at once the debris of a weather balloon with a radar target in the office of Gen. Ramey;

—Sheridan Cavitt, who was at the time the counter-intelligence officer of the Roswell base, and who went in the field with Marcel on July 7 to retrieve the debris.

A look at the testimonies

Let's examine briefly these testimonies.

First, Brazel, who was interviewed in the evening of July 8 in the Office of the *Roswell Daily Record*, where he arrived under military escort after having spent the day at the base (the USAF Report neglects to mention that). It was at the same time Gen. Ramey was showing to the press the balloon debris brought by plane the same day to Fort Worth.

Is Brazel credible? In his interview published by the newspaper the next day (19) (Doc 19), he describes a small volume of debris, of no more than five pounds. This is in total contradiction with the descrip-



I-beam and patterns described by Jesse Marcel, Jr., under hypnosis. Drawn by Kimberly Moeller.

tion given today of a Mogul balloon train, a huge array of 20 to 30 balloons which could be about 200 m long, depending on the models.

Of course, if the military goal was to hide the Mogul balloon, then he had been forbidden to describe it. However, Brazel's description does mention tape with flower design on it, and this detail is put forward now as a "proof" of the Mogul balloon theory.

How good is that "proof"? If the real goal was to hide the UFO crash and show instead balloon debris, they might have had the idea of presenting rather peculiar debris of a Mogul radar target (found in the area, or brought from White Sands?) in order to show at least something unusual to the press, which could "explain" the blunder of the press release.

Awkward testimony

Then of course Brazel would have been instructed to describe that. But his description is awkward. One thing is sure: whatever fell on the Foster ranch was much bigger than five pounds of material, and therefore Brazel was lying at least on that point. He could have been lying as well on the UFO debris.

Secondly, Irving Newton. Newton was the warrant officer called by Gen. Ramey in his office at Ft. Worth who identified at once remnants of a regular weather balloon with its RAWIN radar target, very similar in fact to those of the Mogul balloon trains. Again, note that the officers of Roswell, the elite of the Air Force, were not able to recognize it!

Now, we come to the main point of his testimony. According to Newton, Maj. Marcel tried to convince him that there were "alien writings" on the target sticks. If Marcel was wrong, this could mean only two things: that the material came, indeed, from a Mogul flight, and that Marcel, the officer in charge of the security of the atomic bombers, was a total idiot!

What can we make of that testimony? It is possible that this balloon debris was from a Mogul balloon train. But that does not prove that it came from the Foster ranch, if the decision had been made to hide the real UFO debris and replace it with this balloon debris!

Diverting the attention of the press

And that is precisely what Gen. Thomas DuBose, who was then colonel and deputy of Gen. Ramey, told in 1991 in a sworn affidavit: "The weather

balloon explanation for the material was a cover story to divert the attention of the press." (Doc 20)

DuBose explained that he received orders, with Ramey, directly from Gen. McMullen in Washington. He has also affirmed, in several interviews, that he never saw the real debris. It is a key testimony for the whole Roswell case, which has never been mentioned in the Air Force reports!

Newton's explanation

As for the supposedly silly attitude of Marcel, its description by Newton is somewhat different from the one he gave initially, as mentioned in the book by Kevin Randle and Donald Schmitt, *UFO Crash at Roswell*, published in 1991 (page 74) (20):

"Newton said that he was trying to save face and not seem to be a jerk who could not tell the difference between a balloon and something extraordinary." Which one is the right version? We find an indication of the personality of Marcel in the "Efficiency Report" of his commander, Col. Blanchard: "A quiet, mature field grade officer. Exceptionally well qualified in his duty assignment. Superior moral qualities."

Ironically, this quotation was given by the well known skeptic Philip Klass in his *Skeptics UFO Newsletter* (March 1996) (21) (Doc 21), following virulent attacks by Robert Todd, who portrayed Marcel as a liar, in his bulletin *The KowPsflop Quarterly* (Dec. 8, 1995) (22) (Doc 22). Also note that Newton, when interviewed by the Air Force, is a retired officer and cannot be considered as an independent witness under the circumstances.

Third, Capt. Sheridan Cavitt, the counter intelligence officer who retrieved the debris together with Marcel during the whole Monday, July 7, 1947, on the Foster ranch. The USAF Roswell Report produces a very confused interview, over thirty pages, with Col. Weaver.

A matter of memory

At the beginning, Cavitt does not remember going to the field with Marcel (he remembers going with his assistant Rickett), but later in the interview he remembers the vehicle Marcel was driving: "Marcel had gotten a jeep." He also does not remember the rancher Brazel, who led them to the field at about 140 km northwest of Roswell. He remembers, however, that the debris did not look impressive at all:

"It was a small amount of, as I recall, bamboo sticks, reflective sort of material that would, well, at first glance, you would probably think it was aluminum foil," and he thought it was a weather balloon. What about the huge Mogul balloon train? He does not describe that at all! Well, if he did find it with Marcel on the Foster ranch, he should remember that now. Or is it just a blunder of an old man who sticks to the first story of the weather balloon, when he should not?

In addition to that, Cavitt, who spent the whole Monday with Marcel gathering debris, does not know why there was a press release announcing the discovery of a crashed disk by Marcel. Worse, he does not remember it! The thirty-page interview of Cavitt, supposed to be a major document in the Roswell Report, is full of gaps and contradictions.

