

\$3.00

# MUFON

Mutual UFO Network

## UFO Journal

April 2003

Number 420



*John Schuessler, Jan Harzan, Dr. Robert Wood, and Clifford Clift have personally donated \$1,000 each to MUFON as part of the current membership campaign, and are now officially lifetime members. For a similar donation of \$1,000 or more, you can also become a lifetime member of MUFON and receive the exclusive benefactor MUFON jacket.*

**MUFON**  
**UFO Journal**

(USPS 002-970)  
(ISSN 0270-6822)  
Post Office Box 369  
Morrison, CO 80465-0369  
Tel: 303-932-7709  
Fax: 303-932-9279

**International Director**  
John F. Schuessler, M.S.

**Editor:**  
Dwight Connelly, M.S.  
14026 Ridgelawn Road  
Martinsville, IL 62442  
Tel: (217) 382-4502  
e-mail:  
mufonufojournal@hotmail.com

**Columnists:**  
Walter N. Webb, B.S.  
George Filer, M.B.A.  
Jenny Randles  
Stanton Friedman, M.S.

**MUFON on Compuserve**  
"Go MUFON"  
to access the Forum

**MUFON on the Internet:**  
<http://www.mufon.com>

**MUFON e-mail address:**  
[mufonhq@aol.com](mailto:mufonhq@aol.com)

**MUFON Amateur Radio Net:**  
40 meters - 7.237 MHz  
Saturdays, 7 a.m. CST or CDST

**Table of Contents**

April 2003

Number 420

**In this issue**

**Ramey message & peer review by David Rudiak.....3**  
**Dr. Mullis' strange experience by Bill Chalker.....6**  
**Illinois object darts away by Vic Connor.....8**  
**Challender tracks NASA flights by Will Evans.....9**  
**MUFON Forum by Neff, Pflock, Randle.....11**  
**Filer's Files by George A. Filer.....13**  
**Brazilian case controversy by Dwight Connelly.....15**  
**UFO Press.....16**  
**Utah Boomerang-shaped object by Guy Richardson..17**  
**View from Britain by Jenny Randles.....18**  
**Perceptions by Stanton T. Friedman.....20**  
**The Night Sky by Walter N. Webb.....22**  
**Calendar.....22**  
**UFO Marketplace.....23**  
**Director's Message by John Schuessler.....24**

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

**Copyright 2003 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 2003 by the Mutual UFO Network, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369" is included.

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

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

The *MUFON UFO Journal* is published monthly by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Morrison, CO. Membership/Subscription rates are \$35 per year in the U.S.A., and \$40 per year foreign in U.S. funds. Second class postage paid at Versailles, MO.

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

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

# The question of peer review

**Editor's Note:** Last month researcher David Rudiak discussed various aspects of the Ramey message, which he considers to be the Roswell "smoking gun." This month he concludes his observations with thoughts on "peer review" of work on the message.

**By David Rudiak**

**D**ick Hall has called for an "objective scientific" peer review of work on the Ramey memo, particularly my work. Hall also claims that such a peer review is the only way to validate the contents of the message.

I have the highest regard for Dick Hall's decades of work and sacrifice in this field, and I do not object to "peer review" per se. I just want those calling for peer review to be very explicit about what they have in mind.

I consider biased or poorly thought out peer review to be worse than no peer review. Like many others, I am aware of many agendas from various people in this field. Therefore, how do you keep things "objective" with such an emotionally charged topic?

Here are other major issues in any sort of peer review:

1. Who chooses the peer reviewers? How do you keep the choice of reviewers "objective"?
2. What are the necessary qualifications of the peer reviewers, and who decides this? Why, e.g., is a physical scientist better than an English major or a linguist, since this is primarily a linguistic task, not a physical measurement? How do you keep the peer reviewers objective?
3. How is this peer review going to be carried out? What is the protocol and methodology? Who decides this? How do you ensure the protocol is "objective" or properly designed?
4. How do you keep your peer reviewers motivated so that they persist for a reasonable time (meaning dozens of hours, not 15 minutes), other than paying them a lot of money? Who's going to pay them?

Hall responded vaguely to some of these points, but not others. E.g., he said the peer reviewers would be similarly knowledgeable people in the field and would choose themselves. He thought they would be self-motivated and money wasn't needed.

## **The devil is in the details**

It sounds very simple and high minded to call for a peer review of independent scientists, but the devil is in the details.

Again we have to deal with the problems of who is doing the peer review, and do the individuals or the group have a hidden agenda? Here's another problem with "peer review." Do the people doing the peer review or designing the protocol really understand the problem?

Consider the peer review proposal of Houran and Randle in their paper. They suggested using at least three

separate groups and "triangulating" readings. These would be "independent and blind laboratories that specialize in the area of reading and transcribing archival documents. Their only motivation should be payment for providing professional and objective reports."

Thus to solve the objectivity problem, they suggested telling the groups nothing at all about what the message was about. To keep them even more "objective," the reviewers would also be completely Roswell ignorant. Unlike Hall, they weren't naïve enough to think that blind and disinterested readers would stay "motivated" and work on the task unless money was thrown at them.

This proposal sounds superficially reasonable, but it is full of problems. We are back to the very issues I raised above. E.g., experts like this do not come cheap. To keep them working at the problem for the necessary length of time to make a legitimate study could easily cost in the neighborhood of \$50,000 to \$100,000.

Further, no clear criteria are laid out for how they would be chosen, how long they would work to make the study valid, or why their readings would necessarily be more reliable than previous results.

## **The importance of proper context**

But the more serious inherent problem has to do with keeping the groups completely in the dark in order to make the reading more "objective." In doing so, one has removed absolutely critical information needed to disambiguate the message.


Even the initial Houran and Randle study demonstrated great improvement in reading of certain words by the group knowing the correct Roswell context, though the authors chose to completely ignore this result.

It's somewhat like trying to work a crossword puzzle by providing some of the letters but removing most of the crossword clues. Without the clues, the words become ambiguous with possible multiple solutions. Therefore, the suggested Houran/Randle protocol virtually guarantees failure in reading most of the message.

This is basically a word puzzle. To properly solve it, one needs to know the proper context and apply it.

That is why I like to give the example of the possible matches for the "victims" word if one uses search letters "V I \_ \_ I \_ S," letters that are almost certainly present. There are only 8 possibilities. But still one must choose amongst the possibilities, and that can only be done by applying proper context.

VIOLINS might be a viable choice if we knew the message was from a symphony conductor. VIRGINS might be viable if the message was from an anthropologist and concerned human sacrifice. But neither word seems very likely in the context of a military message at the height of the Roswell incident in the hand of the general trying to kill the story. (Other "matches" include



equally nonsensical words like VILNIUS, VITRICS, VI-ROIDS, VIBRIOS, and VILLI'S)

Thus "VICTIMS" is not an arbitrary word dreamed up by biased Roswell researchers. When you compare the enhanced images against the actual telex font, the first letter can only be a "Y" or a "V." To my eye, the first letter by itself looks slightly more like a "Y" than a "V."

But if you use a search engine and do a very broad word search (see [www.onelook.com](http://www.onelook.com)) using YI??I??, only three hits come back: YI JING (AKA "I Ching"), YID-DISH, and YIPPING. Obviously such "matches" produce only nonsense, and need not be considered seriously.


Similarly, using "V" as the first letter and expanding the search using VI??I??, there are only 73 possibilities, producing mostly nonsensical "matches" like VITRIOL, VIZZINI, VIATICO, VIALING, etc. If you go through this expanded list, the only remotely possible plausible additional word that might make any sense is VIEWING.

The phrase would become "the viewing of the wreck," which might make sense in isolation, but which makes no sense whatsoever in the context of the complete sentence: "the viewing of the wreck you forwarded to the ?????? at Fort Worth, Tex." How do you forward a viewing?

The same argument, incidentally, also applies to the key word "DISC," (or "DISK") another consensus word. These words are literally forced by the clarity of certain letters, the limited number of possible matches, and the correct context. It would certainly be of enormous help if analysts knew that this message followed immediately on the heels of a "flying disk" press release, and that the terms "DISC" and "DISK" were both used equally often to describe the new objects, and frequently enclosed in quotes because they were a new and unusual usage of the words.

No intelligence agency in their right mind would approach reading the message by keeping the analysts completely ignorant of context. I recently sent Randle a long e-mail in which I gave the analogy of a cell phone message from a known terrorist being intercepted, but the reception was poor and the message was full of static and faded in and out. A few words came through relatively clearly, but most of the message was faint and noisy. This is the auditory analog to the written Ramey message.

Now what does the intelligence agency do to interpret the message? What they would really do is turn it over to a terrorism task force that was highly familiar with the terrorist networks. They would tell them *everything* known about the message—when and where it was inter-



cepted, who the known terrorist on the phone was, what he was up to at the time, etc.

If they want their analysts to disambiguate a noisy message, they need to use knowledgeable analysts, and they need to provide them with the proper context. What they would *not* do would be to turn it over to groups of know-nothing scientists and also tell them absolutely nothing so that they will be more "objective."

This is the danger of a badly designed protocol done in the name of "objective peer review." It will likely lead to mostly negative results, and then be used to debunk the whole thing.

Could the results turn out positive or partly positive? That is certainly a possibility. E.g., I consider key words like "the victims" and "in the 'disc'" to be clear enough that they might be successfully read even without knowing the correct context. If such readings were to emerge from completely "blind" readers, it would be hard to deny they were there. This is about the only real advantage I can think of in using the proposed Houran/ Randle protocol.

But even though Houran and Randle propose doing the experiment this way to "corroborate" the message, remarkably they would still dismiss the significance of such positive findings:

"We speculate that any positive findings from a blind triangulated study will only interest hardened researchers of the case. Many people will likely not regard statistical analysis of a computer-enhanced photograph of a document as hard evidence of a UFO crash and retrieval. In short, there is no substitute for having the original or a good verifiable copy of the document."

To this they add:

"Of course, more advanced and systematic triangulated studies of the document could reveal content that bears favorably on a conventional explanation for the crash debris. The field should be prepared for such a verdict as well, and treat the findings with the same respect as they would if the findings were pro-extraterrestrial craft."

This is a classic no-win situation that they have set up in advance. Positive results would be worthless as evidence, whereas negative results should be treated with complete respect.

One wonders with such statements what the point of their testing proposal is anyway, since they are basically asserting that it is impossible to corroborate previous "pro-UFO" readings—they cannot be validated, only invalidated.

Reading the Ramey message remains primarily a linguistic task. Scientific protocols can be devised to help in

interpreting it, such as the one I used and described on my website. (This protocol, incidentally, was also largely endorsed by Houran and Randle in their paper.) But ultimately it comes down to whether the average person sees words there or not.

This cannot be settled by the readings of a few "scientific experts" kept completely ignorant of the contextual situation and hand-selected by researchers who might have their own personal agendas. In fact, I consider such a protocol to be flawed, elitist, and fraught with the potential for abuse.

As Houran and Randle have already made abundantly clear, they consider only negative results as having any validity, while positive results they consider to have no probative value.

With statements like this, I am reminded of previous scientific review panels like the Robinson or Condon Committees, deliberately set up for the purpose of debunking UFOs under the guise of scientific peer review.

I have proposed an alternate statistical test of readings of the Ramey message that I believe circumvents the various difficulties I outlined to Dick Hall. If properly designed, it would be objective, relatively inexpensive, and easy to administer. There would be no need to arbitrarily pick "experts" to read the message or worry about their puzzle-solving ability, motivation, objectivity, or lack of relevant knowledge. The results could be reported in straightforward way.

