


MUTUAL UFO NETWORK UFO JOURNAL

February 2001

NUMBER 393 \$3



The Hyatt Regency-Irvine in Orange County, CA, site of the MUFON 2001 International UFO Symposium July 20-22, 2001.

MUFON
UFO Journal

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

Editor:

Dwight Connelly
14026 Ridgelawn Road
Martinsville, IL 62442
Tel: (217) 382-4502
e-mail:
mufonufjournal@hotmail.com

Columnists:

Walter N. Webb
Richard Hall
George Filer
Jenny Randles

Staff Artist

Wes Crum

MUFON on Compuserve
"Go MUFON"
to access the Forum

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

MUFON e-mail address:
mufonhq@aol.com

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

February 2001

Number 394

In this issue

Reasons to attend Symposium by Jan Harzman3
Georgia FIT's observe object by Tom Sheets.....4
Smith and possible cover-up by Bruno A. Molon.....5
Why government hides the truth by Elaine Douglass....6
Most crop circles not hoaxes by Jim Deardorff.....8
UFO abduction reported in Chile.....9
Filer's Files by George A. Filer.....10
MUFON Forum.....13
The UFO Press.....15
Stress management for ufologists by John Schuessler....16
A view from Britain by Jenny Randles.....18
Perspective by Richard H. Hall.....21
The Night Sky by Walter N. Webb.....22
Calendar.....22
Director's Message by John Schuessler.....24

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

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

Copyright 2001 by the Mutual UFO Network. All Rights Reserved

No part of this document may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the Copyright Owners. Permission is hereby granted to quote up to 200 words of any one article, provided the author is credited, and the statement, "Copyright 2001 by the Mutual UFO Network, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369" is included.

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

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

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

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



Ten reasons to go to Southern California for the 2001 MUFON International Symposium

By Jan Harzan

July 20-21 is fast approaching, and you may be wondering where you should spend your summer vacation. Well, I have a few ideas for you. Here are my Top 10 reasons for bringing the whole family and coming to the 2001 MUFON International Symposium in beautiful Southern California.

10. **DISNEYLAND.** The original Walt Disney theme park opened in 1955 and it is still the biggest southland attraction bar none. Over 70,000 visitors stream through its gates on a daily basis and the park has recently been completely refurbished with new rides and attractions as well as a spectacular parade down mainstreet USA. You won't want to miss this one even if you have been there one hundred times.

9. **CALIFORNIA ADVENTURE.** Disney's NEW all-star attraction adjacent to Disneyland opening in 2001 with a BANG! Be the first in your neighborhood to experience the thrill of this new Theme Park and go home to tell all your friends about it. Destined to become a Disney classic.

8. **SOUTH COAST PLAZA.** A short free shuttle bus ride from the hotel is the world famous South Coast Plaza shopping center with over 150 shops and restaurants for even the most discerning shopper. It is connected by a spectacular sky bridge to the Crystal Court Shopping Center and another 50 plus shops just across the street. This is easily an all day affair for even the most adventurous shopper.

7. **BEAUTIFUL BEACHES.** In July the temperatures will be in the low 80's, and with dozens of beautiful beaches just ten minutes away, like Huntington Beach, Newport Beach and Laguna Beach, you will want to grab your beach towel and suntan lotion and head down to enjoy the waves or lie out in the sun and enjoy a good suntan.

6. **KNOTT'S BERRY FARM.** Always in the shadow

of Disneyland, Knott's Berry Farm more than makes up for it with it's thrill rides and down home style. Touted as America's First Themed Park, this is one attraction if you haven't been, you should put on your list. It is 150 acres of thrilling rides, exciting attractions, outstanding live entertainment, fascinating historic exhibits, world-famous dining and one-of-a-kind specialty shops. The GhostRider has been rated #2 among roller coasters and thrill rides worldwide.

5. **CATALINA ISLAND.** Twenty-one miles off the coast of California is Catalina Island and the city of Avalon. You've heard about it in songs and as a location for many movies filmed in Southern California. Now you can go there! A short \$36 round-trip ride on the Catalina Flyer and you and your family can spend a day, or several days, on the island. Island tours are available when you arrive, and there is a museum and the world famous Casino. Or take the circle island tour, spend the day shopping in Avalon or lie on the beach and get tanned. Lots to do. This makes a great day trip for couples or an entire family!

4. **QUEEN MARY.** Just 30 minutes away in Long Beach you can step back in time and visit one of the most elegant ships of its day. Originally built in 1936 and described as a floating city awash in elegance, the Queen Mary, listed on the National Register of Historic Places, remains one of the most famous ships in history. For years, paranormal experts have believed that the Queen Mary is haunted. Passengers and crewmembers alike have reported numerous eerie sightings. Who knows, perhaps you will be lucky enough to have a sighting of your own.

3. **LONG BEACH AQUARIUM.** The Newest Aquarium in America and perhaps one of the best is the Long Beach Aquarium of the Pacific. 16 exhibits on two levels offer visitors a chance to explore the largest body of water on the Earth—the Pacific Ocean. See jelly fish, sea turtles, seals and sea lions, pet a stingray in an open tank, and ogle in awe at an 88' full-scale model of a Blue Whale suspended from the ceiling. This aquarium has been win-

ning awards since the day it opened.

2. **HOLLYWOOD and UNIVERSAL STUDIOS.** A short hour drive north from your hotel is the city of Hollywood. Home to movie stars, Grauman's Chinese Theater and the Sidewalk of the Stars. Or trip over to Universal Studios to spend the day and check out the NEW attraction Terminator 2 in 3D.

1. **VISIT SAN DIEGO.** Just an hour South is the beautiful city of San Diego with its pristine beaches and family attractions of SEA WORLD, WILD ANIMAL PARK and the world famous SAN DIEGO ZOO. Worth the drive and you can easily spend a day at any one of these wonderful attractions. Just the drive along the Southern California Coastline to get there is worth the trip.

The real reason

Of course the REAL reason you will want to come to Southern California is to attend the 2001 MUFON International Symposium. We have landed a 5 Star hotel in the Hyatt Irvine at the incredible discount price of \$89 per night for double occupancy, compared to the regular room rate of \$225.

For families up to four the hotel has agreed to provide extra beds at the SAME INCREDIBLE \$89 PRICE. Not only that, but they have agreed to extend the price forward and backward two days so that you can spend a full 7 days at the hotel at this low, low price while enjoying all the scenery and attractions of Southern California listed above, or just hang out at the hotel and relax and enjoy their pool, tennis courts and restaurants.

To reserve a room now just call the Hyatt at 949-975-1234 and mention that you want the MUFON Conference rate of \$89. Reserve NOW!!!

To register for the conference go to www.mufonoc.org and send us your information online or print out the form for the conference and mail it in before April 20, 2001, for a \$20 discount off the \$109 price of the conference, or the entire two day conference for ONLY \$89. Why wait? Do it TODAY!!!

Saucer-shaped object reported near Coral Springs, Florida

A 43-year-old educator reported seeing on Dec. 23, 2000, a saucer-shaped object with a dome at an altitude of 500 feet or less. The object was north of Coral Springs, only 250 feet away from the observer's position at 8 a.m.

The saucer flew back and fourth at high speed and appeared metallic. Its lights dimmed and eventually disappeared. The witness said, "I felt helpless, but I got a picture of it, but it turned out blurry." There was rain and a cloud cover.

-MUFON's Worldwide UFO Database. <http://www.mufon.com/>, 1 (800) UFO-2166

Georgia FITs observe object

By Tom Sheets

MUFON Georgia State Director

On Jan. 3, 01, MUFON Georgia (MUFONGA) Field Investigator Trainees (FITs) Carl and Helen Thim of Fayetteville were driving west on Hwy 54 just outside of Fayetteville proper. At 5:32 p.m., twilight conditions, Helen noticed a glowing object in the sky about 30 degrees off of the SW horizon. Closer observation revealed it to be acorn-shaped with a rounded top, about thumbnail size, and glowing with a yellowish light, also appearing to have a mist-like vapor at the top.

As they continued westbound in traffic, she observed it to begin a slow descent of about 5 degrees, leaving what appeared to be a misty trail tracing the descent. She pointed this out to her husband Carl, who was trying to drive and observe. About this time, they reached the central area of town and noticed two jet-like contrails in the sky near the object. These contrails appeared to circle in the sky as if in reaction to what was being observed, but no aircraft were seen.

About this same time an unknown type of helicopter was observed flying north away from Fayetteville. Helen added that before their visual was lost, the object did a Z-shaped maneuver in the sky. Upon arriving home, she phoned the Fayette County Sheriff's Department and was advised that their agency had received no other calls regarding the object.