Let's come now to a very interesting point, the testimony of his assistant, MSgt. Lewis Rickett, as Col. Weaver questions him. That testimony appears in the book of Randle and Schmitt, *UFO Crash at Roswell* (pages 62 and 63), as recalled by Col. Weaver.

In short, Rickett remembered going to the crash site with Cavitt. They found there the Provost Marshal of the base and soldiers gathering the debris. Pickett picked up one piece, which was slightly curved, and tried to bend it against his knee, but failed, and Cavitt (the "CIC officer" in the book by Randle) said to the Provost Marshal: "Smart guy. He's trying to do what we couldn't."

Never there?

At the end of their visit, Cavitt said to Rickett: "You and I were never out there. You and I never saw this. You don't see any military people or military vehicles out here."

Note that this means Cavitt went at least twice to the field: one time with Marcel, the whole Monday the 7th, and there was nobody else apart from Brazel who led them there, and another time (when, we don't know), at a place where soldiers were gathering debris. Perhaps it was the second site, the impact site of the UFO according to Kevin Randle, but the main point is that this testimony of Rickett is acknowledged in the official Air Force report. Col. Weaver asks Cavitt why he said that to his assistant Rickett, and Cavitt replies:

"I could have said that after we got back to the office: "Rickett, this has been a big boondoggle. I don't even want 700 CIC Headquarters to know we wasted our time on it. Forget we ever did it."

"O.K.," replies Col. Weaver!

The question here is, what were all these military people doing there, if there was only a bunch of balloons to recover? And why is there no record whatsoever of this retrieval, either at Roswell or at White Sands? A very reasonable guess here is that this strange scene had nothing to do with a Mogul balloon train, as

recalls very well MSgt. Rickett!

Another Air Force witness tells another story

The Roswell case is a very complex one, and it is obvious that we don't have the whole picture yet. But as soon as we dig a little bit into it, we find flagrant contradictions in the official Air Force story. Here is another one which appears in the testimony of another airman at Roswell, Robert Porter. Ironically, he is quoted in the *Roswell Report*, so we can consider this as an official document.

Porter was flight engineer aboard the B-29 bomber which carried the Roswell debris to Ft. Worth, with Marcel, on Tuesday the 8th. In a sworn affidavit (Doc 23), he says that there were several officers together with Marcel, including the Deputy Commander of the base, Lt. Col. Payne Jennings (a detail deleted in the *Roswell Report*). Obviously, this was a very important flight, and the crew had been told they were carrying the debris of a flying saucer.

They were carrying the debris (obviously only a sample) in boxes as small as shoe boxes, carefully wrapped. Porter noticed that they were very light as if they were empty. This fits well with the description of debris by Marcel, his son, and other witnesses, but it does not square at all with the relatively big pieces shown on the floor of Gen. Ramey's office. This is not speculation, it rests on official documents, the Porter testimony, and the pictures in Gen. Ramey's office.

So, what happened? For his part, Gen. DuBose has said that he received the balloon debris in a large canvas pouch, and Marcel was not there, so it was probably another flight! DuBose carried this debris into Ramey's office, and he never saw the real material, brought on the other flight. In short, the Air Force explanation of the Mogul balloon train relies on very few testimonies, full of gaps and contradictions.

The Roswell report. Case Closed

Let's finish with just a few words on the last Air Force document, *The Roswell Report. Case Closed*, a 231-page book published in June 1997. (23) (Doc 24) The real question here is not whether this new book convinces the reader that Roswell witnesses took anthropomorphic dummies with parachutes for ETs, a perfectly ridiculous idea.

The press, this time, has been at least a little dubious, even in France. The real question is, why did they publish this undefendable document when nobody asked them anything? Perhaps the clue is very simple: they needed to hold the front stage at the moment of the 50th anniversary of UFOs and of Roswell. Apparently they have only succeeded in adding fuel to the controversy.

Notes:

(18) - (Doc. 13) Headquarters, United States Air Force, *The Roswell Report. Fact versus Fiction in the New Mexico Desert*. 1995. US

Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents Mail Stop: SSOP, Washington D.C., 20402-9328.

(Doc. 14) Diagram of a Mogul balloon train.

(Doc. 15) Photograph of radar reflector.

(Doc. 16) Drawings of flowers designs by Charles Moore.

(Doc. 17) Drawings of "hieroglyphs" by Jesse Marcel, Jr.

(Doc. 18) Photograph of balloon debris in the office of Gen. Ramey.

(19) - (Doc. 19) Article of the *Roswell Daily Record* of July 9, 1947: Harassed Rancher who Located the "Saucer" Sorry He Told About It. (Reproduced in the USAF Roswell Report).

(Doc. 20) Affidavit of Gen. Thomas Jefferson DuBose, Sept. 16, 1991.

(20) Kevin Randle and Donald Schmitt, *UFO Crash at Roswell*, Avon Books, New York, July 1991.

(21) - (Doc. 21) Philip Klass, *Skeptics UFO Newsletter*, March 1996, 404 "N" Street SW, Washington D.C. 20024.

(22) - (Doc. 22) Robert Todd, *The Kowpflap Quarterly*, Dec. 8, 1995, distributed by Just Cause, Box 176, Stoneham, MA 02180.

(23) Headquarters United States Air Force (Capt. James McAndrew), *The Roswell Report. Case Closed*, 1997. (see note 18).

