

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

NUMBER 236

DECEMBER 1987


Founded 1967

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.

\$2.50



SOLAR DISK

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

(USPS 002-970)

(ISSN 0270-6822)

103 Oldtowne Rd.

Seguin, Texas 78155-4099 U.S.A.

DENNIS W. STACY
Editor

WALTER H. ANDRUS, JR.
International Director and
Associate Editor

THOMAS P. DEULEY
Art Director

MILDRED BIESELE
Contributing Editor

ANN DRUFFEL
Contributing Editor

PAUL CERNY
Promotion/Publicity

MARGE CHRISTENSEN
Public Relations

REV. BARRY DOWNING
Religion and UFOs

LUCIUS FARISH
Books/Periodicals/History

ROSETTA HOLMES
Promotion/Publicity

T. SCOTT CRAIN
GREG LONG

MICHAEL D. SWORDS
Staff Writers

TED PHILLIPS
Landing Trace Cases

JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
Medical Cases

LEONARD STRINGFIELD
UFO Crash/Retrieval

WALTER N. WEBB
Astronomy

NORMA E. SHORT
DWIGHT CONNELLY

DENNIS HAUCK
RICHARD H. HALL

ROBERT V. PRATT
Editor/Publishers Emeritus
(Formerly SKYLOOK)

The MUFON UFO JOURNAL is published by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas. Membership/Subscription rates: \$25.00 per year in the U.S.A.; \$30.00 foreign in U.S. funds. Copyright 1987 by the Mutual UFO Network. Second class postage paid at Seguin, Texas. POSTMASTER: Send form 3579 to advise change of address to The MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155-4099.

FROM THE EDITOR

The harder one strives for perfection, it seems, the more deftly it slips away. In short, last issue's cover (a striking photograph of the Marfa Lights by James Crocker of Dallas) was printed upside down! In the same issue a letter in reference to Dennis Stillings's helicopter article (No. 231) went uncredited. The author was England's Jenny Randles, of course. And in this issue, space considerations caused us to delete some of the exhibits accompanying Barry Greenwood's MJ-12 article. Our apologies to all those involved. We would also apologize for the presence of two articles on the Billy Meier case, except that any highly visible and controversial UFO incident is always subject to closer scrutiny. Your comments are welcome.

Our present cover, courtesy of NASA, is a high resolution X-ray photograph of the sun calibrated to a temperature of one million degrees centigrade.

In this issue

REASSESSING THE MEIER CASE by Dennis Stacy	3
OCCULTNESS & AMBIGUITY by James Deardorff	5
MJ-12 MAGIC ACT by Barry Greenwood	10
LOOKING BACK by Bob Gribble	17
CENTRAL EUROPEAN STUDIES by Illobrand von Ludwiger	19
UFOs SCIENTIFICALLY LEGITIMATE by Irena Scott	20
UFOs 1947-1987 REVIEWED by Dennis Stacy	23
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE by Walt Andrus	24
COVER: The Solar Disk, courtesy by NASA	

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. In addition, bequests, legacies, devises, transfers, or gifts are deductible for Federal estate and gift tax purposes if they meet the applicable provisions of Sections 2055, 2106, and 2522 of the code.

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. Responses to published articles may be in a Letter to the Editor (up to about 400 words) or in a short article (up to about 2,000 words). Thereafter, the "50% rule" is applied: the article author may reply but will be allowed half the wordage used in the response; the responder may answer the author but will be allowed half the wordage used in the author's reply, etc. All submissions are subject to editing for style, clarity, and conciseness. 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 1987 by the Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155" is included.

REASSESSING THE MEIER CASE

By Dennis Stacy

Dennis Stacy is editor of the *Journal*.

Perhaps already intellectually exhausted from having to review two books in the course of a single season (*Communion and Intruders*), the *NY Times Book Review* gave Gary Kinder's *Light Years* short shrift. "This earnest but silly and sloppy book is entirely devoted to Eduard Meier, a one-armed, uneducated, down-and-out caretaker who lives in a small Swiss village outside Zurich and who was a celebrity in U.F.O. circles in the 1970's," wrote reviewer Edward Dolnick (July 19, 1987, p.21).

The UFO community has not exactly greeted *Light Years* with open arms, either, while waxing ecstatic over Budd Hopkins's *Intruders*, a book whose implications are no-less startling (or fantastic). Part of the response, no doubt, can be attributed to an "us vs. them" mentality, Hopkins being a well-regarded researcher within the field, Kinder being a newcomer, or more accurately, an outsider altogether. Other prejudices come into play, too. Meier is a "repeater," for instance, one who has reported a succession of visits from humanlike beings aboard "beamships" claiming to be from the Pleiades. His reputation, in this country at least, preceded him. He was pictured as a master hoaxer who managed to stage series after series of the most spectacular UFO photographs anyone had ever seen, though no one satisfactorily explained how this was achieved with a single arm and limited resources. Everyone seemed to agree, though, almost by unconscious fiat, that Meier's pictures were simply "too good to be true." Then, there was the matter of his "guilt-by-association" with Wendelle Stevens, now serving time in an Arizona prison. With such predispositions already in place, perhaps we shouldn't be surprised that

this first book about Meier was penned by an "outsider." Who else among us would have touched it with a ten-foot pole?

The intention here is not to resuscitate Meier's (or Kinder's) reputation, but to show that any significant UFO case, and this is certainly that, whether real or not, is worth considering for what it potentially reveals about the UFO phenomenon and how it's perceived by society, both at large and within the miniscule UFO community itself. If the Meier case is an outright hoax, as many ufologists believe, then it becomes a legitimate study in counterfeit currency and a standard by which real coins can be judged. Conversely, it can also be applied as a sort of Rorschach test for individual ufologists. What, specifically, about the Meier case, ruffles your hackles or "turns you off"? Is your discomfiture based on evidence you know to be true and contrary, or simply a knee-jerk response of which we constantly accuse skeptics and debunkers? What follows then is less a comprehensive outline of *Light Years* than an occasional comment where deemed relevant.

THE PLEIADES

In places Kinder certainly reveals himself as overly gullible, trusting completely in his major confidants (Stevens, the Elders) when a little independent research would have mitigated, if not drastically altered altogether, some of his suppositions. For example, he falls hook, line and sinker for the "singularity" of the Pleiades, writing (p. 143) that "Though the Pleiades form little more than a speck in the visible night sky, no other star group has been mentioned as frequently in the literature and mythology of world cultures for the past two and a half millenia. And in every (my italics) instance, the tiny cluster of

seven was portrayed as female: the sisters, the virgins, the maidens, the goddesses."

Yet virtually the first source I consulted on the subject painted a significantly different, although outwardly similar, picture. The article is "Asiatic Parallels in North American Star Lore (Milky Way, Pleiades, Orion)" by William B. Gibbon of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, which appeared in the July-September, 1972 issue of the *Journal of American Folklore* (pp. 236-247). The first crack in Pleidean invincibility occurs when Gibbon writes, "With regard to the Pleiades, two basic motifs stand out among the North American Indians: a group of women, and a group of dancing youths (p. 242)." Are these "dancing youths" *always* women, too, as Kinder so confidently asserts? Alas, no. Gibbon continues: "In some cases several conflicting myths have been recorded from the same tribe. The most important element of this motif seems to be the dancing, since the participants vary in number and are generally designated as children, boys or young men, or, more rarely (my emphasis), young women."

Admittedly, the Pleiades, worldwide, have been most commonly associated with women, as Kinder's sources suggest, but this is perhaps not so mysterious, either, as it is made to seem. (The idea, as employed in *Light Years*, is to support Meier's contention that his female contact came from the "seven sisters," or Pleiades, and that by implication the Pleiadeans may have been visiting us for millenia, that, in fact, such visitations a la ancient astronauts may have given rise to Pleiadean mythology in the first place, accounting for its almost global uniformity and spread. We have already seen that said "uniformity" is not the case, according to Gibbon.)

Is there anything else about the Pleiades, significant enough in itself to

warrant so many ancient cultures paying "undue" attention to what everyone agrees is a fairly visually nondescript group of stars? Gibbon (p. 243) continues: "Among the many poses of the Greek sister Pleiades is that of dancers. The Greeks credited the young women with introducing the circular dance (I can already hear someone saying, "shades of saucers!" - author). A more specific reason for their gaiety was that the Pleiades, rising in the autumn, proclaimed the harvest (my emphasis again). In other words, the Pleiades were paid attention by "primitive" peoples because of the time of year they rose, not because celestial visitors from same pointed them out as their "home."

HUMAN MYTH

Another argument, based on the content of the actual myths, also mitigates against Pleiadean singularity, a point which Kinder and/or his sources, fail to mention, presumably, one supposes, because it doesn't support their case. This is the fact that in almost every myth Gibbon relates, the Pleiades are seen as, i.e., represent, humans who have gone up to heaven, and not vice versa.

Gibbon again, page 243, cites "the Blackfoot who, in addition to the dancers, saw the Pleiades as a group of boys who ascended to the sky out of pique because their fathers had given some buffalo hides to their sisters instead of to them. In another legend the Pleiades represented six brothers whose parents were too poor to provide the boys with buffalo robes. Feeling embarrassed, they resolved to ascend to the sky. The neighboring Assiniboine also saw seven poverty-stricken youths."

To be fair, the Wyandot Indians, northeast of the Great Lakes, says Gibbon, portrayed the Pleiades "as six singing maidens, daughters of the sun and moon, who wished to come to earth to sing for the tribe." Students of mythology and its repetition may still find the more interesting comparison to be between "poverty-stricken youths" and Meier's own financial predicament, than between Semjase and the Pleiades.

Unlike most armchair ufologists (and skeptics, too, for that matter), Kinder got off his duff and actually visited Meier and his surroundings. The details of those three visits, totaling almost 13 weeks in Switzerland, were reported in his open letter to the UFO community in the April 1987 issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal*, and need not overly concern us here. Suffice it to say that Kinder talked with numerous associates of Meier, pro and con, including the neighborhood photo processor where Meier developed his film, and uncovered no obvious signs of collusion and/or massive hoaxing. He also documented those aspects of the case that have proved the most frustrating and perplexing: the disappearance of the so-called unique Beamship metal samples from Dr. Marcel Vogel's laboratory, even as Dr. Richard Haines was on his way over to the lab to view them, the full-spectrum sound recording of another Pleiadean Beamship, and the photographs taken by Meier of an earthquake-ravaged San Francisco, supposedly retrieved from the future, but later shown to have been artwork previously published in *Geo* magazine.

But the Meier case, need it be remembered, is hardly the first extended UFO event to be plagued by contradictory, or even suspiciously produced evidence, as is true of much "paranormal" phenomena, from telekinesis to the production of ectoplasm. Some of those historical precedents have subsequently fared better or worse in the UFO literature; few have generated as much internal heat and controversy. In the name of "scientific respectability" we ufologists constantly clamor for the incontrovertible, physical proof of a solid object behind the UFO phenomenon. Yet the Meier case, if it reveals anything, shows us that "evidence" is just as elusive as the phenomenon itself, and that ultimately we can no more agree on its substance than we can reach unison as to its meaning.

A parallel example, in more ways than one, would be a comparison of the careers of Meier and Uri Geller. There are plenty of bent spoons around, too, but those that cannot be convinced of their paranormal bending, cannot be

convinced, period, no matter how frequently they populate the field. Conversely, those who can be convinced, are easily swayed by a single sample. The best a "skeptical believer" can manage is the position that sometimes Geller cheats — and sometimes he doesn't. But for Meier to have cheated once, if cheat he did, is considered inexcusable and we need not look further. So the esoteric secret, perhaps, preserves itself from prying, profane eyes.

IMPLICATIONS

The final and most important aspect of the Meier Conundrum is how the enveloping mythology is employed by individuals according to their own predisposed beliefs. A favorite taunt of ufology, for example, frequently hurled at scoffers, is Arthur C. Clarke's Law "that any advanced technology will appear as magic." Like a magical mantra, a subset of mental technology, it can be used post facto to "explain" away standard UFO mysteries like the absence of a radar return, sudden aerial acceleration and stops, abrupt materialization and disappearances, and intergalactic travel, not to mention a volume of visitations that amounts to traffic jam proportions. And these lesser mysteries do not even begin to touch on the greater ones associated with the beings who purportedly occupy UFOs, with their powers of mental telepathy, transmogrification, and the ability to pass through solid matter.