The Thims were later perplexed when comparing notes on what they had observed. Carl, although driving, got a pretty good look, and his account agreed with Helen's except for one peculiar aspect. Carl observed the object to be of a definite disc configuration (silver).

It should be noted that this team has conducted several excellent investigations and are widely respected in MUFONGA as objective and professional operatives. Also both are former aerospace employees, Carl being seconded from Boeing to the Pacific Missile Range for 5 years and working as an electronics specialist in the manned space program. He is currently a senior instructor with a large aviation corporation.

The sky over Fayetteville is frequently full of commercial aircraft in holding patterns awaiting clearance to land at Atlanta's Hartsfield Airport (about 15 miles to the north). The viewing conditions during this event appeared to be rather good even for twilight, and mistaking a commercial aircraft seems highly unlikely for these two experienced observer/investigators.

Other possibilities are currently being examined by both the Thims and this SD. It should be noted that there are similar cases in which two or more reliable witnesses in close proximity observe the same phenomena, but each describe different object types and/or different details.

Canada's Wilbert Smith: back-engineering & possible cover-up by U.S. Government?

By Bruno A. Molon
SSD Lake County, IN

In 1950 Wilbert Smith, senior radio engineer for the Canadian Department of Transport, was contemplating a project to harness the energy of the earth's magnetic field to do useful work, such as lift a vehicle.¹

In that year Smith had read two books on flying saucers: One was *Flying Saucers Are Real* by Major Donald Keyhoe. The other was *Behind the Flying Saucers* by Frank Scully. Smith was intrigued by what he had read and was anxious to find out if these books were on the level and represented actual fact. If so, perhaps knowledge gained from the study of flying saucers could be applied to Smith's geo-magnetics research.²

Smith contacted Keyhoe, and the two engaged in a constructive collaboration. Interestingly, the available document trail demonstrates that Keyhoe and Smith had some access to Dr. Vannevar Bush, although on what level and in what capacity remains uncertain.³

Using his position with the Department of Transport, Smith was able to make "discreet inquiries" through the Canadian Embassy in Washington to highly-placed American officials concerning what they may have found out about flying saucers. Smith was given at least one and possibly more briefings by American scientists connected to a super-secret core project charged with back-engineering flying saucer technology which quite literally fell into American hands.

One of these scientists was Dr. Robert I. Sarbacher, as was learned from Smith's personal notes on the interview, which were found by researchers many years later.⁴ Sarbacher was located by researchers in the 1980's and confirmed not only the meeting with the Canadians, but also his involvement in the subject matter, however limited.⁵

Smith was cleared to receive further information and contribute to the American project. Obviously, the American scientists thought that Smith and his theories might be of some use to them.⁶ More on that later.

After consulting with his boss, Dr. Omond Solandt, Smith wrote a lengthy memo to C. P. Edwards, controller of telecommunications for Canada, hinting at what had been revealed to him and requesting the creation of Project Magnet. This was known as the Geo-Magnetics memo of Nov. 21, 1950, and was classified top secret. It was declassified and released by the Canadian Government in 1978 and proved immensely valuable to re-

searchers.⁷ I have received numerous assurances that this document is absolutely genuine.⁸ If so, then in this author's opinion, this affair represents the most significant breakthrough yet to occur in civilian UFO research.

Project Magnet was begun in December, 1950. The project was two-fold: To learn as much about UFOs as possible and to use this data to duplicate their performance.⁹ Smith headed the active project, and during this time had contact with several highly-placed Canadians and Americans. Among these was USN Admiral Knowles, who allegedly involved Smith in the analysis of fragments of unusual material recovered in 1952 near Washington DC.¹⁰

Project Magnet set up a series of instruments in a shed designed to serve as a UFO detection station at Shirley Bay, Ontario. Eventually, on Aug. 8, 1954, this station recorded a positive result.¹¹

This fact ended up being leaked to the press, and ostensibly led to Smith's downfall and downgrading of his project.¹² However, the available documents show that the order to discontinue Project Magnet as an official government sponsored project actually occurred in June of 1954, two months before the Shirley Bay incident. This leaves us with a puzzling picture of what really happened behind the scenes.¹³

As we have seen, the *ostensible* reason for Smith's downfall was the fact of the Shirley Bay incident being leaked to the press, thus compromising the confidentiality of the project and putting the government in an embarrassing position.¹⁴ But as we have also seen, this ostensible reason is not the actual one, for the die was cast in June of 1954.¹³ The actual reason for the June, 1954 downgrading is not available in the public record.

Speculation

Apparently in 1950 the United States flying saucer back-engineering program, in spite of its myriad physical evidence in the form of crash/retrieved exhibits and the finest scientific minds in the free world at its disposal, was floundering—a project in search of a breakthrough. Otherwise, this super-secret American project would never have taken the risk of involving Wilbert Smith.

However, a great change of attitude on the part of the American project toward Smith is apparent between 1950 and 1954. This is evident to anyone examining the available data in the public record regarding the Smith affair.⁹ We are now reasonably certain that although UFO propulsion contains an electro-magnetic component, this is not the essence of the system. Dr Paul Hill in his excellent book *Unconventional Flying Objects* uses the process of elimination, deductive reasoning, and logic to hypothesize that the

main essence of the propulsion scheme is the generation of vectored artificial gravity.¹⁶

Could it be that the Americans were not aware of this in 1950 and were willing to take on Smith and his geomagnetics theories, but had made sufficient breakthroughs by 1954 to know that Smith's ideas were flawed and thus of little use to them? Realizing that the essence of the system was not electro-magnetic would render Smith's continued involvement superfluous. Could this be the real reason for downgrading Smith's role after June, 1954?

Fortunately for ufology, Smith was taken into the project and became a massive leak in the otherwise airtight lid of the cover-up.

Sources

¹UFOs, MJ-12, and the Government, Crain/Cameron, 1991

²UFOs, MJ-12, and the Government, Crain/Cameron, 1991, Smith's notes, pg 4-5

³UFOs, MJ-12, and the Government, Crain/Cameron, 1991, pg 56c-56d, letter Gordon Cox to W. Smith 1-3-51

⁴UFOs, MJ-12, and the Government, Crain/Cameron, 1991, pg 4-5, Smith's personal notes

⁵UFOs at Aztec, Steinman/Stephens, 1986, Letter from Sarbacher to Steinman

⁶UFOs, MJ-12, and the Government, Crain/Cameron, 1991, pg 6

⁷UFO Crash-Retrievals Amassing the Evidence, Status Report 3, L. Stringfield, 1982, Smith's geo-magnetics, memo

⁸Personal contact (telephone), A. Bray, T. S. Crain, G. Cameron, 1998

⁹UFO Connection, Arthur Bray, pg 61

¹⁰Flying Saucers Serious Business, F. Edwards, 1966

¹¹UFO Connection, Bray, pg 63-64, 72

¹²UFO Connection, Bray, 64-65

¹³UFO Connection, Bray, pg 66

¹⁴UFOs, MJ-12, and the Government, Crain/Cameron, 1991

¹⁵UFOs, MJ-12, and the Government, Crain/Cameron, 1991

¹⁶Unconventional Flying Objects, Dr. Paul Hill, 1990

Triangular UFO reported in Kentucky

On Saturday, Jan. 6, 2001, at 10:30 p.m., Landy Tucker was driving on Highway 101 in Clifty, Kentucky, when he saw "a UFO that came from the northeast."

Tucker explains, "I was traveling down Highway 101 in Clifty when I noticed something in the sky. I pulled over to look at it. It made no sound, but I could feel some sort of vibration as it passed over my head. I watched it for five minutes and then it disappeared over the Kentucky hills.

"I don't know what it was, but I guess I was the only person who saw it that night. It was dark in color and V-shaped but made no sound. It flew away to the west southwest." Tucker estimated that the UFO was 12 feet high, 20 feet long, 5 feet wide at the front, and 10 feet wide at the back.

-UFO Roundup, Vol. 6, Joseph Trainor, editor.

Why doesn't the US Government tell the truth about UFOs?

By Elaine Douglass,
MUFON Co-state Director, Utah
regehr@lasal.net

People should go to the MUFON national conference. I always pick up something valuable when I go. For example, at the St. Louis conference last summer I got a small book, *The UFO Briefing Document*, with an introduction by Whitley Strieber.

In it, Whitley asks questions such as, "Why is there all this government denial and secrecy? What 'sane reason' can there be for the government cover-up? And why do scientists still respond with the 'giggle factor' whenever the subject of UFOs comes up?"

That was probably the thousandth time I've heard those questions asked, and it set me to thinking about them for probably the thousandth time. By the way, *The UFO Briefing Document* is by Don Berliner. It's the 1997 Rockefeller-financed presentation of the best evidence, now a Dell paperback. A good book.