Abductees wanted for Ph.D. survey

Stephanie Kelley, a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Kansas, is seeking abductees to complete survey forms regarding their abductions and how they perceive them. "Basically," she says, "I am doing a rhetorical analysis of the stories that abductees tell in order to see how they make sense of their world in light of what they believe happened to them."

Ms. Kelley says that the Department of Communications Studies at the university supports the practice of protection for participants, that participants may withdraw at any time, and that the names of participants will not be associated with the research findings.

She says she hopes to collect more than 200 surveys/interviews, including some at the IUC conference in June. The collection of surveys/interviews will continue "at least through this year," and she plans to complete the doctorate in May of 1999.

She may be contacted by e-mail at skelley@falcon.cc.ukans.edu, or by phone at 785-864-9897 for a form and details. Her advisor is Dr. Robert Rowland, professor of Communications Studies.

THE CASH-LANDRUM UFO INCIDENT

"Three Texans are injured during an encounter with a UFO and military helicopters" is a new paperback book (322 pages) by John F. Schuessler, with forward by Bob Pratt. This is the most important book published on Close Encounters of the Fifth Kind, where witnesses have suffered injuries in the proximity of a UFO. *The Cash-Landrum UFO Incident* is now available from MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Texas 78155-4099 for \$19.95 plus \$2 for Postage and Handling.

The 'Russian Roswell'

By Anton A. Anfalov & Philip Mantle

Editor's Note: Anton A. Anfalov, the author of numerous published articles on UFOs, is the head of the Southern-Ukrainian UFO Centre, Executive Director of the Ukrainian Ufological Association, and MUFON Research Specialist in the Ukraine. Philip Mantle is the former Director of Investigations for the British UFO Research Association (BUFORA), MUFON Representative for England, and co-author of *Beyond Roswell* and *Without Consent*.

This case is to Russia what the Roswell Incident is to the U.S.A. On June 30, 1908, a huge fireball descended and exploded above the taiga in the Tunguska region of Russia. One of the largest explosions known to man, this well documented event has been chronicled in books and magazines around the world.

Fifty eight years later, at the end of June (or the beginning of July, according to some versions), 1966, approximately 1300 kilometers west of the 1908 Tunguska site, another strange object came to earth, accompanied by yet another huge explosion. There were media reports regarding this incident, known as the "Obsky Meteorite," and it is still officially classified as top secret in Russia today.

Research is difficult

Because of the secrecy surrounding this event, it was extremely difficult for Moscow-based UFO researcher Nikolay Kuzmin to locate and interview the relevant witnesses whose eventual testimonies are thought to be only the tip of the iceberg.

According to Kuzmin, the Russian military and scientific services have buried the facts of the case so deep that, as yet, no official documents have surfaced regarding this case, nor has the exact impact site been located. The information concerning this case has come from four individual witnesses, as details on this case have only slowly leaked out.

The impact site is suspected to be some 10-15 kilometers northeast of the village of Topolevka, which is in the Tomsk region (approximately 584 kilometers northwest of Tomsk) in Western Siberia. Nearby are the rivers Ob' and Tryigorodskaya, which is the tributary to the river Ob'. This is near the border of the Truemj region and Tomsk region.

The year 1966 was one of intense UFO activity in the Soviet Union. Moscow geologist Oleg Ivanovich was the first witness located by Kuzmin. Ivanovich recounted the following story:

"In the early part of summer in 1966 I was in-

vited on a geological prospecting expedition along the tributary Tryigorodskaya to the river Ob'. Early in June we had flown from Moscow to Tomsk, then by boat up the river.

"The summer was very hot, and it was my first trip to the taiga. [The taiga is a moist subarctic coniferous forest that begins where the tundra ends; it is dominated by spruces and firs.] The trees provided a marvelous landscape. We were surveying for suspected oil fields and deposits of combustible gases. Unfortunately we did not locate any oil or gas deposits during our surveys. I do not remember the exact date. We were camped out in the taiga wilderness some 20-30 kilometers northeast of Topolevka.

A minor accident

"One day we were passing a bog when our cook, Valya, stumbled into it and was soon up to her waist in mud. Because of this minor accident we stayed at this location for the night. We had a long march to navigate the next day, so we took advantage of the rest. It was during this night that I was awakened with a deafening wail. The noise was coming from the sky somewhere, and it hurt my ears to listen to it. The roof of our tent was illuminated by a blinding bright globe approaching us in the sky. Before I had time to run out of my tent, the globe exploded.

"Flames erupted all around us. The trees were alight nearby, and such was the intense heat that we took quilts from our beds, soaked them quickly in water, and pulled them over us for protection. It was this quick thinking that quite literally saved us that night.

"The next morning the fire had abated somewhat and the forest was charred and black. We gathered what few possessions had survived the fire and decided we had better get out of the area. Moving to the area where we thought the explosion had occurred, strange things started to happen. Our compass needle began to spin out of control, our radio set would not work, and we began to feel weak and ill.

"The trees here were laid down in one direction with the tops ripped off as if someone had taken a giant comb to them. It was here that we saw lights, twinkling bright colored lights. The lights could be seen through the trees and flashing in what looked like a semi-circle. We cautiously moved closer.

A streamlined hull

"Raised up out of the bog was a streamlined hull of an object which appeared to be charred and burnt. It looked like two basins put together, with blinking lights around its rim. A hatch was ajar, and dense smoke was flowing from its opening. Something dark lay prone near the edge of the hatch. Through the smoke it looked like some kind of tentacle.

