

The MUFON **UFO JOURNAL**

NUMBER 121

DECEMBER 1977

Founded 1967



\$1.00

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF **MUFON** MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.

**Ron Arey, Pilot, Left and
Howard Dillinger, Police Officer, Right
Police Helicopter Case**

(See story, Page 3)



The MUFON UFO JOURNAL

103 Oldtowne Rd.
Seguin, Texas 78155

WALTER H. ANDRUS
Editor

WALTER H. ANDRUS
Director of MUFON

PAUL CERNY
Promotion/publicity

REV. BARRY DOWNING
Religion and UFOs

ANN DRUFFEL
California Report

LUCIUS FARISH
Books/Periodicals/History

MARJORIE FISH
Extraterrestrial Life

MARK HERBSTTRITT
Astronomy

ROSETTA HOLMES
Promotion/Publicity

TED PHILLIPS
Landing Trace Cases

DAVID A SCHROTH
St. Louis/Mass Media

JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
UFO Propulsion

NORMA E. SHORT
DWIGHT CONNELLY
Editor/Publishers Emeritus

LEN STRINGFIELD
Commentary

The MUFON UFO JOURNAL is published by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas. Subscription rates: \$8.00 per year in the U.S.A.; \$9.00 per year foreign. Copyright 1978 by the Mutual UFO Network. Second class postage paid at Seguin, Texas. Publication identification number is 2970. POSTMASTER: Send form 3579 to advise change of address to The MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155.

In this issue

RADAR - VISUAL CASE INVOLVING POLICE HELICOPTER	3
Edited by Walt Andrus	
WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM HYPNOSIS OF IMAGINARY "ABDUCTEES"? Part II	7
By Alvin H. Lawson	
ASTRONOMY NOTES	9
By Mark R. Herbstritt	
UFO RELATED INFORMATION FROM THE FBI FILES, Part III	10
By Bruce S. Maccabee	
"CALIFORNIA REPORT" - Thirty Years later: Thoughts In The Dark	15
By Ann Druffel	
IN OTHER'S WORDS	17
By Lucius Farish	
THE HAPPY CAMP, CALIFORNIA SIGHTINGS, Part I	18
By Paul Cerny	
UFOS: GOD'S CHARIOTS?	21
By Ted Peters, Reviewed by Barney H. Downing	
NEW EDITORIAL STAFF FOR THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL	22
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE	23
By Walt Andrus	
1978 MUFON UFO SYMPOSIUM	24

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION

1. Title of publication: THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL

2. Date of filing: October 1, 1977

3. Frequency of issue: Monthly

4. Location of known office of publication: 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155

5. Names and complete addresses of publisher, editor, and managing editor:
Publisher: Walter H. Andrus, Jr., 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155
Editor: Richard Hall, 4418 39th St., Brentwood, MD 20722.

6. Owner: MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC. (MUFON), 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Texas 78155

10. Extent and nature of circulation

(A Not-for-Profit corporation incorporated under the State Laws of Texas.

Trustees: Walter H. Andrus, Jr. (International Director), 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155; Sam Gross (Corporate Secretary), R.F.D. 4, Seguin, TX 78155; John Donegan (Treasurer), 1901 Mount Vernon, Seguin, TX 78155

7. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities: NONE

8. For completion by nonprofit organizations authorized to mail at special rates: NO CHANGE

	Average No. Copies each issue during preceeding 12 months	Actual No. Copies of single issue published nearest to filing date
A. Total No. Copies Printed	1425	1200
B. Paid Circulation		
1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales.	0	0
2. Mail Subscriptions	1220	1063
C. Total Paid Circulation	1220	1063
D. Free Distribution by Mail, Carrier or other means Samples, complimentary, and other free copies	15	48
E. Total Distribution	1235	1111
F. Copies Not Distributed		
1. Office use, left over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing	190	89
2. Returns from News Agents	0	0
G. Total	1425	1200

(signed) Walter H. Andrus, Jr.
Publisher

The contents of the MUFON UFO JOURNAL are determined by the editor, and do not necessarily represent the official position of MUFON. Opinions of contributors are their own, and do not necessarily reflect those of the editor, the staff, or MUFON. Articles may be forwarded directly to MUFON.

Permission is hereby granted to quote from this issue provided not more than 200 words are quoted from any one article, the author of the article is given credit, and the statement "Copyright 1977 by the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas" is included.

Radar — Visual Case Involving Police Helicopter

Investigators: P. Wayne Laporte, Henry H. Morton, Jr.,

David M. Oldham and George D. Fawcett

Edited by Walt Andrus

On the evening of December 27, 1977, "Snoopy II", the Charlotte Police Department helicopter, was flying on routine police patrol over Charlotte, North Carolina. The helicopter with a crew of two was traveling northwest, heading for the intersection of 9th and College streets to inspect a vehicle. At 10:54 p.m., two lights, appearing as aircraft landing lights, approached from the northwest proceeding to the southeast. The lights appeared to be flying in formation. At 10:56 p.m., they passed to the right and over Snoopy by an estimated 200 ft. The helicopter was flying at an altitude of 1800 feet as indicated by the altimeter above sea level or actually 1100 feet above ground in Charlotte, NC.

At 10:56 p.m., Ron Arey age 38, the pilot of Snoopy with nine years of pilot flying experience, contacted the F.A.A. Control Tower at Douglas Municipal Airport by radio and asked the tower what he was "painting" (showing up on radar) near the Coliseum in downtown

Charlotte. The tower operator, Ray Bader age 27, with two years experience as a Marine radarman at Cherry Point, NC and four years as an air traffic controller with the F.A.A. in Charlotte, advised he had four targets -- a Cessna 172 eastbound at 3500 feet and three unknowns on the P.P.I. display scope. The Cessna had mode C identification equipment which clearly identified it on the scope. Since Snoopy was not so equipped, Ron Arey turned his landing light on briefly so Ray Bader could visually observe the location of the helicopter from the tower. Ray couldn't see the lighted "unknowns", but did visually spot Snoopy's landing light. This enabled Ray to check the azimuth heading to correctly identify Snoopy on the radar scope. The two unknowns were "painting" as hard targets with about 60% of the signal intensity return compared to Snoopy. They were moving across the screen as aircraft would do. Tom Carmody, another F.A.A. air traffic controller in

the tower, also verified observing the radar returns of the unknowns.

Ron Arey assumed that the unknowns were military helicopters heading for Fort Bragg, NC, which is southeast of Charlotte. As a matter of information, the helicopter Snoopy II is a Bell Model 206B Jetranger, with the following specifications: length - 30 feet; maximum speed - 150 m.p.h.; maximum ceiling height - 20,000 ft.; range (max.) 400 miles at 5,000 ft.; engine - Allison 250-C18 (317 BHP) Jet Turbine. Ron and his observer that evening, Howard Dellinger, continued their northwest course in response to the police call. Upon arriving at their destination of 9th and College streets, the call was cancelled. Ron and Howard then headed southeast toward the Coliseum. They then spotted the two lighted objects approaching them at the same altitude (1800 ft. indicated). In the vicinity of the Coliseum, Snoopy encountered the two, which appeared to be flying on a passing course to Snoopy's left. As they approached, one shot up at a 45 degree angle to an estimated 4000 feet in about three seconds. Ron advised Ray in the control tower of this fact and related that the other was still approaching at 1800 feet altitude. Ron decided to perform a "pedal turn" to the left as the object passed by. (A "pedal turn" is a maneuver whereby a helicopter makes a pivoting turn, allowing the "chopper" to fly backwards.) This would permit a close inspection of the unknown as it passed by.

As Ron executed the pedal turn, the object began an estimated 200 foot radial turn around Snoopy. At this point Ron and Howard lost sight of it. When Ron turned Snoopy to the right, they saw the object on Snoopy's "tail". Ron proceeded to turn again to get a better view of the lighted object. It again out

(Continued on next page)


3



Left: Ron Arey, Pilot — Right: Howard Dellinger, Police Officer

(Radar-Visual Case continued)

maneuvered the helicopter and its crew. At this point, Ron and Howard realized that they had encountered something very unusual due to its high speed turns. The object behind him appeared to be a globular white light (toward the ultraviolet end of the spectrum) with a surrounding glow. The light seemed to reflect upwards. A silver parachute like object with ribs was attached above the light source with a transparent section between. The closest object ejected something from the front and bottom like a big spark that seemed to fall away from the object as it moved eastward. Snoopy and its crew gave chase to the east, but were quickly outdistanced by the objects speed. When the first object soon disappeared, the helicopter turned around and headed back toward the Coliseum. Ray Bader, the tower operator confirmed that the first unknown was tracking an eastbound course. The flight crew then flew toward another moving light in the sky over Charlotte, but was advised by the tower operator that this was the approach of an Eastern Air Lines Jet airliner to the Douglas Municipal Airport from the northeast.



Conceptual Shape of UFO

At 11:02 p.m., Ray Bader advised Snoopy's crew that the second unknown was over the Coliseum moving toward Southpark. At 11:03 p.m., Ron and Howard reported that they could see it visually. However, a moment later it suddenly vanished simultaneously visually and on the radar scope. In the meantime, the first target that was proceeding eastward, had made a moderate "fade out" 5 miles northwest of Monroe, NC Airport at 11:00 p.m.

For the records, Raymond G. Bader, Air Traffic Control Specialist, ATC Tower, Charlotte, NC has confirmed this information in his letter of January 11, 1978, which is on file by the investigators and MUFON. Taped interviews with the police helicopter crew, Ron Arey and Howard Dellinger, taken in the presence of Captain P. W. Shever and Major E. P. Capell of the Charlotte Police Department are also on file. The F.A.A. Facility Chief, Mr. Gooseclose, at Douglas Municipal Airport has requested that the radar specifications for the Texas Instruments model ASR-4B used in the tower not be published, however they are also on file.