But what about those questions in Whitley's introduction? Why indeed doesn't the US government just come clean and tell the American people everything it knows about UFOs? And given all the splendid evidence the UFO community has assembled demonstrating the reality and the extraterrestrial nature of UFOs, why do scientists, and the media, and the public, still giggle and roll their eyes?

Whitley says maybe the government has done something (that we don't know about) to embarrass itself, and that's the reason for the cover-up. Or, he suggests, possibly the aliens have told our government not to reveal their presence because that would be detrimental to the aliens' interests, or to ours, Whitley does not make it clear which. I agree with this latter idea in a way.

It is obvious the UFO people do not want their presence unequivocally, undeniably, publicly revealed. I doubt, though, they have coerced our government on that score because there are compelling reasons to account for the government's silence apart from any alien coercion.

Silence about UFOs is something everyone wants. There is not just one cover-up. There are three: the government cover-up, the public's cover-up, and the aliens' cover-up. All involved are plainly determined to keep quiet about the alien presence on the planet. That's interesting, don't you think?

The pervasiveness of the "giggle factor," which Whitley complains about, is a clue to this, particularly a clue that the public wants the silence maintained. Ridicule is a form of social control. So unpleasant is ridicule to most people they would rather meet hostility or punishment than

have people make fun of them.

The ridicule which generally follows mention of UFOs comes not even primarily from the government. Most comes from the media, and from your friends. This is how people tell each other to shut up and not talk about UFOs.

The people are not being coerced into silence; it is voluntary. Thus, the cover-up is not imposing a silence on the people that the people don't want, just as the aliens are not imposing a silence on the government that the government doesn't want.

Of course, the aliens are imposing something else on the government, and on the people that we don't want, and that is the crux of the issue. Silence is simply a by-product.

The reason the world's governments (not only our own) say nothing publicly about UFOs is because to do otherwise would cause the collapse of human authority. For example, to publicly acknowledge the abductions would lead to the fall of the US government. Not overnight, not in two weeks, but eventually.

That's shocking, isn't it? And it's something Whitley Strieber and all the other apologists for the aliens don't admit or, like Steven Greer, they concoct preposterous notions such as aliens aren't abducting anyone; it's all being done by the US government. (In foreign countries, too, I suppose.) Instead, consider this:

If the President of the United States had to admit publicly that, Yes, outer space aliens are abducting American citizens and taking little children out of their beds at night, how long do we think it would take for the people of this country to demand protection? And if protection was not forthcoming, how long do we think it would be before there was a political earthquake in this country?

So let's bottomline the situation right now. The aliens are doing something (the abductions) which, if publicly acknowledged, would cause the fall of the US government. That, Whitley, is why there is so much government denial and secrecy. That is the "sane" reason for the government cover-up.

As for the public's cover-up, I submit the public is aware of the reality and the extraterrestrial nature of UFOs. And even if the public is not as fully aware of the abduction phenomena, the public has noticed the prolonged presence (since WW II) and continuing operation of UFOs on the planet, coupled with the government's "inexplicable" silence on the matter. That has cued the public that a dark and terrible secret lies at the heart of the situation, and that it is a situation over which, apparently, the government has no control. The public doesn't want to admit this. That, Whitley, is the "sane" reason for the public's cover-up, i.e., the "giggle" factor.

That leaves us with only one question: What is the reason for the aliens' cover-up? We know they do not want

their presence undeniably, unequivocally, publicly revealed. We know they are conducting a covert operation of great magnitude on this planet. Why? Why don't the aliens end all the secrecy and just come forward and tell everyone all about themselves?

That question I'll submit to Whitley Strieber. What "sane" reason can there be, Whitley, for the alien cover-up?

Supercomputer used to identify objects in space

The Maui High Performance Computing Center is using a powerful IBM SP supercomputer to identify objects in space, including old satellites, foreign spacecraft and unidentified objects.

The new supercomputer assembles photos of objects tracked by U.S. Air Force telescopes, helping to ensure the nation's defense, as well as the safety of NASA space flights. It can process 480 billion calculations per second and is 40 times faster than the IBM "Deep Blue" supercomputer that defeated chess champion Garry Kasparov in 1997.

The SP is the electronic brain that supports the system that locates, tracks and images satellites using ground based telescopes. The images are then digitally enhanced by the supercomputer, using algorithms to improve images in only three to five seconds.

The dramatic improvement in image quality produced by the IBM SP allows the government to identify space objects. In addition, close-up images of damaged spacecraft assist the government in determining the extent of the damage.

The new supercomputer achieves a peak processing capability of 480 billion calculations a second by harnessing the computing power of 320 IBM POWER3-II microprocessors, 224 gigabytes of memory and 2.9 terabytes of IBM disk.

The microprocessors are based on IBM's copper technology. Microprocessors built with copper provide superior performance to those that contain traditional aluminum because copper is a better electrical conductor than aluminum. The center is at the University of New Mexico.

The Andreasson Legacy

Ray Fowler's latest book, *The Andreasson Legacy*. (UFOs and the paranormal: the startling conclusion of the Andreasson Affair), hardback, 463 pages, signed by Fowler, available from MUFON for \$24.95, P&H included. Send check, money order, travelers check, or cash in U.S. dollars to MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369.

Most crop circles not the work of hoaxers

By Jim Deardorff

In a short article in the January 2001 *MUFON UFO Journal*, Jenny Randles gave an interesting overview of the crop-circle phenomenon from the slant of one who believes 90% of them are produced by hoaxers and 10% by naturally occurring atmospheric vortices, or "hot weather whirlwinds." I believe a few corrections are in order, however.

The atmospheric vortex hypothesis tended was prominent at first when the formations were generally circular in appearance. This hypothesis was championed by Dr. Terence Meaden, an atmospheric physicist, whose opinion Jenny Randles has valued highly. However, Ralph Noyes, in his book *The Crop Circle Enigma* notes that "nothing like them [the 60-foot circles] had been seen before."

Even some of the 1980 circles displayed the "sharp cut-off between the disturbed area and the rest of the field, the flattened swirling of the affected crops, the continuing ripening of the [flattened] crop long after." Noyes noted that an atmospheric whirlwind would have to be stationary to stand a chance at producing a crop circle with its sharply defined edges, and he was entirely correct. The reason is, atmospheric vortices are not stationary. They travel along with the general speed of the surrounding air mass in which they're embedded.

Another reason why Noyes could state that "There was no ready explanation for them" is that the speed of rotation at the edges of whirlwinds, dust devils, etc., does not drop off abruptly, but tapers off over a distance much greater than the spacing between adjacent stalks of grain. Because of these reasons, any pattern to be expected from a whirlwind type vortex would be greatly elongated and non-circular in shape, with no chance of possessing edges that give the cookie-cutter type of imprint often observed ever since 1980.

I don't wish to become involved in any contest of credentials with Dr. Meaden, but do need to point out that my own expertise in the atmospheric sciences was as a senior scientist in the field of atmospheric turbulence and convection. However, Meaden does seem to have been aware of the pitfalls of the "hot weather whirlwind" hypothesis, as Randles called it.

As he implied in his book *The Circles Effect and its Mysteries*, p. 20, fair weather whirlwinds or ordinary atmospheric vortices could not be responsible. And we of course know that most of the crop-circle formations have occurred at night, and even under damp weather conditions, when summer whirlwind activity is absent or minimal.



The Henwood Down formation, July 25, 1997, Hampshire, England.

So, contrary to Randles' report, Meaden postulated the occurrence of an extraordinary type of atmospheric vortex unknown to science—an invisible plasma that descends vertically from the sky onto the crop, quickly leaves its imprint behind, and then departs. Later, Dr. Levensgood in the U.S. postulated about the same thing. This is tantamount to saying that an invisible UFO produced the crop circle, with the unidentified maneuvering object being a plasma vortex rather than a solid object.

Both Meaden and Randles are at fault for having ignored particular crop circle features that could not possibly have been formed by any natural spinning vortex or by hoaxing. The frequently seen interweaving of the stems is one of these. And consider the "simple" 57-foot crop circle at Headbourne Worthy discovered on 1 August 1986. Both Meaden and Colin Andrews explored it, made diagrams of it, and reported it in their books, as did Noyes.

It consisted of two counterclockwise swirled layers: an upper visible layer swirled inwards overlying a layer swirled outwards, with the two layers aligned at right angles to each other. If a hoaxer were to try to accomplish this, he would have to first swirl every other stem one way while leaving the rest standing, and then swirl all the standing stems the other way, on top. No one has yet even conceived of how this could be feasibly accomplished, let alone demonstrated how.

Meaden supposed that a plasma vortex that changed its mind halfway through caused it. However, that would be at least as inconceivable, since a non-intelligent spinning plasma vortex on its first touchdown would swirl all the stems, not leaving every other stem standing for subsequent swirling in a different direction to form an upper

layer.