"We could not get any closer as there was no

way we could travel across the bog. We were standing at about 25 meters away from this craft taking photos. I have to say right away that none of these photos came out. I suspect they were fogged by radioactivity. Before too long we all felt giddy and were overcome by nausea. My eyesight began to deteriorate as well, so we decided to retreat to what we considered was a safe distance.

The first helicopter

"Moving off, it soon became dark, and it was not long before we heard the first helicopter. It flew right over our heads. We could not use our radio to communicate with the helicopters as it had failed to work since the explosion. Then another helicopter appeared, then another one, and many more. We assumed they were all heading for the site we had found in the bog. We thought about returning to the site, but it was dark and our compass was not working, so we decided to wait until morning.

"At around 10 a.m. the next morning we arrived back at the bog, the exact same place as the day before. There was nothing to be found in the bog—no craft, no nothing. All we could see were people's footprints and what looked like marks left by the helicopters. Whether the craft sank into the bog or was taken away, I simply don't know.

"When our expedition came to an end and we returned to Moscow we were invited, so to speak, to a certain institution, the KGB regional department. Gathered in a large hall, a smiling, grey-haired man appeared, shook hands with everybody, and displayed an interest in our survey work.

"The mood soon changed, and the man instructed us all that 'It was reported the events in the taiga were witnessed by you all ... I would like everybody to remember that you saw nothing at all. Absolutely nothing.' We exchanged glances, and he added, 'All of you, you understand there is such a thing as a state secret. Now each one of you will sign an undertaking that you will divulge nothing. You know the consequences in case you breach...'

Forced to sign

"We signed. There was nothing else we could do. This is why we kept quiet. I don't even know now what it was or if I can tell you about it. By the way, you should know that most members of the expedition are now all dead. They were strong and healthy, but now they are dead.

"In 1992 there were only two of us left. Pavel lives in Leningrad. He was with the expedition. Today I don't know if he is alive or not. I was told by a number of doctors that those members of our expedition who had died suffered from some kind of radiation illness."

Another two witnesses to the event were found living in the village of Topolevka. Anna Egorovna (died at age 82 in 1995) recounted the incident. She was not sure of the precise date, but is sure it was the summer. Her grandfather, Philip Ivanovich, had gone out into the taiga to hunt (he died before investigators could interview him).

Here is Anna Egorovna's account:

"I went to sleep early as I had to be up early the next morning. During the night I was awakened by a 'boom.' The house began to tremble, and I got up, still half asleep, trying to understand what was happening. Outside it was like daylight. I was afraid. Before I could go out onto the porch the earth began to shake. I have never been as frightened as this in my life.

"Looking outside I saw a fiery globe descending over the taiga. Bright sun-like, the object glowed so much it irritated my eyes. The object hit something far off, the wind rose and then everything grew dark again. All that was left to see was a glow rising aloft in the distance.

"I did not sleep for the rest of the night. I was worried about my grandfather, but he returned safe and sound. He'd been drinking with his friends and had not seen or heard anything. I did hear rumors that people in the next village (Lukashin Yar), which is about 15 kilometres away, saw the fire in the taiga that night. Then special men from the KGB arrived and warned everyone to keep quiet. So that is the story."

The second witness from the village of Topolevka is Michael Kuzmich, a 79-year-old hunter. He told investigators:

"I decided to do some fishing. At that time fish was in plentiful supply. So I thought it would be a good idea to stock up my fish supply. There are plenty of rivers there to fish, so I found a spot, pitched a tent, and got out my tackle and reels. It was getting late so I decided to sleep. I ate some fresh fish soup cooked on my camp fire and decided to treat myself to a self-rolled cigarette.

A sudden fiery flare

"I was sitting on the river bank just thinking and looking at the water, smoking my cigarette. I suddenly saw a fiery flare and a sound like 'Hu-u-u.' Good God, I thought. The sky flared like it was on fire. While I was looking around, I heard an explosion, and I was blown over by a huge blast of air.

"The fir tree tops were crackling with flames running across them. I thought it was the end, that the Chinese had set off a nuclear bomb. In a moment it seemed to become quiet again, with only the taiga on fire. Lucky to be alive I thought. I quickly grabbed my tent and fishing tackle and took off. A fire in the taiga can be a terrible thing. I was sure if the flames caught

up with me I would be broiled. I just managed to escape with my life."

The last of the four witnesses was located later, living in Moscow. His name is Sergey Petrovich M., a 52-year-old aviator. During the 1960s, including 1966, he served with the Soviet Air Force as a technician on aviation equipment at Kolpashevo aerodrome, about 240 kilometers northwest of Tromsk and 350 kilometers southeast of Topolevka.

At Kolpashevo there was a special military helicopter squadron, as well as a civilian air unit. Kolpashevo is also known as a military unit of space command measuring center (CMC). Housed here were Mi-4 Hound helicopters and a few heavy cargo Mi-6 Hook ones as well. Kolpashevo had also served at the test space center for cosmonauts training in specific environmental conditions of the Russian northern region.

Sergey Petrovich M. stated:

"I remember that night well. Our military unit was activated by a general alarm. Taking off in the helicopters we flew for a long time over the taiga. We were in the backwoods. There had been a fire in the taiga the day before and even an earthquake. My colleagues were talking about the sky lighting up and a fiery globe descending. I did not see this myself as I was asleep after being on duty.