As Jack Webb, producer of "Project U.F.O." the new television series on Project Blue Book, would say; "these are the facts" as documented by appropriate recorded testimony. The UFO investigators work cannot and should not stop at this point. MUFON is indebted to the following men who have collectively spent 100 hours investigating this case: P. Wayne Laporte, MUFON State Section Director, Matthews, NC; Henry H. Morton, Jr., MUFON Field Investigator, Wadesboro, NC; David M. Oldham, MUFON Field Investigator, Greensboro, NC; George D. Fawcett, MUFON State Director for North Carolina, Lincolnton, NC.

If this sounds like a solid radar-visual UFO sighting, a JOURNAL reader must continue to explore this case in depth as the investigators proceeded to do. On December 27, 1977 at 9:00 p.m., Eric Moore, a radio announcer at station WRPL, was at the


intersection of King's Drive and Morehead in Charlotte, NC when he noticed a bright white light about one-half the size of the full moon moving in an easterly direction. The light was globular (like a light bulb, not a flare or starlike). Hanging below the light at a rearward angle was a transparent like mass with a hint of silver. It was observed for ten minutes at an estimated altitude of 300 to 600 feet as it passed over Providence and Randolph Road, disappearing behind some trees. A few minutes later, he observed a similar light hovering over the Coliseum. The first object appeared to be following the easterly wind.

Another person claimed that he and two other students were launching balloons from 10 p.m. to 1 a.m. In their testimony, they stated that they launched ten that night. After releasing eight plastic bag balloons, they followed the ninth and tenth from the launch sight at Eastway Shopping Center. The balloons traveled southwest to the Coliseum where they saw Snoopy "suddenly appear" and shine the helicopter spotlight on the balloons, while Snoopy circled them. One balloon was whipped around and the candles were blown out, while the other one was blown upward by the rotor-wash. They said no metal was used in the balloons construction. They were confident that it was a helicopter they were viewing. The balloons at a distance look yellow-white. The Snoopy encounter time with the balloons was 11:00 p.m.

In order to test the validity of hot air balloons as the explanation for this report, Wayne Laporte, along with two other people who have had radar, military balloon launching and pilot experience, launched their own hot air laundry bag balloons. The following observations were made: (1) A balloon held at eye level disclosed that the candles could be seen up to a distance of 100 feet. The plastic laundry bag can be visually observed up to a 300 ft. distance. It was transparent without any silver or milky appearance. (2) The balloon looks yellow-white until reaching the altitude of 800 feet, when it



CHESTER, S.C. MAGNETIC FAULT-35 AIR MILES SOUTH OF DOUGLAS AIRPORT



(Continued on next page)

(Radar-Visual Case continued)

becomes a medium orange in color. (3) The balloons have a life span of 13 to 15 minutes and travel one to two miles at about a 2000 ft. altitude. (4) When they burn out, they "flare up", then the light goes out. (5) The burning plastic straws only appear as "dropping balls" on occasion and fall only about 50 ft. before extinguishing.

On January 14, 1978, the three prime investigators met with a group of people who had previous military radar, balloon launching, helicopter, and jet interceptor experience to review the findings on this case. The hoax or balloon explanation was refuted on the following points: (1) Balloons should have traveled easterly. (2) The students couldn't identify helicopter lighting when questioned. (3) Distant hot air balloons are orange, not yellow-white. (4) A helicopter could get within 75 feet of a hot air balloon for visual identification. If it got any closer, the balloons would be sucked into the rotor blades and not whipped around. (6) Air flow is linear through the blades and downward. The altitude was too high for the rotor blast to deflect off the ground to affect the objects. (7) The police did not use the spotlight during the encounter. (Editors note: The landing light was turned on briefly so the F.A.A. tower operators could identify the position of Snoopy over the Coliseum.) (8) Since no metal was used in the balloons construction, it would not show up on radar. (Weather balloons being tracked by radar, require a transponder like device or have to be wired with copper in a prescribed manner.) (9) A hot air balloon does not move at 230 m.p.h.

For the sake of being objective, the investigators elected to disregard the pilot's estimate of speeds and altitudes of the objects. They could not disregard the radar findings of an operator with six years experience. The radar contact rules out hallucinations, visions, and planets. The radar estimated tracking speed of 200 m.p.h. or more rules out birds, insects and radio controlled model aircraft.

The nearest possibilities could have been simultaneous mirage -- "angel targets" due to air inversion layers. The investigators considered that the radar waves may have been bent by trapped layers of warm air and were picking up moving ground targets. Simultaneously, the observers were viewing lights from automobiles. These possibilities are untenable due to the following: (1) no indications of inversion targets (angels) were showing up on radar before or after the encounter. (2) Targets were well defined, not nebulous. (3) Angel targets "shimmy", dart about, appear, vanish, then reappear. These did not. (4) Angels do not track for a distance of 10 miles.

Again, could they have been hot air plastic laundry bags or weather balloons? It is possible to create radar returns from plastic and weather balloons by creating a wire frame or using strips of foil. (Editors note: foil cut into one half wavelength pieces at the radar transmitting frequency, when dropped from aircraft or fired from a gun or cannon is used as a technique known as "jamming". The ability of a radar to detect aircraft behind such a reflective screen is ineffective.)

The pilot reported that one object ascended to 4000 ft. while the second continued coming toward him at 1800 ft. If they were balloons and had drifted into a thermal current (uprising air column), both objects would have ascended as they encountered the thermal current. It is difficult to imagine how a balloon could "outfly" and outmaneuver a helicopter.

Were the unknown targets aircraft? The 200 to 230 m.p.h. estimated speed of the radar target eliminates military helicopters. It is within the capability of some twin turboprop observation craft such as the Mohawk and Bronco. The moderate radar target fade out would indicate a descent below the radar antenna beam. However, the abrupt disappearance of the second target over Charlotte is difficult to explain in terms of aircraft. This implies fantastic, rapid vertical acceleration beyond present spacecraft ability, quick vertical descent to tree top level, activation of some sophisticated radar

jamming device that could absorb radar waves 100%, complete disintegration, or going to a quick hover. Since MTI radar was being used, a hovering target would appear to vanish. (The purpose of MTI is to eliminate ground clutter and stationary targets.) However, the first unknown was moving at speeds faster than military helicopters. A conventional airplane cannot hover. If the object went into a hover mode, it remained for some time. The moment an object moves, the MTI radar picks it up. The target never did reappear after the abrupt fade-out. The radar indicated that Snoopy and one unknown were "painting" as one target on the scope. This indicates that Snoopy was very close to the unknowns. If it was an aircraft with only a landing light on, Ron and Howard would have seen an airplane shape, not the shape described.

Of possible interest to people who have constructed UFO magnetic detectors, the following is related. Wayne Laporte lives in the area over which the first object would have passed moving toward Monroe, NC Airport. His UFO detector utilizes a very sensitive compass and a photoelectric eye. If the compass needle deviates more than a few degrees, the alarm activates and a clock stops in order to register the time the device was tripped. The detector range is based on an estimate of a two million gauss field strength at two miles distance. The detector was not tripped that evening.

The panel of investigators and solicited advisors, after hearing all testimony, have concluded the Snoopy II and its crew of two had encountered an Unidentified Flying Object or UFO. All witnesses have volunteered to undergo polygraph tests if necessary. Even though *JOURNAL* readers have not had the opportunity of interviewing the witnesses, sharing in the thorough investigations, hearing the interviews on tape, this is an example of the effort expended and techniques used to identify a UFO. What do you think Ron Arey and Howard Dellinger saw at close range--a hot air laundry bag balloon or a UFO?

WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM HYPNOSIS OF IMAGINARY "ABDUCTEES"?

By Alvin H. Lawson

Professor of English California State University, Long Beach

(Copyright by Alvin H. Lawson, May 1977)

Supplement to the 1977 MUFON UFO Symposium Proceedings

Part II

6. VERBAL PHENOMENA ASSOCIATED WITH HYPNOTIC REGRESSION

Verbal phenomena which have emerged in regressions of both "real" and imaginary abductees may or may not have a common origin, though recent research into brain hemisphere specialization for verbal and non-verbal functioning is suggestive. One witness stuttered markedly whenever he tried to repeat what an alien entity allegedly said to him, though he did not normally stutter and though he narrated the remainder of his encounter with no trace of stuttering. Another witness used three or four different "voices" for as many aliens, whose cryptic communications seemed to erupt from him involuntarily. Also, "verbal blocks" were demonstrated by both "real" and imaginary regressees, during which they were unable to articulate anything for periods ranging from seconds to several minutes in response to particular questions about their UFO experience. (This seemed unusual to the hypnotist present, though it may well be more common in clinical hypnosis experience than we are aware.) Finally, and this has been noted widely by experienced investigators, the so-called "messages" which abductees allege have been given to them by their alien captors have in common at least this: a tediously narrow range of subject matter and an unrelieved banality of content.

As was indicated above, studies have shown that the brain's left hemisphere is specialized for language and analytical functions, while the right hemisphere governs separate and even opposite functions such as intuition, the emotions, and spatial concepts. Recent

work at Stanford Research Institute and by others* has supported the long-held hypothesis of distinct hemispherical specialization, and has also led to a tentative suggestion that if paranormal functioning does involve the brain at all that the neurological centers of any paranormal activities are located in the brains' right hemisphere. If this idea is valid, it may have great significance for UFO researchers who are studying the paranormal component of UFO reports: since a paranormal experience (right hemisphere) may be separated from both verbalization and analytical activities (left hemisphere), it is no wonder that witnesses to paranormal experiences find themselves under real difficulty both in articulating their experiences and analyzing them with any precision.