Instead of looking at the entire message, much of it extremely difficult to read, I would focus in on the clearer key words and phrases that go to the heart of the debate as to whether Roswell was a mundane balloon crash or really did involve the recovery of a "flying disk" and bodies. The two phrases I consider the most important here are "THE VICTIMS OF THE WRECK" and "IN THE 'DISC' THEY WILL SHIP."

The basic technique would be of an opinion poll. Using previously enhanced, high-resolution images of these phrases, competing interpretations would be presented to hundreds of literate, native English speakers in three different situations. First they would be given no context. Then they would be given a false context. Then they would be given the correct Roswell context. In each situation they would choose which reading they thought best matched the actual text (or indicate they thought none of them were a good match).

Some of these competing readings would be "pro-UFO." Some would best match the false context. Some would be neutral or perhaps meaningless. E.g., one "pro-UFO" reading would be mine: "IN THE 'DISC' THEY WILL SHIP." A reading that would favor a misleading "atomic bomb" context, such as used in the first Houran/Randle study, might read "IF THE 'BOMB' WERE THEN SENT." And a neutral reading might be "IS THE 'WISH' WHAT THEY WANT." Word length would be matched in all instances, and attempts would be made to come up with words that matched as many clearer letters as possible.

I would predict my phrase would be preferentially selected in all three testing situations, but most often when

knowing the correct context. A complete skeptic would predict that no phrase would be picked preferentially, since the letters and words are nothing more than meaningless blobs and completely unreadable. A moderate skeptic would probably predict that the preferred choice would be completely dictated by the testing situation.

Such a test amounts to little more than a multiple-choice quiz. It could be easily administered and scored, including by multiple researchers once standardized. The statistical significance of the results, or lack thereof, could be easily calculated. It would test critical phrase readability using a broad spectrum of English readers under multiple conditions, including the correct context.

A simplified, unscientific version of such a poll already exists on my Website at [www.roswellproof.com/critical\\_phrases.html](http://www.roswellproof.com/critical_phrases.html). So far 70% - 80% of the respondents agree that the critical words "THE VICTIMS" or "IN THE 'DISC'" are indeed present in the message, vs. 10% or fewer that disagree.

The respondents are self-selected and strongly "pro-UFO," judging by another polling question. Thus the results are hardly objective or statistically valid. But this does give a rough idea of just how readable these words really are.

### Conclusion

Gen. Ramey's remarkable message is probably the single most important piece of evidence to emerge on the Roswell case in the last decade. Previously the Roswell case had been built up primarily from the testimony of military and civilian witnesses. Some of this testimony has been compelling. Some far less so, if not downright fraudulent. Even with the most credible witnesses, we have the problem of human memory being imperfect, making evaluation of accuracy difficult.

Documentary evidence directly or indirectly bearing on Roswell has also generally proven to be ambiguous with multiple interpretations. Leaked "smoking gun" documents, such as the many infamous "MJ-12" papers, tend to show up in people's mailboxes and are of dubious origin and authenticity.

The Ramey memo, unlike witness memories, is frozen in time and unchanging. It can be repeatedly studied. It is also unique in being an unquestionably authentic document, a military message held in the hand of the general who helped engineer the Roswell cover-up.

Nonetheless, it is admittedly at the limits of legibility, and results remain partly ambiguous. However, even without consensus on the overall contents, there has already been peer consensus on key portions of the memo, particularly the incriminating words "VICTIMS" and "DISC/DISK."

The mention of "victims" constitutes the first documentary evidence of the recovery of bodies of some type at Roswell. And the crash object is clearly being referred to as a "disc," not a balloon or conventional aircraft of some type. Thus many of us consider the Ramey message to be the true "smoking gun" of Roswell, despite the attempts of some naysayers to undermine its obvious importance. (Visit my Website at [www.roswellproof.com](http://www.roswellproof.com))

Dr. Kary Mullis' strange experience

# The raccoon and the Nobel Prize

By Bill Chalker

On a Friday night in April, 1983, Dr. Kary Mullis, a biochemist, was driving up to his cabin in Mendocino County in northern California. During that drive to his Anderson Valley cabin Mullis conceived one of the great discoveries of modern chemistry—the polymerase chain reaction (PCR), a surprisingly simple method for making unlimited copies of DNA, thereby revolutionizing biochemistry almost overnight.

Mullis described his discovery in *Scientific American* ("The Unusual Origin of the Polymerase Chain Reaction," April, 1990). He was awarded the 1993 Nobel Prize in Chemistry for his discovery.

Two years after his discovery, on a Friday night in the summer of 1985, Dr. Mullis drove up to his cabin. Arriving around midnight after driving for about three hours, he dumped groceries he bought on the way, switched on the lights (powered by solar batteries) and headed, with flashlight in hand, to the outside toilet located about 50 feet west of the cabin.

He never got there that night. Quoting from his 1998 book, *Dancing Naked in the Mine Field*, Mullis encountered something extraordinarily weird on the way. "At the far end of the path, under a fir tree, there was something glowing. I pointed my flashlight at it anyhow. It only made it whiter where the beam landed. It seemed to be a raccoon. I wasn't frightened. Later, I wondered if it could have been a hologram, projected from God knows where."

"The raccoon spoke. 'Good evening, doctor,' it said. I said something back, I don't remember what, probably, 'Hello.' The next thing I remember, it was early in the morning. I was walking along a road uphill from my house."

Mullis had no idea how he got there, but he was not wet from the extensive early morning dew. His flashlight was missing, and he was never able to find it. He had no signs of injury or bruising. The lights of the cabin were still on, along with the groceries on the floor. Some six hours had gone by unaccounted for.

Later in the day he found that an area of his property—"the most beautiful part of my woods"—had inexplicably become a place of dread. A year or so later Mullis exorcised this fear John Wayne-style by shooting the wood up.

While his attempt at psychotherapy proved successful, it did not help him find out what had happened that night in the summer of 1985. Mullis would become the only known Nobel prize laureate to claim an experience of what might be an alien abduction.

About the author

Bill Chalker, one of Australia's leading UFO researchers and writers, is the author of *The Oz Files: the Australian UFO Story* (1996). He graduated with an Honours Science Degree with majors in chemistry and math at the University of New England, and has more than two decades of experience in industry as a chemist, laboratory manager, and quality manager. He lives in Sydney, Australia.



Bill Chalker

Mullis describes himself as "a generalist with a chemical prejudice." Others have described him as "Hunter Thompson meets Stephen Hawking" or "the world's most eccentric and outspoken Nobel Prize-winning scientist."

It is not easy to dispose of Mullis' experience as a drug or alcoholic hallucination. For one, he was not affected by either that midnight. Plus, he has not been the only one to have experienced strange events at the cabin.

His daughter, Louise, disappeared for about three hours after wandering down the same hill. She also reappeared on the same stretch of road. Her frantic fiance was about to call the local sheriff.

Mullis had told no one of his experience until his daughter called to tell him to buy Whitley Strieber's *Communion*. She was phoning to also tell her father about her strange experience. By coincidence, when she rang, Mullis had already been drawn to the book and was up to the point where Strieber reports strange "owls" and little men entering his house.

In his own book, Mullis concluded, "I wouldn't try to publish a scientific paper about these things, because I can't do any experiments. I can't make glowing raccoons appear. I can't buy them from a scientific supply house to study. I can't cause myself to be lost again for several hours. But I don't deny what happened. It's what science calls anecdotal, because it only happened in a way that you can't reproduce. But it happened."

Mullis confirmed all this and more when I spoke with him recently. And another person encountered a "glowing raccoon" between the cabin and the toilet. This was a friend of Mullis who did not know of the "raccoon" story and was a first-time visitor at a party at the cabin after the announcement of the Nobel Prize win in 1993.

This man did not stick around, fleeing up the hill towards the house. On the way he encountered a small glowing man, which then suddenly enlarged into a full sized man who said something like, "I'll see you tomorrow."

The man, who was not experiencing a drug or alcohol-induced hallucination, left with a friend without informing anyone, returning to his hotel at a nearby town. That night the man inexplicably found himself outside in the hotel

car park, troubled and terrified by the impression he had somehow been back at the Mullis cabin.

He and his friend returned the following night to the cabin, where the celebratory party was carrying on from the previous night. As the man arrived, he was shocked to see the "full-sized man"—seen as an enlarging apparition the night before—drive up in a car. This was too much for the first-time visitor. He left in a panic, holding Mullis somehow responsible for the previous night's events.

Sometime later, in tears, he revealed the full story to Mullis, who identified the man his friend had seen as his elderly neighbor. Mullis checked with his neighbor, and sure enough he had come to the party on the second night, arriving to be seen by the terrified visitor.

However, the neighbor was certain he was not there on the first night, not in person and not lurking as a glowing raccoon or a small glowing man that enlarged into a vision of himself.

There is more, but that can perhaps wait for another more detailed telling.

Given this sort of activity on his property, it perhaps isn't surprising that Mullis told me he thinks the nature of his experience is even stranger than abducting ETs. Instead he speculates about multi-dimensional physics (a la Michio Kaku's *Hyperspace*, 1994) at a macrocosmic level, "like anything can god-damn happen, and the speed of light is not really the limit in terms of interactions with other cultures or whatever. This stuff about grabbing people or subjecting them to all kinds of experiments—it's just anthropology at a level we don't understand quite yet."

As for PCR testing of biological samples from abductee experiences, he indicated, "You might imagine that I thought of that myself. As for instance in 'you can have some of mine, if I can have some of yours.'" He would like to look at this work, but he feels that the idea of an alien culture needing our DNA to survive is very unlikely, and a program on the scale and nature of David Jacobs's *The Threat* improbable.

Any culture that could conquer the barrier of space-time could have easily conquered the far simpler problems of complex biochemistry, and would not need us in the manner described in the grey alien-human "hybrid" agenda theories.

### 2002 Symposium Proceedings

The *MUFON 2002 International UFO Symposium Proceedings* book is available from MUFON Headquarters for \$25 + \$2.50 p&h (U.S.). For deliveries outside of the United States an additional \$4.00 postage (total \$6.50) is required. The book contains the papers presented at the annual MUFON Symposium in Rochester, New York, by **William J. Birnes, Richard Dolan, Timothy Good, Betty Hill, Bill Hamilton, Budd Hopkins, David Jacobs, Don Ledger, Peter Robbins, Jeffrey W. Sainio, Chris Styles and Richard Thieme.**

## Odyssey spacecraft transforms our understanding of Mars

NASA's Mars Odyssey spacecraft has transformed the way scientists are looking at the red planet.

"In just one year, Mars Odyssey has fundamentally changed our understanding of the nature of the materials



on and below the surface of Mars," said Dr. Jeffrey Plaut, Odyssey's project scientist at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL).

During its first year of surveying the Martian surface, Odyssey's camera system provided detailed maps of minerals in rocks

and soils. "A wonderful surprise has been the discovery of a layer of olivine-rich rock exposed in the walls of Ganges Chasm," said Dr. Philip Christensen, principal investigator for Odyssey's thermal emission imaging system at Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz.

"Olivine is easily destroyed by liquid water, so its presence in these ancient rocks suggests that this region of Mars has been very dry for a very long time.


"Infrared images have provided a remarkable new tool for mapping the Martian surface. The temperature differences we see in the day and night images have revealed complex patterns of rocks and soils that show the effects of lava flows, impact craters, wind, and possibly water throughout the history of Mars," Christensen said.

Odyssey has measured radiation levels at Mars that are substantially higher than in low-Earth orbit. "The Martian radiation environment experiment has confirmed expectations that future human explorers of Mars will face significant long-term health risks from space radiation," said Dr. Cary Zeitlin, principal investigator for the Martian radiation environment experiment, National Space Biomedical Research Institute, Houston.