"At long last our helicopter (Mi-4 Hound) began to descend. We jumped out and the man in charge drew us to attention. 'This is a military secret,' he told us, and that we would be to blame if anything went wrong. I remember we were in a glade, and all around were burnt trees, and nearby was a large bog. We were led to the bog and were amazed to see a craft half buried in it.

"This thing in the bog looked like two pans together with colored lights around the rim. My colleagues clarified it right away: flying saucer. Some more helicopters landed with more personnel, and one cargo helicopter landed also.

"The command was given: the saucer had to be hooked on by steel ropes to the belly of the cargo helicopter. We began to construct a device to enable us to lift the saucer out of the bog. When I got nearer I could see that there was a hatch open. It looked dark inside, and steam or smoke was coming out of the hatch. I could also see some kind of flipper leaning out of the hatch. It looked long and tapered and was dark-brown in color.

A streamlined craft

"The craft was big, some 8-10 meters in diameter. It was very streamlined, and we had nothing to hook the ropes onto. We made a 'string-bag' type device in order for us to lift the object.

"There was also a scientist with us. He had come on the cargo helicopter. He kept touching and scraping the hull of the object and then shone his electric torch onto the flipper. He cautiously wrapped the flipper in polyethylene or something similar and handled it very carefully. We were cautioned once again to keep silent about this.

Successful removal

"The cargo helicopter rose up and hovered over the saucer and began to lift it. It moved only slowly, and at one point I thought it was going to break loose from the ropes. All of a sudden it was out of the bog with slush flowing from it, and the cargo helicopter took it away. We were splashed with mud from the bog and were covered from head to foot. The lights from the saucer, which was hung beneath the helicopter, were visible in the sky for quite some time.

"I don't know anything more about it. There was talk in our unit that the saucer was transported to some secret military aerodrome and was under examination by scientists and the military. It was rumored that they called it the 'Z Object,' in short, classified.

"It was rumored also that some bodies were recovered inside it, but this could simply be fairy tales. I left the military a long time ago now, and I have no idea what the object was. I would like to know at some point what it was."

The Tunguska blast in 1908 is still hotly debated even today. Some say it was an astronomical body of some kind, while others state that it was an artificial craft of extraterrestrial origin. The "Z-Object," or the "Obsky meteorite," could rank as being even more mysterious than its 1908 counterpart.

What was it that shattered the peace and quiet of that June night in 1966? Why was this strange object not destroyed on impact? Officially, of course, it never happened at all.

A satellite?

Could the "Z-Object" not have been extraterrestrial at all, but rather a Soviet military satellite of some kind with a nuclear reactor on board? In 1965 in Kecksburg, PA, U.S.A., a somewhat similar incident took place. Some think that this event could also have been a secret Soviet satellite, rather than an alien spacecraft. [See the Sept. 1989 and the Feb. 1991 *MUFON UFO Journal* for details on the Kecksburg incident.] Is it a coincidence, for example, that the Kolpashevo helicopter unit was part of the space command at the time?

This would explain the readiness of the personnel there to deal with such an incident. However, nearly all Soviet satellites are launched in a completely different trajectory, and the descent of the "Z-Object" would therefore not conform to normal Soviet satellite

trajectories. No Soviet satellites carry multi-colored lights around their rim either.

It would be pure speculation to suggest where the "Z-Object" eventually went for study. Even in today's modern Russia it can still be dangerous to delve too deeply into such top secret matters. How long the secrets of this and other events will be kept hidden is anyone's guess, but despite the political and economic turmoil in the former Soviet Union, the search for more information continues.

Note: Both authors are attempting to obtain more information on UFO activity of any kind in the former Soviet Union. Please contact the authors c/o: Philip Mantle, 1 Woodhall Drive, Batley, West Yorkshire, England, WF17 7SW.



LOG # 971130hC, MA-1, 09/28/96, Northfield, MN, at 07:35 hours CDT, 13:35 GMT, for 40 seconds. Index = 15.0% Investigator: Joel Henry.

The witness contacted the investigator two days after the event.

As the witness was driving eastward on Highway 19, about a mile and a half out of Northfield, he noticed a pair of closely spaced contrails from a jet aircraft. Because of his radar and air traffic control training in the Army National Guard, his interest in watching the phenomenon was spurred.

Suddenly, the aircraft made a steep, almost vertical ascent from an altitude of about 6,000 feet. Curious about the strange maneuver, he focused his attention and saw a glowing object, which did not have a contrail, headed toward the jet at about 7,000 feet altitude.

When the luminous object reached the vicinity of the jet, it maneuvered around and above it in an erratic, winding manner. The object seemed to be wobbling and moving short, unequal distances in spurts, as if jumping. As it wobbled, it tilted to reveal its disc-like shape and a domed top. It was about twice the size of the jet.

The witness had the impression that the jet was attempting to chase it, but the jet was far outclassed by the speed of the glowing disc. His view was suddenly obscured by trees, and he lost sight of the aerial game. No radar tracking was recorded by the radar facility in Farmington, but they routinely ignore military maneuvers.