This difficulty with articulation and analysis became obvious during the SRI "remote viewing" or clairvoyance experiments where a S would often draw a target accurately but identify it inaccurately: a tennis court's squared screen fence was sketched correctly but was mistakenly labeled "windows"; and a playground merry-go-round was drawn well but described as the cupola of a building.*

If there is a paranormal component to UFO encounters, then, one indication of its presence might be the unsatisfactory nature of verbal phenomena such as we have been discussing. Under this view, if the witness has contact with "something" which involves to some degree a paranormal event such as telepathy, the witness may have a tough time analyzing and articulating the telepathic communication in verbal terms--and thus we have the verbal "blocks", the

"alien voices", the banal "messages", and other verbal phenomena, all of which may be evidence of the mind's largely futile attempt to express the ineffable. The verbal responses may thus not relate at all to the truth or falsity of the content of the witness's narrative. Note that other non-analytical (right hemisphere) details of shape, color, etc., are normally part of any good CE-III report; such functions can be considered of potentially high reliability.

Knowing that the verbal component of abductions may be the weakest link in the credibility chain, investigators who can employ hypnosis should utilize non-verbal techniques such as sketching, finger-motion, yes-and-no responses, pendulum, and other "silent witness" methods of dealing with UFO reports. It is painfully obvious that the verbal matter in most abduction cases is unsatisfactory, but if it is ever to be more than what most observers have long considered an embarrassing absurdity, it will have to be analyzed more carefully by knowledgeable researchers.

*See Puthoff and Targ, "A Perceptual Channel for Information Transfer over Kilometer Distances: Historical Perspective and Recent Research," in *PROCEEDINGS OF THE IEEE* Vol. 64, No. 3 (March, 1976), pp. 329-354. (Includes a fine bibliography of recent brain hemisphere and related research.) Dr. Puthoff discussed some of the ufological implications of the SRI work at an informative meeting at Foothill College, Los Altos, Calif., in April of 1976.

*See Puthoff and Targ, pp. 339 and 341 respectively.

(Abductees continued)

7. COMPARISON OF DRAWINGS BY "REAL" AND IMAGINARY ABDUCTEES

As we saw in part III of this study, investigators found what seemed to be a telepathic component in the verbal responses of imaginary S's. A pair of drawings by two subjects, however, suggest that there may have been telepathic communication of data visually as well. The drawings (see Figures 7A and 7B)* are both top views of a UFO interior. The imaginary S's sketch is remarkably similar to one by a "real" witness whose case had been investigated two months previously by the same three individuals who were conducting the imaginary session, and who were thoroughly familiar with the "real" witness's drawings. Some significant similarities between the two:

1. GENERAL OCTAGONAL SHAPE OF EACH ROOM
2. THE WORD "ME", ASSOCIATED WITH A CIRCLE, APPEARS IN EACH
3. THE WORD "LIGHT" IN ONE AND "LIGHTS" IN THE OTHER
4. "INSTRUMENTS" USED ON THE S's ARE ON THE LEFT SIDE IN EACH
5. A CONTROL BOARD OR OPERATING AREA IS AT THE TOP OF EACH

Along with the similarities there are obvious differences in the drawings, but these are interesting and may be explainable. The "remote viewing" experiments at SRI again may have something to teach us. For instance, there are three tables in sketch 7A, two in 7B; but there are three circles in the center of the "real" drawing (representing "aliens"). It is possible that the three geometric shapes were "picked up" telepathically by the S's right hemisphere and then analyzed incorrectly as rectangular tables by the left hemisphere. A similar conclusion is suggested by the "ladder" in drawing 7A which is located in the same area

where 7B shows an entity ("weird guy"). (Even the fact that the imaginary S failed to include any alien entities in her drawing may have significance. The SRI sketches and accompanying tape narratives only rarely included figures of humans at remote target locations, and moving objects also were almost never noted.* An alien entity in motion thus might be expected to have a poor chance of being "seen" in a "remote viewing" situation.)




FIG. 7A. IMAGINARY S's DRAWING




FIG. 7B. "REAL" WITNESS'S DRAWING

If, however, the imaginary S has somehow reproduced the "real" drawing through paranormal means, the primary mode must have been telepathic rather than through "remote viewing" in the SRI pattern. There was no copy of the "real" drawing in the room; the memories of the hypnotist and two investigators were the only immediate conceivable source. It was a different situation, obviously, when the imaginary S's were, as was theorized, "lifting" information from the interrogation form during their regressions: they may well have

"remote viewed" individual words and concepts rather than derived them from the investigators' minds. (All three researchers, remember, were studying the interrogation forms and its suggestions during the imaginary sessions.) Thus there may have been two paranormal modes in effect during the hypnosis regressions of imaginary UFO abductees: telepathy and clairvoyance or "remote viewing".

These matters are speculative, but together with the data on possible ESP effects from part III above, they provide sufficient reason to believe that during hypnosis S's may somehow "lift" significant amounts of data from investigators present, and that the reliability of information gained through use of hypnosis in allegedly real cases must not be taken for granted.

This study has provided evidence showing that imaginary S's under hypnosis report UFO experiences which seem identical to those of "real" witnesses. However, my assumption--and it is a major one--is that abductions are "real" in some sense to witnesses, and so the central question to serious study of abduction reports is this: what is the nature of the "stimulus" which triggers in witnesses the sequence of events which they describe as an abduction experience? We cannot answer this question, and it may be simplistic to adopt either a "nuts-and-bolts" or "psychic" hypothesis.

Because the research indicates that the imaginations of individual witnesses may be the source of much if not all the data we have about alleged abductions, I feel that these experiments represent a significant challenge to the "nuts-and-bolts" interpretation of the UFO mystery. It has long been supposed that any non-physical hypothesis would fall short of explaining physical "evidence" such as disturbed vegetation and soil, and photographs. Yet there are recent experiments at SRI which provide

*Fig. 7A was drawn by the same S who sketched Figs. 5 and 6, and whose narrative appears as Appendix #2. Fig. 7B was drawn by the "real" S of Appendix #1.

*Puthoff and Targ, p. 346.

laboratory evidence that both physical and physiological effects can be caused through non-physical or paranormal means. While this evidence offers a possible solution to the current physical/psychic UFO dilemma, most ufologists seem unaware of its existence, let alone its significance. Some physical effects emerged in one experiment with the psychic Ingo Swann which involved five separate perturbations of a magnetometer which was designed to be perfectly shielded from any normal external electromagnetic radiation. Swann "placed his attention" (apparently via "remote viewing") on the internal workings of the instrument and as he did so obvious variations were noted in the magnetometer's output recordings, proving that physical changes were caused through seemingly paranormal mental phenomena.* Again at SRI, another experiment** showed physiological modifications in EEG readings of a "receiver" S when a telepathic "sender" S in another room was stimulated with a flashing light. Further, the "receiver" S was not conscious of the incoming paranormal stimulus; rather, the entire physiological response was effected below the cognitive level of awareness. This is clearly analogous to UFO witnesses like Barney Hill who manifest physiological effects in the absence of a conscious memory of a causative event.

Thus one of the most challenging aspects of the UFO enigma, the seeming psychic/physical dualism of the phenomenon and its effects, may have a viable--i.e., currently demonstrable--theoretical "explanation". UFO's have always invited exotic speculations--Jung's UFO-collective conscious link has lately been given new emphasis--but the hypotheses, like the questions, have a way of getting curiously, too! UFO's will be understood only when human ingenuity is equal to the task. An obviously increasing professionalism in UFO investigators worldwide is giving us better data and will help significantly.

But the findings of the present study support the view that the real hope lies in current research on consciousness and the brain, and in the new seriousness evident in research into the paranormal. Whether or not these lines of study will lead soon to a "nuts-and-bolts", "psychic", or any conclusion we cannot know. Against the immense UFO mystery, the only certainty is our stark ignorance.

*In *QUANTUM PHYSICS AND PARAPSYCHOLOGY*, ed. Laura Oteri (New York, 1975), pp. 129-150.

**In *Puthoff and Targ, "Information Transmission Under Conditions of Sensory Shielding," NATURE*, vol. 252, pp. 602-607 (Oct. 18, 1974).



Mark R. Herbstritt

Astronomy Notes

THE SKY FOR FEBRUARY 1978

Mercury - Early in the month it may be seen very low in the south-east before sunrise, but by the end of the month it is too close to the sun for observation, being in superior conjunction on the 26th.

Venus - It is too close to the sun for observation.

Mars - Moving from Cancer into Gemini, it is about 30 degrees above the eastern horizon at sunset and sets shortly before sunrise.

Jupiter - In Taurus, it is high in the east at sunset and sets about 4 hours before sunrise.

Saturn - It rises at about sunset and is above the horizon all night, being at opposition on the 15th in the Constellation Leo.

The alpha Aurigid Meteor shower occurs February 5-10.

1977 MUFON SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS

(166 pages)

UFOs: WHAT'S YOUR BALL GAME? by Thomas M. Gates, Sunnyvale, Calif. MUFON Consultant in Astronomy

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF UFO RADIATION BY James M. McCampbell, Belmont, Calif., MUFON Director of Research and Author of UFOLOGY.