Or consider those crop-circle formations in which the stems are bent over well above the ground. The "egg, slice & tear" formation of 21 June 1994, at Birling Gap, East Sussex, was one of these. At this point the plasma-vortex theorist has to assume a hoax by unknown methods, while the hoax theorist tries to ignore such a feature, as he/she cannot find anyone who can begin to demonstrate how it could be feasibly achieved.

However, ignoring the evidence is not a new tactic. We all know that various details of many witnesses' UFO reports have been repeatedly ignored since 1947 because they defied any explanation by 20th-century science.

In pointing this out I am not implying that crop-circle hoaxes have not occurred. Their numbers have increased along with the increasing attention paid to the phenomenon. Randles was right in mentioning that there "always was a crop circle mystery even before the hoaxers began their games."

One way to help distinguish the broken-stemmed hoaxed formations from the pristine genuine ones is to notice that for the latter no confessed hoaxer will come forth or show solid evidence of their having made it. But one must beware of cases in which a hoaxer may learn of a genuine formation before others learn of it, and, with a few accomplices, trample it down heavily at night to break stems and blur edges to make it look like a man-made construction (though with an appealing and creative geometry), and the next day claim it was all man-made. The intricate and creatively designed but trampled looking formation at Avebury in late July, 1990, is a good candidate to have been this kind of hoax.

Finally, we should not ignore the witnesses who have observed crop circles being formed during a brief period of some 10 to 20 seconds, which also rules out hoaxers, while sometimes also observing the presence of one or more low-level blobs of light moving about (UFOs). These cases, along with definitive UFO sightings in a region the night before a crop-circle formation appears in the immediate area (e.g., see Delgado & Andrews' *Circular Evidence*), all indicate that the crop-circle phenomenon is a part of the UFO phenomenon.

This follows from simple observation and logic, not from desires to sensationalize the phenomenon, which is the explanation that Randles seems to prefer. The UFO phenomenon by its very association with UFO intelligences is a sensational matter for most of us, and neither the witnesses who are exposed to it nor news media "long starved for the big story" deserve to be belittled for reporting facts that are intrinsically sensational.

Editor's Note: See the MUFON UFO Journal issues of September and October 1998 for additional information regarding the research of W.C. Levengood, John Burke, and Nancy Talbott (the BLT team).

UFO reportedly abducts two in northern Chile

On Thursday, Oct. 19, 2000, at 7 p.m., teacher Juan Rojas Moffett was chatting with some colleagues in a second-floor classroom at the Escuela San Francisco (school) in Chiu-Chiu, village in northern Chile about 40 kilometers (25 miles) from Calama, when he saw a bright light in the dark sky. That was the beginning.

Three hours later, at 10 p.m., 35 adults, members of the local branch of the General Center of Parents and Attorneys (a kind of Chilean PTA), were holding a meeting at the school. Twenty children were playing in the schoolyard, waiting for the meeting to end. They heard a weird sound, and then the UFO appeared.

Students Rene Calpa Carranza and Walter Anza Vilca stated that the object, which was predominantly white in color with blue, red and yellow flashing lights, hovered above the schoolyard. A number of the children also recalled a burning odor.

As the UFO hovered overhead, a panel slid open on the underside of the craft, and a dazzling light beam stabbed downward, bathing two people in its unearthly glow. Struck by the beam were Sra. Fresia Vega, the school custodian, and student Valentina Rojas Espinoza, age 8. The pair instantly vanished.

According to Monica Espinoza Fernandez (the girl's mother), "The children were outdoors and were the witnesses, although not in the same way as Fresia and Valentina, and they (the other children) called for the meeting to end and the parents to come outside. We heard an enormous blast, much louder than the shattering of glass, and everyone went outside for a look."

The stunned adults reportedly saw an object that was hovering no higher than a four-story building above the schoolyard. The eye-dazzling beam then switched off, and the UFO zoomed away to the south. Fresia Vega and Valentina Espinoza were found, dazed and shivering, a short distance away.

In an interview with the newspaper *El Mercurio* de Calama, Fresia Vega said, "It was a very large ship, about the size of a soccer field, surrounded by lights of every imaginable color. In the middle of it there was a door from which there came a light that blinded me and left me paralyzed. I felt myself being sucked in through the door, and I felt a tingling sensation all over my body.

"Voices became far, far away, and I froze. That's when I realized I must have passed out because I remember nothing at all. I then felt the door was being shut with a sound like that of iron, and the ship looked like it was surrounded by light." Much like the custodian, Valentina Rojas Espinoza said, "I felt cold, and my blood froze. I was very scared, and I hid behind Fresia."

—UFO Roundup, Vol. 5, No. 44, Editor: Joseph Trainor

Filer's Files

By George A. Filer
Director, MUFON Eastern Region

Tent-like object in Indiana

MICHIGAN CITY — The witness, a 26-year-old male, was walking in Dunes National Park on Dec. 21, 2000. When he got to the top of Mount Baldy at 8:45 PM, he looked down and noticed a shiny, metallic-like tent sitting on the ground about fifty feet away.

It had a dome with appendages. The witness states, "It sat there for about two minutes, then began whining, and finally took off at an incredible speed, making a high-pitched whining sound. I also noticed a strange smell. The object changed color to a bright red and finally fiery red heading higher and finally too far away to see."

"I looked at my watch, and noticed that roughly two hours had passed. My memory and motor skills were affected by the incident. I had involuntary actions that included paralysis and a rash."

—MUFON Worldwide UFO Database.



George Filer

Hexagon-shaped object reported in Connecticut

MONROE — On Jan 16, 2001, at about 7:30 PM, a resident of Newtown was traveling on Route 25 near Monroe. A hexagonal-shaped object flew across the roadway in front of her. The object was about as long as a commercial jumbo jet, and was a dark gray or black in color. This witness saw some sort of "ridges" on the bottom surface, with a blue/green light at each of 5 points, and a small red light on the 6th point. There are similar hexagon type reports on file for Georgia and Pennsylvania. Thanks to Tom Sheets, ISUR Board, SD-MUFONGA.

Strange object filmed in Michigan

DEARBORN — A UFO video clip was filmed on Ford Road on Sept. 5, 2000, of an odd bright light in the northeast sky at 6:50 AM. The object was only a few degrees above the horizon and the Sun had not come up yet. The witness pulled into the new Visteon building's parking lot and started filming. At first he thought it may be a cloud, but it actually sat motionless and then slowly

moved to the southeast. The video shows a "ribbed" disk-shaped form which appears underneath the "illuminated/reflecting" upper section of the object. The video and other UFO investigations can be seen at this web site. http://members.home.net/tattoo89/UFO_1_Backup-1-1.mpg

Underground activity at White Sands?

OROGRANDE — MUFON researcher Tony Rullan writes regarding Fred Wilcoxon's assertion that White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) has alleged underground bases. "I tried to see them from the top of the mountains (in public lands) west of Orogrande. One day from 10 AM to 2 PM, I and two other MUFON members saw from the highest peak that 30 people went into a tent west of Orogrande."

"I presume that the tent had an underground entrance, since it was too small for that many people. Then a black helicopter landed and one man got off and walked into the tent. The tent was a red inflatable type of tent (not a normal tent). It looked like those kiddie tents built for kids to jump in."

"Anyway, I did not see any airstrip or airport for planes. We did see a whole bunch of helicopters (old types) to the west of Orogrande (nothing suspicious here) and south of where this tent was located. While I lived in El Paso, I met a lady who worked as secretary in an underground base in WSMR. The base she worked at, though, was on the east side of the range close to the Organ Mountains."

"My friend Wayne once ran into another underground facility on the northern end of the range, by the Oscura Mountains. He saw all the air ducts from above. He does have permission to go into the range. With regard to Fred Wilcoxon's claim of discs flying out of a base near Orogrande, I doubt this, but anything is possible since WSMR is huge."

California object splits

SANTA BARBARA — This letter was written to Dr. Roger Leir. "On Dec. 17, 2000, my friend and I were on the roof when he saw an object in the sky. The object was almost straight up in the sky overhead, and about the size of Venus, but looked metallic from a reflection of the sun. Atmospheric distortion was evident, when comparing it to aircraft flying in the area. We assume the object was at a higher altitude."

"Looking through binoculars, I saw a puff of smoke or vapor from the UFO. We both lost sight of the object when it split into three separate smaller ones, and the total brightness went down. It split from one to two and from two to three. (X to x x to x) The split off flew north east. When I moved I lost them in the field of view. We

viewed the object for about 7 minutes, just before 4:50 PM. This object has shown itself going back to 1992, during the holidays. It has been witnessed by many individuals and studied by MUFON." Thanks to James Brandt and Dr. Leir.