If we accept future technology prima facie as magical, what is there in the Meier case, then, as well as countless others, that prevents our welcoming it as extremely solid evidence of extraterrestrial visitation? Certainly it is magical enough, and since the consideration too magical cannot apply by definition, could it be that we simply have too much "evidence" in and of itself? If this is indeed the case, we need not examine Meier so much as our own preconceptions. Ultimately, the UFO phenomenon may be incapable of proof, which places it squarely in an experiential — or existential —

(continued on page 22)

OCCULTNESS & AMBIGUITY

By James Deardorff

Mr. Deardorff is Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University.

INTRODUCTION — ETI AND THE MEIER CASE

One of the many messages coming from the Meier case is the well known idea that UFO intelligences are to be equated with extraterrestrial intelligences (ETIs). Essentially the same idea minus the UFOs happens also to be a respectable school of thought discussed in astronomical journals for the past 15 years. This is the hypothesis that extraterrestrial intelligences (ETIs) are in our proximity and have been aware of us for millennia. However, radio astronomers usually prefer the competing hypothesis that all ETIs are essentially forever isolated within relatively small spheres of influence within the galaxy, and that we have therefore by chance escaped their detection so far.

The problem with this astronomical view is that it falls far short of recognizing Clark's law — that what ETIs in advance of us can do should seem indistinguishable from magic to us, whether they are 200 years in advance or 200 thousand years or 200 million years. This should apply to the fields of galactic transportation and communication as well as to other fields of which we cannot conceive. Thus, the possibility that advanced ETIs are not restricted in mobility by our present limitations of rocketry and relativity is much more plausible than not. That UFOs could be their vehicles of travel and refuge then becomes an obvious idea to explore, as the astrophysicist Peter Sturrock of Stanford pointed out in an article in the *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society* (a British journal; 1978, pp. 521-523). Unfortunately, his plea to bring the data of the UFO organizations into action has been ignored by astronomers, who

seek a message from the stars, not from a contactee on Earth. It would be very disappointing to them to have scientific interest in the ETI problem shift from radio astronomy to the UFO-contactee-abductee problem.

If we could dip into the past, say 200 years ago, and bring back some people and scientists to examine our present technology, they would regard much of it as magic, or occult. Similarly for us if we were brought 200 years into the future, assuming our civilization survives that long. Therefore, what we or ETIs 1,000 years into our future could do would seem like magic raised to the 5th power (1000/200). What ETIs 3,500 years ahead of us could do would seem like magic raised to about the 17th power — extremely occult. If there are any ETI-contactees around today who have been treated to some displays of their contactors and who have reported on it, their reports would therefore seem very occult to the rest of us. Eduard Meier is one such contactee whose reports, if genuine, should seem like magic raised to about the 17th power. *This they do.* Starting in 1975 he was supplied with a very lengthy series of messages over a several year period whose main theme is spiritualism — reincarnation and evolution of the soul. This does not sit well with many UFO investigators who seek hardware, not a *spiritual message.*


However, the Meier case is most unique in that the amount of evidence his contactors supplied him with, mostly photographic, is *much more bountiful and of higher quality* than anything seen heretofore. It was a new idea that a particular contactee somewhere might be singled out and *supplied with evidence by ETIs* in order to support their messages. Another idea totally foreign to UFO investigators is that the ETI might have a *strategy* of doing this in such a way that the overall covertness of the UFO phenomenon would be maintained until

mankind is better prepared for the first official, overt contact. That is, that a prime contactee could be allowed a lot of color photographs and some movie-film exposure of their craft, but not allowed any photos of themselves nor allowed to bring any others to witness the actual contact meetings. I have mentioned five reasons now (*italicized*) why the Meier case was rejected, around 1979, by the main UFO organizations which spent little or no time looking into it before calling it a hoax.

A sixth reason is that Meier said he had been a contactee on many occasions well before 1975. Of course, this would be a perfectly logical course of action for ETIs who were pursuing a strategy and who needed to educate their contactee in certain matters. However, that fact was held against Meier on the grounds that ETI contacts or UFO sightings should be random things. Only recently have UFO organizations begun to realize, after several books on UFO abductions appeared under the auspices of respectable publishers, that abductees receive repeated attention from their abductors who seem to have their own strategies. Thus, we can now see that contactees might also receive repeated ETI attention, so that this sixth reason probably no longer applies.

It was therefore left up to lesser known investigators, with the exception of Wendelle Stevens, to investigate the Meier case in depth. He published his findings in 1982 in an investigative report of limited distribution. He could find no evidence of fraud, except by some who called Meier a fraud. Stevens was therefore also discredited by the main UFO organizations.

A few years later an initially inexperienced UFO researcher, the investigative journalist Gary Kinder, made an in-depth study of the Meier case for three years which culminated



the object a small model. It may be pointed out that the occult disappearance of UFO evidence is also not new; as an example, several different copies of a certain letter which would have helped expose a UFO coverup by the British government were noted to have disappeared under mysterious circumstances by Butler, Street and Randles, authors of *Sky Crash*.

The other occult aspect of this photo case, besides Meier's acknowledgement that these were shots of a posing beamcraft purposely allowed him, is that the contactor later took the time to explain qualitatively to Meier what had happened to the tree (they had "changed its time").

On numerous occasions soon after Meier had said he had had a contact with one or more of the Pleiadeans, he and others could point to geometrically precise "landing patterns" in remote meadow grass or on snow near his contact point. These received much photography by Meier and others. Again this is too commonplace to dwell on here, except to note the most occult aspect described well in Kinder's book, regarding the affected grass, continuing to stay alive for months afterwards, but growing horizontally in a swirling pattern. The second occult aspect is that Meier could ask Semjase how this could be, and receive a qualitative answer (the grass' sense of direction of gravity had been distorted by 90 degrees).

On several, if not perhaps all, of Meier's beamship photography sessions, it appears that if Meier could photograph the craft then other Swiss villagers in the general vicinity, or motorists on one occasion, should also have noticed the craft or have been able to photograph it. Again Meier received an answer from Semjase to his question on this: they can render their generally invisible craft visible from any narrow sector they wish. This is not a new thought, but one forced into existence from other UFO-sighting cases, as discussed for example in the book by Randles and Warrington *UFO Cases: A British Viewpoint*.

In some of Meier's movie-film segments Semjase's beamcraft is seen to perform maneuvers involving

in *Light Years*. As Dennis Stacy points out, Kinder broke new ground as well as treading old ground in having experts in various fields reexamine some of the evidence. But again there was no sign of a hoax, no sign of accomplices, and no mechanical nor financial means uncovered for Meier to have accomplished a hoax. Already, I have heard Kinder labeled as incompetent by UFO investigators for having reached these conclusions. I would recommend that you read his book and then decide for yourself if the case is not indeed worth the most serious of studies.

The lesser known investigators, Lee and Brit Elders along with Thomas Welch, published their results in two volumes containing enlarged color photos from Meier's daytime photo-session contacts. They spent over 300 days at the Meier farm house investigating the case, during some 16 trips between Arizona and Switzerland over a 4-year period, and it seems unlikely that the sales from their two photo-albums have recouped their expenses. They have apparently also been dismissed by the main UFO organizations for seeing reality in the Meier case, for taking his spiritual message seriously, and for charging for the sale of their photo-albums.

The reader need not be a student of psychology to recognize what appears to be going on here!

COMPARISON

Since the occultness of reports from the Meier case is one reason it has been disparaged, let us briefly compare its occultness with that of other UFO cases to see if there is much new.

In at least two incidents in the Meier case, a tree too close to Semjase's hovering beamcraft soon afterwards developed many dead branches next to where the craft had been. This is so commonplace in the UFO literature as to need no substantiation here. However, in at least one of these instances the contactors (Pleiadeans) were said to have later caused the tree to disappear without any indication left that it had ever existed. This is the fir tree in Meier's photo series #55-57, 64-66, 69-71 and 76, all taken on July 9, 1975, according to Meier's records. In this series at least 5 of the photos show indisputably that part of the hovering object was either within the branches or on the far side of the tree from the camera.

I asked two professors of forestry at Oregon State University if this tree in the photos was at all identifiable; it did not take them long to say it was definitely a mature *Abies alba*, or European silver fir. (They had very little so say or ask about the saucer-shaped object.) This indicates that the tree could not have been a model tree, nor


incredibly great accelerations for the craft or any occupants. However, this kind of behavior on the part of UFOs is so commonplace that it was one of the first occult aspects to which UFO investigators had to become accustomed.

On at least one of Meier's photo-collection sessions, Semjase could remotely control the basic operation of his movie camera while Meier concentrated on the use of his 35mm camera. And on the April 14th, 1976 occasion when a Swiss Mirage jet made 22 successive passes at Semjase's beamship, Meier reportedly learned later from her that she had remotely disabled the pilot's armaments and camera. However, reports of telekinesis have come out of numerous UFO investigations, often involving the continued motion or transport of an automobile no longer under the control of the driver whether or not its engine was running (as in the book *Sky Crash*).

SPIRITUAL THEME

Regarding the spiritual theme which runs throughout the Meier case, especially in Semjase's messages, the occurrence of such is again nothing new although Semjase goes into much greater depth than usual. In a much higher percentage of alleged contactee cases than one would expect demographically, the message recipient ends up discussing reincarnation as a reality, regardless of his or her previous religious affiliation. Nevertheless, in almost all those cases the contactee had no evidence as substantial as photographs to back up his message. Thus, a dedicated Christian, Moslem or Jew who does not believe in reincarnation, or who believes in resurrection, may be alarmed by the Meier case and have strong incentive for dismissing it or discussing only its weak points.

Meier's claimed ability to receive thoughts telepathically from his contactors, telling him where to travel on his moped for a contact or photo session for example, is again not new. This is the normal mode of communication from UFO intelligences to humans, with language or thoughts



somehow being expressed in the native tongue of the contactee or abductee. The UFO organizations have by now mostly accepted this apparent fact as truth despite its great occultness. Even more occult, in many instances it is apparent that the UFO intelligences could read the mind of a witness and respond almost instantaneously. This is equivalent to inadvertent mental telepathy directed from human to ETI. An aspect of the Meier case which is only a slightly further extension into the occult is that he claims to have been taught how to communicate telepathically at will with Pleiadeans with whom he became acquainted; some of his two-way communication sessions were ostensibly via telepathy and did not represent face-to-face meetings.

A related piece of occultness is that the Pleiadeans are said to be able to detect when or if any human is anywhere near their contact vehicle, and able to ascertain the whereabouts of a particular individual, such as the contactee. This latter ability, however, is common to many other contactees' experiences.

Also, the method by which Meier would, a day or so after each contact session, record the word-by-word conversations of the contact, was ostensibly some form of machine-controlled telepathy. His recording of it was like "automatic writing" or

"automatic typing." As an apparent result, his voluminous contact notes are much more interesting reading than if they were merely later remembrances or summaries of what had transpired. (Occasionally, Meier would note that an item which they had discussed at a contact meeting had been censored out of the later machine-telepathic transmission. Meier's objections to Semjase about this went unheeded; she reserved the right to withhold various portions of their conversations from the written record.) One may note that numerous alleged contactees claim to have received their messages via automatic writing.

Meier's reported rides in Pleiadean beamships also should not be thought of as new or preferential treatment; Enoch of Old Testament days appears to be one of the first contactees to have been so treated, judging from his books which never quite made it into the Bible. Daniel Fry (see his book *The White Sands Incident*) is but one example of a modern case of this nature which predates the Meier affair. And, of course, there are the numerous abductees who have been taken into saucer craft against their will. Since Meier appears to have been on a friendly basis (though not always so, judging from his contact notes) with several different Pleiadeans, and treated almost as if he were one of them, it would be surprising if he had

not been treated to such travels. At the least, a saucer craft would be a convenient place to hold covert contact meetings.