"We've also observed solar particle events not seen by near-Earth radiation detectors," Zeitlin said. The gamma ray spectrometer suite, which early in the mission discovered vast amounts of hydrogen in the form of water ice trapped beneath the Martian surface, has also begun to map the elemental composition of the surface.

JPL, a division of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, CA, manages the 2001 Mars Odyssey mission for NASA's Office of Space Science in Washington. Investigators at Arizona State University, the University of Arizona, and NASA's Johnson Space Center, Houston, built and operate the science instruments.

Additional science partners are located at the Russian Aviation and Space Agency and at Los Alamos National Laboratories, New Mexico. Lockheed Martin Astronautics, Denver, the prime contractor for the project, developed and built the orbiter. Mission operations are conducted jointly from Lockheed Martin and from JPL.



OVAL LIGHTS WITH A LITTLE FUZZY HALO AROUND THEM.

## Illinois object with lights darts away

**Investigated by Vic Connor,  
MUFON State Section Director, McLean  
County, IL, and certified Field Investigator**

This sighting was reported to IL MUFON State Director David Marler and NUFORC.

I spent 80 minutes interviewing Kent, an analyst for State Farm, who was the only witness, and reenacting his sighting. The following are his words:

"I was driving home from work on Route 51 south from Bloomington to Heyworth, IL, on Aug. 22, 2001, around 23:15. This is about a ten-mile drive. I was about half way home when I noticed three bright lights, side by side, in the sky hovering around the Randolph Grain Elevator.

"I estimate the object was about 500-1000 feet in the air. Curiosity got the best of me, so I turned on Randolph Road and proceeded east to check things out. As I got closer, the object was still hovering, and the lights were getting brighter. I passed the grain elevator, and the object still had not moved.

"I was getting closer, and my cell phone rang, and no one was there. I looked later, and no incoming call registered in my log on the phone. I kept driving, and then all of a sudden the object darted northeast very quickly and was gone.

"I checked the flight schedule at the Central Illinois Regional Airport, and nothing comes in from the south at that time. The airport is about 10 miles from the sighting. There is a plane that comes in from Chicago at 11:10, and I could see the landing lights as I was stopped on the road. I don't know what I saw, as the object appeared to be an oval shape, based on the layout of the lights. The cell phone ringing and the way the object left the area is what has made me think I saw something out of the ordinary. Unfortunately, I have no pictures."

We twice drove over the route he took while he watched the UFO. I noted times, distances on various roads, and his estimate of the position and size of the object. Because two and a half months had elapsed since the sighting, the scenery is different, and memories had faded, so

these angular measurements were rough to make. Using a dime and quarter at arm's length, I had Kent tell me roughly how high the object was at different times.

While driving his truck, he was able to almost constantly watch the object, which at times was blocked by the high corn stalks when he drove through a dip in the road, and once by a grain storage elevator. He drove mostly south and east over the county roads. Since the object was mostly east of him when he could turn off the main road, I noted that he drove almost exactly a mile in an easterly direction towards it.

Fortunately, since Kent was moving about a mile toward the object, I had two angles and one side of a triangle. Using trigonometry from this, I was able to estimate that the object was 1.67 miles away from him originally, and then 0.67 miles away before it shot off and was gone from sight in less than one second.

It was approximately 350 feet up and about 35 feet to 50 feet long. Again, this is a rough estimate, and it assumes that the object did not change altitude even slightly during these few minutes. Kent thought the object was stationary the whole time he was trying to approach it until it zoomed off. His sighting lasted 3 minutes and 50 seconds, plus/minus 10 seconds.

The airport is actually 13 miles NNE of him, and he saw the landing lights of the last plane from Chicago arriving at our airport to the north. From what he describes, the pilot of this plane could have had a good view of the UFO as it streaked towards him. Since the object disappeared in less than a second, the pilot in preparing for his landing could have easily not seen it.

Kent has excellent (20/15) vision, and he saw dimmer surrounding lights around the three main bright lights. He thought this could be due to the humidity in the air.

Kent was agitated in a concerned way by the time he got home. I talked with his wife, who stated that her husband "is normally pretty laid back," but she became a little concerned that night because of his demeanor. I asked her if he arrived home at the time she had expected, and she said yes, which would indicate no missing time. Kent saw no other people during this experience.



## Challender tracks NASA flights for UFO clues

By Will Evans

*Sacramento Bee* staff writer

**W**hen NASA launches another shuttle into orbit, the folks at Mission Control won't be the only ones following its every move.

Jeff Challender will be watching every second of shuttle footage available on cable television from his Sacramento, CA, home. And he'll be recording it, adding it to his collection of hundreds of missions, for proof.

Proof of what, he doesn't know. But Challender, 49, believes National Aeronautics and Space Administration cameras are catching glances of UFOs.

Alien spacecraft, space animals, secret government experiments or none of the above—Challender has no idea what they are. But despite debunkers who say he's staring at ice particles or other space junk, Challender doesn't think the white spots occasionally moving across his screen can be explained by normal means.

These flying objects are, at least for him, "unidentified."

"I don't go for the flying saucers and little green men routine," he says. "All I know is that there is something appearing on NASA video that doesn't belong there."

Though there are many UFO trackers in Sacramento, he's one of only a handful in the world that scope NASA flights for clues. And for his patience and dedication to detail, watching video that he says produces about 10 seconds of "interesting" material out of several hundred hours, he has become respected as a self-taught "expert" in the wider UFO community.

"He has probably more expertise than anyone else, certainly outside of government, in looking at the film," says George Filer, a retired Air Force major who runs a UFO Web site from New Jersey.

Challender, disabled by a severe spinal injury, lies on a mattress surrounded by an arsenal of recording equipment for his work: nine VCRs, stacks of VHS tapes, two DVD burners, and a DVD player.

With his massive, hand-built, quadruple-hard-drive computer in front, he seems suspended in some kind of space vessel himself.

But the only thing that hints of extraterrestrial interests is a little silver alien, perched on top of his computer.

Challender grabs the NASA footage from Channel 72, run by the Sacramento Educational Cable Consortium. From each mission he'll probably examine 30 to 40 hours of tape, sometimes straight from breakfast to when his family calls him to dinner.

The longtime aviation junkie started taping missions in 1997, just for fun, to edit each one into a documentary. But in 1999, he saw something that grabbed his attention: an illuminated dot, pulsating as it whizzed across the screen. Then, later, he saw many white dots moving



*Jeff Challender of Sacramento, CA, is surrounded by computer and electronics equipment that he uses to examine NASA mission films for unidentified flying objects. (Sacramento Bee/Manny Crisostomo)*

around, changing direction and speed. What were they? Challender has been tracking similar "anomalies" ever since.

"I want answers," says the former railroad laborer. "I believe something's going on and the facts are being kept from us."

NASA isn't so sure.

"I'm not aware of any visuals of (extraterrestrial) activity," says Fred Brown, executive producer of NASA Television.

Challender points to incidents where the camera seems to zoom in on one of the dots and then cuts off the live footage—signs, he says, of a coverup.

Nonsense. Brown says. "If those things were out there and we were trying to hide them, we wouldn't put them on NASA Television."

Challender is probably seeing bits of liquid or ice, close to the camera, blown around by jets of gas from the shuttle, says Seth Shostak, an astronomer at the SETI Institute, a nonprofit organization running what used to be NASA's "Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence."

"You have to be careful," he says. "They're very impressive if you're naive."

But Jack Kasher, a retired University of Nebraska, Omaha, physicist, says he's viewed Challender's findings, concluding that they aren't ice particles, and challenging anyone who says so to prove it.

Still, Shostak says, why would SETI spend millions searching for alien radio signals if there were Martians buzzing around every NASA mission?

Shostak believes that there is alien life. If 10 percent of stars had planets and 1 percent of those supported life, there could be millions of worlds with life just in our gal-

axy, he calculates. But NASA would have no incentive to hide any evidence.

"That would be the greatest thing for NASA. Their budget would go up instead of going down," he says.

Bernard Haisch, ex-director of the California Institute for Physics and Astrophysics, has led several NASA studies, and doesn't think the civilian agency is involved in any cover-up—but he thinks there probably is one.

In fact, there are quite a few government people and aviation experts—even famed astronauts Gordon Cooper and Edgar Mitchell—who believe the government knows more than it's telling.

"I know there's something out there because I've chased 'em," Filer says. Flying in the Air Force in 1962, he was ordered to follow a supernaturally large object detected by radar, and came close enough to see its lights before it disappeared.

Aviators apparently have so many such experiences that one ex-NASA scientist founded the National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena, which compiles UFO reports from pilots.

Since the government no longer investigates UFO reports, the task falls on these private organizations and on amateurs.

The Mutual UFO Network, for example, is dedicated to investigating all sightings. Cynthia Siegel, director of the Sacramento chapter, is training half a dozen locals to become "field investigators" to document sightings with interviews, photographs, and video—even soil samples.

"There are so many more accounts than people realize," Siegel says.

The National UFO Reporting Center recorded two Sacramento-area reports in December: a "cigar-shaped craft" and a "triangular craft with three large white lights."

Challender, searching for more by using a different technique, founded Project P.R.O.V.E. It stands for "People Recording Orbiting Vehicles from Earth," which says it all. Challender holds his ordinary camcorder to the sky when the International Space Station passes over Sacramento and waits for something unusual. So far ... nothing.

"But I don't give up hope," he says.

An even more difficult project may be establishing credibility for UFO buffs. To help change the kooky image, Linda Willits of Folsom works on Project Disclosure, which gathers testimony from top government and military figures who "believe."

On the other hand, she participates in what some consider the definition of kooky, traveling around the country to summon ETs through meditation. "We ask them to show up and they always do," she says.

That's not Challender's style. He shirks the "true believer" label and diligently fills out incident reports for everything he sees, striving to be scientific.

Yet, he knows he's unlikely to solve the puzzle from his home in Sacramento.

"The only way I will find out is with full government disclosure. Or if something lands in my front yard and asks me if I want a ride," he says with a chuckle. "But I'm not holding out for that."

## Meteorite impact study suggests life may exist on Jupiter's Europa

Scientists simulating meteorite impacts on the frozen oceans of Europa have made an electrifying discovery, which raises the chances of finding life on Jupiter's moon.

Jerome Borucki, at the NASA Ames Research Center, fired aluminum bullets into a block of ice. They found that when the bullet impacted, sensors embedded in the ice detected an electric shock. A second, and much larger, electrical discharge was observed a few moments later.

A shell of ice many kilometers thick encases the surface of Europa and scientists speculate that liquid water—and therefore life—might lie beneath.

Evidence for the presence of the molecular building blocks for life comes from the yellow-brown stains seen on the ice by the Galileo probe. "Europa is a high priority target for exploration because the key ingredients for life seem to be there," says Ron Greeley, a planetary scientist at the Arizona State University. "But even if you have the ingredients, is there a spark that creates the first organic molecules?"

Borucki's bullet experiments suggest meteorite impacts might have provided that spark.

The electric shock had gone undetected because no one had put sensors below an impact crater before. The team thinks the current is caused by the movement of protons as the ice cracks.

Methane and ammonia are likely to be present in Europa's ice, and the energy pumped into the ice by a meteorite impact will melt it. Shock this mixture with electricity, says Borucki, and complex molecules should form.

"We do see a handful of very large craters on Europa, and there would have been a lot of energy associated with those," comments Greeley. A lander may be sent to the surface of Europa to look for organic matter.

Greenley estimates the earliest launch date for the mission to be 2011. *Journal of Geophysical Research - Planets* (Vol 107, p 24) Thanks to Tom Deuley.