UFO INVESTIGATIONS by Bill Pitts, Fort Smith, Ark. MUFON State Director for Arkansas

WHY THE COVER-UP? by Richard Gottlieb, Phoenix, Arizona Member of Ground Saucer Watch (GSW, Inc.) Research Board

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD OF INVESTIGATING UFOs by John L. Warren, Ph.D. Los Alamos, New Mexico. MUFON Consultant in Physics and State Director for New Mexico

FUTURE PHYSICS AND ANTI-GRAVITY by William F. Hassel, Ph.D., Woodland Hills, Calif., MUFON Consultant and State Section Director

MODERN IMAGE PROCESSING REVISITS THE GREAT FALLS, MONTANA AND TREMONTON, UTAH MOVIES by William H. Spaulding, Phoenix, Ariz., Director of GSW, Inc., MUFON State Director for Arizona and Photographic Consultant

WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM HYPNOSIS OF IMAGINARY ABDUCTEES? by Alvin H. Lawson, Ph.D., Garden Grove, Calif. MUFON State Section Director for Orange County

SCIENCE FICTION, SCIENCE, AND UFOs by Stanton T. Friedman, Nuclear Physicist, UFO Lecturer, and MUFON Consultant in Nuclear Physics

Price: \$5.00 Post Paid From:

MUFON

103 OLDTOWNE ROAD

SEGUIN, TEXAS 76135 U.S.A.

UFO RELATED INFORMATION FROM THE FBI FILES: Part 3

By Bruce S. Maccabee
MUFON State Director for Maryland
(Copyright Bruce S. Maccabee, 1977)

Part III (Continued from November issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal*)

It is interesting to note the comments within the preceding document about the apparent lack of interest of the "high brass", as expressed by Col. Garrett, apparently with the concurrence of Gen Schulgen. This information obtained from the intelligence services associated with air force flying saucer "research" provides an interesting contrast to Ruppelt's claim^{21,22} that the "top brass" wanted the problem solved quickly and that this desire resulted in pressure and "frantic attempts to find answers"²².

Thus far I have presented information which shows that (a) many UFO reports were non-trivial, (b) the AAF took the flying disc reports seriously, and (c) the AAF was certain that no U.S. Government project resulted in flying disc reports. This information by itself was sufficient to suggest that the discs were real objects and were therefore a *military* intelligence problem, not a domestic intelligence problem. Thus from this information alone the FBI could have concluded that its investigations were not necessary. That such a conclusion had already been reached in early August by at least one agent is illustrated by the following memorandum to Mr. Ladd from Mr. Coyne:²²

"It is felt that the situation regarding these flying saucers and flying discs is very similar to the situation which was previously encountered by the Bureau during the past war in handling complaints arising out of the sighting of Japanese balloons (sic). You will recall that at the inception of these complaints the Bureau conducted considerable investigation and located

numerous balloons as a cooperative measure for the Army and that after considerable work had been done, the Army then informed that these were military weapons and that they would take over handling of these completely. This they did and in an extremely short time issued a big press release as to the splendid work of the Army in locating these Japanese balloons. From the information available thus far, it does not appear that these discs should be treated as other than as a military weapon. Certainly the Bureau has no way to determine what experiments the Army and Navy are conducting and whether such might be arising out of experiments being conducted by them nor do we have any way of determining how far the Russians have progressed in certain experiments and whether such might be the results of experiments by the Russian Army. It (sic) short, it would certainly appear that this is a military situation and should be handled strictly by military authorities."

"In this connection it might be pointed out that our present Portland case arose out of the fact that two Army Intelligence officers were returning from an interview of two individuals who reportedly had seen flying discs." (This refers to the FBI investigation of the circumstances surrounding the plane crash after two Army officers investigated the Maury Island report - note by present author.) "If the Army Intelligence officers are handling some of these interviews, it is believed that they should be handling all of these interviews, and it is not believed that the Bureau should be expending its precious manpower on these complaints which have thus far no connection with our Russian espionage program. The military authorities certainly are better equipped to know what they are looking for than we are

and have more facilities for handling material which it is necessary to examine as a result of its being reported as a remnant of a flying disc. It is believed that the Bureau is merely playing bird-dog for the Army by using our manpower to run out these complaints on flying discs."

Despite the eminently reasonable argument put forth by Mr. Coyne, the Bureau continued its investigation through August and into September. Then the Bureau received the following letter from its Special Agent in Charge in San Francisco:²⁴

"I am transmitting herewith copies of a 'restricted' letter dated September 3, 1947, which was furnished to me by... (name not given) . . . which letter is designated to certain Commanding Generals of the Army Air Forces from Col. R. H. Smith, Assistant Chief of Staff - Intelligence, Headquarters Air Defense Command, Mitchel Field, New York, concerning the Cooperation of FBI with AAF on Investigations of 'Flying Disc' Incidents".

"It is my understanding from recent Bureau instructions that we are to assist the Air Force Intelligence personnel in the investigation of flying disc incidents. However, it will be noted from the attached letter that it is Army interpretation that it was their intent that the Bureau would investigate those incidents of the so-called 'discs' being found on the ground and apparently not those which are observed only in flight. Further, the attention of the Bureau is respectfully called to paragraph two of this letter and to the last sentence therein which states, 'The services of the FBI were enlisted in order to relieve the numbered Air Forces of the task of tracking down all the many instances which turned out to be ash can covers, toilet seats and whatnot.'"

"In the first place, the instructions issued by the Army Air Forces in this

letter appear to limit the type of investigations which the Bureau will be asked to handle and secondly it appears to me the wording of the last sentence in the second paragraph mentioned above is cloaked in entirely uncalled for language tending to indicate the Bureau will be asked to conduct investigations only in those cases which are not important and which are almost, in fact, ridiculous."

"The thought has occurred to me the Bureau might desire to discuss this matter further with the Army Air Forces both as to the types of investigations which we will conduct and also to object to the scurrilous wordage which, to say the least, is insulting to the Bureau in the last sentence of paragraph two."

The above letter was sent to Ass't. Director D. M. Ladd, who, about a week later, provided a sort of summary of the situation regarding "flying discs" to the director, H. Hoover. The Ladd memorandum to Hoover was as follows:²⁵

"The Bureau was requested by the Air Forces Intelligence to assist in attempting to arrive at an explanation of the (flying discs). The Air Forces indicated that the alleged sightings of flying discs might have been made by individuals of Communist sympathies for the purpose of causing mass hysteria in the United States over the fear of a secret Russian weapon. The Bureau agreed to assist in the investigation of the reported sightings, and the Field was advised in Bureau Bulletin No. 42, Series 1947, dated July 30, 1947, that they should investigate each instance which was brought to their attention of the sighting of a flying disc in order to ascertain whether or not it was a bona fide sighting, an imaginary one, or a prank. The results of the investigation conducted by the Bureau Field Offices in this matter have failed to reveal and indications of subversive individuals being involved in any of the reported sightings.

(Underlining by present author.)"

The Ladd memorandum then describes the "restricted" army letter obtained by the agent in San Francisco,

and points out that "This letter states in substance that it was the original intent of the AC/AS-2, Headquarters, Army Air Forces that whereas the ADC would interview (underlining in Ladd's letter) responsible observers", the FBI would investigate incidents of discs on the ground. The memorandum to Hoover concluded with the following recommendations:

"It is recommended that the Bureau protest vigorously to the Assistant Chief of Air Staff-2. It is also recommended that the Bureau discontinue all activity in this field and that the Bureau Field Offices be advised to discontinue all investigations and to refer all complaints received to the Air Forces."

Apparently the fact that no subversion had been found, when coupled with the fact that the AAF was carrying out their own interviews and restricting the FBI to useless cases, created a rather emotional response on the part of the FBI, for only two days later Hoover wrote to Major General George C. McDonald, Ass't. Chief Air Staff - 2 at the Pentagon the following letter:²⁶

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been requested by your office to assist in the investigation of reported sightings of flying discs."

"My attention has been called to instructions disseminated by the Air Forces relative to this matter. I have been advised that these instructions indicate that the Air Forces would interview responsible observers while the FBI would investigate incidents of discs found on the ground, thereby relieving the Air Forces of running down incidents which in many cases turned out to be 'ash can covers, toilet seats and whatnot'."

"In view of the apparent understanding by the Air Forces of the position of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in this matter, I cannot permit the personnel and time of this organization to be dissipated in this matter."

"I am advising the Field Divisions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to discontinue all investigative activity regarding the reported sightings of

flying discs, and am instructing them to refer all complaints received to the appropriate Air Force representative in their area."

(signed) John Edgar Hoover, Director

On October 1, 1947, in Bulletin #57 of that year, the FBI published the single sentence directive, "All future reports connected with flying discs should be referred to the Air Forces and no investigative action should be taken by Bureau agents."²⁷

The explicit reference by Hoover to the wording in the restricted Army letter shows that Hoover wanted the Army to know his agent had "penetrated" its secrecy. This, then was the intelligence "scandal" referred to in Part I; the "last straw" that caused the abrupt end of the official FBI investigations into UFO reports. However, this did not end the FBI involvement with "discs". As I have mentioned previously, agents continued to file brief reports and to interview Air Force officers and to collect UFO related information for about 16 years after this directive. Moreover, the information collected by the FBI in the following years is at least as important, if not more important, to the understanding of the governmental involvement with UFO reports as is the information collected during the period up to October 1, 1947. Information collected after October 1, 1947 will be presented in subsequent papers. However, before ending this part, I would like to present some of the interesting information contained in the FBI file that was obtained before October 1947 and also a listing of the cases filed during that period.

On July 18, 1947, the special agent in New Haven, Conn. wrote the following letter to the Director of the FBI:²⁸

"For the information of the Bureau this is to advise that on July 7, 1947 Mr. ... , Stamford, Conn. appeared at the Stamford Resident Agent's Office and furnished the following information:

Mr. prefaced his remarks by stating that he is a scientist by

(FBI Files, Continued)

occupation and is currently employed at the American Cyanamid Research Laboratories on West Main Street in Stamford, Conn., in the Physics Division. Mr. further indicated that during the war he was employed at MIT, Cambridge, Mass., in the Radiation Laboratory which is the Laboratory connected with the Manhattan Project. Mr. advised that he is thirty years of age and is a graduate of the University of Arizona."