Meier's recordings indicate he once had a case of pneumonia partially cured during a contact session, and once had some broken ribs healed by a machine on Semjase's beamcraft. Again, this does not constitute unhealed of UFO occultness. Numerous UFO witnesses or contactees have attested to having had various ailments cured following a contact — even cancer.

Several secondary witnesses in the Meier case noted that he vanished from their midst on a couple of occasions, apparently to attend contact meetings, and once he was observed to return in the same manner. Again, this basic phenomenon is not entirely new for us, having occurred, apparently, in the Travis Walton case (see *Abducted!* by Coral and Jim Lorenzen). Reports of UFO entities moving up or down a beam of "solid light" seem to represent a similar degree of occultness; see for example *Sky Crash*.

Meier's main investigators, Wendelle Stevens and Lee & Brit Elders, were occasionally at Meier's farmhouse when he went out for a nighttime contact meeting. They once noted soon afterwards that their watches registered highly incorrect times. Again, such a "disturbance in time" is not a new phenomenon to hear of accompanying a UFO event. However, Meier reported much more occult experiences involving time, namely various forms of time travel. One of his beamship trips, documented later via extremely lengthy contact notes, was said to occupy 5 days' time. When Meier returned, his face showed an approximately 5-day growth of stubble, and he promptly slept for 26 hours. This was attested to by witnesses, and his having shaved the morning he had departed was also attested to. Yet, he was noted to have been away for only one day.

On March 18, 1978, Meier allegedly was allowed to time-travel into the future to view and photograph the ruins of San Francisco after a devastating earthquake. This is one of the most occult, and most disputed, of his reports. His alleged photo of the

ruins at first glance is said to look just like a photo of a painting within the September, 1977, issue of *GEO*, a German magazine. Discussions within his notes from contact #106 with Quetzal, another Pleiadean, indicate Meier's apparent consternation upon learning that this painting had pre-dated his photo, and supply Quetzal's explanation which involved still more occultism.

MAGIC

Does all this seem like magic raised to the 17th power? I believe that it does, and that occultism to some such degree must be expected if this comprehensive series of contacts were genuine. Yet most of Meier's confrontations with the occult do not represent phenomena unfamiliar to ufologists, but rather represent an unheard of amount of exposure to it by any one individual. According to Hynek's "strangeness index," the Meier case would rank at the extreme in strangeness; without Meier's photographic evidence and secondary witnesses to provide credibility the case would receive little or no attention. Disparagers of the case have therefore had to say something about the photographic evidence.

PAST DISCREDITING OF MEIER'S PHOTOS

How were these photos belittled despite analyses by specialists declaring that no signs of fraud could be detected in the photos examined?

First, those specialists who had done the examination of selected prints, out of Meier's 700 or so photos showing beamcraft, and unable to find fault, were simply declared inept.

Second, at an early date William Spaulding of Ground Saucer Watch had been given 10 of the Meier photos to analyze by a West German UFO investigator. Spaulding decided they were fakes, and claimed that they involved suspended models, double exposures, and the double print method. (The implausibility that a hoaxist would use all three such diverse methods should have alerted more serious investigators to look into the

matter for themselves.) Kinder's book gives ample reason why Spaulding's conclusions regarding UFO photos should not be trusted. Another reason, however, is that Spaulding admitted in a letter to *Flying Saucer Review* (issue No. 5, 1985) that he believes the only bona fide "saucers" are those constructed secretly by governments on earth.

Third, many times after Meier loaned out photos and film, what he received back were apparently copies. The specific generation of the print or internegative placed at the disposal of the investigator thus is not usually clear. This has discouraged examination of even those aspects which do not require the originals.

Fourth, Kal Korff, an 18-year-old youth at the time, discredited both Meier and Stevens in his 1981 book *The Meier Incident: The Most Infamous Hoax in Ufology*. Korff accepted Spaulding's conclusions and made heavy use of ridicule, while never once suggesting that Clarke's law should be kept in mind. In the *Abies alba* photo series already discussed, he implied that the later disappearance of the tree had not happened, further implying that a model tree had been used.

In the March 29, 1976, series two of the photos shown in the Elders' photo-albums indicate that the craft was behind a limb of a deciduous tree. However, Korff claimed from one of the same photos in his book that it was instead in front of the tree. He then called it a model UFO. However, in a 1981 article in *Frontiers of Science*, (March-April issue) he claimed the same tree was a model tree. Yet we know from photos in the Elders' et al. photo album, Vol. 1, that the deciduous tree in question was not a model, since a photo of it a year and a half later by one of Stevens' investigative team showed the same tree, this time in leaf.

In Meier's close-up beamship photo, #6, the upper of three circumferential ribs girding the craft was described as uncannily resembling a (braided) rope. Korff implied that it may have been a cow-bell rope. However, close inspection of the "rope" where its cross-section appears at opposite edges of the craft discloses that it has rather square corners, unlike

a rope.

Considerations such as these, plus Korff's prolific use of innuendo rather than unbiased observation, should have alerted other UFO investigators of the need for a comprehensive and objective study of the Meier case. Instead, the heads of the UFO organizations often referred to Korff's book as reason why they needed to take no interest in the case.

My own observations presented here might be declared biased by any who adhere to the view that ETI cannot be in our vicinity and cannot be strategically observing us. Admittedly, this review is written from the perspective that the in-proximity school of thought regarding ETI is more plausible than the radio astronomers' school or the mankind-is-unique school of thought.

AMBIGUITIES

With the in-proximity school of thought, the ETIs, and most certainly those in charge of the "embargo" against Earth, give high priority to maintaining the embargo until our understanding of the situation has increased substantially. With the leaky-embargo hypothesis, equally high priority is presumed given to their supplying gradual leaks in the embargo (UFO sightings and contactees) that would help increase our understanding but without disrupting the embargo. This would mean that in a comprehensive case accompanied by extensive photographic evidence, at least some of the scenes might need to be partially staged in a manner that would introduce some ambiguity. Then skeptics who are mentally unprepared to acknowledge the plausibility of the in-proximity school of thought would not be "forced" into new thought patterns by the sheer weight of evidence.

They could instead cry "hoax" without undue embarrassment, directing attention to suspicious looking scenes while ignoring the others. This neutral level of ethical behavior on the part of the ETIs carrying out the embargo would be consistent with likely ethical reasons for their maintaining an embargo in the first place. It would also help maintain the

embargo in the presence of leaks. The absence of undisputed hard evidence from UFO sightings in general after forty years would fall into the same category of explanation.

The abductee phenomenon would appear not to be part of a planned leaky-embargo strategy. It would instead seem to represent independent ETI behavior deemed sufficiently innocuous by ETIs in charge of the embargo as to require their taking no corrective action, as long as the abductions do not cause any abrupt rupture in the embargo.

One of Meier's 8-mm movie-film segments (18 March, 1975) is clearly a candidate for planned ambiguity on the part of the Pleiadeans. When some Japanese UFO investigators viewed this film, or a copy of it, at Meier's farmhouse, they saw the unknown object circling within a nearly horizontal plane, with its closest point of approach once bringing it just behind the upper tip of a fir tree. Each circle took only a few seconds. From the video views of this film now available, however, the viewer cannot be at all certain that it had actually passed *behind* the tree. If it had instead been a suspended model close to the camera, then the circular motion might be explained as simple harmonic motion induced by motion of a supporting pole above the view of the camera.

However, on one of the apparent passes of the object past the top of the tree, the tree's upper portion was seen to make a sudden swerve along the direction of travel of the craft, immediately followed by return to normalcy. This indicates some kind of action of the craft upon the tree which would rule out the model theory, as the tree was again no model. However, the motion of the tree seems incomprehensible, suggesting some action of occult ETI technology upon it. A biased skeptic might call this a "copy-out," and insist that photographic evidence be rejected which involves incomprehensible action of any object additional to the UFO.

The same cry for inadmissibility has been made regarding the series of photographs showing the beamcraft posing around various sides of the *Abies alba* tree because it later occultly

disappeared without trace. Such cries must obviously be resisted, since occultism is to be expected, as is an intelligent strategy on the part of any ETIs in our vicinity.

One series of Meier's photos which has been ridiculed shows him, and in one instance the arm of an alleged Pleiadean (by the name of Alena) pointing a "ray gun" said to be a museum piece of one of the colleagues of Semjase. Meier was allowed to test the weapon on July 6, 1977, near his farmhouse during a contact when no one else was around. He burned a hole completely through the trunk of an apple tree, about 10 inches in diameter. This would not seem like unreasonable behavior for a contactee interested in guns, in alien technology, and on friendly terms with humanoid ETIs with whom he had become friends after 77 previous contacts since 1975. However, a skeptic who cannot tolerate ETIs having a strategy involving a primary contactee similarly cannot tolerate the possibility that such an event occurred.

Silly arguments have therefore been advanced why the gun depicted in the pictures must be a fake, notwithstanding the present existence of the hole in this tree, the photos Meier took of it soon afterwards showing charring around the hole but no wood dust, and the difficulty of drilling a hole of this length through a tree by a man with only one arm. Nevertheless, since the evidence is not compelling it instead seems incriminating to a biased skeptic, yet the entire episode would be consistent with an ETI strategy of occasionally supplying ambiguous evidence chiefly for the "benefit" of skeptics.

Ambiguities seem to have been built into the messages Meier received too, as if failure to do this might cause a premature rupture of the embargo against Earth. That is, parts of the messages relating to science and ancient history seem to involve absurdities, just as most alleged contactee messages seem to contain absurdities. An unknown fraction of the apparent absurdities, however, may instead constitute science or truths which will only become evident to our descendants of the distant future. In

addition, there may be other motivation why ETIs interacting with Earth would not act in an entirely truthful manner. It would cause us to question all parts of any given message, accepting none of it on faith. This in turn would tend to cause those who appreciate the spiritual content of the message not to get carried away and turn it into a new religion, nor to worship these ETIs as gods. According to Meier's contact notes, the Pleiadeans do not wish this to happen.

SUMMARY AND PROGNOSIS

An entirely new attitude is needed for analysis of the Meier contactee case. It needs to be viewed from the outlook that ETIs in our proximity likely exist and likely possess a strategy for dealing with an emerging civilization. We must cease accusing experts who examine Meier's evidence and find no sign of a hoax of being incompetent on that account. Instead, we need to accept these findings as the basis for

much more extensive investigations, and for treating Meier as an honest reporter unless it can be proven otherwise beyond reasonable doubt. We must learn to put ourselves in his shoes and ask what we would have done in his stead, if we had been exposed since childhood to an appealing ETI philosophy and had agreed to publicly disseminate it.

Because of the ambiguities apparently built into some of the Meier evidence, we must examine *all* the evidence, not just that fraction which may look suspicious to diehard skeptics. Haven't we learned by now to be skeptical of skeptics who claim, for example, that a low soaring object the size of a football field moving slowly along at dusk without making noise is just a tight formation of powered hang gliders whose pilots and airfield cannot be ascertained? We must be especially skeptical of skeptics who may have one or more non-scientific reasons for wishing a particular case to be a hoax.

At the least, we could examine all

the evidence and secondary witnesses carefully and form our best estimates of the odds that Meier and assumed accomplices could have successfully fabricated this evidence. We could inquire into what motivations he might have had for so doing, and for persisting to this day, if other than to disseminate an ETI spiritual message. We could examine his lengthy series of messages carefully to see what the most trustworthy essence of it seems to be.

I think we should do all these things and more. However, in final analysis it seems likely that if Meier represents a prime ETI contactee in a strategy designed to maintain covertness for a while, that strategy will continue to succeed. The Meier case, as a prime leak in the embargo, will not turn into a rupture of the embargo unless or until we learn for ourselves what our rightful place is as thinking beings within a galaxy and universe which may be heavily populated with other thinking beings.

MJ-12 MAGIC ACT

By Barry Greenwood

The following article is reprinted by permission of Barry Greenwood, editor of *Just Cause*, published by Citizens Against UFO Secrecy. A one-year subscription is available for \$10, from CAUS, Box 218, Coventry, Conn., 06238.