### WUFOD login & password for MUFON members

WUFOD is MUFON's Worldwide UFO database, linked to the MUFON home page. URL for WUFOD is: <http://ohiomufon.services4all.com>

login (where it says Name) is: member  
password is: !member!

Remember, the login is the word "member," NOT your name! Both login and password must be typed in lower case to enter WUFOD.

Print out the user guide once you log in and read it for best use of the database.

Logins and passwords for investigators will be given them by their State Directors. All Field Investigators should be getting email from WUFOD when a case is entered in your state. If you aren't, please contact [geekology@worldnet.att.net](mailto:geekology@worldnet.att.net)

## Scoop marks

**Editor's Note:** The following report by a school teacher, who prefers to remain anonymous, is presented by William I. McNeff, MUFON Minnesota State Director. It is not a scientific study, nor does it seem to easily fit within present perimeters of what we think we know about scoop marks, but perhaps the observations will generate responses from those familiar with the topic. It has been edited to conserve space.

**Introduction by Neff:** Scoop marks, tiny circular indentations in the skin, have been observed on some people who suspect or believe that they may have been abducted by aliens, and researchers who interpreted the Roper Poll results conservatively estimated that at least 2 % of the population appear to have been abducted.

This paper represents the observations of a teacher, working as a substitute teacher in various Minnesota schools. I have known this person for more than twelve years, and believe her to be an intelligent and reliable individual who is very familiar with the abduction phenomenon. Her observations are presented as follows:

**Observations by the teacher:** Although this is not a scientific study, I would like to share some of my observations made while substitute teaching at some of the area schools. For instance, one recent assignment involved teaching an 8th grade World Geography class at a school for the gifted and talented. There were six scheduled classes containing a total of about 160 students of mixed ethnicity, including Asian, African-American, Latino, and Caucasian.

As I began to pass out the tests for the first class, I noticed how many of the students' faces contained scoop marks! The marks appeared in the middle of a cheek (usually the right cheek) or on the forehead. After observing this in the first class, I looked carefully at each of the students in the remaining classes (as unobtrusively as possible) and was amazed to see how many kids had the same marks. Most of these kids had otherwise smooth, flawless complexions.

The scoops, all perfectly round "cut-outs," were of different sizes, with the smallest the size of the head of a pin and the largest about a half inch in diameter. This larger mark appeared on the right cheek of a boy of Hispanic origin. He had a dark, olive-type complexion with no other markings whatsoever. The vast majority of the scoops seemed to be about one-fourth inch in diameter.

Some argument may be made that these marks could be the result of chicken pox, measles, acne, etc. However, pock marks and acne scars are irregular, as opposed to the crisp, perfect scoop marks. This cannot possibly be coincidental. I find it hard to believe that all of these kids had chicken pox that left scars that all looked alike in the same couple of spots on their face! On one

10th-grader, I noticed both acne scars and a scoop mark on his forehead—each type distinctively different.

These marks are so precise that they could be described as "cookie cutter perfect." Many are so obvious that they are seen upon a first glance. The interior of the scoop is flat, not rounded inside (as with an ice cream scoop indentation). On absolutely all of them, there is a perfect, flawless, distinctive sharp rim. This sharp rim is what makes the mark so noticeable. When viewed from an angle, light hitting the mark actually casts a tiny interior shadow.

By far, most of the scoop marks appear on the cheek (usually the right cheek), but may also be seen on the forehead above either eye. I've noticed a few marks between the eyes, above the nose, but these have been infrequent.

Last year, I observed four marks on the otherwise flawless skin of a Latino girl about ten years of age—one on her right cheek, two above her right eye, and one, which was larger than the others, between her eyes. All displayed that same "cookie cutter" precision.

Another interesting aspect of the students I've observed is that the marks appear on those who seem to be the most intelligent and/or physically attractive. I'm now beginning to look at the behavior and social maturity of these kids.

This is a real "wild card" because some with scoop marks, while extremely intelligent, have definite behavioral problems. It is my feeling that these kids desperately need to be challenged. They question everything, take objects apart to "see what makes them tick," and are generally restless and needing something to constantly occupy their time. If not given the opportunity to absorb themselves in something they can get "lost" in, they often end up diagnosed with "attention deficit disorder" and are put on Ritalin or else start to self-destruct because of antisocial behavior.

I would say that roughly 1/4 of 100 to 115 kids, or about 1 in 4 kids in the gifted and talented classes, had scoops, some with multiple scoops. In regular classes, I don't see nearly this number. I'll see a kid here or there in a class who has one or multiples. Often these are younger kids (under 10) who have not yet gone through puberty, so there is no possibility of them having had acne.

I began collecting and documenting my observations, and afterward took "second looks" at each student in an effort to recheck my original findings. This required me to be especially discreet!

My observation of scoop marks is not limited to students. I have an acquaintance who knows of my interest in this subject. She mentioned that her seven-year-old son is in the gifted program in his school. As she was talking, I noticed that she had a nice, crisp cut, perfectly round scoop mark on her right cheek!

My own ten-year-old nephew in San Antonio, who is in the gifted program in his school, also has scoop marks. The boy's mother is my sister—and she has three scoop marks on her right cheek and eye area. I've talked with her now and then about the UFO situation, but I don't know if she would believe that there might be a connec-

tion between the ETs and these marks. And finally, I have one scoop mark myself, on my right cheek.

## Pflock questions Friedman

Dwight:

As always, I found Stan Friedman's column in the February 2003 *Journal* most interesting, which is not to say I found myself entirely in agreement with everything Stan had to say (surprise!). For now, I will confine myself to making just a couple of points.

First, Friedman asserts that Kevin Randle's and Mark Rodeghier's *International UFO Reporter* articles on Roswell non-witness Frank Kaufmann "do not give Don Schmitt any credit for the discoveries [of Kaufmann's duplicities]."

In fact, Rodeghier states right up front that he "was able to visit Roswell along with two other Roswell investigators (one of whom was Don Schmitt...) and meet with Juanita Kaufmann, Frank's widow. Because of her long acquaintance with Schmitt, she allowed us access to her husband's office and papers..." (*IUR*, Fall 2002, p. 9.)

Second, while Friedman tells us at great length about his meetings with Kaufmann in 1995 and 1999 and his suspicions about Kaufmann's story, he makes no mention of the fact that in May, 1993, I interviewed Kaufmann at length. Nor does he mention that I first recounted this interview and presented other damning information about Kaufmann in my Fund for UFO Research monograph "Roswell in Perspective," published in early 1994, and later expanded upon this in my *Roswell: Inconvenient Facts and the Will to Believe* (Prometheus, 2001; see especially Chapter 5, "Tales of Kaufmann").

In essence, I had published virtually everything but the smoking gun well before anyone else in the field, and more than three years before publication of Randle and Schmitt's *Truth About the UFO Crash at Roswell*, in which, as Stan pointed out, the case presented depends upon Kaufmann's flights of melodramatic fantasy.

To their credit, and quite unlike certain others on the Roswell trail, Randle, Rodeghier, and the Center for UFO Studies have not only followed the inconvenient facts about Frank Kaufmann where they led, they have made them—the smoking gun—public and available for all to read and ponder.

They deserve our commendation, not condemnation and snide potshots.

—Karl T. Pflock Placitas, New Mexico

## Randle disputes Friedman

Dwight and all,

I have to say that the latest Stan Friedman column is so full of misinformation (think false claims) that I thought I would take a moment to supply the alternative.

1. Stan has known for years that the information about Gerald Anderson taking Dr. Buskirk's anthropology class came not from Larry Henning (think Red Herring here), but from officials at the Albuquerque High School. When I told Fred Whiting that Anderson had taken the class, he

called Stan, who called Gerald, who called the high school threatening to sue everyone.

Rather than expose the officials there, who, while on the telephone with me reviewed Anderson's record and told me that he had taken the Anthropology course, to the lawsuits Anderson threatened, I talked to a number of students from the class.

Only Henning seemed to remember Anderson. But here's the scoop. Anderson attended the Albuquerque High School. Buskirk taught there. Do we really need them in the same classroom?

2. I didn't shake Stan's hand because I was telling him, in the world of gentlemen, that I was annoyed with his efforts to block publication of my first Roswell book. He wrote the publisher, suggesting plagiarism and other such unethical practices. Stan, however, wasn't above using interviews that I conducted, or that I and his new best friend, Don Schmitt, conducted, with neither credit nor attribution. All you have to do is read his book and match the interviews with those we had conducted.

3. This nonsense about forgetting to mention Schmitt is another Red Herring. Stan knows that Schmitt was left out of the web articles because Schmitt would not return telephone calls or answer emails. We had no choice but to leave him out.

When complaints surfaced, obviously driven by Schmitt, who did not mention them to any of us, we corrected the situation. Lost in all this is the fact that Walter Haut told me about Kaufmann, I arranged the first meetings with him, and all other meetings flowed from that.

I will note that it was Schmitt who carried the documents from the Kaufmann house, and it was Schmitt who shared them with us, so I hope Stan saved some of his criticisms for his new best friend.

I might also point out here, that some of those documents are a matter of public record, and that some of them had been given to me by Kaufmann. Only a couple of them were new.

I could go on here, but frankly, Stan wins by default. He'll get the last word because my National Guard unit has been activated, and I will be out of the loop in a week. These new matters will take my time and energy, and I will not have good access to UFO related materials.

—Kevin D. Randle

**Editor's Note:** The above pieces by Pflock and Randle are included as responses to columnist Friedman in order to be fair to these individuals. However, it is not the intention of the *Journal* to continue this "dialogue," which shows signs of deterioration into personal criticism, rather than dealing with strictly factual matters.

### Check your label for expiration date

Please check your mailing label periodically for the expiration date of your MUFON membership and *MUFON UFO Journal* subscription. Renewing prior to expiration saves MUFON needed funds, and assures that you will not miss an issue of the *Journal*.



# FILER'S FILES

By George A. Filer  
Director, MUFON Eastern Region

Unless otherwise noted, these reports have not been verified by official investigations.

## Flying triangle/diamond in Connecticut

MOOSUP — It was 4:10 AM, and the witnesses were driving north on Route 395 on March 3, 2003, when they saw a square or triangular shape object. If you place your forefingers and thumbs together you will see a shape like this ◊. There were lights at each "point," and a band of light blue lights that connected the four. Bright white and blue lights were moving around the craft.

The sky was full of stars, but in the center of the craft was blackness. "I yelled at my husband to stop and go back, but he wouldn't because we would be late for work," said the female witness. "He later admitted to being afraid."

The object was just hovering above Route 14 making no sound. It was 300 feet away and was 50 feet on all four sides or around 200 total feet, or the size of a football field. Thanks to: Peter Davenport, NUFORC



George Filer

## Large triangle reported in Florida

MILTON — At about 10:30 PM on March 10, 2003, the witness was taking out the trash when he had a strange feeling just before seeing a large dark triangle-shaped object that was at least 80 feet long. It was about 50 feet wide at its widest point, with a large bluish light on the bottom of each tip of the triangle.

The witness states, "I could actually see that the bottom of this thing was not smooth, but had form and small dips and valleys in it like something machine/manmade. I heard a faint hum and was in shock because it appeared to be only about 200 feet high with a blurry haze around it.

"I looked down to clear my eyes and looked back up and it was much smaller. I looked down again to clear my eyes from the light and looked back up and it was gone. It was like a dream, but I don't think I was dreaming, but I felt impending doom." Thanks to Peter Davenport, NUFORC.

## Orange erratic object seen in West Virginia

NEW MARTINSVILLE — Five men were standing outside at 8 PM on March 8, 2003, and noticed an orange compact disc-shaped object moving very quickly through the air. It had a slight zigzag to its movement, but there

was no exhaust trail. There were no blinking lights to indicate an airplane, plus it moved in a way too erratic for any aircraft.