UFOs reported in Chile

There have been a series of sightings in Chile's 2nd Region in recent months. Local researcher Jaime Ferrer reports that a luminous object with an almost-rhomboidal configuration was seen on Monday, December 18, 2000, at 22:30 hours in the area known as Ojo de Apache, two kilometers west of Calama.

The witness, Mrs. Maria Angelica, said she was walking home on a road with no lighting in the area when she saw the UFO. She says she lives in terror, because every night she hears violent stomping on her rooftop that she feels are related to the UFO. She claims her animal-owning neighbors have lost many animals to the intruders.

Flying triangle reported in Maine

SACO — The witness reports, "On December 29, 2000, I was driving into Saco at 10:10 PM when I noticed a very bright white light. The craft had seven lights on its under side and a big one in the front. There was no tail on the triangle shaped craft!" He drove east chasing the object and lost it in the trees, but picked it up at Route 1 moving very very slowly.

He pulled into the Shop N' Save parking lot and watched the craft fly over. He said, "It was three times the size of any aircraft I had seen before and it had a huge white light in the front, one large square in the bottom center, and three smaller squares on each wing, with a red light on each wing tip. Have I been witness to a top secret craft or a space ship?"

Another witness?

NORTH WHITEFIELD — Another witness nearby writes, "My sightings have been numerous the past six years but this is the first time I have seen them early enough in the evening to get my husband and my son to look also.

"Six years ago, I woke at 3:15 AM, and looked east out the window and saw a twinkling star in the distance but I noticed that it had colored lights and it was moving incredibly fast. I thought I was seeing things. It went zipping around the sky.

"A few months later, I was cleaning out a mobile home that belonged to an elderly couple and found a VERY CLEAR picture from 1967 of a "flying saucer" over our

same treetops. I showed it to my husband and said I had seen one in the night some months ago. I live in Maine and about 30 miles from Brunswick Naval Air Station so I've always hoped what I'm seeing is just some kind of military secret.

"This past summer, I saw a triangular craft with four very large 'balls' of light on it appear briefly just below a cloud and then disappear back into it. I have seen the 'craft' I saw tonight on many occasions.

"My most recent sighting was at 7:00 PM, on January 1, 2001. I saw colored lights and asked my husband where his binoculars were? He said, 'Why do you want them?' I said, 'I am going to look at a UFO that has been bugging me for years.'

"I wish I had a telescope because that thing sat there for 3 1/2 hours without moving much. It moved three times when an airplane entered the airway. Each time, the craft blinked red and green lights more frequently like normal plane's lights when another airplane would fly near. It would move horizontally and a bit vertically. When the airplane passed, it stopped and remained stationery until the next plane came along.

"About 75 minutes after I spotted this first craft, a second one appeared from the north. About that time, I told my husband there were two of them out there now. He started to take me serious and went out with the binoculars to look and agrees that he's never seen anything like it. About an hour later, two more showed up. Thanks to Peter Davenport, Director NUFORC, www.ufocenter.com

Alabama policeman reports flying triangle

MUFON Headquarters reports that a witness who is a police officer in Alabama writes, "I am a private pilot and I was an air traffic controller with the FAA. A few months ago I was on patrol at 02:30 AM and observed an object with three lights, amber in color on the left side, middle, and right side of the vehicle.

"I went to my patrol car, drove to the middle of the school parking lot, and watched. The vehicle traveled to the southeast and there was never any sound. The three lights stayed 'pointed' in my direction. There were no anti-collision lights on this vehicle, just the three amber colored lights. I got a pair of 10x50 binoculars and could see the vehicle was a dark color with squared 'windows.'

"My police radio never stopped working, nor did my patrol car shut off. At a point one to two miles to my southeast the vehicle turned directly north without making a slow banking turn. It turned from a heading of 120 degrees to a heading of 360 degrees in an instant!

"As I continued to observe, I could make out that it was triangular in shape and 300 feet in length, using the high school football field as a size comparison. As the vehicle turned north the three amber-colored lights turned

again and faced me directly. Since the moon was not out I was about to observe star constellations and the North star.

"I reached into my patrol car and got my maglite flashlight. I shined 30,000 candlepower at the vehicle. Though this may have possibly been considered a stupid thing to do, being a cop, I am very curious. Nothing happened. The vehicle continued northbound and disappeared.

"We have Columbus Air Force Base and Meridian Naval Air Station near us. When my Chief relieved me at 6:00 AM, I told him what I had seen. He asked, 'What time?' and when I told him he told me to forget it!" Thanks to mufonhq@aol.com and Alan

Triangular object sighted in Indiana

BLOOMINGTON — Joseph Trainor reports that on Friday, January 5, 2001, eyewitness G.E.D. was driving east on Indiana Highway 45 between New Unionville and Bloomington. He reported, "I saw a very unusual aircraft on my way home from work. I saw a bright yellow light with a white light, maybe not as bright, hovering in the sky. There were two red lights on top, none on the belly.

"So I rounded a bend and I saw that the craft was about 50 feet above treetop (level), crossing the road from right to left (north), directly overhead. I pulled off to watch and noticed that other vehicles behind me had also done the same. There was no noise. I rolled down my window to listen but there was no sound.

"As the craft passed over my car, I got a quick look at it against the night sky. It was triangle-shaped with a white light at each of the three wing tips (corners) and appeared to be black in color. A mile or so down the road, the snow looked blown across the road like drifting. The rest of the road was clear.

"I thought it was a helicopter at first until I saw the thing. It was not like anything I had ever seen." Bloomington is approximately 68 miles south of Indianapolis. Thanks to Steve Wilson Sr. and UFO Roundup Volume 6, #2 January 11, 2001 Editor: Joseph Trainor.

Illinois light reportedly sends down beam

CHICAGO — The witness reports, "On New Year's Eve at 11:45 PM I was watching TV with my wife and friends when our neighbor came over asking if I saw the alien spacecraft. I said no but went outside with our friends. After about 20 minutes I saw two sets of lights going in circles for about 30 seconds.

"Then one of the lights got brighter and a ray of light flashed toward the ground. This was about half a mile away, when I saw something go up the ray, then it disappeared. I called the cops and they told me that other people had been filing a report saying they had seen aircraft in the sky.

Flying neon light reported in Montana

HAVRE — The witness states, "On December 28, 2000, my daughter woke me up at 4:00 AM, and after I got her settled in to bed, I saw a bright light high in the sky. It was not a star, as it would get brighter, than lighter. I watched for maybe two minutes, and it blinked out." There were no clouds, but it seemed to have a haze around it.

"Then tonight, I was letting my cat out at about 5:50 PM, and there was a very bright light in the sky again. I grabbed my camera and took a picture, and grabbed my binoculars. It looked like a sideways white neon light, with a blue spike-like thing on top. Almost like a toy top. It was positioned almost sideways. I have my parents video camera from filming Christmas stuff, and I went in the bedroom to grab it, but the object was gone when I came back. Dogs in the neighborhood were barking, but my own, wasn't. I am still shaking!" Thanks to Peter Davenport, Director NUFORC, www.ufocenter.com

UK woman reports triangle

At 11.30 p.m. on Jan. 13, 69-year-old Anne Saunders of Matlock saw a spaceship hovering over Crich. She said, "I looked through the bedroom window and saw a massive triangle in the sky. I thought, Good God! I am a skeptic, or at least, I was. I thought it was a reflection in my glasses!"

But it was no reflection. After further investigation, Mrs Saunders said she couldn't believe her eyes. The retired local government officer and her husband watched the craft for three minutes. The triangle was full of pulsating colored lights with a dark center. It made no noise.

"Then the front end bit broke away," continued Mrs Saunders, "and flew across the sky at tremendous speed towards the Masson hillside.

"When it re-appeared, there was no uniformity. It was just a random shape of pulsating lights, clustered together. I was absolutely gobsmacked. I was looking from one to the other and thinking I must be dreaming. It was massive. This has certainly inspired me to be a believer."

Mrs Saunders now goes to bed at night armed with binoculars and a camera, just in case.

—Andy Darlington Jan. 17, 01, *The Matlock Mercury* Online, Derbyshire - UK (c) Wilfred Edmunds Newspapers Ltd

MUFON MUGS

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


 The UFO PRESS

Adamski did not visit the Pope

Dear Dwight,

As promised in my letter dated on 14 November 2000, please find enclosed some very serious clues concerning the dubious encounter of George Adamski with the Pope John XXIII on 31 May 1963. These data have been obtained with the Nonciature Apostolique In France, which is the Vatican's Embassy to Paris. These documents are:

1 - A copy of letter dated on 23 November 2000 sent to me by the Papal Nuncio in France, his Eminence Fortunato Baldelli.