We can now report to you that, regrettably, the MJ-12 affair appears to be a grand deception and, consequently, a giant black eye on the surface of UFOlogy. This conclusion did not come lightly and was the result of extensive inquiries by CAUS. We did have high hopes that perhaps our initial doubts would have been allayed by additional releases and that a proper explanation would be found for the problems. It was not to be. The deeper we looked, the worse it became.

In dealing with government

documents it is vitally important that we know *where* information comes from. Otherwise, how can one possibly vouch for its authenticity? It is why CAUS regards cover letters from agency releases almost as important as the releases themselves.

In the case of MJ-12, Moore, Shandera and Friedman (herein referred to as MSF) have not provided this most basic element. The material, save for the 1954 Cutler memo, was sent to Jaime Shandera anonymously on undeveloped 35mm film which was later made into hardcopy. Who is the source? MSF doesn't say. Where did it come from? They don't say that either. This by itself should raise suspicions, but there is much more.

SHANDERA

Why did Shandera receive the film? He is not exactly a well-known person in UFOlogy. We have a situation where a "government source" finds it important to release very sensitive, still-classified documents on crashed discs, Roswell, and alien bodies, certainly the story of the century! To whom does he go? Walter Cronkite? Dan Rather? Carl Sagan? No, he goes to MSF who are clearly in the pro-Roswell camp already and need no convincing. And they do have much to gain from these "documents" being made public. It sounds pretty self-serving that someone should anonymously drop proof of Roswell into the laps of only its chief supporters and no one else who may have more influence in uncovering the "truth."

Why, at the MUFON Symposium in June, did Moore declare that the

burden of proof is on those suggesting a hoax (in front of a press conference) while saying in a Ft. Walton Beach, Florida, newspaper that he has found no undeniable proof that the document is genuine? In a true scientific investigation the burden of proof is *always* on the proponent to prove his case, not on the opponent to disprove.

Why did MSF alter the appearance of the MJ-12 documents in their first release of the *Focus* newsletter without explanation? Whole sections were deleted, giving the appearance of government censorship, by MSF as they later admitted. It smacked of a sensationalist technique to arouse interest.

These are only minor quibbles over technique. The major problems follow.

MJ-12 DOCUMENTS

The core of MSF's case lies in the documents which have been "released." These are what must survive scrutiny if we are to accept MJ-12 as genuine. Since we have described them previously, we will report on our study of the papers without extensive re-quoting.

- The "Project Aquarius" report — A three-page extract of a larger document with title page and two pages of text. Source and date are unknown and no other information is traceable. We direct your attention to the title page (Exhibit 1).

You see in large print "EXECUTIVE CORRESPONDENCE" and below in typescript is "Executive Briefing." Looks impressive doesn't it? It implies an important presidential paper with the bold phrase "EXECUTIVE CORRESPONDENCE." However, there is a problem as you will see next.

Exhibit 2 is a reproduction of a sample sheet of stationery with a clear, plastic cover that had accidentally been sent with an FOIA release to Robert Todd in 1979. The cover says "EXECUTIVE CORRESPONDENCE" at the top and on the bottom it says "DO NOT WRITE ON THIS COVER AS IT IS INTENDED FOR RE-USE. RETURN IT WITH THE FILE COPIES TO ORIGINATING OFFICE." It is a

~~TOP SECRET~~
~~TOP SECRET~~

EXECUTIVE CORRESPONDENCE

EXECUTIVE BRIEFING

SUBJECT:

PROJECT AQUARIUS (CS)

Knobbed bracket and shapes of letters match well with Exhibit 3.

Irregular line thickness and edges have a drawn appearance.

ATTENTION

THIS DOCUMENT WAS PREPARED BY MJ12. MJ12 IS NOT TRANSMITTED BY AIR MAIL.

EXHIBIT 1

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

June 24, [redacted]

[redacted] /MJ12

Executive Briefing (Memo)

Yesterday R2 requested briefing on Project "A". In particular, he wanted updated info from [redacted]. PJ3 advised that that info was not available to P2. Apparently, White House requested info because of [redacted]. Can't seem to make those fools realize [redacted] info is not available for any dissemination, per EO 11652, regardless of who requests info. Contact T-2P and see if he can assume custody of the matter.

Don't allow AF to evaluate IDENT info. They may open up a little too much. KEND-2 can assist to some extent.

FJS

~~TOP SECRET~~
~~TOP SECRET~~

EXHIBIT 3

HANDLE ON [redacted]
[redacted]

plastic file cover used internally by various agencies in transmitting and filing paperwork. The bottom portion of the cover takes away much of the presidential flavor of the top phrase.

Now note Exhibit 1 again. While the plastic cover in Exhibit 2 shows the top and bottom printing at the very top and bottom, the Aquarius paper shows "EXECUTIVE CORRESPONDENCE" dropped down about an inch or so, resulting in the bottom phrase vanishing. We believe that this was a deliberate deception to give the paper an appearance of being presidential by moving the top wording downward to cause the more mundane bottom phrasing to disappear off the photocopy.

The emblem on the cover of the Aquarius paper has more the appearance of being drawn on rather than printed on the page. A felt-tipped pen could have done just as well.

Of the various projects mentioned on page 2 of the Aquarius text, one, "Pounce," just appeared in UFO history. It was said to be a proposal for investigating UFOs by Kirtland AFB, New Mexico, according to the CIA's 1953 Robertson Panel. No explanation of "Pounce" appears in the Aquarius paper.

Additionally, "Project Sigma" in the Aquarius paper (said to be an Air Force effort to communicate with aliens) has been located in the massive, two-volume *Code Name Directory* by the Defense Marketing Services of Greenwich, Connecticut, 1986 edition. It is listed as a "Top Secret Air Force program involving Rockwell International."

If the DMS "Sigma" is not the same as the Aquarius "Sigma," then Aquarius Sigma is probably wrong because duplication of code names in a close time frame is not within normal military procedure. Obviously, two programs with the same code name within the same branch of service (Air Force) would be confused. That's why selection lists of code names exist.

If the two projects are the same, where is the massive security for Aquarius "Sigma" that it appears in a commercially available directory?

Project Snowbird, in a previous issue of *Just Cause*, was described as a

"Joint Army/Air Force peacetime military exercise in the sub-arctic region, 1955, according to Gale Research's *Code Names Dictionary*, 1963. No connection to UFOs is apparent here and certainly not in the context of the Aquarius paper's description. Snowbird was a training exercise for Army and Air Force units under arctic conditions.

Finally, our last issue dealt with the short-lived confirmation of an Air Force "Project Aquarius" by the NSA. The revelation fizzled however when the NSA retracted its confirmation based upon a false assumption.

No other independent confirmation of the Project Aquarius document has been possible.

MJ-5

• The CIA "MJ-5" memo — A one-page document (Exhibit 3) on CIA letterhead, but not released through FOIA. Source and year of memo are unknown. Deletions by MSF. This document first appeared in Moore's newsletter *Focus*. It has not appeared in any subsequent discussion of MJ-12.

The MJ-5 memo is a real problem. Type style, placement of security markings, use of CIA letter stationery instead of internal forms and language are all atypical of CIA standards. The executive order number quoted in the memo is non-existent. The deletion by MSF of the year forbids accurate follow-up and implies an attempt to cover a deception. We were informed by MSF in a June phone conversation about various points in favor of MJ-12. When discussion focused upon the MJ-5 memo, we stated our concern over the flaws in this paper. A response from the CIA regarding the authenticity of the memo was entirely negative, the CIA labeling the memo a "poorly made fabrication." When informed of this, MSF's only response was, "You believe them?" Indeed we do if the statement agrees with what we can see with our own eyes!

It is notable that MSF have let the memo quietly disappear from later presentations of evidence on MJ-12, even though, according to MSF's phone conversation, it came from the same source as the other documents.

Why is this memo no longer being discussed? Suspicious as well is the similarity of the type style in the MJ-5 memo, written on CIA letterhead, and the Aquarius paper, written by the MJ-12 group. If the MJ-5 memo is no longer valid to present as evidence of MJ-12, and it came from the same source as the other documents, then what does this say about the Aquarius paper, or indeed the rest of the evidence?

• The MJ-12 Briefing Paper — An eight-page document with a title page, introductory page, three pages of text, a list of attachments, title page for Attachment "A," and Attachment "A," a copy of a signed letter by President Harry Truman. Source is unknown.

Numerous inquiries have revealed that there has been no confirmation of this document in any library or archive. The one source most certain to have information on the Briefing Paper is the Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kansas. Their response is Exhibit 4.

Page 2 of the Briefing Paper refers to the formation of MJ-12 "by special classified executive order of President Truman on 24 September, 1947..." We have checked the Truman Library's listing of executive orders and found that no orders were issued on 9/24. Executive order numbers 9891 - 9896 were issued respectively on 9/15, two on 9/20, 9/23, 9/30 and 10/2/47, none even closely resembling the MJ-12 subject. There is no gap in the number sequence for these dates so none are missing. Further, the number quoted in Attachment "A" of the Briefing Paper, #092447 (Exhibit 5A), is not an executive order number but the date of President Truman's memo, 9/24/47! Executive orders are not numbered by date but are numbered sequentially, and at the time the numbers were only four digits.

Truman's "EO" (Exhibit 5B) was sent to the Truman Library for authentication. Their answer is Exhibit 6. None of the other attachments are available for examination.

We also find peculiar the atypical use of "O" prefixes in front of numbers (07 July, 06 December, 092447).

In the text itself, two things require comment. Page 3 of the Briefing Paper states, "The wreckage of the craft was also removed to several different

EXHIBIT 5A

COPY ONE OF ONE.

NUMERATION OF ATTACHMENTS:

"ATTACHMENT "A".....Special Classified Executive Order #092447. (TS/EO)

Operation Majestic-12 Status

EXHIBIT 5B

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 24, 1947.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Dear Secretary Forrestal:

As per our recent conversation on this matter, you are hereby authorized to proceed with all due speed and caution upon your undertaking. Hereafter this matter shall be referred to only as Operation Majestic Twelve.

It continues to be my feeling that any future considerations relative to the ultimate disposition of this matter should rest solely with the Office of the President following appropriate discussions with yourself, Dr. Bush and the Director of Central Intelligence.

locations." We question the wisdom of this practice; if indeed it happened at all. One of the first procedures in aircraft accident investigations is to reconstruct the vehicle from whatever is left of the wreckage: We saw this in the Challenger disaster; gather all the pieces in one place and reassemble them to either determine the cause of the accident, or in this case, see what the vehicle looked like. Apparently such was not done here. Keeping pieces in different locations forbids reconstruction and risks the loss of pieces in transit between various places. Immediate reconstruction is primary, especially with an exotic, unknown vehicle.

We draw your attention to Exhibit 7, a report on a 1950 UFO crash extracted from the Briefing Paper, page 5. According to a report by Jerome Clark in the February 1980, *Saga UFO Report*, a UFO crash took place 15-20 miles into Mexico from the Laredo, Texas area. It is most likely the same

story referred to in the Briefing Paper as we find no other different 1950 crashed UFO reports in that area. The story is based on the testimony of Lt. Col. Robert Willingham, an eyewitness.

Another reference, in Leonard Stringfield's *The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome, Status Report 2* (Case B-7) discusses the same story and gives the location of the crash as 30 miles NW of Del Rio, Texas, as corrected by further research.

However, the Briefing Paper pinpoints the "El Indio-Guerrero" area, some 90 miles SE of the Del Rio position and 70 miles NW of the Laredo site. There is a significant disagreement between eyewitness statements and the Briefing Paper regarding location.

Additionally, if the object were a spaceship (the Briefing paper only says "probably of similar origin" to the Roswell crash), isn't it getting short shrift in the Briefing Paper? After all, MJ-12 was supposed to be an elite panel formed to study such incidents. This

case is said to be only the second crashed UFO in history and yet it gets only slightly over 7 lines in the Briefing Paper! Visibly, there is no evidence that MJ-12 had much information on the 1950 "crash," despite the fact that it had almost two years to gather details. Is what is described in the Briefing Paper on the 1950 incident terribly different from a meteorite impact? Read it again!