The center was not as lit as the outside edges were. All of the witnesses reportedly saw the shape. At one point, they moved because it was starting to go behind some trees. Three went one way, two the other. From about a hundred feet apart, all five witnesses observed it until it disappeared into the horizon. Thanks to Peter Davenport, NUFORC.

## V-shaped lights in Ohio

CUYAHOGA FALLS — The witness was taking his dog out at 10:15 PM when he saw lights in a "V" formation moving quickly and silently on March 3, 2003.

He states, "I saw a 'V'-shaped formation of 12 to 15 lights traveling very quickly northwest. They were traveling silently, and in a few seconds were out of sight. The individual lights stayed in formation and seemed to flit around. It made me think of a group of clear spheres flying in formation with a single firefly darting around in each one, if you can imagine that."

## Pilot reports triangular lights in Ohio

COLUMBUS — An ATP-rated Learjet captain was flying as co-pilot in a Cessna Citation II on March 7, 2003, at 0515 GMT when he saw three bright lights in a triangular pattern hanging in the sky to the north near Cassiopeia, at an estimated altitude of 45-49000 feet.

The witness was flying at 39,000 feet and asked his partner if he was watching? He said yes. The lights were all of a greater relative magnitude than Sirius—perhaps equaling or greater than Venus in brightness. After about 5 to 10 seconds, the lights began to move eastward, accelerating rapidly and fading from view simultaneously (may have been receding?).

"No aircraft in my experience has ever accelerated so quickly," said the primary witness. "We believe it was one object, though no details could be made out between the lights. It might have been three separate objects, but they would have had to have been maintaining a precise formation during acceleration."

Both pilots have been flying aircraft for over 15 years, and both stated they had never seen anything like this.

## Object hovers over Missouri field

ASHLAND — The witness reports, "While driving to Columbia, MO, at around 10 PM on March 8, we spotted a bright star in the sky just above the tree lines about seven miles away from it. The object did not appear to

move, and as we got closer it had several white lights. When we came right up parallel to it, the object seemed to be hovering over a field with a protruding spotlight.

"As we passed the object, we turned to view it from our back window. A bright red light flashed on the top of the object, and one on the bottom. Then, after a minute or so, the lights began to flash all around the bottom of the craft, which made it appear to be spinning.

"We continued to watch when all the sudden the craft quickly crossed the highway and caught up with us instantly. It flew close, but after a couple minutes the craft disappeared behind the trees." NUFORC

### **Transparent objects in Louisiana**

WESTLAKE — While on the job on March 4, 2003, two workers observed three craft flying over at a very high rate of speed. One witness reports, "We both witnessed the three craft as these objects flew toward the northeast. What really shocked the both of us was that they were transparent! I could see the clouds right inside of the craft." Thanks to Peter Davenport, NUFORC.

### **Object just above road in Arizona**

CHINO VALLEY — On March 5, 2003, A black object was sitting on the dirt road (or hovering just above it) at the top of the hill in front of two observers at 9 PM. One of the witnesses stated, "It was at least as big as a school bus, but didn't seem to be made of anything solid. It was like a black and gray cloud that moved like an octopus. It came around to the side of our car and passed over the hood and windshield about 10 feet off the ground.

"It made no sound at all. It followed us for about half a mile, and we were spotlighted in a bright, white light that must have been above us. Then it was gone." Thanks to Peter Davenport, NUFORC.

### **Animal reactions in Costa Rica**

MONTEVERDE — On Feb. 28, 2003, at 1 AM, five dogs barked wildly, then ran away. The witness reports, "We looked to see what was up, and saw a single blue white light that had red, orange, and green lights spinning around the top. A steady bright white light was at the base. The light was dancing in the sky, making deep drops, and steep climbs, other times staying motionless.

"When it appeared that the light turned to the other side, we could see the outline shape of a saucer. At times the object appeared to send rays of reddish light downward to earth. The light at times seemed bright and focused in our direction, but at other times dim and focused away. It was mostly in the southwest sky toward Puntarenas and then south over Panama. Once the light disappeared, the dogs all quieted down."

### **Circular structure in Washington state**

WENATCHEE — The witness was taking out the garbage on March 3, 2003, when he saw a bright light in the western sky at 10:40 PM. He states, "The light was too

bright, and within a matter of seconds the object almost seemed to zero in on me, dodging left and right in an unfamiliar pattern at various speeds.

"I called to my girlfriend to come and see it. As she came to the door we both saw a large circular structure or sphere with bright white lights on the left and right sides, a red at the bottom, and a sort of blue or green at the top. The craft traveled from about five miles away to 50 feet above my head in probably 20 seconds.

"I am a retired software consultant. I have been very skeptical/analytical about supposed 'sightings' for the great part of my adult life. But what I saw tonight will change my reality forever. My girlfriend is a college student/waitress. She witnessed the event with me and concurred with my description."

### **Orange spinning object in Seattle**

SEATTLE — The witness reports, "It was around 6 PM on Feb. 12 when my 14-year-old daughter asked me what that 'burning orange light' was. My 11-year-old son and I also saw a glowing orange or burning round object moving at a steady rate of speed and altitude at just above tree level. My son grabbed his binoculars and said it looked like a spinning top with an antenna on top.

### **Time loss reported in Washinton state**

SEATTLE — A crime investigation specialist was on his way to a crime scene outside of Seattle on Feb. 13, 2003, at 2:30 AM. He had to be at the crime scene by 3 AM, so he rushed a little.

The witness states, "It was beginning to rain, and my car started making these weird noises—the radio turned on automatically and started tuning to numerous stations, and the lights inside and outside the car were flashing. I looked up and saw this huge triangle-shaped thing.

"In a few seconds a blue, blinding light distracted me. Suddenly it all stopped, and my car was parked on the side of the road with everything switched off. I looked at my watch and it read 3:03 AM. I then realized I had lost 33 minutes. I turned on my car and drove to work with a lot of confusion on my mind."

### **Brazil experiences UFO flap**

BRASILIA — The Distrito Federal, which is home to the capital, is now in the midst of a UFO flap. The first sighting in the D.F. took place on Feb. 4, 2003, when a UFO reportedly hovered 100 feet away from a witness. Four days later, a silver UFO was hovering in the air in a rural district, just a few meters off the ground.

On March 1, 2003, at 10:15 p.m., Aurezio Galo, 33, who lives in Gama Leste, used his binoculars to observe a round object with red, orange and white colors around it that pulsated and rotated.

On March 8, 2003, a UFO was sighted in Maceio, a large port city at around 6:30 PM, crossing over the city, with a luminous aura that pulsed at regular intervals. Inside the aura was a misty blue and yellow object. The UFO moved in a zigzagging trajectory for one minute." Thanks to Thiago Luiz Tichetti e Paulo Silva Countinho.

Howe, Gevaerd disagree on merits

# Brazilian case sparks controversy

By Dwight Connelly

It's the same case, but two well-known UFO investigators see it very differently. The case involves Urandir Oliveira, who lives in Brazil, and the investigators are Linda Moulton Howe and A. J. Gevaerd.

Analysis of a cotton and polyester woven bed sheet by biophysicist W.C. Levensgood of Pinelandia Biophysical Laboratory in Grass Lake, MI, has shown unexplained anomalies, according to Howe, who collected the samples in Oliveira's home in February.

The samples are from a sheet from Oliveira's bed which appears to show a burned outline of a body pattern, and which was reportedly created in connection with an abduction. There was also an alleged body outline on the ceiling above the bed, and Howe also took samples of this.

Levensgood, known for his work on grain samples from crop circles, says the polyester in the altered area has been "converted into what I call vitreous fibers," while the control area shows no such conversion.

He says that normal sources of heat could "absolutely not" cause this conversion. In addition, the blue cotton threads interwoven with the polyester show no sign of scorching, despite the fact that polyester has a melting point of 500 degrees F., and cotton has a scorch temperature of 300 degrees F.

Levensgood notes that the blue color of the cotton has turned brown, but that there is no carbonization, which would be present if heated with a laser or other known heating device. He says he has "no idea" how the anomaly could have occurred. "This is not the usual kind of heating."

Howe's pursuit of this case became controversial when A.J. Gevaerd, publisher of *Brazilian UFO Magazine* and MUFON Director for Brazil, stated that the Oliveira case was a hoax, publicizing his opinion on the Internet. As a result, Howe was "dis-invited" as a speaker at the Seattle UFO/Paranormal Group conference in May, "because of the controversial nature of the Brazil case."

Howe contacted MUFON International Director John Schuessler about MUFON's position, and he told her that Gevaerd had not forwarded anything to MUFON on the case, and that MUFON had no position at this time. He said, however, that he did support her efforts to have



Linda Moulton Howe

materials from the case scientifically tested.

Schuessler also noted that he has "a lot of respect for Lefty Levensgood, and when he does an analysis he doesn't make things up. As such, his analysis is one good data point. If someone wants to do a second analysis—and I always encourage more than one analysis by more than one lab—they would probably find the same thing. This is really damning evidence for something."

Gevaerd says that he has debated the case with Howe on the Internet, as well as in person which she visited the area, and that it "involves the worst kind of UFO hoaxer we ever had in Brazil." He said the case is rejected by 99% of the Brazilian UFO community.

He says that Oliveira lives "some 40-50 miles from my place, and I have been observing him, collecting info about his present and past activities, talking to witnesses, investigating several claimed cases that supposedly happened around his farm, etc. for almost eight long years. I know just about anything of his scam, and tried very hard to warn Linda Moulton Howe about it."

He adds, "I didn't inform MUFON simply because the whole case has no credibility whatsoever. There is no case to report. Anyone from the Brazilian press knows it, anyone in the Brazilian UFO community knows it, anyone in the man's neighborhood knows it."

Howe is scheduled to discuss the case in April as one of the featured speakers at Lou Farish's Ozark UFO Conference in Eureka Springs, AR. "She definitely has not been dis-invited," Farish emphasized. Howe, a media personality and the author of several books on animal mutilations and other areas of ufology, is one of the popular "regulars" at the annual conference.

Levensgood is scheduled to speak at this year's MUFON symposium.

## SETI says 150 sources of possible signals from ET identified thus far

SAN FRANCISCO (Reuters) — Using 4 million computers worldwide, SETI scientists based at the University of California, Berkeley, said they have identified about 150 sources of possible signals from intelligent civilizations.

The California researchers plan to head to Puerto Rico to use one of the world's most powerful telescopes to more closely investigate the signals that might be from extraterrestrials, a university spokeswoman said.

"They are homing in on interesting signals," said Sarah Yang, a spokeswoman where the SETI@home research project is based. "They have not said they found anything." The project links volunteer computer users into the researchers' efforts to search for strong or unusual signals from space that one day may lead to the proof that there really may be something else out there.



***UFOs and the Murder of Marilyn Monroe* by Donald R. Burluson, Ph.D., 2003, Black Mesa Press, P.O. Box 583, Roswell, NM, 88202-0583, 95 pages, 5X8 soft cover, \$9.95.**

**Reviewed by Dwight Connelly**

This is a book with a title that is sure to be embarrassing to serious UFO researchers—a book you won't leave out on the coffee table. Never mind that it was written by a serious, experienced, and respected ufologist. Has Burluson gone off the deep end?

No, despite the red flags that the title raises, and despite the occasional emotional writing of an obvious fan of Marilyn Monroe, this book is based primarily on research, rather than sensationalism.