In the answer to my request, the Vatican's Ambassador to Paris claims that the name of George Adamski has not been found in the records of the Vatican's secretary's office. More, John XXIII cannot have had a meeting with George Adamski on 31 May 1963, because that day the Pope was seriously ill.

2- Copies of pages of the Volume of Vatican's Activities, pages of 30 and 31 May 1963, proving that indeed, on 31 May, 1963, Pope John XXIII was seriously ill, and he received the Unction's Sacrament of the sick.

3- Copy of a page from the Annual of Medals, John XXIII, Year V, 1962-1963. The only one "golden ecumenical coin" (as said M. Fred. R. Chaffee in M.U.J. no. 389, page 18) which was struck by the Vatican during the years 1962-1963 is a medal for the celebration of the Ecumenical Council (Vatican II), which began on 11 October 1962, in the town of Assisi, Italy.

Consequently, contrary to the statements of M. Chaffee, on 31 May 1963, this medal was for sale.

Please note that, according to one of my friends (a priest), if one or several persons desire to have a meeting with the Pope (even a secret meeting), an official State or religious organization must go bail for him or them.

The Vatican has very rigid formalities about this point. Indeed, the Pope cannot encounter anyone, anywhere, any day, and all the meetings are arranged a long time in anticipation. I doubt that such an official organization has accepted "to patronize" George Adamski, who was regarded as being a quack by all State and religious organizations.

I hope that this information will put an end to the myth of George Adamski. O.K., old George was contacted by false extraterrestrial beings, but he faked photos and lied several times.

-Jean Sider

Or did he?

Following is a reply to Jean Sider from Timothy Good: Dear Jean,

Thank you very much for your letter and enclosures of 29 November last.

As you should know from *George Adamski: The Untold Story*, both Lou Zinsstag and I exposed a number of Adamski's lies (see also *Alien Base*), but the Vatican meeting is not among these.

First of all, the photostat of the medal you provide is not the one which was awarded to Adamski. The actual medal is the one I have photocopied for you (see enclosed). According to Cardinal Basil Hume, Archbishop of Westminster (see enclosed), there is no way Adamski could have obtained that medal at that time unless he had received it personally from the Pope.

This information comes from Desmond Leslie, who discussed the matter with Hume. I suggest you contact Desmond, who lives in France- La Colette, ch. d' L' Ancienne Gare, 06640 St. Jeannet, telephone 0493-244005, fax 0493-247641 He is not very well, but I'm sure he would be pleased to respond by phone to your enquiries.

As to the Vatican's denial of Adamski's very short, private visit, that is hardly surprising. I too received a denial, though the earlier response received by Ronald Caswell was ambiguous.

With the exception of "Ramu," all the names of Adamski's spacepeople were suggested by Charlotte Blodget and Adamski. Contrary to your claim, none was proposed by the spacepeople themselves, which weakens considerably your "demonological" interpretation. In some of the other abductee and contactee cases you cite in the *MUFON UFO Journal* (No. 357), your argument might apply, although you make some very tenuous similarities between mythological names and names given to, or given by, ETs.

If you read *Alien Base* and *George Adamski*, you will note that I have addressed nearly all criticisms levelled against Adamski's "scoutcraft" photographs. Not one single criticism stands up from a photo-optical point of view. I have written what I have written and stand by it. Incidentally, I presume you saw William Sherwood's letter published in the *MUFON UFO Journal* recently (see enclosed)?

In your article in the *MUFON UFO Journal* (No. 357), you misrepresent the opinions of my friend Lou Zinsstag when you state, "This very serious author claimed that Adamski experienced his contacts with so-called Venusians in ecstatic state, or mediumistic trance." That was true in SOME cases. You conveniently forget to point out that Lou was convinced that many of his contacts took place in our physical reality, without recourse to

trance, and that Lou herself was present on at least one occasion when one of the "spacepeople" sat near Adamski in Basle, and that she herself had a physical encounter, also in Basle—as indeed did I, in New York.

—Tim

A different take on the Ramey letter

Dear Mr. Connelly:

While I am gratified to see continued interest in the now famous Ramey Letter ("Possible New Evidence on Roswell Crash," December 2000), I feel that I need to point out a number of points on which my own analysis differs from what has been presented.

I am working with nearly a thousand images of the letter or portions thereof, and even in my best imaging, the reading VANDENBERG in the upper left corner is extremely tentative, though I wouldn't rule it out. I do see what looks like VA- at the base of what appears to be a cradle telephone, but as for the rest, the field in which the supposed sub-image lies is so problematical with patterns of light and dark that a case could be made for its saying almost anything.

I do not see that the letters -NDENBERG differ in any statistically significant way from any number of other possible patterns. As I've said before, one has to be careful, in this business, about seeing the face of Elvis in the cracks in the adobe

Assuming for the sake of argument that the reading VANDENBERG is indeed present, I believe it's a mistake to infer that the memo is to Vandenberg, as the name (if it's there) is not positioned correctly to be an addressee (it's at an irregular angle to the edges of the paper). General Vandenberg as Deputy Commander, US Army Air Forces, would logically have been involved, certainly, but it's more likely that the memo could have been from Vandenberg, as the large-type name (if present) would appear to be part of a letterhead device of some sort.

However, my main concern is that the letter is obviously not signed "RAMEY." The signature, of which I attach a copy of one of my images, is clearly six letters long, and while some of the letters remain a bit "blobbed" at best, the letters -PL- are quite legible. I'm sticking to the probable reading TEMPLE, whatever the reasons may be for the memo to be signed that way.

I won't go into all the other points of interest in the memo, as people have seen my own reading, but I would mention, with regard to the reading "A-1" in line 4, that I have done some very close "stretch" imaging that shows the configuration to be A3. Also, near the end of line 5, I'm quite sure of the reference to "SITE TWO AT CARLSBAD" that I have pointed out before.

Again, it's good that a number of people are working with high enthusiasm on the memo. One must proceed

with great caution. I've been working on the memo for over two years, and if there's one thing I've learned, it's that the thing is beastly difficult to read. In any case we're all agreed that what it says is of immense importance to the Roswell incident.

—Donald R. Burleson, Ph.D.

Implications of Blackburn article

The intriguing article by Dr. Ronald F. Blackburn on "Optical detection of inbound space vehicles (December 2000 *MUFON UFO Journal*) compels me to comment on not what he did say, but on what he did not.

He lucidly contends that the ability of a spacecraft traveling at a fraction of the speed of light to avoid collisions between itself and space debris is severely constrained by technical requirements. Therefore, it seems that if collisions between UFOs and debris particles should actually occur, and we do not have, at least publicly, any information that impacts of "nuclear detonation" quality have been observed, then Dr. Blackburn appears to be arguing against the existence of alien spacecraft piloted by sentient beings.

The theme, however, is mitigated by the following possibilities:

1) Alien craft do not traverse space in a manner which would bring them into contact with space debris (i.e. Wormholes).

2) A craft traveling at speeds closer to that of light may attain a mass sufficient to warp the space around itself. This could alter the flight path of an approaching particle such that a collision might be avoided.

3) UFOs may utilize force fields whose properties are, at the moment, merely terrestrial fancy.

4) There is some controversy concerning the solidity, or ability to change size and shape, of alien craft in either our dimension or our neck of the universe.

With regard to points 1 and 4, it is worthwhile noting that an observer who sees an anomaly undergoing a reduction in size would experience the same event whether the anomaly was either traveling away from him at great speed or gradually disappearing *in situ* out of our universe. Also, many abductees have reported the experience of passing through solid walls and other objects.

Clearly, then, while the presence of debris particles in far space is a logical deduction from our near space experience, the absence of collision observations does not negate the ontological probability of UFOs.

—Keith Midgen

Photos needed

The *Journal* needs your photos of your MUFON group's activities (speakers, exhibits, etc.), with individuals clearly identified left to right.



MUFON UFO Journal & Skylook 1967-1996 Index compiled by Edward G. Stewart, 1996, 8 1/2 by 11, 629 pages, \$59.95.

Reviewed by Dwight Connelly

This index to articles in the *MUFON UFO Journal* and its predecessor, *Skylook*, had to be a tremendous undertaking. It features a subject index, sorted by author, of 98 subjects—ranging from “aircraft-like UFOs” to “crop circles” to “landings” to “radar cases” to Tunguska event” to “Ufology and science.”

This covers the first 317 pages.

An author index, sorted by category, requires the next 51 pages and several hundred entries. This is followed by an index to each of the *MUFON Symposium Proceedings*, beginning in 1971 and ending in 1996. Next is an index for the third and fourth editions of the *MUFON Field Investigator's Manuals*.