MSF have stated that they have found nothing wrong in the Briefing Paper; that they find agreement with what they have discovered and reported in their various papers and *The Roswell Incident*. We agree! But that is the problem — there is little that conflicts with what was already on the record for a number of years. Enough is in print on the Roswell incident to concoct a pretty good — but false — scenario. This must be considered as an equally plausible explanation for the documents at present unless some compelling new information comes along.

MSF have cited a December 8, 1950, FBI cable as evidence in favor of the 1950 Texas crash. The cable states that the FBI field office in Richmond, Virginia, was advised that Army Intelligence was placed on "Immediate High Alert" for any information on "flying saucers." Anything at all on the topic was to be phoned to Air Force Intelligence. While intriguing, caution is advised in linking this firmly to the Texas incident. First — The cable is not classified, though it states that the alert was "strictly confidential." Second — The cable says nothing about Texas, crashed discs, MJ-12, or related matters. Third — It is not clear why the Richmond FBI field office or Richmond Army Intelligence would be put on alert relative to the Texas incident for "any information whatsoever" on flying saucers. Fourth — If this were a top security matter, why involve the FBI, a non-military agency?

CUTLER MEMO

• The 1954 Cutler Memo — A one-page memo on carbon copy paper from Robert Cutler, Special Assistant to President Eisenhower, to General Nathan Twining. Source is the Air Force Intelligence file group at the

National Archives in Washington, D.C. The Cutler memo is the key document to MSF's case because it is the sole piece of MJ-12 evidence that could be traced to an official source. If this is genuine, then there was an MJ-12.

As mentioned in our last *Just Cause*, problems arose early. In telephone conversations with Edward Reese of the Military Reference Branch of the National Archives, CAUS learned that while the memo was found in an Air Force Intelligence file box, several things were peculiar.

1) The security marking appeared in an unusual position, under the date instead of on the top and bottom of the page. 2) It was a carbon copy; unsigned and not the original. 3) It lacked the usual stamping, initials; etc. found on old documents. 4) It originally lacked a Top Secret register number, by which the document could be filed into a proper folder. Implication was that it was not part of the original file group released by the Air Force.

More on #4. Reese said he received several requests for the Cutler memo, probably as a result of an article by Bruce Maccabee in the November/December 1986 issue of the *International UFO Reporter*. The article by Maccabee was the earliest mention of the existence of the Cutler memo, presumably given to him by Moore.

Reese was unable to locate the document until one of the requests (Reese couldn't remember who) included the Top Secret register number of the file which contained the memo. Apparently sometime before, someone had gone through the box with the Cutler memo, recorded the register number of the file, then later submitted the request using the register number (T4-1846). Reese, finding the memo in the file, was puzzled that it lacked the number so assigned the file number to the document himself to allow its re-location.

Moore and Shandera said they were the first individuals to inspect the boxes in 1985. In fact, the release authority at the Archives, identified by the written notation on later copies (NND 857013), indicates the year of declassification (1985) and the case number (7013) for the entire file group, not just file T4-14

1846. Yet, Moore's copy of the memo indicates that it was released on 1/12/87.

Questions arise! If the memo was found by Moore and Shandera in 1985, why do they present a copy released two years later? Did they not get a copy when it was found on site? How did the unknown phone caller know the register number unless he went through the file and why didn't he make a copy while there? Where is a copy of the memo with a dated release of 1985? The implication of this is that someone planted the memo before 1987 and set it up to be "officially" discovered and "officially" released by Archives personnel. Why no mention of it by MSF before this year when, as evidenced by our article in the December 1985 *Just Cause*, the topic was already public news and needed to be verified at that point? Why didn't MSF confide in us at that point when we would have helped?

Reese also said that an Archives visitor, not Moore or Friedman, insisted that the memo be stamped with the official National Archives stamp on the front, contrary to Archives policy of stamping the backs of documents. This was certainly to guarantee the appearance of "officiality" when the memo is reproduced. Moore's first release of the memo is the front-stamped copy (Exhibit 8).

In the file T4-1846 along with the Cutler memo is a withdrawal card for an "Air Intelligence Estimate 1/54." The original document was classified and dealt with Soviet aircraft. Question: why would the Cutler memo be filed in the same folder with a document on a completely unrelated topic?

Upon visiting the National Archives on June 25th, this editor had a chance to examine the Cutler memo original. It was in Box 189, Records Group 341, Entry 267. The box was virtually empty except for a few folders containing a small number of non-UFO documents and folders with withdrawal cards. The box had been carefully scanned before declassification and most of the files were removed and replaced with the cards. Question: How did the "Top Secret Restricted" Cutler memo escape the obviously careful sanitizing of the box, though MJ-12 was

supposed to be of extreme sensitivity?

The memo itself was on delicate carbon copy, rice-type paper with the typing in blue carbon impression and a red slash through the security marking. The memo was remarkably clean looking with little sign of 33 years of wear and handling, except for a very slight age browning around the four edges. A watermark, "DICTATION ONION SKIN," could be read and in smaller, less distinct letters a word looking like "FOX," perhaps the manufacturer. Other marking was evident but entirely unreadable.

Reese was in a quandry because, despite his suspicions about the memo, he had to treat it as genuine. He expressed to this editor his opinion that it wasn't genuine but, in lieu of a forger coming forward, it would be extremely difficult to prove. I suggested that the document be given an in-house analysis. The controversy was sure to increase and an analysis might answer some questions. Reese thought it was a good idea so with that I thanked him and left.

While you are digesting this assault on your brain cells, Exhibit 9, coming from the Assistant Director of the Eisenhower Library, gives that institute's conclusions on the Cutler memo and MJ-12.

Finally, a "coup de grace" for the Cutler memo came from the Archives. Exhibit 10 is a disclaimer now being sent to requesters of the memo. It gives a 10-point list of reasons why they feel the Cutler memo "poses problems." The disclaimer is signed by the same individual who was quoted in MSF's press release of June 11th as initially believing that the memo was genuine, based on the simple fact that it was found at the Archives.

DISCUSSION

Pro-MJ-12 people have claimed that security is such at the National Archives that a hoax could not be perpetrated. This editor visited the Archives on June 25th with two file folders full of zeroxed government documents, this to aid in my research into other matters. I signed in at the desk, obtained a researcher's card and walked on in without anyone so much

as peeking at my folders. I spent 45 minutes with Mr. Reese while there, chatting about MJ-12 and UFOs. During that time I had ample opportunity to plant or steal documents while Reese was fielding phone calls.

After our discussion I left with a manilla envelope that Reese kindly provided for my folders full of documents. I went down to the desk at ground level, signed out and left. Again not so much as a look at my envelope. So much for massive security! It would have been easy, had I been so inclined, to plant a single page hidden on my person into a folder. The last I heard the National Archives was not doing a strip search of every patron!

Reese had admitted that there was no way to prevent some "seeding" or thefts, that they just didn't have that kind of security. A recent news story revealed the theft of historic documents from the Archives by an art historian, something Reese told me about well before it ever became news.

MSF's press release of June 11th makes several interesting comments. Acknowledging that they are not in a position to endorse the authenticity of the documents, MSF say, nevertheless, that they *appear* to be genuine and that "nothing has surfaced during the course of our research which would seem to suggest otherwise." They also state that a "detailed and exhaustive study" has been underway since December 1984.

In that two-year study how is it that MSF managed to avoid the negative comments of various agencies and libraries relative to the authenticity of MJ-12? The Truman and Eisenhower libraries would be among the first sources to contact since the key documents came from those administrations. Either MSF contacted those sources, received positive replies, and for some strange reason are withholding results that would help prove their case, or MSF received negative replies and, as such, are misinforming the public in their press release that *nothing* was found casting doubt on the affair. Or MSF did not contact them at all, laying waste to their claim of a detailed and exhaustive study over two years.

Actually a "Majestic" project was

EXHIBIT 2

July 14, 1987

~~TOP SECRET RESTRICTED~~
~~SECURITY INFORMATION~~

MEMORANDUM FOR GENERAL TWINING


SUBJECT: EIC/MJ-12 Special Studies Project

The President has decided that the MJ-12 SSP briefing should take place during the already scheduled White House meeting of July 16, rather than following it as previously intended. More precise arrangements will be explained to you upon arrival. Please alter your plans accordingly.

Your concurrence in the above change of arrangements is assured.

ROBERT CUTLER
Special Assistant
to the President

JAD 85703
7/14/87



found at the Archives but was nothing more than an emergency war plan drafted in 1952. No connection to MJ-12 is at all evident.

MSF's sole support from an expert at the National Archives was a quote in the London Observer by archivist Jo Ann Williamson on May 31, 1987 (MSF Press Release, June 11, 1987, pg.3), when the story was forced into the spotlight by Timothy Good's new book *Above Top Secret*. This support did not develop during the two-year study but only after it hit the press. And, as slim as it was, it was demolished by Williamson herself in the July 22, 1987, National Archives MJ-12 disclaimer.

It would now be a good idea for MSF to publish all the evidence of the exhaustive, two-year study, which they claim totally supports MJ-12, very soon as the story is under considerable assault.

It is also time to see the additional portion of MSF's information; the things that they have publicly stated as having in hand relative to MJ-12. This

information is, by their words, far more sensational than what has already been released. MSF wants a scientific investigation into MJ-12, but have yet to open the book fully on what broadcaster Paul Harvey calls the "rest of the story." Where are those photographs and video tape? Why haven't recent press releases by MSF discussed the "MJ-5" memo and the Aquarius report? Where is the President Carter briefing paper? Let us hear a little more about "EBEs" and the "Highs?" We know MSF have this information and it certainly would be a revelation if what we hear about these things turns out to be true. Why are MSF playing "Project Blue Book" and not releasing the beef?

DISTURBING REVELATION

Now that we know the MJ-12 story is severely flawed, what is the source of this information? Since MSF aren't talking about their sources, we've discovered several things which we

think point in the right direction.

- In 1984, Linda Moulton Howe, who produced the well-known cattle mutilation film *Strange Harvest*, was contacted by a government source to aid in producing a UFO documentary, essentially providing an answer to UFOs. She was invited by the source, briefed on the story, then sworn to secrecy about it until the film's eventual release. The deal was never completed. Details of the story given to her match the MJ-12 tale, along with much extra detail about contacts with "EBEs" (see MJ-12 Briefing Paper), Nordic-style aliens called "Higs" and conflicting alien factions.

- In March 1986, UFO lecturer and researcher Robert Hastings visited with Dr. Paul Bennewitz of the Kirtland 1980 sightings (see *Clear Intent*, Epilog) at his home in Albuquerque, New Mexico, very close to Kirtland AFB. During the interview Hastings reported that Bennewitz used the phrase "Extraterrestrial Biological Entities" to describe the aliens in his UFO activities. The phrase is identical to the MJ-12 Briefing Paper's description of aliens and came a full year before the public release of the MSF papers. How did Bennewitz know this phrase without having been told by someone?

- CAUS Director, Peter Gersten, in a visit with a military intelligence source at Kirtland AFB in 1983, was informed of a wide range of bizarre UFO stories. Included were comments on a briefing paper on UFOs for President Carter, the Cash/Landrum UFO being a government exploitation of UFO technology (something Bennewitz has claimed as well), Bill Moore being "right on" with Roswell, and an admission that the original Project Aquarius cable (see *CAUS Bulletin*, December 1985) on Bennewitz and his UFO photos was "retyped" and not an original cable. This cable was the first mention anywhere of MJ-12 and Project Aquarius.

What links these three incidents together?

- Linda Howe's source was Air Force OSI Special Agent Richard Doty.

- Peter Gersten's interview was with OSI Special Agent Richard Doty.

- Bennewitz was the subject of OSI Special Agent Richard Doty's

investigation of the 1980 Kirtland AFB, N.M., UFO sightings and the two maintained contact thereafter.

Consider also that William Moore has been associated with Doty from the time after the original Kirtland sightings in 1980. Doty's home base, Kirtland, is noted several times in the various MSF papers. Doty knew details of MJ-12 before the December 1984 receipt by MSF of the newly-publicized papers, as evidenced above. Doty was the OSI agent on duty at Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota during the period of the November 1977, Ellsworth hoaxed *Incident Report* in which UFO aliens were said to have engaged in a gun battle with Ellsworth security guards. This from Doty himself to Peter Gersten in 1983.