Mr. stated that the topic of "flying saucers" had caused considerable comment and concern to the present day scientists and indicated that he himself had a personal theory concerning the "flying saucers". Prior to advancing his own theory, Mr. remarked that immediately after the conclusion of World War II, a friend of his, Mr., allegedly observed the "flying saucers" from an observatory in Milan and Bologna, Italy. He stated that apparently at the time the "flying saucers" had caused a little comment in Italy but that after some little publicity

they immediately died out as public interest. Mr. stated that it is quite possible that actually the "flying saucers" could be radio controlled germ bombs or atom bombs which are circling the orbit of the earth and which could be controlled by radio and directed to land on any desired target at the specific desire of the agency or country operating the bombs. He stated that one of the items of interest which he personally has observed is the fact that the saucers have been observed in Mexico City, New Orleans, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Halifax, Newfoundland, Paris, Milan, Bologna, and Yugoslavia as well as Albania. By placing a string around the globe of the earth it would be noticed that all of the above mentioned cities form a direct orbit or circle around the earth and would be more or less in line of any path in which the saucers could be circling."

Mr. further stated that he had recently talked with one of the owners of (....) company in Glenbrook,

Conn., and had been informed by that his company is making a large powerful telescope to be used in searching the stratosphere for atom bombs."

The opinion expressed in the above letter is very interesting when contrasted with public statements of scientists and others who apparently thought the discs were imaginary, illusions, misidentifications, hoaxes, etc., anything but real objects that should have concerned the scientific community. It also contains an allusion to what might have been a significant pre-Arnold sighting in Italy.

A listing of the good cases in the FBI files up to October 1947 follows. A comparable listing could be made for historical or sociological purposes of the hoax cases. However, I have chosen not to present such a list since it would contain none of the cases that the Air Force considered important for the understanding of "flying discs", although it would contain many of the cases investigated by the FBI.

Date	Place	Local Time	Brief Description
1945?	Germany	evening	armed forces witness saw object that approached, descended with oscillating motion
1/16/47	North Sea, England	2230	RAF Mosquito vectored and chased unidentified aircraft for 50 miles at 22,000 ft.
April, '47	Virginia	-----	meteorologists' reports of pre-May sightings of disc through theodolite
5/5/47	Washington State	1530	three witnesses saw silver object do "nose dive" and disintegrate leaving a pillar of smoke
5/19/47	Colorado	1215	three railroad employees saw silver object traveling fast; was fuzzy even with binoculars
5/17-21/47	Oklahoma City	2030	Byron Savage's report; white disc-like object seen for 15-20 seconds
6/2/47	Rehoboth, Delaware	-----	Forest Wenyon's report; air observation of a rapidly moving "jar-like" object (also Sept. 1946 sighting referred to)***
6/14/47	Bakersfield, Calif.	1200	Richard Rankin's report; many discs sighted flying in groups
6/22/47	Greenfield, Mass.	1130	Rapidly moving; round, silvery-white object
6/24/47	-----Kenneth Arnold's report-----		
6/24/47	Cascade Mountains	daytime	prospector Johnson's report of object that affected his compass***
6/28/47	Nevada	1400	Lt. Armstrong from the air saw object traveling toward him
6/28/47	Alabama	2120	Maxwell AFB sighting by AAF personnel; "cold sober" pilots and air intelligence officers saw object travel in zig-zag course for 5 minutes
6/29/47	White Sands	1300	Zohn and Kauke report of object traveling rapidly near V-2 proving grounds
6/30/47	Grand Canyon	0910	Lt. McGinty in aircraft reported two round grey objects traveling straight down

Date	Place	Local Time	Brief Description
7/3/47	Maine	1430	Astronomer Cole saw many objects cross sky rapidly
7/4/47	Emmet, Idaho	2015	United Airlines Pilot Smith and co-pilots - objects from the air
7/4/47	Oregon	1305	Portland police officers and many others saw three discs flying east and two flying south
7/6/47	Alabama	2045	Staff Sergeant Livingston and many others saw rapidly moving lights; photos obtained
7/6/47	Hollywood, Calif.	-----	several objects reported
7/6/47	Kansas City	1345	Major A. B. Browning AC/A3, Pentagon, saw bright, silver, disc-shaped object while flying at 10,000 ft. in a B-52 in CAVU weather.
7/6/47	Fairfield, Calif.	day	Capt. Burniston(?) of the AAF and wife saw rapidly traveling object oscillating side-to-side
7/7/47	Arlington, Va.	2300	someone in the Office of the Air Inspector saw a rapidly moving object from his home
7/7/47	Phoenix	1700	former Naval Ordnance Laboratory employee photographed object making circles in the sky***
7/7/47	Koshkonong, Wisconsin	1145	airplane instructor and student in aircraft saw object descend and fly horizontally at a speed estimated to be 6000 MPH
7/7/47	East Troy, Wisconsin	1430	AAF captain and passenger in aircraft saw object travel horizontally at a speed estimated to have been 3690 MPH
7/8/47	Hamilton Field, Calif.	-----	Staff Sgt. Baker reported he and several others saw three round rolling objects traveling faster than P'80's
7/8/47	Muroc, Calif.	1010	many military personnel sighted two silvery discs followed by a third
7/8/47	Norfolk, Va.	afternoon	B. Turrentine saw and photographed object rocking and spinning like a football***
7/8/47	Mt. Baldy, Calif.	1550	A. E. Morman(?), 1st Lt. in fighter squadron while flying at 20,000 ft. reported flat object with no wings or vertical fin at about 35,000 ft.
7/9/47	Grand Falls, Newfoundland	2330	discs reported by police officials
7/9/47	Boise, Idaho	1215	newsman Johnson after three days of air search saw a "flying disc"
7/10/47	St. John's, Newfoundland	2315	Several people reported to the police glowing, round objects
7/10/47	Harmon Field, Newfoundland	1700	Airline representatives saw disc-like wagon wheel cut through clouds at 10,000 ft; photos of trail taken
7/11/47	Codroy, Newfoundland	0030	several people reported rapidly moving glowing object with a trail
7/12/47	Elmendorf Field, Alaska	1830	several officers observed grey object following land contours for several minutes
7/20/47	steamship near Newfoundland	2015	silvery reddish flashes seen as object apparently traveled and changed course numerous times
7/20/47	Frostburg, Maryland D.S.T.	0915	circular whitish object flying above broken clouds making a noise
7/23/47	Harmon Field, Newfoundland	2345	flashing reddish light traveling rapidly at high altitude for 3 minutes
7/29/47	Canyon Ferry, Montana	1205	bright disc traveling rapidly, then hovering and fluttering and finally "melting into thin air"
7/29/47	Hamilton Field, Calif.	1200	AAF officers observed two objects traveling faster than P-80 aircraft; milky white; second zig-zagged behind first
7/?/47	Ft. Richardson, Alaska	-----	Two Army officers reported to the Intelligence Director seeing round rapidly*** moving silver object under clouds for 20 seconds
8/?/47	near Los Angeles	1000	while hiking in mountains; observer reported a small object on the ground that took off and "knocked him to the ground" (letter to the FBI)
8/3/47	Hakensack, N.J.	1945	observers saw round black object moving "too rapidly to be a balloon"***

(continued on next page)

(FBI Files Continued)		Local	
Date	Place	Time	Brief Description
8/4/47	Near Boston	1600	Air Line Captain and Navigator saw bright orange cylindrical object blunt at both ends
8/4/47	Bethel, Alaska	2200 (daylight in Alaska)	pilot and co-pilot saw object like flying wing but no propellers or jet exhaust***
8/6/47	Philadelphia	2230	many observers saw object like a "giant firecracker" travel at an apparent speed of several hundred mph***
8/6/47	Myrtle Creek, Oregon	1815	former Navy pilot and student saw round aluminum-like object from their aircraft on two occasions about 10 minutes apart***
8/7/47	Ocean Lake, Oregon	2330	bright disc sighted
8/13/47	Redmond, Washington	0900	Brummett and Decker reported two bright objects traveling very fast; seen eight seconds
8/13/47	near Twin Falls, Idaho	0930	county commissioner and ex-sheriff reported two discs and great height and a roaring noise***
8/13/47	Snake River Canyon, Idaho	1300	A. C. Urie and sons reported structured disc-like object flying within the canyon***
8/14/47	Placerville, Calif.	1600	object seen that traveled rapidly and disappeared in a puff of smoke
8/14/47	Guam	1040	enlisted men saw crescent shaped objects on a zig-zag course twice as fast as plane
8/19/47	Twin Falls, Idaho	2130	residents and police officers reported groups of objects flying over city under overcast sky; very fast and glowing***
9/3/47	Oswego, Oregon	1215	lady and children saw "two dozen" round silver objects; platter shaped***
9/6/47	Shouns, Tenn.	----	two observers reported football shaped object turning end over end in air; seen against overcast sky***
9/8/47	Logan, Utah	2240	three flights of "saucers" seen by several people; yellowish-white objects circled city rapidly; seen against overcast***
9/11/47	Portland, Oregon	1715	Portland police and many others saw silvery object travel rapidly and circle city***

(Note: the next "good" report in the portion of the FBI file that I have is in early 1948, and then reports "picked up" again in 1949.)

(***: denotes cases in which the FBI interviewed one or more of the people who reported UFOs)

Although in a few of the above cases the brevity of the description mirrors the brevity of the report, in most cases the above descriptions do not do justice to the amounts of information furnished by the witness(es).