READER'S CLASSIFIEDS

UFO MANIA

The Lore and Legend of Ufology. Featuring floating aliens, jelly creatures, tin can beings, gelatinous somethings, mystery foam, folding UFO's, human burnings, minisauces, blue globs, cloud phenomena and many more fascinating stories. Illustrated. FREE UFO magazines and maps with order. Only \$7.95, Box 347032, Cleveland, Ohio 44134

SPECIAL BOOK

"AROUND AND ABOUT THE SAUCER WORLD" presenting Governments Mini-sauces; Two Dimensional Flying Saucers; Largest UFO Waves in History; Man Who Manipulates Time and Space; much more. Only \$9.95 postpaid. Free Digest with order. UAPA-B, PO Box 347032, Cleveland, Ohio 44134

DENNIS WILLIAM HAUCK BOOKS

Autographed copies direct from author of CAPTAIN QUIRK, about William Shatner's UFO abduction (\$4.95), and HAUNTED PLACES, a guidebook to 2,000 paranormal and UFO hotspots in the United States (\$15.95). Send price of book plus \$2.00 s/h to: D.W. Hauck, PO Box 22201, Sacramento, CA 95822-0201

MASTERPIECE: Roswell. UFO's, an ancient civilization and angels. There are those in space and on earth ready to kill to prevent revealing the truth. Science fiction based on fact. \$14.50 (includes s/h) to: Silver Fox Press, PO Box 6057, Walker Branch, Roswell, NM 88202 ("How To Stop An Abduction" included at no extra cost.)

JOHN MACK: STAR WISDOM CONFERENCE

May 8 & 9: PEER/Interface present Native American/Science Conference, Boston. John Mack, Astronaut Edgar Mitchell, Sequoyah Trueblood, Dhyani Ywahoo, Astrophysicist, Rudy Schild and Experiencers Explore Stories of "Star People" and "Alien Abduction." Pre-conference clinical workshop. Information and Registration: 617-964-9360, Interface, 218 Walnut St., Newton, MA 02160.

UFO RELATED MATERIAL FOR SALE:

(Out of Print, Rare). Write to: Tom Benson, PO Box 1174, Trenton, NJ 08606-1174 for latest list.

END UFO SECRECY!

Join Operation Right to Know's growing campaign. Help end the government's UFO cover-up. Our activities have gained mainstream respect and recognition, including OMNI, CNN, & CBS. Minimum \$15 contribution gets you newsletters, gets you involved. We are volunteers. Contributions go for expenses only. ORTK, PO Box 3173, Gaithersburg, MD 20885

MUFON MERCHANDISE FOR SALE

Wear official MUFON T-Shirts (royal blue printing on white cotton), sizes: S, M, L & XL. Two styles of baseball caps (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 or if both ordered is only \$3.00. MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155-4099. (Check, money order or cash in U.S. dollars.)

MUFON MERCHANDISE

Official MUFON gift items for sale. Ceramic coffee mug with blue logo - \$8.00. Ten inch diameter, battery operated wall clock with logo in black on white face - \$15.00. S/H for each is \$3.50. MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155-4099 (Check, money order or cash in U.S. dollars.)

FREE OFFER

The information and where-to UFO magazine presents 10 classic UFO maps, 5 beautiful UFO illustrations, 4 unique UFO magazines and large UFO source packet. All free with a 6-issue subscription to *Flying Saucer Digest* for only \$14.95. Send to UAPA-M, Box 347032, Cleveland, OH 44134.

THE EXCYLES

Mia Adams' true story about her contacts with ET's & romance with intelligence agent. Included is the agent's report outlining the agendas of alien confederations on Earth & intelligence agencies network created to deal with them. Send \$16.95 + \$2.95 S/H to: Excelta Publishing, PO Box 4530, Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33338. (Credit Card orders - Toll Free 1-800-444-2524, \$16.95 + \$3.95 S/H)

OHIO MUFON MEETINGS

Northern Ohio, May 2, 1998, 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. at Taylor Memorial Public Library, Third St. at Broad Falls, Cuyahoga Falls, OH. Southern Ohio, May 9, 1998, 11 a.m. to 5 p.m., Xenia Community Library, 76 E. Market St., Xenia, OH. Please RSVP to William E. Jones, State Director, Box 162, 5837 Karris Square Dr., Dublin, OH 43016 or call 614-486-5877.

THE AGENDA:

Find out the real motives behind UFO abductions, and what part angels, demons and ancient civilizations play. Biblical references as well as modern writings included to present the truth behind it all. Believe it or not, we win! Send \$12.50 (includes S/H to: Silver Fox Press, PO Box 6057 Walker Branch, Roswell, NM 88202. ("How To Stop An Abduction" included at no extra charge.)



May 1998

Bright Planets (Evening Sky):

There are no bright planets in the evening sky this month.

Bright Planets (Morning Sky):

Following their spectacular pairing last month, Venus (magnitude-4.0) and Jupiter (-2.2) widen the gap between themselves in May. In Aquarius the giant planet rises in the E first, about 3 a.m. in mid-month, and remains rather low in the sky. Jupiter lies near the lunar crescent on May 21.

Venus follows, rising in the E shortly before 4 a.m. The brilliant planet can be seen near the crescent Moon on the 23rd, and quite near our satellite on the 29th.

Late in May, Saturn (0.4), in Pisces, emerges in the ENE about 3:30. The ringed world is near the lunar crescent on the 23rd.

Meteor Shower:

The morning meteor shower called the May or Eta Aquarids peaks early on May 5 at a rate of about 20 per hour. But northern observers have only a brief window between when the shower's radiant rises at 3 a.m. and twilight begins to brighten the sky. (The interfering gibbous Moon sets about 3 a.m.) Look for bright yellowish streaks moving swiftly out of Aquarius in the east. Southern Hemisphere skywatchers are better favored with a higher radiant point and twice the number of Aquarids.