The author works from the hypothesis that Monroe had a romantic affair with President John Kennedy, that he "imparted state secrets to her, including his knowledge of at least one UFO crash and retrieval," that their relationship soured, that she threatened to hold a press conference to "tell all," and that Robert Kennedy and two other individuals killed Monroe to keep her quiet.

Burluson states that this hypothesis explains the known facts best, has a high probability of being true, and can be regarded as true "until a better hypothesis—one better able to explain the facts—comes along, if it ever does."

Much of the background material on Monroe utilized by Burluson comes from other books about her death, such as Frank Capell's *The Strange Death of Marilyn Monroe*, Robert Slatzer's *The Curious Death of Marilyn Monroe*, Anthony Summers' *The Secret Lives of Marilyn Monroe*, and Norman Mailer's *Marilyn: A Biography*.

Burluson's UFO connection utilizes such books as Bruce Maccabee's *UFO FBI Connection, the Secret History of the Government's Cover-Up*, Kevin Randle's *Project Moon Dust: Beyond Roswell—Exposing the Government's Continuing Covert UFO Investigations and Cover-Ups*, Stephen Greer's *Extraterrestrial Contact: The Evidence and Implications*, Michael Hesemann and Philip Mantle's *Beyond Roswell: The Alien Autopsy Film, Area 51, and the U.S. Government Coverup of UFOs*, and Clifford Stone's *UFOs are Real: Extraterrestrial Encounters Documented by the U.S. Government*.

The relationship of the Kennedys and Monroe appears to have been well documented by many researchers, so

**UFOs  
and the Murder  
of Marilyn Monroe**



Donald R. Burluson, Ph.D.

the real challenge for Burluson was to tie this relationship to UFOs. Readers will have to determine how well this is done, and much depends on the degree of respect that one has for a key piece of evidence which emerged in the 1990's: supposedly a CIA document dated Aug. 3, 1962, the day before Monroe's death.

This document, marked Top Secret, was apparently not declassified and released by the government through normal channels, but supposedly leaked to Timothy Cooper, "an investigator trained by the Nick Harris Detective Academy," by "someone he understood to be a former CIA archivist." It was later publicized on Fox TV and in *UFO Magazine*.

Dr. Steven Greer, who is best known for his Disclosure Group activities, claims that the document came to him in 1994 "by way of contact with access to NSA officials," and claims "it has been authenticated by the best document researcher in the world." Unfortunately, as is typical of Greer's sources, this expert "prefers not to be identified."

The document has a subject line which reads "Marilyn Monroe," and a project line which reads "Moon Dust." Burluson says Moon Dust was a project related to the recovery of crashed space vehicles, including UFOs. Also present on the document is routing data and reference to MJ-12, believed by some researchers to be a group formed by President Truman to deal with UFOs.

Included in the alleged CIA document is information regarding wiretaps of a conversation between Monroe and Robert Kennedy, a notation regarding her "trists" [sic] with the Kennedys, mention of Dorothy Kilgallen (who also met death in an unusual manner), reference to Monroe's "diary of secrets," Monroe's allegation that President Kennedy had visited a secret base to inspect "things from outer space," and a notation that she threatened to hold a press conference and "tell all," among other things.

Burluson, through the assistance of Jane Shoemaker, a student worker at the computer lab he directs at Eastern New Mexico University, made another significant discovery regarding the document. A smudge that apparently held some sort of writing was noticed to the left of the words "Top Secret."

Through image enhancement, Burluson was able to ascertain that the image was an imprint or bleed-in which contained "Gen. Schulgen Intelligence Collection Memorandum—19....," plus some additional information.


The significance of the "Schulgen connection," says Burluson, is that Brig. Gen. George Schulgen's job in the the 1940's was "coordination of the investigation of 'flying disks,' as they were then often called."

Burluson concludes that this connection between the CIA memorandum and the Schulgen document "establishes a solid link between the UFO coverup and what happened to Marilyn."

"The first thing I did upon discovering the Schulgen connection," Burluson explains, "was to publish an article about it in the *MUFONUFO Journal*—the May 2001 issue—for my own safety, and Jane Shoemaker's."

(Continued on the following page, lower left)





## Boomerang-shaped object reported in Utah

Investigated by Guy Richardson  
MUFON Utah FIT

**Summary:** Adult male witness (DOB 1959), married, employed as a sanitation supervisor, 11:14 p.m. (MDT), July 6, 2000, in Salt Lake City, UT, reports seeing a gray, boomerang-shaped object flying a straight-line path to the southeast. No external lights; object appeared to reflect city lights. No sound. Duration: 20 seconds. Apparent size, 1 1/2 inch diameter. Actual size and altitude unknown.

I met with the witness, Chris, at his home on Oct. 21, 2000, to take his statement regarding the UFO sighting he witnessed July 6, 2000.

He stated that he arrived at his place of work, located at 1535 So. Edison St., Salt Lake City, at 11:14 p.m. (MDT)

and was exiting his vehicle when he noticed a gray, crescent-shaped object through the sunroof.

He observed the object move from a position directly overhead, traveling southeast, to a point about 15 degrees above the horizon until the object was no longer visible. Witness states the object emitted no light of its own, but appeared to reflect lights from the city. He detected no sound coming from the object. Duration of sighting was approximately 20 seconds.

Chris reports the object's apparent size was 1 1/2 inch, but since the object's altitude is unknown we are unable to estimate object size. The National Weather Bureau reports the sky was clear with no cloud cover at the time of the sighting, thus removing any possibility of determining altitude based on cloud cover.

Assuming the witness was correct in his impression that object was "reflecting city light," we considered the idea that there is some range of altitude beyond which an object would be too high to reflect ground light, and that that range, if known, could be used to estimate altitude. However, we know of no methodology for making an estimate using this assumption.

The witness was certain of the shape of the object, which he described as "the bottom portion of a classic heart shape" or boomerang. He produced a small wooden carving he had made of the object, which had a "wing-span" about 10 times greater than its thickness.

He said he has had numerous sightings of UFOs since 1972. Some of these events are documented on his web site ([www.rocke.tri-pon.com](http://www.rocke.tri-pon.com))

The moon on the date and at the time of sighting was 36 % crescent, and elevated in the west only 5 degrees, whereas the object the witness saw was initially overhead and moving southeast.

### Monroe and UFOs...

(Continued from preceding page)

The final "clincher," says the author, comes from Mexican film director and screenwriter Jose Bolanos, who reportedly called Monroe around 10 p.m. on Aug. 4, an hour before she died. In a 1983 interview by Anthony Summers, Bolanos reportedly said that Monroe told him "something shocking—something that one day will shock the whole world."

Burleson reasons that a report of the affair with Kennedy would hardly shock the world in 1983, 21 years after Monroe's death and 20 years after JFK's death. "Our hypothesis here," says Burleson, "is that JFK had told her UFO-related, extraterrestrial-contact-related matters of high secrecy."

There are other pieces of evidence that Burleson provides, including surveillance tapes.

Does Burleson make a case for Monroe being murdered by Robert Kennedy in order to keep her from disclosing government secrets regarding UFOs? This is for the reader to decide, but he certainly provides some interesting material.

### Newsletters appreciated

The MUFON UFO Journal staff appreciates receiving newsletters from local MUFON groups.



# VIEW FROM BRITAIN

By Jenny Randles

## Rendlesham Forest—a new view

Probably the most famous UFO case in the UK is the December 1980 case in Rendlesham Forest, Suffolk, when USAF personnel from the twin NATO bases of Woodbridge and Suffolk had a close encounter with a conical mass that allegedly left behind radiation and physical traces, and was subject to a live tape recording as part of the events unfolded.

The case was kept secret (except from one or two UFOlogists) for three years until it appeared on the front page of Britain's biggest selling tabloid (the *News of the World*) in October 1983—largely as a consequence of the infamous Halt memo.

This one-page memo was the preliminary report sent to the British MoD by eyewitness and deputy base commander Lt Col Charles Halt, released in June 1983 to CAUS (Citizens Against UFO Secrecy) under the US Freedom of Information Act.

At the time of this release the UK had archaic secrecy laws that had prevented any real information being passed to its citizens, and these have only recently been partially amended by Tony Blair's government with the release in 2001 of the MoD file on this case—which would otherwise have remained secret for at least another decade.

It was this move that was partly the spur for a documentary feature on the case to be made for the BBC by Mentorn, a well-respected company that has made several successful series for Britain's oldest TV network funded by taxpayers money through a licence fee.

The documentary, titled "Britain's Closest Encounter," was produced to coincide with the screening by the BBC of the final episode of the Spielberg mini series "Taken," and was to be presented within a themed "UFO Night"—although in reality this was the only serious UFO program included in what would have been better billed as a sci fi night.

So what was the result of such a high profile team tackling this classic UFO case?

### A new angle

I have had quite a lot of involvement with the program as it was put together, and it was interesting to see the way in which the production team decided to focus their



Jenny Randles

activity. From the start they decided to do something different and not attempt to solve the case or prove that it was an alien contact.

Rather, they wanted to tell the story of the case as social history—looking at how different aspects of society interacted with the tale as it came to light and developed from rumors to front page headlines.

Admirably, the BBC managed to put together a wide range of "players," including witnesses (Charles Halt and Jim Penniston) who were taken back to the deserted and rather sad looking remains of Bentwaters Air Base and who wandered dolefully around the forest thinking back over 23 years.

Several local civilian eyewitnesses briefly described what they saw on those nights. Then the role of the UFOlogists was told, dominating in fact the middle part of the one-hour film.

The two local women, Brenda Butler and Dot Street, who first heard the tales about the events on base, were introduced, and the story related of how they tried to learn the truth. Then I came along (although the film utterly omitted any mention as to why, implying that I befriended them to lend a hand when in reality it was because I had discovered the case at the same time as they had done via independent radar evidence—evidence never even mentioned in the program!)

The documentary then related how we tried to piece the case together and challenge the MoD to tell what the truth was as soon as we had the evidence to do so, marching along to Whitehall in London, risking arrest under the Official Secrets Act, and arguing with them to come clean! Of course, they didn't, but it made for a dramatic moment in the film—even if it was portrayed somewhat over the top as if this were a political thriller!

Then the various skeptics were introduced: forester Vince Thurkettle, astronomer Ian Ridpath, folklorist David Clarke, and others. They briefly trotted out the lighthouse, stars, and meteor explanation that they defined to try to solve the case as soon as it had appeared in the media.

But there was little effort to try to vindicate the theory or test it alongside the evidence, and only a cursory rebuttal came from the witnesses—in effect saying they would not even listen to such ideas. In reality the explanation was presented not as proof or disproof, but as part of the human drama that Rendlesham had become.

### A strange conclusion

In conclusion the film rather drifted away. There was no attempt to tell the story after late 1983 when the lighthouse theory was proposed. As a result, there was nothing about the amazing political to-ing and fro-ing that went

on between 1984 and 1986 involving several prominent UK political figures arguing round the case. Perhaps such matters were left out in fear of legal repercussions. I am sure this is why several juicy pieces of social history that might have been included in the film were also omitted. But what splendid scenes they would make in a Hollywood reconstruction nonetheless!

In the end, the film settled on asking Brenda, Dot, and me to state what we now believe 20 years later. I was given little opportunity (20 seconds!), and it was more or less claimed that I now thought the case was solved.

Well, yes and no. This is not the place to discuss it in depth, but readers may have seen my articles on the case since the MoD file was released and know that I still think there are outstanding questions, especially about the EM effects described by Penniston and others. But that was airbrushed out of my interview in this rather hurried conclusion.

Dot Street explained how the case had seriously disrupted her family life, and she had more or less opted out some time ago. Brenda Butler meanwhile was seen taking guided tours around the forest, still searching for the truth, and persuaded now that she has seen things herself within these haunted woods. It was a poignant but rather odd last few frames.