Most of the above cases are in the Project Blue Book listing ("Table of Contents") in the National Archives. However, I have not found the following cases listed: 1945(?), Germany; 1/16/47, North Sea; April '47, Virginia; 5/5/47, Washington State; 5/19/47, Colorado; 5/17-21/47, Oklahoma City; 7/8/47, Norfolk, Va.; 7/8/47, Mt. Baldy, Calif.; 7/10/47, St. John's, Newfoundland; 8/6/47, Myrtle Creek, Ore.; 8/7/47, Ocean Lake, Ore.;

8/13/47, Redmond, Washington; 8/14/47, Guam; 9/6/47, Shouns, Tenn.; and 9/11/47, Portland, Ore. (Note: the absence of a listing at the beginning of the Blue Book file does not necessarily mean that a case does not exist within the microfilm record at the National Archives; cases could be contained within the Office of Special Investigations - OSI - section of the microfilm record. The OSI section has no "table of contents".)

Most of the 59 cases listed above were sufficiently detailed and reported by sufficiently reliable witnesses that it would be difficult to conclude from them that nothing unusual was being seen. Especially impressive, for example, were the 7/8/47 sightings at Muroc AFB in which several military observers signed statements that they

and others saw two flights of objects, the first being of a pair of silver round or disc-like objects, and the second being the flight of a single roundish object. Unfortunately the Air Force investigation was typically brief so that a lot of potential information was lost (e.g., observers at different places on the air base should have been asked to give accurate direction and elevation angles so that the altitudes of the objects could have been estimated).

The portion of the FBI file that I have obtained contains only a couple of entries for the year 1948, showing that Hoover's effort to extricate the FBI from the UFO scene was initially successful. However, the FBI began receiving information from the Air Force again in 1949, some of which was

(Continued on page 16)

"California Report"

By Ann Druffel

"THIRTY YEARS LATER: THOUGHTS IN THE DARK"

Many writers' ideas stream from the subconscious in the middle of the night. They inevitably disappear if ignored and vanish like ghosts never to return. And so writers have learned to scribble down the precious fragments as soon as they perceived--in the dark.

The following are "thoughts in the dark", not only because they occurred to me in the above fashion, but also because they concern a subject which has been "in the dark" for the past thirty years--i.e. what is the nature of the UFO phenomenon?

Perhaps the most perplexing facet of the UFO phenomenon is its seeming ability to prance just ahead of researchers seeking its solution. Twenty-five years ago, the "objectives", as those persons favoring the extraterrestrial hypothesis were called, were teased by "hard" data which seemed beyond their ability to analyze satisfactorily. For instance, in the classic case known as the Florida Scoutmaster report (August 19, 1952), we were presented with seeming evidence of a propulsion system which could produce charred roots in vegetation over which the UFO hovered, while leaving the outer vegetation intact and unharmed. Though this could have been physical proof of a nuts and bolts craft, no use was ever made of this information. Would adequate analysis have uncovered the possibility that microwave radiation had damaged them? Unfortunately, the science of the time was not sufficiently curious or competent to provide the answer.

In contrast, on August 21, 1955, the Sutton family of Hopkinsville, Kentucky, was plagued for hours by intent, persevering "robots", after a glowing light had descended from the sky near their farmhouse. In spite of competent investigations by several researchers, notably Isabel Davis, the

other "objective" researchers at the time were not quite ready to accept the facts of this terrorizing visitation. So unprepared were ufologists in general that total publication of the entire Hopkinsville publication was not planned until very recently. In the 1950's, also, all "contactees" who claimed to have been inside UFOs and to have been given messages regarding the UFO occupants' motives and purposes were, without exception, regarded as deluded or as hoaxers.

Faced with contradictory and often unacceptable evidence, therefore, the researchers of the 1950's slipped and slogged in a sea of data. The objectives failed in their attempts to prove UFOs as physical craft because of their inability to analyze the data efficiently, and the ETH hypothesis, as the **only** explanation for UFOs, died withering on the vine.

In the late 1960's and early 1970's, scientists began entering the UFO field in considerable numbers, and scientific laboratories gradually became ready and willing to analyze data. "Hard data" cases--landing traces, affected vegetation, etc.--still occur today, and scientist eagerly pursue the slender threads of evidence left behind. But surprisingly, the **main point of ufological interest** seems to be CE-III and "abduction" cases involving communications between humans and UFO entities. Today, seemingly reliable persons of good reputation report experiences **inside** UFOs, whose occupants are often disturbingly ugly. At the same time, the old-style "contactees" who met and discussed philosophy with beautiful human-like individuals from other worlds have slipped silently into the background.

Like numerous other researchers, I have been currently swamped with reported abduction cases which allegedly occurred in the early 1950's but without exception, these have lain

hidden in the recesses of witnesses' minds and only now are coming to light. The types of witnesses (reliable) and the kinds of statements (coherent) presented by these older hidden cases are similar in all ways to the modern-day "abductions" reported weekly around the world.

Why does the phenomenon work in this fashion? Were there **no** cases of frightening abductions, consciously remembered, in the 1950's? Were all the CE-III abduction witnesses consciously made to "disremember" the occurrence? And why are there both conscious-memory cases **and** cases of "amnesia" occurring now in the 1970's?

For what it is worth, a peculiar fact needs pointing out. In several cases currently being investigated in the Southland, I have noted that occupants of an abducting UFO often resemble what would be **logical projections** from the witnesses' own mind. To illustrate, in a case occurring in August 1971 at Palos Verdes Peninsula, two of the entities were described as "brain-like". The reliable, careful witness drew sketches of viable creatures resembling brains, complete with two hemispheres, a medulla oblongata, and thread-like "convolutions". In this particular case, the witness is a bright individual who has, for one reason or another, been for most of his life overshadowed by an also-bright sibling.

Another example concerns a matter of much delicacy. In a 1953 case, a young girl, troubled with problems of sexual indentifications, was allegedly abducted by ufonauts who were man-like, slim, masked and ostensibly differing from one another only by size. After her experience had been uncovered by hypnosis decades later, the witness also remembered a slight added difference. The creatures
(continued on next page) 15



Lucius Farish

In Others' Words

The "green fireballs" which mystified New Mexico observers in 1948-49 are re-examined in the November 22 issue of *National Enquirer*. The objects, seen over Los Alamos, White Sands and other locations, have never been identified. The November 29 *Enquirer* reported on Britain's recent UFO flap, including reports of UFO occupants seen in various locations. More reports of UFOs over atomic installations are featured in the *Enquirer* for December 6. Several 1950-51 sightings over Oak Ridge, Tennessee are detailed. In the December 13 issue, reports of UFOs over nuclear bomb storage areas and missile sites are presented, taken from official Air Force documents. These sightings occurred in 1975.

The December 6 issue of *The Star* carried an article on the recent publicity surrounding NASA's review of the UFO evidence. NASA's skeptical and biased attitude toward the subject has been clearly displayed in recent press releases, so if a full-scale investigation is (grudgingly) launched, no one need expect anything but a repeat of the Condon fiasco.

The new film, "Close Encounters of the Third Kind," has been receiving a lot of advance publicity recently, with large articles in *The Star*, *Newsweek*, *Time*, *U.S.* and various other magazines. There are simply too many such articles to mention, so I won't attempt it. The novelization of the film is also available in a paperback edition from Dell Books.

A new quarterly UFO magazine which shows promise is *The UFO Examiner* edited by Ralph C. DeGraw (Route 1, Hazleton, Iowa 50641). It is published in conjunction with the

organization Ralph has formed, Private UFO Investigations. The subscription rate is \$4.00 for 4 issues or \$7.50 for 8 issues. The first issue contains some interesting material on Iowa sightings, as well as reports from other areas of the country, and foreign sightings. The *Examiner* is very nicely done, reproduced by photo-offset, 20 pages per issue. It is well worth your attention.

Another new publication, this one a tabloid newspaper, is *The Hefley Report* (P.O. Box 7242, Burbank, CA 91510). It contains material on UFOs, Fortean subjects, psychic phenomena, etc. The first issue (designated "Preview '78") is now available at 50¢ or subscriptions are available at \$3.99 for 10 issues. UFO material in the first issue includes a lengthy interview with contactee George Van Tassel and a short item on a mysterious "cylinder" from the sky by yours truly.

Still another new entry is *Ideal's UFO Magazine*, published quarterly at \$1.25 per issue. Although the contents of the No. 1 issue are largely rehash, the material seems to be handled responsibly. Considering the fiction being represented as fact by some of the other UFO magazines, this is a refreshing and welcome change. If you can't find this new magazine on your stands, you may order copies from Ideal Publishing Corp., 2 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016.

A very good article on CIA involvement in the UFO subject may be found in the December issue of *Crawdaddy* magazine. This one is definitely recommended reading.

You may recall that I've previously mentioned (several times) a *Playboy* feature on UFOs which has been postponed for a year or so. It finally

appears in the January issue of the magazine and, frankly, was not worth the wait. The panel discussion features Hynek, Sprinkle, Harder, Salisbury and Vallee on the "pro" side, with Philip Klass and Ernest Taves representing the skeptics. In essence, it's the same old stuff we've heard and read numerous times before. A selection of UFO photos and a summary of three abduction cases accompany the discussion.

The January issue of *Fate* has a good article by Ted Bloecher on UFO occupant cases, plus a report on various Texas UFO sightings by Van Smith.

UFO Report for January features articles by John A. Keel, Maurice Chatelain, Jay Gourley, Walter N. Webb and others. Jerome Clark's interview with Betty Hill is of considerable interest, especially in view of the publicity Mrs. Hill has received in recent weeks.

Two new paperbacks of interest are *The Hynek UFO Report* by Dr. J. Allen Hynek (Dell Books) and *Encounter Cases From Flying Saucer Review* edited by Charles Bowen (New American Library). A new paperback by Coral and Jim Lorenzen of APRO, *Abducted: Close Encounters Of A Fourth Kind*, should be available in a Berkley paperback shortly.