Moon Phases:


- First quarter--May 3
- Full moon--May 11
- Last quarter--May 19
- New moon--May 25

The Stars:

Late in the evening after twilight ends, we get our last look at the winter stars Procyon, Pollux and Castor the Twin Stars, and Capella as they sink into the W and NW.

Meanwhile, bright orange Arcturus in kite-shaped Bootes and blue-white Spica in Virgo hover around the celestial meridian in the S. Summer's heavenly harbinger, the Summer Triangle (the stars Vega, Deneb, Altair), has risen above the NE horizon at 11 p.m. Also at this hour the red heart of the Scorpion, Antares, can be seen low in the SE.

High in the N the Big Dipper is poised upside-down in its best viewing position of the year.



April 10-12 - Tenth Annual Ozark UFO Conference, at the Inn of the Ozarks Conference Center, Eureka Springs, Arkansas. Additional information may be obtained by calling (501)-354-2558.

May 8-9 - PEER/Interface present Native/Science Conference, Boston, MA. For information/Registration: 617-964-9360, Interface, 218 Walnut St., Newton, MA 02160.

May 9 - MUFON Mid-Atlantic UFO Symposium, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., Bethesda Ramada Inn, Bethesda, Maryland. For further information, call Tom Burch at (301) 349-2434.

June 18-21 - The 19th Rocky Mountain UFO Conference, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY. Further information will be forthcoming.

June 26, 27 & 28 - MUFON 1998 International UFO Symposium, Renaissance Denver Hotel, Denver, Colorado. Hotel reservation and registration information is published in this issue of the *Journal*.

July 3-5 - Roswell Days, Roswell, New Mexico. For more information, contact International UFO Museum & Research Center, P.O. Box 2221, Roswell, NM 88202 or call (505) 625-9495.

| NEW SUBSCRIPTION TO THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL | |
|--|---|
| <p>Please send one subscription to:</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Address: _____</p> <p>City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____</p> <p>Please send second subscription to:</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Address: _____</p> <p>City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____</p> | <p>Person securing new subscriptions:</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <p>Address: _____</p> <p>City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Check, Money Order or Cash enclosed for \$60.00</p> <hr/> <p>Cut out or reproduce this order form and mail to: MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155 with \$60.00 to cover both subscriptions. Please print or type the names and addresses clearly.</p> |

(continued from page 24)

address and have had some 2500 e-mail messages sent to us. When it was brand new, we found that we had to work with it for a while to see what it was really all about. Now that we have an understanding of the e-mail system through the efforts of **Tom Deuley**, we are looking for volunteers to split up the 8 to 10 hours per week that it takes to receive, sort and handle the mail.

Volunteers will be asked to open the e-mail account one or two scheduled days per week to download all of the mail for that day; go through it; answer what they can; and set aside what seems to have no meaning, or pass it on to the Director, the *Journal* editor, or whomever it may be addressed to in the MUFON organization. Difficult mail will be forwarded to the International Director for resolution.

Most often, preformatted responses can be used for people asking for information to join, or asking for information on what we do. (MUFON headquarters will provide standard information packets.) Volunteers need to be able to tactfully answer questions and make statements for MUFON; therefore, they must have a full understanding of MUFON, its bylaws, policies, goals, and mission. Volunteers will need to load the America On Line (AOL) program to gain access to the account, but will not have to pay the monthly charges. The account will be limited to MUFON e-mail use only.

Anyone interested must be a MUFON member in good standing, and must send a short paragraph about what they feel they will be doing, how they will handle difficult questions, and a short resume that should support a broad knowledge of the UFO phenomenon and a broad knowledge of MUFON. This statement will be used to judge between the various volunteers, and for getting some idea of their writing styles. Anyone interested in carrying out an important part of our daily function, for now and into the future, please submit your applications to MUFON, or contact MUFON headquarters for more information.

Symposium Proceedings design contest

The success of the 1996 and 1997 *Symposium Proceedings* cover design contest has prompted MUFON to make this an annual competition. **Fran Geremia**, wife of the New Hampshire State Director, **Peter Geremia**, was the 1996 winner, and **Anson Seale** won the prizes for 1997 with his "50th Anniversary of Ufology."

The cover design should reflect the symposium theme "Closing the Great Divide Between Science and Ufology." It must also include, in addition to the theme, the wording "MUFON 1998 INTERNATIONAL UFO SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS," the location "DENVER, COLORADO," and the symposium dates "June

26-28."

The contest submissions must be "camera ready" and not simply attractive designs, symbols or artwork. The contest prize winner will receive \$100 in cash plus \$100 in MUFON publications or merchandise. Please submit entries to **Walter Andrus**, the *Symposium Proceedings* co-editor. The deadline for cover designs is May 1, 1998.

MUFON lapel pins

Due to the popularity of the attractive lapel pins, we have received another order for distribution. The one-inch-long oval-shaped pin has the MUFON logo in blue on a white background outlined in silver, with a pin clasp on the back suitable for fastening to clothing. You may order yours from MUFON in Seguin, TX, for \$5 plus \$1 for P&H.

This is an opportunity to let people know that you are a MUFON member by proudly wearing our new lapel pin.