Then comes an index for each issue of *Skylook*, beginning with September, 1967, and ending with the May, 1976, issue. This is followed by an index for each issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal*, beginning in June, 1976, and ending with the August, 1996, issue.

For those who have, or can obtain, a significant number of the back issues of *Skylook* and the *Journal*, as well as the *Symposium Proceedings*, this index provides a tremendous tool for research. I use it frequently in checking old cases, and it is a great time-saver.

The *MUFON UFO Journal & Skylook 1967-1996 Index* is available from MUFON Headquarters.

***Extraordinary Encounters, An Encyclopedia of Extraterrestrials and Otherworldly Beings* by Jerome Clark, ABC-CLIO, Inc, 2000, 7X10 hardback, 290 pages, \$75.00 (Amazon).**

Reviewed by Dwight Connelly

Good writing and expertise are expected with an author like Jerome Clark, who put together the excellent *UFO Encyclopedia*, and this book is not a disappointment.

It covers in a reasonably thorough manner everything from abductions to Zolton, including a great many other-than-human beings that most of us have heard of rarely—if at all. There is Ausso, an extraterrestrial supposedly encountered by E. Carl Higdon, Jr., while hunting elk in Wyoming. There is Melora, a channeling entity who communicates through Jyoti Alla-An of Boulder, CO. And there are the Men in Black, the “dead extraterrestrials,” and Daniel Fry.

Some entries are brief, while others run multiple pages. Mixed in with the decidedly weird are such items as a

short biography of Budd Hopkins and a balanced look at abduction cases and research.

For the those already familiar with ufology, this book can be quite useful in looking up some of the little-known extraordinary entities that seem to pop up now and then in the literature. But the uninitiated may experience difficulty in separating the more respectable cases from those that may be no more than the product of one individual's overactive imagination.

Clark recognizes this problem, noting, “Not everyone, of course, is telling the truth, and when there is reason to be suspicious of the testimony, that consideration is noted.” Maybe, but several questionable individuals and events are presented with no hint of suspicion. Clark also seems aware of this: “Mostly, though, I let the stories tell themselves.” This he does quite well, and many of the entries are quite fascinating.

The arrangement is alphabetical, and Clark has included in the Preface a very handy listing of all of the entries. There is also a nice index which includes a section on “hoaxes” and “unconfirmed hoaxes.” The listings are detailed enough to cover such items as “use of ventriloquism.”

This is a useful and interesting book which would be a valuable addition to the research library—after you have had the fun of skimming through it.

***Project Mindshift* by Michael Mannion, M. Evans & Co., New York, \$19.95**

Reviewed by R. J. Durant

The Mindshift Hypothesis: “Our world has been and is now being visited by advanced intelligent entities from elsewhere, and this reality has been known to a limited number of people within the U.S. government since at least 1947.” This is probably a fair statement of the beliefs of nearly all readers of the *MUFON UFO Journal*, but it is by no means a proposition capable of definite proof.

The author asks us to accept it in a tentative sense for the purpose of argument, and to explore a tantalizing logical result of the hypothesis: “If a small group within the United States government knew about extraterrestrial life, and if they knew or feared that the public could not handle that information, then what would they do? A program to prepare the American public to be able to accept the reality of extraterrestrial life would seem to be in order. It would most likely have been considered by those in power as a serious option. Could government undertake such a program successfully?”

Michael Mannion's approach to exploring these questions is simple but ingenious, and provides a fascinating review of the impact of UFOs and ufology on American culture, though in the end we are still searching for answers.

He approached a group of prominent UFO researchers and asked their opinions. Thus we are spared the abstract and often hostile and nonsensical musings of psychologists and anthropologists who know nothing about UFOs, want to know nothing about the topic, but don't mind going on at great length telling the world that this is a nonsense field populated by the brain damaged. For an example of this sort of fare, see *UFO Crash at Roswell* by professors Benson Saler, Charles Ziegler, and Charles Moore.

So we have astronaut Edgar Mitchell, John Mack, Stanton Friedman, Budd Hopkins, Don Berliner, David Jacobs, Raymond Fowler and Michael Lindemann chatting much as they would in your kitchen. Instead of the cartoon characters that some of these figures seem to have become over the years, we find men of intellectual power, wit and insight. The issues Mannion raises—and allows his subjects to discuss with complete freedom—make fascinating reading.

A series of chapters deal with the UFO theme in the movies, television, print and even music, and include speculations about the use of these media to carry out the hypothetical program to “educate” the public.

Like the interviews, this is well informed and provocative, and serves as a fine historical summary of media events that have had great impact on the public's perception of the “visitors.” Was the baton being waved from a vault in Langley? We never learn that, but Mannion has documented the existence of a wonderfully rich media symphony that sings of the flying saucers.

Joseph Trainor has sighting

On Sunday, Dec. 10, 2000, at 5:20 p.m., UFO Roundup editor Joseph Trainor spotted a dark hovering delta-shaped UFO in Duluth, MN (population 85,000).

Trainor reports, “It was a black triangle, with its apex pointed upward at a one o'clock angle, and the ‘base’ at the bottom. The object was in mid-air, an estimated 35 degrees above the southwestern horizon. It was the size of my thumbnail at arm's length. The color was matte black, a shade darker than the surrounding night sky. The object had no discernible motion and hovered silently. There was no sound.

“The sides of the triangle were slightly rounded, a bit concave, giving the object the look of a bulky arrowhead. There were three sets or arrays of four lights each on either side of the triangle, and no lights at the bottom. Twelve lights in all on either side. In descending order, the lights in each array were red, green, gold and white.

“I observed the object for five minutes. It was hard to judge distance, but my guess is that the object was a few miles away, possibly over the Spirit Valley area in the West Duluth section of the city.”

Trainor added that this is the third UFO he's seen.

Part Two Stress management for ufologists

By John Schuessler

MUFON International Director

Editor's Note: This is a continuation from last month's *Journal*.

UFO “Experts” and Their Egos: A lesser, yet still significant, source of stress for ufologists comes from the so-called experts. Many experts are so wrapped-up in themselves and their findings that they belittle the work of others in the field.



John Schuessler

Some are considered to be experts because of their long-time involvement in the field. Others are instant experts because of their credentials. Experts make broad declarations based on their findings and expect everyone else to agree with the result.

At times they will “take another look” as some older case and come up with a sudden insight explaining it. When they do this, they are assuming the style of the debunker.

Most ufologists do not see themselves as experts. Instead they are workers in the field, trying to add information to the database and to discover the realities of the big UFO mystery. They recognize that this is a work-in-progress and want to contribute to the eventual solution.

To these workers, the expert is often an icon to be admired and supported. When this expert says and does things that belittles the work of others, or expounds on their personal bias in cases, the worker is often dismayed or stressed over it.

While it may be natural to get angry or disgruntled by the proclamations of the experts, there is an easy way to relieve the stress of the situation. Just remember that the experts are people too. They may have interesting credentials and a significant public image, but they are on the same journey as you.

They do not have all the answers yet, and in fact may not be any closer to the real answers than you. Otherwise the UFO mystery would be solved and the experts would no longer be needed. Work with them and learn from them, but don't turn them into idols.

Communications: Much of the stress we feel comes from lack of communications. Some people need to be constantly in contact with others, interchanging ideas and

getting feedback. Others don't need as much contact. All, however, are stressed if they do not get the amount of communications they need. Some join UFO organizations in order to improve their access to information. They may not know what they want, what kind, or how much communication they need; but if the organization doesn't measure up to this nebulous definition of need, they quit.

Some solve their need for increased communications via the Internet. They may not care about the quality or depth of the material they are getting on the Internet as long as their communication need is satisfied. They may send a letter or e-mail to someone and then expect an immediate reply. If they don't get it, then they are angry and stressed over it.

This is a difficult problem to solve. It is based on expectations, and often these are unexpressed expectations. It goes without saying that there would be a lot less communication-related stress if every individual and organization would improve the communications process.

While this may eventually happen, you do have control over half of the communication process. Communicate as little or as much as is required to satisfy your own comfort level, but don't set a stressful level of expectation for the communication you expect in return. You do not and cannot control how much or how little other people participate in the communications process. It even helps to strive for quality, not quantity, in these exchanges.

Government Cover-up: A 1997 public opinion poll showed that 82% of Americans believe the government is hiding evidence of intelligent life in space, and a 1996 poll showed that 49% of Americans believe the government is concealing UFO information.

My guess is that more than 95% of ufologists believe the government is concealing UFO information. This is a very frustrating situation. Most ufologists are hard working, church-going, proud citizens. Many are veterans of the various armed forces, and some had UFO experiences while in the military.