Question: Is Richard Doty Moore's source for much of the information we are now seeing? We think it is a virtual certainty!

We are also convinced of Doty's involvement in the notorious "Craig Weitzel" hoax letter, which we can discuss sometime in the future.

As a result of all this, we are now forced to reassess the credibility of the now-famous OSI report on the 1980 Kirtland UFO sightings, authored in part by Doty. We had reproduced this as a late entry in *Clear Intent* (Epilog).

FINAL WORD

UFOlogists' comments on MJ-12 have been to the effect that there is no evidence conclusively disproving MJ-12, when they should be saying that there is no evidence conclusively proving MJ-12. What has happened to critical thinking on this affair? This is the bottom line in any scientific or legal investigation. Questions must be answered concisely and completely to satisfy the rules of evidence. A claim must be solidly supported by an interlocking network of facts leading to a logical conclusion. In this case — we have a mess!

Our comments in this article are strictly limited to the MJ-12 documents and associated events of the last few years. We are making no comment or conclusion on the Roswell incident itself. Something crashed there in July 1947. We don't know what. We weren't


there! But in any argument about the incident, it must be conclusively proven that a "spaceship" with aliens, or whatever, came down.

Therefore, we do not regard the MSF documents as convincing proof of the MJ-12 group or the Roswell crash. There are too many hard questions which haven't been answered effectively and MSF's explanations, or in some cases excuses, are nowhere near being decisive. Friedman has used the phrase, "Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence!" in his defense of MJ-12. But neither is it proof of existence!"

To us, MJ-12 is a case of, "You've got to believe it to see it!"

© 1987 *Just Cause*

(Postscript: Acknowledgements go to Peter Gersten, Robert Todd, Robert Hastings, William Steinman, John Lear, Jim Melesciuc, Peter Geremia, Dr. David Jacobs and Marge Christensen for valuable comments and assistance.)



MUFON
103 Oldtowne Rd.
Seguin, Texas
78155

LOOKING BACK

By Bob Gribble

FORTY YEARS AGO—December 1947: No significant reports on file for this period.

* * *

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS AGO—December 1952: A B-29 bomber with a three-man crew was cruising over the Gulf of Mexico — about 100 miles south of the Louisiana coast — just before dawn on the sixth, when several UFOs appeared on the bomber's three radar scopes. The unknowns maneuvered around the bomber at speeds computed at 5240 MPH. All three members of the crew had visual contact with the objects as they streaked past their aircraft. After several minutes of maneuvering around the B-29, the five UFOs, still moving over 5000 MPH, merged with a larger object which appeared on radar as a half-inch blip. Instantly the huge blip began to accelerate and flashed across the three radar scopes at a speed computed to be over 9000 MPH.

Two pilots of an F-94 made visual and radar contact over Odessa, Washington, on the tenth with a large, round white object larger than any known aircraft. A dim reddish-white light came from the object as it hovered, reversed direction almost instantaneously and then disappeared. The object appeared to be level with the intercepting F-94 at 26,000 feet. Airborne radar and visual contact were simultaneous and lasted for 15 minutes. Time of incident was 7:15 PM.

On the 19th, a large UFO was sighted by ground crew personnel at Anderson Air Force Base, Guam, a Naval officer 14 miles south of the base, and from an incoming B-17, 115 miles west of Guam. The object appeared cylindrical in shape, of silvery color with a bright flame trailing from the rear. The speed was considered to be in excess of that of a conventional jet and in each case the sighting did not exceed 45 seconds.

An RB-36 reconnaissance aircraft

was flying northeast of Puerto Rico on the 31st at 8000 feet when the three-man crew observed a large UFO in a clear moonlit sky. The object, which appeared to be a reddish-orange ball of flame, was seen on the horizon and approached the aircraft's left side, passed over the wing at a distance of about 300 feet, and then moved away from the tail and climbed out of sight in a few seconds.

* * *

THIRTY YEARS AGO—December 1957: Howard Hendricksen was driving near Scenic, South Dakota at 5:40 AM on the 18th when a UFO passed directly over his car at an altitude of about 200 feet. He said the craft was tipped on its side, and the bottom which was the only illuminated portion, lit up the area in line with the bottom of the craft "as bright as day." Hendricksen said the craft was huge and "filled the windshield" of his car as he followed it along the badlands road. The top was dome-shaped, as on a frying pan, with what looked like the body of a big bomber sitting on top. Immediately in front of this portion was a dome. He said nothing was illuminated except the bottom, and he couldn't be sure if there were windows in the "bomber body" portion or not. With the exception of the lighted portion, the craft was silver colored. There was no sound. Hendricksen was able to attract the attention of other witnesses who saw the craft briefly as the lighted area turned to a deep orange and in less than 60 seconds rose vertically and disappeared.

* * *

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO—December 1962: A UFO landed at the Ezeiza International Airport near Buenos Aires, Argentina on the 22nd. In the early morning darkness a DC-8 airliner was making its landing approach when the pilots spotted a disc-shaped craft sitting at the end of

the runway as the airport lights came on. When the captain notified the tower a controller told him the craft had just descended to the ground. The disc remained on the ground for a few minutes then ascended and moved out of sight.

* * *

TWENTY YEARS AGO—December 1967: Ashland, Nebraska Police Officer Herb Schirmer spotted a strange lighted object near Highway 6 about 2:30 AM on the second. "As soon as my headlights, which were on bright, struck the object," he said, "I knew it was no truck, and what I saw scared me." He described the craft as elliptical in shape, about the size of a room "perhaps twenty feet long and as much as 14 feet thick," surrounded by lighted portholes. The craft was hovering just a few feet off the ground. It was soundless. The craft soon shot up to about 50 feet, stopped, then went straight up and disappeared.

Under hypnosis Schirmer stated that when he came upon the craft a beam of light was turned on him and also lit up the front end of the patrol car. He also observed a human form (four or five feet tall) emerge from beneath the craft and approach him. He stated the form was shaped like a man. Four other witnesses in the Ashland area reported they saw an object earlier the same night similar to what Schirmer said he saw.

"I felt sick all over and my car was being pulled off the road to the right. It came to a standstill and the engine would not turn over. I saw a round disc, and heard voices coming from it."

The Ithaca, New York woman (name withheld) was driving on Route 34 with her five-year-old son about 6:45 PM on the 12th. "At first I observed red lights in the rear-view mirror. The lights passed my car and I saw a large disc about the size of a box-car hovering at an altitude about the height of a telephone pole. It lit up the inside of my car with a blood-red color. It was so eerie; there was no sound. I became hysterical and shouted to my son, but he would not move and seemed to be in a trance."

At this point her car was pulled off to the side of the road and would not start; the horn did not work and her

lights dimmed. It was a domed, elliptical-shaped object with square red and green windows, a white dome and a bright white light which shone from the center of the object to the ground. "We were in this position for about 10 to 15 minutes. I'm sure it wasn't any longer than that, but it seemed like an eternity." Then she heard a humming sound, she said, although the car windows were closed. "I heard voices. I became completely hysterical and felt like I was being watched. My son would not respond to my cries. I knew the radio was not on."

"Your son will not remember anything; only the fact that the car stopped and then started again," the voices said. After repeated efforts my car started and I fled down the road without looking back. "My child would not respond, but I felt whatever it was, it would not harm me," she said.

* * *

FIFTEEN YEARS AGO—December 1972: Mr. & Mrs. Charles Willis were driving near Millville, New Jersey at 8:50 PM on the seventh when they saw a large cylindrical light, about the size of a small airplane, flying high over the road ahead of them. The light hovered, came down to the tree line and remained in that position for a brief time. When they sped up the road to investigate further, it crossed from one side of the road to the other and disappeared into the woods on the right side of the road. The next day State Police uncovered a cleared site approximately two feet in diameter where the object had reportedly landed. Police said the area was bare of all vegetation and pine needles and in the center was a round hole two inches wide and four inches deep. "It was a real wild area and I don't see how anything could have gotten in there except from above," Trooper Leonard Anderson said.

On the 10th Irene Collins of Skelton, West Virginia, observed "a huge light that came down through the sky," about 9:30 PM. "I just happened to look out and saw it," she said. "It looked like a huge ball 10 feet in diameter or even more that seemed to drift down. I watched it for three or four minutes before it fell to the ground." She said the object shined with a

whiteish-yellow glow. The next day a shallow crater, eight feet in diameter, was found at the site where the ball landed. It resembled a miniature moon crater with material piled up around the perimeter.

* * *

TEN YEARS AGO—December 1977: "There's no doubt in my mind that this craft was intelligently controlled. It seemed to be playing games with us," declared veteran Charlotte, North Carolina, Police Officer Ronald K. Arey, recalling his harrowing close encounter with a dome-shaped UFO. As Arey, 39, maneuvered his police helicopter into tight turns, trying to outflank the UFO, the craft responded — to his amazement — by staying directly behind the chopper's tail. "It scared hell out of me," Arey's partner, patrolman Howard Douglas Dellinger, 32, admitted. And Arey recalled: "It evidently knew what I was doing, because it appeared to be trying to get on my tail as I was trying to get on its tail." Arey and Dellinger were on routine helicopter patrol over Charlotte when they spotted, about 10:55 PM, two lighted objects they believed to be aircraft flying in formation. "But as we got closer I observed there were no navigational lights, no rotating beacons, no strobe lights...no anything," Arey said. Climbing for a closer look, the officers were stunned to see one of the craft suddenly vault from about 1700 feet to about 4000 or 5000 feet in two or three seconds." The second craft was "silver-looking." Bigger than the helicopter, it radiated a strange, bright orange glow and had "a kind of dome over it," Dellinger said. In an instant, the UFO swung past and took up a position behind the chopper.

"I was circling to the left and it started circling to the left, about 150 feet behind me," Arey said. "We were just standing up there doing tailspins, and it looked like it was playing games. But as soon as I could get a look at it, it was right back on my tail." As he boldly played cat and mouse with the UFOs, Arey radioed air traffic control at nearby Douglas Municipal Airport. Traffic Controller Ray Bader, 27, confirmed he had the helicopter on radar, plus a light plane — as well as two

unknown objects. Two of the (radar) targets, he noted, were very close to each other. Dellinger, a veteran of more than eight years as a policeman, was fighting a growing sense of panic. "There's some things you fool with...and I don't think this is one of them," he shouted to Arey, who whipped the chopper around in several complete 360-degree turns in a period of 20 to 30 seconds, hoping for another chance to view the craft close up. That thing bothered me," Dellinger remembered later. "I wanted to get the hell out of there."

But Arey, determined to confront the UFO, suddenly wheeled the chopper around in the opposite direction. He caught a brief glimpse of the craft again, but the game was over. "A ball of fire as big as your fist came out from underneath and dropped down, and the object headed off," Arey recalled. "I gave chase at about 140 MPH, but the object ran off and left me. Then all of a sudden the light went out and we couldn't see anything else."

Bader confirmed that when Arey chased the UFO, it disappeared on the radar screen. Moments later, air traffic control radioed that they had something else on the screen. "We turned and there was an object in the sky...same thing we had sighted before," Arey said. As the helicopter closed fast, the UFO simply vanished. "When (Arey) said he had lost the second (unknown) aircraft, we didn't see it any longer on the radar, either," Bader said.

MUFON

**40 YEARS
IS LONG
ENOUGH**

Fund for **UFO** Research

CENTRAL EUROPEAN STUDIES

By Illobrand von Ludwiger

The following paper was read by Dr. H. Theodore Auerbach, MUFON's representative for Switzerland, at the MUFON International Meeting in London, July 13, 1987. Mr. Von Ludwiger is MUFON-CES director.

The German speaking group MUFON Central European Section, MUFON-CES for short was founded in 1975. It now numbers about 40 active members in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. Membership is by invitation only and presently consists of 15 physicists and mathematicians, 11 engineers, and 13 astronomers, biologists, chemists, medical doctors, and other scientifically trained individuals from 10 universities and from industry.

Our chief aim is to raise the discussion of UFOs to a level of serious scientific inquiry. For this purpose it is necessary to get other scientists interested in the topic. We do not officially engage in public information, since this activity is carried out by other groups in our countries.