January will see the publication of three hardcover books of interest: *Cauldron of Hell: Tunguska* by Jack Stoneley (Simon & Schuster) - *Our Ancestors Came From Outer Space* by Maurice G. Chatelain (Doubleday) - *The Murmurs of Earth* by Carl Sagan (Random House).

THE HAPPY CAMP, CALIFORNIA SIGHTINGS

By Paul Cerny

Western Regional Director, MUFON

PART I

A series of UFO sightings and other strange happenings plagued the Happy Camp, California vicinity from about late October 1975 through April of 1976. The number and quality of the observations has since dwindled down considerably to mostly nocturnal lights seen occasionally by the few interested local people. At the height of the flap in this remote forested and low mountainous region, some of the reports were so bizarre as to be unbelievable. I hesitate to even mention them except for the absolute insistence of several of the main witnesses that these incidents did occur. I wish to emphasize the lack of actual evidence in the way of any photographs or other material with the exception of one photo shown to me which shows a wide streak of light with a blunt stop and a vague flat object at the stop end. Both the streak and the vague object are so faint as to be undesirable for publication. Faint, but possible, imprints were found in one landing spot, but these were not substantial enough for verification due to the hard and rocky ground. No unusual radiation was detected in any of the areas visited.

Since we are dealing strictly with the verbal dissertation of the witnesses themselves relating to this series of sightings, we are presenting these encounters to the readers in this manner to formulate their own hypothesis as to sincerity and evaluation.

There was only one outstanding daylight sighting and a couple of lesser ones near dusk, so almost 100% were nighttime encounters. Character reference checks were made locally on most of the sighting participants, most of whom checked out quite well, and

one or two who we felt had natural tendencies to exaggerate or embellish. As the stories unraveled, these characteristics were taken into account. With all the variances, it made these series of sightings extremely difficult to interpret. What did help was the number of persons involved in quite a few of the encounters. Adding to this was the gratifying experience of Tom Gates and myself being blessed with a spectacular observation ourselves. Tom is the head of the Space Science Center at Foothill College in the San Francisco Bay area and West Coast Astronomy Consultant for MUFON. We are both Special Investigators for Dr. Hynek's Center for UFO Studies as well.

The events leading up to this series of sightings was first called to our attention by William Murphy, MUFON State Section Director for Shasta County at Redding, California, who alerted our bay area group and did some of the investigation.

During the approximate six-month period from November 1975 through April 1976, almost every night at least something was seen by the active observer participants that frequented the mountain location near Happy Camp where the observations were made. These were mixed in with an occasional close encounter of either "alien craft" or humanoid figures being seen. It began to be a novelty to the participants, varying in numbers up to about twelve to fourteen devoted Happy Camp observers frequenting this mountaintop observing area. At least two to five persons, sometimes more, would be on the mountain nightly just to observe what could be seen. There were nights when nothing was observed but an occasional aircraft or meteor, weather permitting. It is best at this point to indicate these people were

quite familiar with various types of aircraft, especially private planes, as there is an active airport just a mile above the community in the area northwest of town on a plateau. Military aircraft and helicopters are a common sight. Helicopters, particularly, are used by the Forest Service and the logging operations in the area. Most of the closer objects seen by the observers were described as disc-shaped and usually glowing orange. At accelerations the UFO's would change color to red, yellow, then white and on into blue.

The first sighting of any consequence was by Steve Harris and Stan Gayer, two lumbermill electricians, on October 25, 1975. These two men are young, 24 and 19 years old, respectively. They do a lot of hunting and back road exploring in the area, so are completely familiar with the surrounding environment.

On the night of October 25, Steve and Stan were on the flat-topped area called the "saddle" by the local people. The saddle is a rather large flat parking area about 110 feet wide by 350 feet long. It was about an hour after dark when they spotted a large red "star" in the sky to the northeast of their position. Then another in the opposite direction. Looking back again at the one in the northeast, they discovered it had disappeared. Disregarding the second big red "star" they observed a reddish-orange light pass over a low ridge about five miles away and disappear. As they started to drive down the mountainside from the saddle, a large orange light took off from an area below them and to the right. It rose straight up and out of sight in a few seconds—a rather startling sight in the eerie darkness of the mountain terrain. Steve related, "We were pretty shook up about that thing,

whatever it was." The spot where this object took off is down off the narrow, winding mountain road to the right and about 600 feet down to a rather large level area approximately a quarter of a mile square. The area is sparsely covered with brush, occasional trees and old logs. A few clear spots are also present and a narrow jeep trail runs down to the clear areas from the main road. At a distance of about a quarter of a mile away and as fast as the orange lighted object moved, it was difficult to determine any size. Nothing could be seen other than the bright orange light making its rapid departure up and out of sight.



Landing site area from the "Saddle" actually down about 600 ft. and 1/2 mile distant.

After calming down to some extent, the two decided to drive their four-wheel-drive Ford Bronco down to the spot where they saw the orange light take off. This spot became known later as "the landing site". Several other experiences were to happen at this location. Arriving at the spot where the orange light was seen to make its hasty departure, the two men searched the close area with flashlights and presently came across a pile of what looked like mica or vermiculite, normally a type of packing material. It was about a foot in diameter and four to six inches high, as if someone had poured it out of a pail. The two men were certain this material was left there by the orange object. They stated it had not been there the day before when they were hunting through that same spot.

Dr. Richard F. Haines, a physicist from Los Altos, California, later had

this material analyzed for us at a laboratory available to him for such purposes. An Energy Dispersive Analysis of X-rays instrument, model 608, was used in the tests. Comparison tests were run on mica, another known vermiculite, and the unknown material. Printout and photographs of graph element distribution were also supplied and are in MUFON Western Division files. Conclusion of the tests indicated it is just another form of vermiculite, somewhat chunkier and thicker particles than common vermiculite. How it got there, of course, remains a mystery. Dropped or abandoned there by a UFO seems unlikely; more likely by other hunters. However, the material is not common to the area.

The next evening after complete darkness, Steve, Stan and Carl Jackson, a foreman at the mill who is about 35 years old, came up to the landing spot to look at the vermiculite pile and inspect the general area. Not having a radiation counter as was desired, they brought along a metal detector just to see if anything could be detected with it. It was at this time that Steve claimed he found three large shallow but discernible imprints in the rocky ground (soil and rock mixed). They were roughly twenty feet apart in a definite triangle pattern, varying up to about an inch deep. Each imprint, according to Steve, was about 18"x24". It should be pointed out that it was approximately two months later that MUFON investigators first heard of these sightings and arrived on the scene January 2. By this time, several rains and snow coverage had destroyed any recognition of these prints.

Steve also claimed the metal detector indicated metal or at least a reaction in the detector when passed over the imprints. At this time (two months prior) it was not determined exactly what caused this, since there was no obvious metal present to be seen.

At this same time when the print areas resulted in the detector giving off its characteristic "squeaking," another loud sound was heard. This was described as high pitched, perhaps in the vicinity of 10,000 to 12,000 cycles

along with a wow-wow-wow variance in amplitude. Carl Jackson exclaimed, "My God, what was that?" He made a grab for a .30 caliber carbine that was resting on the hood of the Ford Bronco. The loud screeching sound came from just over the embankment down toward the canyon below and seemed only forty to fifty feet away. Steve described the noise as sounding electronic, similar to microphone feedback. All three men were standing close to the car there in the darkness examining the imprints and vermiculite pile by flashlight. Stan was back near the rear of the car and was using a powerful Quartz-Iodine hand spotlight. He was lighting up the area and turned the spotlight right where the sound appeared to be coming from. Suddenly he screamed, "There's eyes, there's eyes, big eyes!" Strangely, nothing else was visible but the large eyes even in that extremely bright spotlight. The distance to the eyes was estimated at 30 to 40 feet away. The eyes appeared to be silver in color and slightly pale blue; about 2 1/2" in diameter and roughly 8" apart. What astounded them most was the fact that no body or shape was visible even in that powerful light at that close range. A sort of black outline was detected, very vaguely, below the eyes which were about five feet above the ground level. It was as if whatever object was there was blocking out or absorbing the powerful light in some manner as to render it invisible except for the eyes. Background of trees and brush were brightly illuminated around and above the object, or creature, but nothing directly behind it showed up. It was as if there were a blank spot there in the light's glare except for the very obvious large eyes.

This all took place for about a minute; then the eyes appeared to turn sideways and then away as if whatever it was went retreating back down the embankment, still not visible. Only a blank area in the light beam! When the eyes were moving, no up and down motion was observed as in walking. The motion was steady as if floating. These men are familiar with all kinds of


animals in the area, even at night; especially deer, bear, coyote, etc. Never had they seen anything resembling this oddity. All three were about equal distances from this creature, machine, or whatever it was! The eyes seemed highly reflective, had no pupils or other recognizable eye features.

They had the distinct impression the "creature" (for lack of anything else to call it), had come up the slope and was watching them as they inspected the ground at the site. They considered firing the rifle at the creature but thought better of it. Steve commented they could not see anything within five feet around and below the eyes. The light was simply blanked out in this area, as powerful as it was. These particular spotlights are 200,000 candle power.


As the creature disappeared down the embankment and the trio was getting over its initial shock, they decided it was time to get out of there! Hastily piling into the Bronco, they started up on flat ground but found they could not move the car! All four wheels (four-wheel drive) were spinning and

throwing rock and dirt. It was as if they were partially suspended above the ground with just enough weight to throw ground material with the spinning wheels, but being held back from forward movement. This lasted 15 or 20 seconds, then suddenly the car bolted forward as if being released and one wheel went into a ditch. The resulting jolt damaged the rear universal joint, which later had to be repaired. Backing out of the ditch they headed out of the area and back to town at a fast rate.