Award for securing new members

Numerous MUFON members shared their interest in the *MUFON UFO JOURNAL* by purchasing Christmas gift subscriptions for friends and relatives. We are extending this idea with a new concept to increase our overall membership. Any current MUFON member will be awarded a lapel pin if they solicit two new members by completing the enclosed form (page 22, or a copy thereof) and attaching a thirty-dollar check for each new member.

A former member who has allowed his/her subscription to expire for more than one year will qualify as a new member in this plan. Here is your opportunity to invite people who attend local meetings, your friends, and relatives to join MUFON, and you will benefit by receiving a free lapel pin.

Foreign membership subscription price to be increased

Based upon the "Membership *Journal* Survey" recently conducted, it was the consensus of the vast number of members responding that the foreign membership/subscription rate should be increased to \$35, consistent with the higher postage charges for mailing to foreign countries.

Most magazines charge this differential rate to foreign subscribers. MUFON was basically subsidizing a portion of the postage, which we cannot afford to do.

This is an advance notice that the \$35 rate will become effective immediately for new members and to all others upon their renewal date. The subscription/renewal forms are being revised accordingly.

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

Walter Andrus

News from around the Network

New officers

Tinus J. DeBeer, B.A., (Pretoria, Gauteng), a Field Investigator and member since 1994, has been appointed to National Director for South Africa. He is an accountant by profession. **Gerald E. Rolwes**, M.S., Lt. Col. USAF Retired (Spokane), formerly the Asst. State Director for eastern Washington state, has been promoted to State Director for Washington, replacing **Laurence T. Childs** (Seattle), who will become the Asst. State Director for western Washington. Jerry Rolwes has selected **David George**, B.S. (Chattaroy) to fill the vacancy of Asst. State Director for eastern Washington.

Colorado State Director **Michael G. Curta** has reassigned county responsibilities for the following State Section Directors: **Charles E. Brady**, D.D.S., (Pueblo); **Edward W. Burke**, B.S., (Colorado Springs); **James P. Carrion**, M.A., (Greeley); **Rolland L. "Pete" Clark**, B.A., (Aurora); **James A. Eddleman** (Lakewood); and **William E. Patton** (Golden). All of these gentlemen will have active roles in the upcoming MUFON International UFO Symposium hosted by Colorado MUFON in Denver.

Other new State Section Directors are **John Ventre** (Greensburg, PA) for Westmoreland, Fayette and Indiana Counties; and **William W. Morris** (Corona De Tucson, AZ) replaces **Wilma June Scherrer** as State Section Director for Pima County, AZ. **Laura Andrews**, M. S., (Bradenton, FL) became a Research Specialist in Engineering.

Congratulations to the following three people who passed the Field Investigator's exam this month: **Jeff L. Pukal** (Bloomington, MN); **Greg Presto**, B.S., (Scottsdale, AZ); and **Vickie E. Farnham** (San Bernardino, CA),

MUFON 1998 Symposium

The MUFON 1998 International UFO Symposium will be held June 26, 27 and 28, 1998, at the beautiful Renaissance Denver Hotel in Denver, CO. The theme for this year's symposium is uniquely titled "Closing the Great Divide Between Science and Ufology."

The following list of outstanding speakers have been confirmed: **Ann Druffel**; **Michael Lindemann**; **Stanley V. McDaniel**; **Debra Lindemann**; **Tracy**

Torme; **Nancy Talbot**; **Richard F. Haines, Ph.D.**; **David M. Jacobs, Ph.D.**; **Jaimie Maussan**, and **Jose Escamilla**. With regrets, **Jenny Randles**, from England, will be unable to speak due to the illness of her parents. The speaking agenda will be published in the May issue of the *Journal*.

Reservations for rooms at the Renaissance Denver Hotel, 3801 Quebec Street, Denver, CO 80207 may be made by calling (303) 399-7500, 800/HOTELS-1 or FAX (303) 321-1783. Prices per night are single, \$89; double, \$89; triple, \$99; and quad, \$99. Please advise the hotel that you are attending the MUFON UFO symposium to obtain these special rates. Complimentary airport shuttle from the Denver International Airport is provided, as well as complimentary parking at the hotel for guests. The cut-off date for these rates is June 11, so make your reservations at the hotel promptly.

Early symposium registration before June 10 is \$75 per person, or \$85 per person after June 10 and at the door. Tickets for individual sessions will be \$20 (three sessions on Saturday, June 27, and two sessions on Sunday, June 28). The cost of the delicious buffet on Friday evening from 6-9 p.m. is \$25 per person, which includes a star party by advance registration only. An advance registration application form has been enclosed with this issue of the *Journal*.

The charge for vendor tables will be \$70 for the first table and \$50 for each additional table, with a limit of six to each vendor for the entire symposium. Please contact **Rolland L. "Pete" Clark** at 341 Lansing Street, Aurora, CO 80010 for table reservations. Checks should be made payable to MUFON Colorado 1998 Symposium.

In addition to the above events, the State/Provincial Directors' Annual Meeting will be held from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Friday, June 26. Assistant State Directors are also invited to attend. If the State or Provincial Director will be unable to attend, he/she should designate someone to represent his/her state or province, preferably a State Section Director. Workshops are being scheduled for June 25 & 26.

The cover of this *Journal* depicts the skyline of Denver with the Rocky Mountains in the background, inviting you to our symposium.

Volunteers needed for e-mail processing

For more than two years we have had an e-mail

(Continued on Page 23)