The papers presented at our annual meetings are worked out in detail and published in the form of proceedings, each volume containing some 200-500 pages. Altogether we have published more than 2700 pages of text in German so far. In addition, members give public talks and write articles and books on an individual basis.

UFOs should be analyzed from both physical and psychological points of view, but only the physical examination can be conducted in an objective manner free from contradictions. Unfortunately, among the more than 50 UFO sightings investigated by us so far there were hardly any electromagnetic cases. In a first step we searched the available literature and set up special data catalogs, comprising:

- 1319 cases of electromagnetic

and gravitational interactions in the vicinity of UFOs.

- 552 cases of strange behavior of animals.
- 350 cases of different types of UFOs.
- 150 psychological effects.
- 128 solid light cases.
- 85 cases of UFOs accompanied by intense light emission.
- 117 UFOs observed by astronomers.

SOLID OBJECT

Next, we analyzed the phenomenological spectrum of sightings and reached the conclusion that a solid object, interacting physically with its surroundings, is at the core of the UFO phenomenon. Luminous phenomena like ball lightning, will-o'-the-wisps, and paranormal light effects on the one hand, and CE-IV experiences and psychological projections according to C.G. Jung on the other are borderline cases which should be attributed to UFOs only after thorough investigation. Accordingly, we have concentrated our efforts on the physical aspects of the phenomenon and less on the psychological reaction of witnesses.

Theoretical studies were carried out for the purpose, among other things, of finding answers to questions such as:

- What physical mechanism can lead to the extreme brightness in the air surrounding UFOs? (1977, 1983)
- Is it possible for laser or particle beams to produce solid light? (1978)
- Does today's physics allow the generation of antigravity? (1975, 1983)
- Is it theoretically possible for solid objects to appear and disappear? (1978)
- Which physical theories permit the displacement of objects between widely separated points? (1978)

One result was that there indeed exist unified field theories of matter and gravitation able to provide at least a qualitative answer to these questions. This implies that from an astrophysical viewpoint the extraterrestrial hypothesis can no longer be excluded, provided the theories mentioned are verified by experiments on elementary particles.

We also tried to find answers to problems of historical interest, such as:

- Can one find a technical interpretation of the "air wars" mentioned in old Indian manuscripts?
- Do Sumerian writings contain reports on extraterrestrial visitors?
- Are UFOs shown in illustrations of medieval single leaf printings?
- How frequent were UFO sightings in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries? (1976, 1983)
- What were the "foo-fighters" of World War II? (1978)

These investigations reveal that objects, whose characteristics were similar to those of today's unidentified light phenomena already were observed in the 17th century (1976). However, sightings were fewer in number than those of will-o'-the-wisps and paranormal light phenomena.

We carefully analyzed once again a sample containing 17% of the Blue Book material (1981) and came to the conclusion that the reports were clearly distorted by the generally prejudiced attitude prevalent among investigators. All documents are characterized by lack of carefulness, lack of familiarity with scientific methodology, and by improper application of statistics. The number of case histories remaining unevaluated due to allegedly insufficient information is five times as great as the number of objects claimed to be unidentifiable. The material is well suited for *not* confirming any hypothesis.

SOVIET DATA

Through various channels we were able to secure about 600 manuscript pages of Russian Samisdat material about UFO sightings and theories, including full names and addresses of witnesses. The most interesting reports were translated by us into German and published in our conference reports (1981). The documentation shows that EM-cases, CE-III events, and abduction cases with hypnotic regression occur in the USSR, too.

In contrast to witnesses in the West, Russians seem to be less concerned about ridicule than they are about being questioned by the secret police. It might be mentioned that the Petrosawodsk sighting in 1977 cannot be interpreted as a rocket launched at about that time in Plesetsk, 125 miles away, as James Oberg has contended, because the phenomenon was observed for 5 minutes under a low cloud ceiling.

In a medical study, physiological and psychological effects of UFO radiation were compared to those of electromagnetic irradiation. Statistical methods for electronic data analysis were developed and suggestions were

made for an automatic registration of UFOs (1981). A number of reliability studies were concerned with data evaluation and the credibility of witnesses. The following topics were investigated:

- The value of psychological tests for obtaining objective statements from witnesses.

- Methods of photoanalysis for the discovery of hoaxes (1976).

- Possibilities and limitations of hypnotic regression as a source of information.

New methods of checking on the reliability of witnesses.

- The psychological effects of a culture shock initiated by sudden contacts, as demonstrated by the example of the Melanesians and Tasadays.

Throughout our work we have emphasized the application of scientific methods of investigation. We could demonstrate the correctness of these methods when they were applied to the interrogation of witnesses and to the theoretical treatment of problems. Criticism by sceptics is, in general, psychologically motivated and not the

product of scientific considerations. A procedure may be termed unscientific or pseudoscientific only if the method employed is wrong, not merely because it is applied to "strange" phenomena, such as UFOs.

At present we are engaged in completing the tenth MUFON-CES conference report and in various other activities, including the analysis of UFO case histories with the aid of IBM PC's personal computers and an H.P. 9000 computer with colored, real-time graphics, the investigation of an abduction and solid light case in Germany, and the setting up of a consistent terminology for the most frequent UFO types.

A number of abduction witnesses await being questioned under hypnosis. Unfortunately, the medical hypnotist and head of a clinic with whose help we investigated the CE-III case of Langenargen (1977) is no longer at our disposal due to chronic lack of time. Lack of time of our members is, in fact, the main obstacle in our research. It also is the reason for my failure to be personally present at this meeting. Best regards to all MUFON members.

UFOs SCIENTIFICALLY LEGITIMATE

By Irena Scott

Irena Scott is a MUFON consultant in physiology.

"No scientific investigation of the UFO problem has been carried out during the entire twenty-two year period between the first extensive wave of sightings of unidentified flying objects in the summer of 1947 and the convening of this symposium." The above statement was made by the late Dr. James E. McDonald at the UFO symposium held by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) in 1969. Even now, 17 years later, it is still true. Why?" (MUFON UFO Journal, August, 1986.)

The above quotation is similar to numerous others which indicate that UFO studies are not accepted by

science. This purported lack of scientific acceptance results in the impression that anyone who believes this phenomenon is odd, illogical, crazy, a mystical believer, or perhaps subject to worse aberrations. This attitude is demoralizing to those engaged in sound studies of the phenomenon.

Is this perception correct? How can one establish whether or not the study of the UFO phenomenon is acceptable to science? First, one needs to establish criteria. One such criterion is to determine whether there are reviewed papers of original research on this subject in scientific journals (the scientific literature), which consider the possibility that UFO phenomena can be a distinct class rather than an IFO

subclass. A general guide to what constitutes scientific literature might be those publications listed in the *Science Citation Index*. In order to test the premise that UFO observations are not scientifically acceptable, I submitted one original research paper on UFO observations to a reviewed scientific journal and two abstracts about aspects of the UFO phenomenon to two scientific societies. All were accepted with little trouble.

By this criterion (a reasonable one), statements that the study of UFO phenomenon is unacceptable to science are false. Not only is it possible to publish studies which "explain" the UFO phenomenon in the scientific literature, it is also possible to publish those which suggest its further

examination. UFOlogists, then, should think of their subject as of interest to science and publishable in scientific journals.

METHODS

The scientific method, which includes observing nature, classifying data, and forming and testing hypotheses, obviously includes study of the UFO phenomenon. Acceptable reasons for collecting UFO observations are:

1) In accordance with the empirical method of science, it is permissible to make and record any observation, even if it is unexplained, not in agreement with current theory, and no one believes in it. For example, there were written descriptions of supernovae before their current scientific explanation existed.

2) Observations can be made in instances when no hard evidence exists. "Hard evidence" is defined by current paradigms. For example, neither a meteorite nor a meteorite crater would have been accepted as "hard evidence" in the 1700's, because scientists did not believe that rocks fell from the sky. Similarly, the argument that UFOs can't exist because no one has captured one is not convincing, because no laboratory rat has captured a scientist. There is no reason to assume that all phenomena are under human control. Exploring an unknown because of scientific curiosity is justifiable scientifically and is not the same thing as believing in it.

3) It is illogical to say that because some UFO observations are explainable by prosaic means, all are. One should not "solve" an unknown by believing that it is known, or by extrapolating known cases to include it. Each case should be solved individually.

4) The scientific method has not necessarily been used in purported scientific studies of UFO observations. For example, the Condon Committee Report lists 23 of the 59 cases they studied as unexplained. However, they concluded, "Our general conclusion is that nothing has come from the study of UFOs in the past 21 years that has added to scientific knowledge." This does not follow scientific methodology

because, the conclusion is not in agreement with the results nor with the 95% confidence limit generally used for (explained) data.

5) Proving that UFOs exist, or looking for a perfect case may be a poor way to examine the UFO evidence, because the phenomenon might exist but not provide evidence that people can understand. The current methodology of science is based upon statistical examination of many examples. One data point has little chance of standing by itself. For example, before the concept that rocks could fall from the sky was accepted, a survey might have shown differences between the population of people witnessing events matching meteor observations and those regularly seeing pink elephants.

6) It would not necessarily cost too much to finance UFO research. The government's 1988 budget proposals show the military's share of the R&D budget to be 72% (Feb. 6, *Science* 1987). This money includes funds for development of such controversial "advances" as Star Wars.

After the initial observations of a phenomenon, additional scientific methods may be used depending on the data and the state of current expertise. For example, the human race is believed to have accepted the idea of a spherical earth revolving around the sun during the last few hundred of its purported 40,000 years of existence. Since people have only been exposed to the UFO concept for 40 years, we may not be able to handle some of the concepts needed to understand it. As an example, the spread of the black plaque might have been prevented had people determined how the infestation was transmitted; but, people had no concept of life forms that they couldn't see, thus, no laboratory manipulation took place.

HYPOTHESES

However the testing and falsification of hypotheses is possible and much should be done with the abundance of existing UFO data. For example, if UFO sightings are the result of misidentification, there is no obvious reason to hypothesize a greater

misidentification rate in one place than another. However, the results of *Project Blue Book Special Report #14*, showed differences between sections of the country and, in addition, Maccabee has calculated that this distribution did not correlate with population density (*Historical Introduction to Project Blue Book Special Report #14*, 1979). Thus, the hypothesis has been falsified.

Another test can be made with the time distribution of the number of reports. One could hypothesize that misidentifications should occur at the same rate during different years. However, the results of Project Blue Book's monthly summary of the number of reports received for the years, 1950 - mid 1967 show large significant differences (chi square) can exist during random sampling of different sequential years. Thus, the hypothesis of misidentification is thrown into doubt. Sufficient data exist for the examination of many other possibilities:

1) UFOs may be sensory and/or perception errors -- In this instance the subject should be studied because it is necessary to find out why large groups such as the reported fifty thousand witnesses at Fatima, the many observations by scientifically trained people, and all the other good observations, occur. It is vital to understand this sort of phenomenon now because of the possibility that military "advances" can destroy humanity. Misidentification by only a few people could result in mass annihilation. In addition, location of missiles and their computer controls may allow only a few minutes for life or death decisions.

2) Not all UFOs are misidentifications -- In this case an attempt should be made to find out what unexplained possible UFOs are. This may come about by present day methods of science; however, it is possible that observations will be unexplained. It should also be considered that some UFO phenomena might represent life forms capable of manipulating evidence.

3) New theories, reasoning, and social and scientific changes may be important to the UFO phenomenon. The quantum theory, for example,

introduces people to such concepts as observer-dependent phenomena, experiments suggesting that interactions can occur that are not limited by the speed of light, the idea that the human brain may produce reality, multiple universes, and a questioning of the idea of cause and effect. All of these ideas may be important to the UFO phenomenon. For example, the debunkers have always maintained that possible extra-terrestrial life forms could not travel to earth because the speed of light would be a limitation.

4) Biblical and other religious ideas may be important or vital.