Overall the film was a bit of a curiosity, less about UFOs than UFOlogists, but not, I felt, terribly insightful into how and why different people can approach a set of events and ultimately reach very different conclusions about them.

But it was certainly a different way to make a program on UFOs, and the BBC is to be congratulated for attempting the experiment, even if in the end I am not sure it will have added much to our knowledge of what UFOs might be.

However, it does at least show that UFO cases are human dramas every bit as much as they are scientific anomalies to be investigated. That is something we tend to forget when we regard witnesses almost like a piece of a puzzle rather than human beings deeply affected by the events they have experienced.

So keep an eye out should one of the PBS channels that screen BBC material decide to repeat "Britain's Closest Encounter."

## Coast to Coast continues decline following exit of Art Bell

Coast to Coast AM has been cancelled by New York flagship station WABC. Since Art Bell's departure, the program has struggled, and has now lost both its New York and Chicago outlets.

### Photos needed

The *MUFON UFO Journal* welcomes photos from MUFON meetings and other events. Please clearly list, left to right, who is in the photo and what is taking place. These may be sent snail mail or forwarded electronically over the Internet.

## Colorado MUFON signs up most members in first round

A Coleman night vision scope will be awarded to Colorado MUFON for signing up 18 new members for international MUFON. Second place goes to Southern California with 14 new members, and third place goes to Florida with 12 new members. "These two fine organizations will receive symposium proceedings for their libraries," says Membership Director Lin Simpson.

Colorado MUFON is now out of the running for any future prizes that will be awarded. There will be two more chances to receive prizes for state organizations and for the individual who signs up the most new members to MUFON.

In order for an individual to win a MUFON windbreaker, MUFON must have a way to track all the new members that are signed up. No one used the form included with the first article to sign up new members, according to Simpson, so recruiters are asked to write their names at the bottom of the paperwork for new members signed up between now and the end of June, 2003.

Paperwork and checks should reach MUFON headquarters early enough so that winners can be selected and announced at the 2003 symposium in Dearborn, MI. If the winner is present at the symposium, his or her MUFON windbreaker will be presented at the symposium and a picture taken that will be included in the following month's *Journal*.

Mail materials to MUFON, PO Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369


## Xendra reappears—this time in Brazil

The Xendra, a luminous blue arch reputed to be an extraterrestrial interdimensional gateway, has appeared again, this time in northern Brazil.

According to Brazilian ufologist Eustaquio Andrea Patounas, the weird glowing arch appeared on eight consecutive evenings over the grounds of the Maceio Mar Hotel in Maceio, the seaport capital of the state of Alagoas. The Xendra appeared just hours after a UFO was seen flying over the city.

"For eight days (March 2, to March 10, 2003) a strange blue portal has appeared," Patounas reported. "It was also seen by fishermen, who radioed questions about the phenomenon to the maritime authorities. It was an interdimensional portal that energized and appeared to move and hover over the sea just off shore."

The Xendra was reported for the first time nearly a year ago in Los Cipreses National Park, near Rancagua in Chile. A Chilean UFO group, holding a weekend seminar, saw the luminous blue arch materialize. Twenty-four of the participants claimed to have entered the portal, where they saw bald-headed aliens wearing long robes. (UFO ROUNDUP, Volume 8, Number 12, March 19, 2003)



# PERCEPTIONS

By Stanton T. Friedman

## The laws of physics

I am sick and tired of people complaining that one or another law of physics would have to be violated by flying saucers, and, therefore, since I am a nuclear physicist, how can I say some UFOs are alien spacecraft?

There is a long list of such supposed violations: It would take too long to get here from other star systems. It would take too much energy to get here from other star systems. Right angle turns are impossible. High accelerations would violate the laws of physics. People can't be taken through walls without damaging the walls or the people. Etc. ad nauseum.

What we seem to be dealing with are claims by people who don't understand the laws of physics, who have no comprehension that the feasibility of accomplishing a particular objective is almost completely dependent on the engineering assumptions made, and that much of the blind acceptance we give to today's technology would have been totally rejected by other noisy negativists 100 or more years ago.

It is easier and perhaps more erudite to suggest that something is impossible because it supposedly violates the laws of physics rather than admitting, "I don't know how to do that." Can we reach the stars? Can we withstand high accelerations? Can we go into orbit? Can we make powerful computers that will fit on a desk?

Slide rules and vacuum tubes won't cut it for today's computers. Neither will transistors nor integrated circuits... But micro integrated circuits will do it. They were only attained with the expenditure of billions of dollars and thousands of man-years of effort by physicists and others.

The key thought is that progress comes from doing things differently in an unpredictable way.

### Acceleration

How much acceleration can people stand? This, of course, is a biology question, but the simple answer to so many such questions is that it depends... on the duration of the acceleration, the direction of the force acting on the person with regard to her body, the magnitude of that force, the restraints on the person, etc. As it happens, the shorter the duration, the more one can stand.

This question is often confused by the units we physicists use. One G (ask any physics class) is 9.8 meters per second squared—which means nothing to most people. In normal units that is about 21 miles per hour per second. NASA data shows that a trained pilot can perform a track-

ing task while being accelerated at 14 Gs for two minutes.

Think about that for a moment. 14 Gs is about 300 miles per hour per second. A Corvette going from 0 to 60 miles an hour in 6 seconds if uniformly accelerated is pulling 60/6 or 10 mph per second, or only about 0.5Gs! It turns out one can withstand 30 Gs for 1 second without damage, if properly constrained, and the force is in the right direction with regard to the body.

Notice how the astronauts are launched on their backs because people can stand much more acceleration back to front than foot to head. Note, too, that contour couches are used to distribute the load and that strong seat belt restraints are employed.

There are really no laws of physics being violated here, though one book foolishly claimed that when one gets to 8 G's, one dies. True, if one slams a standing unrestrained person into a brick wall... Dr. Stapp actually lived through deceleration of 43 Gs (From over 600 mph to zero), for a fraction of a second. The rocket sled can be seen at the Clyde Tombaugh Space Museum in Alamogordo, NM. No, you wouldn't catch me on such a sled.

### Right angle turns

Some have said that saucers making right angle turns violate the laws of physics. The laws of physics say nothing about the possibility of making rapid right angle turns. Our present jet and rocket technology, which work by carrying along something thrown out the back end, is not capable of providing right angle turns, because we cannot rapidly change the direction of the rearward thrust.

A magnetoaerodynamic system which could provide rapid changes of the direction of electric and magnetic forces probably could provide right angle turns. More likely there is a technique about which we know nothing.

### Sonic booms

Sometimes it is claimed that one cannot go faster than the speed of sound in the atmosphere without producing a sonic boom. Therefore, any claims of supersonic flying saucers without booms being heard would mean the laws of physics would be violated. The truth is that the production of a sonic boom is dependent on the shape of the high speed object and its interaction with the surrounding boundary layer of air. If the air is electrically ionized (made to be a conducting plasma) then there may NOT be an accompanying sonic boom.

### Energy and time

I have been told that getting here from another solar system in a time shorter than the average person's life span would take far too much energy and would violate the laws of physics, or it would take thousands or millions of years. The fact is that the feasibility of any space travel is based upon the assumptions made.



Stanton T. Friedman

As I noted in my "Challenge to SETI Specialists" (see my Web site at [www.v-j-enterprises.com/sfpage.html](http://www.v-j-enterprises.com/sfpage.html)), a "scientific" calculation in 1941 of the required initial launch weight of a chemical rocket able to get a man to the moon and back concluded it would be a million million tons.

Dr. Campbell was off by a factor of 300 Million! He made all the wrong assumptions, such as single stage rockets, a limit of 1G acceleration, using a retrorocket to slow down when approaching earth on the return, assuming much too low an exhaust velocity, and assuming that the rocket would have to provide all the energy.

We use cosmic freeloading such as the earth's rotation of 1000 mph when launching to the east near the equator, the gravity field of the moon to pull in the rocket, and the earth's atmosphere to slow us down on return. It was Dr. Campbell's ignorance that was the problem, not the laws of physics.

Another misunderstanding of the laws of physics comes from people pointing out that since one would have to approach the speed of light (670,000,000 mph) to go to nearby solar systems, the amount of energy required would be humongous because the mass of the rocket increases as one approaches the speed of light. However, it only takes one year at 1G acceleration to get close to the speed of light.

If one uses nuclear fusion of deuterium (heavy hydrogen) and helium-3 (light helium one produces charged particles which can be directed by electric and magnetic fields) then there is ten million times as much energy per article as they can get in a chemical rocket. The particles are born that way and are not accelerated to that energy.

In addition, time slows down for things moving that fast to the point that at something like 99.99 % of light speed, it only takes a little over six months pilot time (not counting acceleration time) to go the 39 light year distance to Zeta 1 and Zeta 2 Reticuli.

Also, if one uses gravitational assist (the traveler doesn't provide the energy) as we do on all our deep space probes, the increase in mass wouldn't matter anyway. A black hole would be quite convenient.

### **Moving through walls**

"But Stan, how do the laws of physics permit people to be pulled through walls and windows without breaking them or the person?" I haven't the faintest idea. I am sure that 150 years ago the idea of having information enter a closed room and be reproduced to make pictures and sounds on TV and radio sets using electricity, which also wasn't known at that time, would have been thought absurd.

Remember that radio waves have been reaching Earth for billions of years even though we weren't aware of them. Maybe we will learn how, with strong electric or magnetic or unknowium fields, to go through the mostly empty space of walls and windows with the mostly empty space of people.

New nanotechnology techniques are truly as extraordinary as the breakthroughs in quantum mechanics, relativity, radioactivity, and solid state physics over the past century or so. Does anybody really believe that the

progress has stopped? I certainly don't.

That we cannot either explain or duplicate what to us seems like anomalous technology, doesn't mean a more advanced society didn't get there a long time ago. It is our lack of understanding that provides the limits, not the laws of physics.

### **Limited realms**

Remember that the closest-to-each-other pair of sun-like stars, Zeta 1 and 2 Reticuli, are a billion years older than the sun. An important aspect of the laws of physics is that they apply in limited realms. Einstein's relativity involving increase of mass and slowing down of time is only significant at velocities near that of light, or in situations where the conditions are very different from "normal"—for example, near very very dense black holes or neutron stars.

Quantum mechanics, on the other hand, normally deals with the world of the very small. In the biological sciences we find that a great variety of very new microscopes enable us to see the very small world. Nanotechnology and quantum dots are part of that very small world.

The myriad of applications for lasers, from the check-out counters, to CDs, to very sophisticated analyses of materials, to the surgeon's special tools frequently accomplishing what was thought to be impossible should help us recognize that violations of the laws of physics are not really very common.

What new realms will be discovered in the next decade or in the next century? New variations on old themes of the world of physics?

---

### **Reminder**

State and local MUFON organizations which have address changes, email changes, or web site changes need to immediately contact MUFON Headquarters so that this information is included in our files and on our website.

### **New black cap**

MUFON has a new black cap with white MUFON logo to match the new field investigator black t-shirts (the caps also look great with the white t-shirts). Screen printed is \$8 + \$3 S&H. Embroidered is \$15 + \$3 S&H. MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369. (Check, MO, or cash, U.S. dollars.)

### **MUFON field investigator t-shirt & cap**

The field investigator t-shirt has the MUFON logo over the left chest pocket and "MUFON Field Investigator" on the back. It comes in S, M, L and XL in white with a blue logo (\$12 + \$3 S&H) or black with a white logo (\$15 + \$3 S&H).