(The next issue will cover more humanoid and creature encounters as well as close vehicle encounters in the Happy Camp area. Tape transcripts by Eleanor Sanini, typing by Carol Wells. Other MUFON investigators involved in these sightings were Tom Gates, Ken Tice, Carrol Minnis and Joe DuBois.)



Landing site and area where Bronco got "stuck".



UFOS: GOD'S CHARIOTS?

by Ted Peters

(Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1977), 192 pp., \$7.95

Reviewed by Barry H. Downing.

This is the first book by Ted Peters, MUFON State Director for Louisiana, and a very welcome addition to the more specialized field of UFOs and religion. Peters is Associate Professor of Religious Studies at Loyola University in New Orleans, is an ordained Lutheran minister, and holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Chicago.

The subtitle for his book is "Flying Saucers in politics, science and religion", and it could also have included "psychology", so that we can see Peters is attempting a very difficult synthesis.

Peters stands in a religious philosophical tradition that includes Aristotle, Aquinas (in spite of his being Lutheran), and more recently Paul Tillich. His psychological views are heavily influenced by Jung, as are his definitions of human religious needs. His task is to link his idea of God which he derives from Tillich and his forefathers with the phenomenology of the human UFO experience in light of man's unconscious religious needs. If this task sounds difficult, it is. Peters has made his journey through the UFO wilderness, and whether one can finally agree with his view of the trip, and the slides he took along the way, it is important for all truly interested in the UFO problem to share this trip with him.

Peters comes at the UFO problem with the knowledge of someone who has investigated UFOs first hand, and therefore, believes that UFOs are more than pure imagination. But what, he does not know. He is a student of psychology, and knows that we tend to project our inner needs onto an external reality in a way that may be deceiving. He notes that your understanding of the nature and purpose of UFOs depends as much on who you are as what UFOs are. Thus, those whose main orientation is politics

tend to see UFOs as what he calls Model I: "The Interstellar Diplomat." On the other hand, those who think UFOs are like our moon walkers here to pick up rocks see them as "Model II: The Research Scientist". Those of a religious orientation are responsible for "Model III: The Celestial Savior".

Peters, to be fair, should have listed his own view as "Model IV: The Psychic Savior". His approach is not far in spirit from that of Jacques Vallee in *The Invisible College*, although for reasons I do not understand Peters does not seem to know of the parallel. Vallee argues that UFOs serve a psychic symbolic function in guiding human destiny, and that finally is also the conclusion of Peters, although stated in terms of liberal Christian philosophy rather than secular science, as does Vallee.

Peters reviews many UFO cases and stories, and also spends quite a bit of time reviewing various UFO cults and their psychological implications, as well as the more popular "religious" UFO material such as that of Erich von Daniken and myself. He does some good work discussing the way in which "beliefs" have set scientist against scientist in the UFO struggle. His religious background serves well to give him an outsider's view of how scientists act religious in the name of science.

MUFON Journal readers may notice that while Peters respects my UFO theology more than that of others, like that of von Daniken, he nevertheless thinks I have missed the mark by quite a bit. How is it that Peters and I differ?

Our basic differences, as Peters has proven by his own thesis, have more to do with our own views of how truth is discovered than with the data we find in the UFO story.

I would see the difference between Peters and me as like that between Descartes and Newton. Peters, like

Descartes, assumes that truth is primarily in philosophy, and in the mind. "I think, therefore I am."

Newton, however, assumed that truth was something discovered through experience, and therefore, through examination of data and experiments.

Peters understands God to be the "prime mover" of Aristotle and Thomistic philosophy. He is invisible, infinite, totally other than man. I basically believe that I can understand God if he gives me some scientific evidence to go on. For me, the Bible represents a religious laboratory in which the evidence concerning the nature and purpose of God is explained. The Bible explains that God is invisible, as Peters also believes, but that God nevertheless makes himself visible through angels, quasi-spiritual beings. Jesus represents the height of divine visibility. Thus, the reports in the Bible of "The pillar of cloud and of fire" and the "chariot of fire" of Elijah take on importance for me because they represent reports of human experience, and the modern UFO reports take on religious meaning for me because they are similar to Biblical UFO reports.

Peters objects that I have made God too concrete, maybe even making UFOs into an idol. Perhaps he is right. But I object that Peters does not take seriously enough the view that the invisible God of his own free will chooses to make himself visible to us through visible mediators, and UFOs may be a modern form of divine revelation. Peters does conclude that UFOs are a kind of divine revelation, but perhaps only in the sense that the human unconscious has projected our basic human religious values into a myth acceptable to the space age.

This is a brief, and incomplete, contrast of our views, but to those

(Continued on page 22)

Director's Message

By Walt Andrus

A more appropriate sub-title for this month's message might be "What's Going On Around the Network?". Joe Santangelo, State Director for Massachusetts, was the first to submit his 1977 Annual Report of activities. His report to all members lists twenty-one active investigators and consultants, the UFO sighting reports investigated, and the weekly log of amateur radio stations "checking in" on the forty meter net each Saturday morning at 0700 Central time or 1300 (U.T.) on 7237 KHZ. Some of the regulars on the net besides Joe (N1JS) were WØNC, WA4RPU, WB4YDD, WBØFDA, WA80PR, W3JQ, WA5CTJ, K8NQN, WAØTEQ/8, WB4ZEK, WA1SWA/4, WA9ARG, W4ABF, WB9UAY, K9PAW, WB3BVZ, WA4TDE/8, WB8RGQ, K3ROJ, K4TD, K9FR, K4HXC, WB2GKB, KØIQA, W8RUF, and W4VAH.

The physical size of the State of Massachusetts is an asset, whereby they may have state meetings on a monthly basis. This is not a luxury that states like California, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, and Texas enjoy.

In this same vein, a committee composed of Ray Rhein, Nolie Bell, Dan Duke, and David Oldham has initiated an organization and planning letter for their "Second Annual Training Conference of the North Carolina Mutual UFO Network, Inc." to be held this summer on a date and location to be determined.

In order to bridge the distance involved, Leonard Sturm, State Director for Illinois, has been writing a personal letter to each new member in his state, welcoming them and making some very positive suggestions to help make them more effective investigators. As all members know, the State Section Director and State Director receive a copy of the completed and processed membership application of each new member in their area of responsibility. Jim McCampbell,

MUFON Director for Research, has been sending a copy of his book "UFOLOGY" to all new Consultants when he receives their processed membership form from the MUFON office.

Budd and April Hopkins in New York City were the hosts for the recent monthly meeting of their UFO Study Group. Ted Bloecher presented a talk on the ever-increasing number of humanoid reports and his progress in computerizing 1500 such reports dating from 1896 to the present. Ted and David Webb are Co-Chairmen of MUFON's Humanoid Study Group. Ted will share his work on HUMCAT to the folks attending MUFON's Ninth Annual UFO Symposium in Dayton, Ohio. (See announcement in this issue of the *JOURNAL*)

Joseph A. Blake, State Section Director for the Virginia counties of Montgomery, Craig, Giles, Pulaski, Roanoke and Floyd has been organizing a UFO Study Group centered around Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University at Blacksburg, VA. He has received fine public relations exposure in the *Daily Bulletin* (Dec. 2), the "On Campus", a faculty-staff newsletter (Dec. 9, 1977), *The Blacksburg Sun* newspaper (Dec. 14, 1977), *The Blacksburg Sunday Sun* (Dec. 18), and the *Roanoke Times and World News* (Dec. 26). The news media has become very conscious of the UFO phenomenon through the release of the motion picture "Close Encounters of the Third Kind", therefore we want to stress that all members should increase their local publicity at this particular time.

"The Tenth Annual UFO Picnic" is scheduled for Sunday, June 25, 1978 at the Fish Hatchery Park in Carlyle, Illinois. This fine event is sponsored by the UFO Study Group of Greater St. Louis with Rosetta and Dick Holmes as the local hosts. They are also sponsoring Mrs. Betty Hill, who will be speaking at Forrest Park Community College in St. Louis, MO on Friday night, June 23, 1978 and at the Carlyle

High School Gym in Carlyle, Illinois on Saturday night June 24th. The Barney and Betty Hill incident is probably the best known of all UFO cases as far as the general public is concerned. It is one of the first abductee cases in which hypnotic regression was utilized to reconstruct the events occurring during the unexplained time lapse.

Rosetta Holmes has received confirmations from other well known abductees who plan to attend the picnic on Sunday, June 25th, starting at noon. Charles Hickson is coming from Pascagoula, Mississippi. Elaine Thomas and one of the other ladies involved in the Stanford, Kentucky case will attend. (For details on this fantastic case, see the January 1977 issue of *THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL*.) Elaine was delighted when she received her invitation and the opportunity to meet Betty Hill in person. Carlyle, IL is about 50 miles east of St. Louis, MO on highway U.S. 50, which is adjacent to the park. Regretfully, your Director will be unable to attend this year after having been present for six picnics in past years.

On January 28th, John F. Schuessler, MUFON Deputy Director of Administration was host for an informal but important weekend meeting in Clear Lake, Texas. Attending were Thomas H. Nicholl, Deputy Director for Business Management from Leawood, KS, Howard M. Sussman, M.D., Consultant in Internal Medicine from Houston, TX, Richard C. Niemtzw, M.D., Consultant in Radiation from Galveston, TX, and your Director from Seguin, TX. Future planning as it related to research projects consumed the majority of the discussion. It is an honor to be associated with such talented gentlemen, who are applying their knowledge and experience to resolving the UFO phenomenon. However, the most gratifying portion of the big UFO picture is that this experience can be repeated whenever groups of MUFON people gather in Boston, New York, St. Louis, Detroit, Houston, San