CONCLUSIONS

There is an advantage to UFOlogists and to humanity in noting that observations of the UFO phenomenon are acceptable to science. Scientific acceptance will improve the investigation of the phenomenon, result in wider dissemination of information, scientific and public scrutiny, and better data collection. In addition, the study of the possible group of unexplainable cases may push forth the frontiers of science.

UFOlogists should submit more research to scientific publications. If papers are rejected, the reviewer's comments should be published to ascertain whether the rejections are for sound reasons. The idea that UFOlogy is scientifically acceptable should be considered as a viewpoint in UFO publicity campaigns. It should be noted that differences exist between the scientific and the debunker viewpoints and that UFOlogists have as valid a claim to a scientific viewpoint as debunkers do. With more scientific publications, UFOlogy might have increased respectability, additional grant funding, and increased leverage for obtaining information from government sources.

**MUTUAL
UFO
NETWORK**

MEIER, Continued

pigeonhole as opposed to a physical one.

Apples and oranges, as we know, cannot be added without a fundamental change in category. And the taste of one neither proves — nor disproves — the existence of the other.

MESSAGE, Continued

UFOlogy" was published in the October 1987 issue number 234 of the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, since it was not included in the published proceedings. In the future, we hope to publish the paper submitted by **Vincente-Juan Ballester Olmos**, titled "Characteristics of Close Encounters in Spain," assisted by **Joachim A. Fernandes**.

REVIEW, Continued

works) admirably lives up to the Tomes hard earned reputation: timely, lively and exhaustive.

UFOs 1947-1987 is equally suitable as an introduction to an inherently fascinating subject in all of its ramifications or as a handbook of contemporary ufological research and thought. Though possibly difficult to track down, it's the sort of publication one wishes could become an annual affair. If your bookstore can't find a copy, try contacting the publisher at 1 Shoebury Road, East Ham, London, England, E6 2AQ, or Bob Girard's Arcturus Book Service, 4431 Village Square Lane, Stone Mountain, GA, 30083. The price is about \$25.

**SUPPORT
THE
SYMPOSIUM
JUNE 24-26
1988**

UFO NEWSCLIPPING SERVICE

The UFO NEWSCLIPPING SERVICE will keep you informed of all the latest United States and World-Wide UFO activity, as it happens! Our service was started in 1969, at which time we contracted with a reputable international newspaper-clipping bureau to obtain for us, those hard to find UFO reports (i.e., little known photographic cases, close encounter and landing reports, occupant cases) and all other UFO reports, many of which are carried only in small town or foreign newspapers.

"Our UFO Newsclipping Service issues are 20-page monthly reports, reproduced by photo-offset, containing the latest United States and Canadian UFO newsclippings, with our foreign section carrying the latest British, Australian, New Zealand and other foreign press reports. Also included is a 3-5 page section of "Fortean" clippings (i.e. Bigfoot and other "monster" reports). Let us keep you informed of the latest happenings in the UFO and Fortean fields."

For subscription information and sample pages from our service, write today to:

UFO NEWSCLIPPING SERVICE
Route 1 — Box 220
Plumerville, Arkansas 72127

Lawrence Fawcett and Barry J. Greenwood

**CLEAR
INTENT**



**THE GOVERNMENT COVERUP
OF THE UFO EXPERIENCE**

What does the government know about UFOs and why won't it tell us?

With a foreword by Dr. J. Allen Hynek

UFOs: 1947-1987 REVIEWED

By Dennis Stacy

This review originally appeared in "California UFO," 6 issues, \$15, 1800 S. Robertson Blvd., #355, LA, CA, 90035.

Lovers of the odd and unusual have long relished the lively, and often as not, irreverent *Fortean Times* of London, co-edited by Bob Rickard and Paul Sieveking. A graphically illustrated journal of all things anomalous, from spontaneous human combustion and "Nessie," to UFOs and toads entombed in stone, the *Times* takes its name from the iconoclastic American collector of same, Charles Fort (1874-1932).

The tightly-packed quarterly has earned a reputation for its mordant, bordering on black, humor, an encyclopedic reach of subject matter, meticulous attention to annotation (and attribution for credit where's it due), and a list of regular contributors that reads like a Who's Who of Fortean phenomena, or forteana, for short.

Last summer the dynamic duo behind the *Times* ventured into fullscale book publishing, and for most of us the results couldn't be more felicitous. The new imprint is called Fortean Tomes, and its first publication is a mammoth collection (384 pages of closely packed print and pictures) containing more than 50 essays on virtually every aspect of the UFO phenomenon imaginable, from its worldwide scope to its implications for both individuals and society.

Designed to commemorate Kenneth Arnold's "first-of-its-kind" 1947 sighting, the book has been dubbed *UFOs 1947-1987: The 40-Year Search for an Explanation*. Compiled and edited by Hilary Evans (with John Spencer) for BUFORA, the British UFO Research Association, *UFOs* is a truly international compilation, with contributors weighing in from Poland, France, the United Kingdom, Canada, Zimbabwe, Spain, Belgium, Australia,

Sweden, and of course the United States. Contributions from China, Japan, the Middle East, and certain Third World countries would have been appreciated, but the editors are to be congratulated for ranging as far afield as they did, given the budget and deadline considerations under which they had to work.

As it is, readers will find the time and expense of searching out a copy worth the effort. There is much here that one would not normally expect to find between two covers, and for the most part the attention to detail and quality is what we've come to expect from Fort's heir apparents. The volume itself is what we would call a trade-size, quality paperback, with stiff, glossy covers, front and back, depicting a colorful variety of other UFO book and journal covers that have appeared over the last forty years.

Many of the contributors will already be well known to American readers, including John Keel on the Maury Island caper, Jacques Vallee on the use of computers, Leonard Stringfield on crash/retrievals, and others. Others may already be familiar with English ufologists like Jenny Randles and John Rimmer, editor of *Magonia*. Editor Evans contributes several pieces himself, including an introduction, and fills in where someone else probably missed a deadline.

The result is a compendium of approaches and viewpoints that manages to avoid leaning too heavily in favor of any one editorial philosophy. Writers, chosen for their expertise in a particular area, are simply allowed to have their say. Contents are divided into five major sections, covering UFO phenomena, assessment of same, explanations, social implications, and the role of skepticism. Appendices include a list of current international UFO organizations and books about UFOs, rated as either "essential"

reading, "recommended," or "an important regional study." An index would have been an added delight, but its absence is hard to quibble about in light of the overall project and the fact that separate articles are arranged by subject matter in a more or less chronological and comprehensive table of topics.

Under "The Phenomena," for example, one finds sections about UFOs before 1947, UFOs and the African tribal system, UFOs as a global phenomenon, UFOs in the Soviet Union, UFO occupants, contactees and abductions, and so on. "Assessing the Phenomena" deals with how to investigate UFOs, how to define UFOs, physical traces, effects on humans, radar returns, witnesses and related topics. The various hypotheses put forth to explain UFOs in all their myriad manifestations are treated in a third section. Here one encounters Swedish "ghost rockets," extraterrestrials, *ultraterrestrials*, so-called "spook-lights," an analysis of theoretical UFO propulsion systems, "space critters," and all other sorts of "explanations" offered over the last four decades and beyond. At the very least, one comes away well educated to the realization that we are no longer talking about the simple "daylight discs" and "nocturnal lights" of years past.

Section five, "UFOs and Society," looks at the psychological and social implications inspired by the UFO phenomenon, including pieces on UFOs and scientists, UFO cults, comparisons with religious folklore, and even UFOs in the cinema.

Selecting "favorite" selections from the above would be an exercise in futility. Suffice it to say, to coin a cliché, that there is something here for everyone. The first of the Fortean Tomes (at least a half dozen volumes on different subjects are in the immediate

(continued on page 22)

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

by
Walt Andrus

The MUFON Board of Directors and Staff take this opportunity to convey Season's Greetings to our members throughout the world by wishing each and everyone a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. While we are celebrating the conclusion of a memorable year in Ufology, our monthly magazine, the MUFON UFO JOURNAL (formerly SKYLOOK) observed its 20th anniversary of publication during Septmeber 1987. This is a tribute to **Norma E. Short** and the dedicated editors who followed in her footsteps, elevating the publication into the finest monthly UFO magazine in the world.

Several State Section Directors have been reassigned to new counties after changing their residences. **Ralph Savarese**, a retired Methodist Minister, is now responsible for Harrison, Jackson and Hancock Counties in Mississippi; **Jack Poorbough**, living in Jensen Beach, Florida, has been assigned to St. Lucie and Martin Counties; **Norma J. White**, formerly living in West Virginia, is the new Section Director for Wicomico, Worcester and Somerset Counties in Maryland; and **Don Mason**, former State Director for Idaho, has returned to the U.S.A. from Canada to accept the position of State Section Director for Ada, Boise, Canyon, Elmore Fayette and Gem Counties in Idaho.

John Lear, State Director for Nevada, has appointed **Morgan Clements** as the new State Section Director for Lincoln and Nye Counties. **Mrs. Judith M. Diliberto** has recommended that **Kevin Lammens** of Babylon, New York replace her as State Section Director for Suffolk County on Long Island. **Kenneth Ring**, Ph. D., a professor at the University of Connecticut, has accepted the position of Consultant in Psychology.

State Directors have been

receiving copies of the Field Investigator's Examination to administer to their members, attached to a cover sheet of instructions, and a blank answer sheet. **Mrs. Shirley A. Coyne**, 73 Borman, Flushing, MI 48433-9239 will grade all examinations and submit the results to the individual, the State Director and MUFON headquarters.

The MUFON 1988 UFO Symposium will be held on June 24, 25 and 26, 1988 at the Nebraska Center Hotel, University of Nebraska in Lincoln, hosted by MUFON of Nebraska. **Ray W. Boeche** and **Scott Colburn** will chair the host committee. **Walt Andrus**, in conjunction with the host committee, has started extending invitations to the featured speakers. Special hotel rates for the symposium will be \$35 for single occupancy and \$38 for double occupancy plus tax per night. The Nebraska Center will hold 90 double hotel rooms for symposium participants. Should additional housing accomodations be required, they can arrange for overflow in adjacent hotel/motel properties.

With the promotion of **Dan Wright** to Deputy Director of Investigations on the MUFON Executive Committee, a vacancy now exists for Central Regional Director on the MUFON Board of Directors. Dan will continue to fill the position of Investigative Coordinator in his new capacity. An election will be conducted in early 1988 to elect a Central Regional Director by the members in the Central States, composed of the following states: ND, SD, NE, KS, OK, TX, MN, IA, MO, AR, LA, WI, IL, IN, MI, KY, TN, AL and OH. Any current members desiring to be a candidate should contact your State Director so that he/she may submit your name in nomination. All candidates names must be received by MUFON headquarters by January 30, 1988. A primary election will be held if over six candidates are nominated with the ballots being

enclosed in the MUFON UFO JOURNAL. The term of the new Board Member will be 4 years. (State Directors are eligible and may nominate themselves if they so desire.) Nominations are now being accepted.

Edward F. Mazur, State Director for Arkansas, has nominated **Bill Pitts**, former State Director for Arkansas and presently a State Section Director for the above post. Mr. Pitts was the sponsor and chairman of the very successful Fort Smith (Arkansas) UFO Conference held in 1975. Please give this matter serious thought and advise your State Director.

The Fund for UFO Research, host for the recent MUFON 1987 International UFO Symposium held on campus at The American University in Washington, DC, has a variety of important publications, books, video tapes (VHS or Beta), audio tapes of the symposium speakers and research papers that are available for purchase. Please request "Reply Form 2Q87" for this extensive list by writing to: Fund for UFO Research, P.O. Box 277, Mt. Rainier, MD 20712.

The Fund for UFO Research has only two sources of income to support its activities: contributions and sales of documents and other educational materials. Contributions to the Fund are 100% tax deductible; the price of documents is 50% tax deductible.

The MUFON 1987 International UFO Symposium Proceedings (222 pages) is available from MUFON for \$15 plus \$1.50 for postage and handling. It contains all of the papers presented by the featured speakers that were received before the proceedings went to press on June 1, 1987. The theme is: "International Symposium on Unidentified Aerial Phenomena: 1947-1987." **Stanton T. Friedman's** symposium paper titled "Canadian

(continued on page 22)