MUFON has a black cap with white MUFON logo to match the field investigator black t-shirts (The caps also look great with the white t-shirts). Screen printed is \$8 + \$3 S&H. Embroidered is \$15 + \$3 S&H. MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369. (Check, MO, or cash, U.S. dollars.)



## May 2003

### Bright Planets (Evening Sky):

**Jupiter** (magnitude -2.0), not far from the Beehive star cluster in Cancer, stands brightly in the SW at dusk.

**Saturn** (0.1) remains near the right horn tip of Taurus as it slides into the boundaries of Orion during the month. But the giant planet is very low in the W at twilight, setting in the NW about 10:30 in mid-May. It disappears into the solar glare by month's end.

### Bright Planets (Morning Sky):

**Venus** (-3.9) rises only one hour before the Sun (midmonth) and stays very low in the E during twilight. Our dazzling planet neighbor might be visible very near the lunar crescent on the 29th. (Southern observers see Venus at a somewhat higher elevation.)

**Mars**, in Capricornus, steadily brightens from magnitude 0.0 to -0.7 during the month. It rises in the ESE about 1:30 AM in mid-May, climbing to the SSE by dawn. (The red planet gains a much higher altitude from the southern states.)

**Jupiter** sets in the WNW about 1 AM in midmonth.

### Moon Phases:

New moon—May 1  
First quarter—May 9  
Full moon—May 15  
Last quarter—May 22  
New moon—May 31

### Transit of Mercury:

For the first time since 1999, the little planet Mercury crosses in front of the Sun on May 7. Although the entire event lasts over 5 hours and favors Europe, Africa, and Asia, the transit will be in progress at sunrise for only the eastern U.S. and Canada, and ends about one hour after sunup.

The Sun's maximum altitude in the U.S. varies from only about 1 to 10 degrees, so an unobstructed ENE horizon is required. In addition, a telescope is necessary to glimpse Mercury's tiny round disc on the face of the Sun. Use either an **absolutely safe** solar eyepiece filter or project the Sun's image onto a white screen or surface.

On a projected view, Mercury will be near the top edge of the Sun at sunrise. As an example, at Boston the Sun rises at 5:32 (EDT). There Mercury exits the edge of the solar disc at 6:34 when the Sun is only 10 degrees up.

### Moon Eclipse:

On the night of May 15-16, the full moon passes through the Earth's shadow, creating a total eclipse of the Moon. The eastern half of the U.S. will see all phases of the event, while in the western states the Moon rises already

partly eclipsed. Partial eclipse begins at 10:03 PM (EDT). The Moon is totally eclipsed from 11:14 PM to 12:07 AM. Our satellite exits the umbral shadow at 1:17 AM.

### Sun Eclipse:

On the late afternoon of May 30, the new moon covers nearly half the Sun in a partial solar eclipse visible from Alaska. Local times of maximum eclipse, with obscuration percentages, at two cities follow: Anchorage, 9:28 PM, 42 %; Juneau, 9:25 PM, 48 %.

**Do not look directly at the Sun** without using a safe filter, such as a welder's glass of shade #14. Or project the solar image, as in the above Mercury transit.

### 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 the Herdsman and blue-white Spica in Virgo the Maiden 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 PM. Also at this hour the red heart of the Scorpion, the star Antares, can be seen low in the SE.



**April 11-13**—Annual Ozark UFO Conference, Eureka Springs, AR, Lou Farish. ozarkufo@webtv.net, 501-354-2558

**April 12**—International UFO Museum at Roswell, Jerry Smith. jerrysmith@gbis.com

**June 14**—International UFO Museum at Roswell, Paul Davids, producer of the movie "Roswell." roswellufo@aol.com

**June 27-29**—Alternate Realities Conference, Roan Mountain, TN. www.ETconference.org

**June 14-15**, Third Australian National UFO Conference, Brisbane, Australia. briz.net/uforg/event1.html, 07-3376 1780, gottscha@bigpond.net.au

**July 3**—International UFO Museum at Roswell, July Festival, Derrel Sims. dwsims@neosoft.com

**July 4-6**—MUFON International UFO Symposium, Hyatt Regency Hotel, Dearborn, MI.

**July 5**—International UFO Museum at Roswell, July Festival, The "Roswell Dig" panel discussion, including Don Schmitt, Tom Carey, and William Doleman. schmittdon47@aol.com

**Aug. 2-3**—International Scientific & Metaphysical Symposium 2003, Brisbane, Australia. Glennys Mackay at glenmack@pacific.net.au or Diane Harrison at auforn@hypermax.net.au

**Sept. 13**—Roswell International UFO Museum, Gloria Hawker. damom15165@aol.com

## Director's Message...

(Continued from Page 24)

### Position Announcements

New Mexico State Director **Donald Burleson** has announced the assignment of **Frank Burchardt** as State Section Director for Eddy County. Frank has also agreed to be a translator for the German language.

**Bruno Mancusi** has accepted the position of MUFON Representative for Switzerland. Bruno is a long-time member of MUFON. He is on the editorial board of *Anomalies*, serves as a correspondent for *Sezione Ufologica Fiorentina* and *Centro Italiano Studi Ufologici* and is active in the Database of Swiss Sightings: *Registre des Observations d'Ovnis en Suisse*.

**Stephanie Pasche** in Lausanne, Switzerland, has been assigned to the position of translator. We welcome Stephanie as a new member of MUFON.

### New Field Investigators

**Kathleen Marden**, Director for Field Investigator Training, announced that the following Field Investigator

Trainees have successfully completed the Field Investigator's Exam and are now MUFON Field Investigators: **John M. Fegel**, Bernalillo, NM; **Judith Knickle**, Gloucester, MA; **John Pander**, Suwanee, GA; **Frank J. Rice**, Dublin, OH; **Paul Schiltz**, Richfield, MN; **Randall Snow**, Gainesville, FL; and **Denise M. Stoner**, Winter Park, FL.

All Field Investigator Trainees are urged to study the *MUFON Field Investigator's Manual* and take the exam. The manual provides guidelines for UFO investigations and reporting. It is available from MUFON Headquarters for \$25 plus \$3.50 p&h in the U.S. Add \$4.00 for orders shipped outside of the United States. The exam is available from MUFON Headquarters and is mailed free to trainees when they have completed their studies.

### New Publication by MUFON Member

**Stanton T. Friedman** is featured in a new video first broadcast on the Canadian Space Network in June, 2002. The title of the video is "Stanton T. Friedman is Real." It is available from UFORI, POB 958, Houlton, ME 04730-0958 for \$20.

# UFO Marketplace

**The Cash-Landrum UFO Incident** by John Schuessler (forward by Bob Pratt), 323 pages, soft cover, 5 1/2 X 8 1/2, \$20.00 plus \$2.50 post. Available from MUFON, Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369.

### Ryan and Bob Woods Majestic Documents

Now Available from MUFON:

Majestic Documents Book (190 pgs) \$18 + \$2 p&h

SOM1-01 Manual (Reproduction) \$8 + \$2 p&h

CD-ROM - The Secret \$16 + \$2 p&h

For orders outside the U.S. please add \$4 p&h per document. Order from MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369

### MUFON MUGS

Official MUFON ceramic mugs with blue logo, \$8.00, plus \$3.50 S&H. MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369. (Check, MO, or cash, U.S. dollars.)

### MUFON shirts and caps

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

### Advertising rates

	1x	3x	6x
Back cover	\$450	\$425	\$400
Inside back cover	\$425	\$400	\$375
Full page	\$350	\$325	\$300
1/2 page	\$250	\$225	\$200
1/4 page	\$150	\$125	\$100
"Calling card"	\$55	\$50	\$45

### Advertising deadlines

Issue	Ads due
June 2003	5-1-03
July 2003	6-1-03
August 2003	7-1-03
Sept 2003	8-1-03
October 2003	9-1-03
Nov. 2003	10-1-03

*The MUFON UFO Journal reserves the right to refuse advertising for any reason.*

## DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

By John F. Schuessler  
MUFON International Director

### MUFON Headquarters Office Restructuring

The MUFON Business Board met at MUFON Headquarters on Saturday, March 1, 2003, for a regular quarterly meeting. One of the key issues addressed by the board members was the efficiency and cost effectiveness of headquarters operations.

The headquarters office provides four functions, as follows: 1) A large meeting space for local group meetings, press briefings, and briefings for visitors; 2) A museum area for the benefit of visitors; 3) Space for headquarters administrative functions and archival of MUFON reports, records and library books; and 4) Storage of MUFON products for sale (Symposium Proceedings documents, back issues of the *MUFON UFO Journal*, shirts, caps, coffee mugs, etc.).


Prior to the tragic events of 9-11-2001 the headquarters office was operating efficiently and paying its own way. That has not been the case since 9-11.

The number of visitors went to nearly zero for several months and has never regained a sufficient flow to make the facility pay its own way. Individuals have had to make up the shortfall in dollars for payment of rent and operating costs.

We are now approaching the end of the three-year lease, and the landlord has notified us that the rent will increase significantly for the next three years. Because the facility is not now paying its own way, the MUFON board determined that due to world conditions, the problems with the U.S. economy, and the drop in visitors to the office, there is no way the MUFON Business Board can approve a new lease at an increased rental rate.

Therefore, it was decided to close the existing office and split the functions for economy and efficiency of future operations. For some undetermined time the public meeting area and the museum will be closed and the contents stored. The headquarters office function will be split in two, with the administrative functions conducted at one location while the MUFON archives will be maintained open and available at another location.

This plan eliminates the functions that are not cost effective while maintaining the functions necessary for MUFON activities well into the future. Our thanks go to the MUFON Business Board members that made the tough decisions and directed the future plan for the MUFON organization.



John Schuessler

### New Computer-based Initiatives

The MUFON Business Board authorized two new initiatives that will benefit the membership. In a timely manner our excellent web master, **Bill Konkolesky**, made it known that due to increased personal activities in Michigan MUFON, he desires to be replaced as webmaster. We assured him that we will make his request a priority as soon as some of the following initiatives are defined.

The first initiative is to upgrade the MUFON web site by the addition of a significant amount of UFO and science-based information, along with additions to the shopping cart. **Tom Deuley** accepted the task of defining these changes and submitting them to the Business Board for approval.

A second initiative is to convert the huge MUFON paper archive of UFO reports and associated data into an electronic format. **James Carrion** of Colorado MUFON has been working on an archiving process that will capture all of the MUFON archives in an electronic database, and has demonstrated the viability of the plan.

This will result in a number of documents that can be made available on CD-Rom and on the MUFON website for research and analysis by MUFON members. Board member **Robert Simpson** will be working with James to set up the equipment and processes necessary to get all of the archived materials scanned into the database. Volunteers will be the key to the success of this project.

### MUFON 2003 International UFO Symposium

On-going world affairs have stolen the limelight from UFO activities. As a result, the print, radio, and television media have other priorities in their reporting. It doesn't matter that we are receiving as many, if not more, UFO reports than in the past. They just have other priorities.

During these times MUFON is trying to do business as usual, bringing you reports, data, and results of on-going research. Our symposium is a good example of making information available that you cannot get elsewhere.

**Richard McVannel** and his Michigan MUFON team have planned an exciting symposium at a fabulous facility in Dearborn, Michigan, on July 4, 5, and 6 for the benefit of everyone in the UFO field. We are asking you to make an extra effort to attend and support the symposium this year. We need you to help us make this a successful event.

That will do more to demonstrate the importance of what we are doing to the media and government officials than anything else we can do right now. All the information you will need to register is listed at [www.mimufon.org](http://www.mimufon.org) or by writing to 2003 MUFON International UFO Symposium, P.O. Box 51100, Livonia, MI 48151.

(Continued on Page 23)