Additionally, ufologists are generally well versed in advances in science and technology. They know about all of the technological devices available to military agencies that have the ability to detect, locate, track and identify UFOs. At the same time these ufologists are unable to tap into any of this technology while investigating UFO cases, so they must be content with eyewitness testimony, trace effects, photographs, and videotapes as their documentation of UFO events. When they try to remedy this situation by contacting government agencies, they are usually given the idiot treatment. Is there any wonder they are stressed about it?

Yelling about "government cover-up" isn't going to help much either. The cover-up has been going on for fifty years and is pretty well entrenched. There are experts with big budgets controlling this information. Verbal at-

tacks on the government get lost in the noise of the hundreds of other groups attacking the government. If you are going to make headway on this problem, then concentrate first on improving the quality of your investigations and the depth of your documentation. Don't allow your results to languish in your file cabinet. Get the information out to the public.

Perhaps you can affiliate with non-profit groups that can act as a body to establish a working relationship with some government agencies that could eventually result in an open flow of UFO-related data in real time while a UFO event is going on. Such a venture could help government agencies reestablish a level of trust within the American public, something that is badly needed. This is at least worth a try.

Public Appearances: Public speaking can be stressful. It exposes you to an unknown audience, unusual questions, and unknown outcomes. Some people cannot do it without a carefully-prepared text in front of them. Others have the ability to speak in an impromptu fashion. All experience some level of stress during the process. Unfortunately for any ufologist with a fear of public appearances, it is still important to do it. It is a part of the communication process that exposes more and more people to the details of the UFO mystery.

Most people can eventually overcome the fear of public speaking and then they find it very rewarding. Something to keep in mind when asked by the local radio or television station, newspaper, or service club, is that you have the information they want and need. You are in control of that information.

The more often you appear, the easier it gets. If you want to improve more quickly, then join a local Toastmaster's Club or take some courses at a local educational institution. The additional bounty gained in making public appearances is that it improves your speaking skills and self-assurance level for work, home, and service organizations. It may also gain you tips on cases.

Other: Sources of stress are everywhere and need to be dealt with or they can be debilitating. I have noted a few of the sources of stress experienced by ufologists, but the list could go on and on. The main thing to remember is that you can be as stressed or as stress free as you decide to be. Don't let others assign stress to you.

Next month: Part Three, the Conclusion.

2000 MUFON SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS

Theme: UFOs in the New Millennium in St. Louis, MO. (274 pages) Published papers of thirteen of the leading UFO researchers. Price \$25.00 plus \$1.75 for P&H. Send order to MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369

A view from Britain

By Jenny Randles

There has been only one case on the minds of British UFOlogists as 2001 got underway—the best known of all close encounters in the UK, which is the multiple sightings in Rendlesham Forest.

This Suffolk pine wood encircled an episode involving both local villagers and USAF airmen, as well as officers from the then twin NATO bases of Bentwaters and Woodbridge. The case occurred in late December 1980, so the 20th anniversary was bound to bring much attention.

It certainly did, with vigils in the forest and anniversary skywatches—not to mention media stories. There are rumors of odd lights being seen that week, although that has been true for many years in this area (where tourist walks are even taken from time to time). The air bases have long been deserted following the end of the Cold War, and Orford Ness is now a nature park with the deserted huts and bunkers still the source of much talk.

The Rendlesham Forest case has generated more books than any other single event beyond Roswell. And in late November the fifth full volume to appear about its mysteries was released in the UK by Sidgwick & Jackson. *You Can't Tell the People* is by former private detective and internet gossip column editor Georgina Bruni.

A major search

She has conducted a major search for witnesses and sources during the past three years and has published her findings in this voluminous text. It certainly introduces some new data, including site photographs taken shortly after the incident in the forest, and brings to light a couple of new witnesses.

In the process it ignited a furious internet debate over the Christmas/New Year holidays. The arguments rage between a group of British UFOlogists, backed by skeptics such as science writer Ian Ridpath, who champion the view that the case has gradually dissolved into a series of misperceptions of mundane phenomena—like a prominent local lighthouse and some stars. Unsurprisingly, many UFOlogists feel this is an over simplification that rejects, needlessly, the testimony of responsible witnesses.

I do not intend to go into the finer points of that debate here, but rather to look at an issue that has emerged from the current furore that might be significant to this case. Both Jennie Zeidman and I have reported the basic facts in the *MUFON UFO Journal* during the early days of its research in the mid 1980s. This will give interested read-

ers a basic grounding. Although there were many sightings in the area spread over a period of several days, this case essentially revolves around two major incidents.

In the early hours of 26 December 1980 strange lights were seen falling into the forest by a security patrol at the East Gate of Woodbridge base. One man from that patrol (Airman, later Sergeant, John Burroughs) went into the forest along with two others who arrived from Bentwaters to investigate (Sergeant Jim Penniston and his driver, Airman Cabansag).

Once inside the forest they closed in on a semi transparent ethereal floating object that made strange movements and then shot skywards. At closest proximity Penniston says that what seemed like "mirror writing" was etched on the side. There is evidence of an altered state of consciousness involving these witnesses during this phase.

"Landing marks" found

In the forest at the point of this close encounter "landing marks" were later found by Burroughs and Penniston—in essence a big hole punched through the tree canopy, a scuffed up area on the ground, and a triangular set of shallow indentations.

Following further sightings in the woods, in the early hours of 28 December 1980 the deputy base commander, Colonel Charles Halt, then led a team of men, including a base photographer, to the site to take samples and measurements and "resolve" the event. They failed.

Halt took a dictaphone with him and recorded the procedure "live," but during this period more strange lights returned and Halt and several airmen chased these for some distance through trees, sporadically recording what they saw onto the tape. This included star-like lights, beams akin to lasers striking the ground and a "winking eye" object.

Central to both of these events is the question of the "landing site"—or as Halt on tape correctly calls it the "suspected impact point." It is truthfully this because Penniston and Burroughs were never certain that the smokey thing that they saw on the first night literally touched down. As such, how sure can we be sure that the marks they found do relate to the UFO?

A forest in the dark is a very difficult place to navigate. One group of pine trees looks much like any other. Certainly, if these airmen found marks at a spot near where they thought the UFO had been there is good reason for them to have assumed that the UFO caused them. But it likely was more an assumption than certainty. They did not see any UFO create these marks.

The real issue

However, the skeptics are fond of debating how the marks in a triangle inside the "landing zone" could have been created by rabbits, but the real issue to me involves the hole smashed through the pine canopy. I have never

seen a skeptic attempt to explain this, other than to dismiss it as either irrelevant or not proven to be there. But it was there. How do we know? Because the witnesses describe it.

It is clearly reported by Halt on the tape as he stands at the site 48 hours later recording what he sees. And it was independently described to researchers—even before the Halt tape surfaced—by a forester who found it. This, to me, is critical evidence. He was not a person unfamiliar with the woods.

Knew area well

This man, Brownlea, knew the area very well. When he spotted this massive hole punched through the tree tops one day in mid January, he had no doubt that it was unusual. Moreover, he thought it indicated that something had crashed from the sky into the trees. Brownlea very properly reported the matter to the nearby Forestry Commission offices. And they discussed the meaning.

Could the air base have been testing some kind of remotely controlled “drone” was one theory. Did something fall off a plane? They rejected any thought of an air crash because, as forester Vince Thurkettle told me, there was no way such a major event on their land and so relatively close to their offices could have been cleaned up and all wreckage removed without them becoming aware of it.

At the point when these discussions went on (early 1981), there was no public knowledge of the UFO sightings, not even in the local media. In fact the first ever reference to the case in a public forum was my short piece on the unverified rumors that appeared in *Flying Saucer Review* (FSR) magazine in March 1981.

But by then there was no trace site for us to study. In fact there was no trace site by the day after Brownlea found it! Even as he turned up for work the day after the above discussions he found logging crews already leveling this part of the forest. They were ordered to chop the trees.

Claims as to what went on are rife. A local garage owner (Gerry Harris) reported that an airmen told him the trees were being cut down because the forest was irradiated (radiation levels were recorded at the site by Halt on 28 December, but these are of dubious importance according to the manufacturers of the equipment used, and clearly were not considered a threat as Halt and his group spent hours on site whilst unprotected).

Why were the trees cut?

Obviously, cutting down trees would not deradiate an area. But it shows how stories about the site and the sudden decision to fell trees were getting around. So why was this part of the forest felled as soon as Brownlea found that hole through the trees? Its a good question.

I asked the forestry commission offices in 1983 and was told it was just routine. The trees in this area had been “scored” before Christmas indicating they were part

of the extensive pine wood now ready for harvesting. In fact, on the Halt tape you can hear discussions about the discovery of some notches on trees surrounding the landing site, and Halt comments that they seem to be “old.” As they were.

Who ordered the felling so rapidly? Brownlea agreed they were in an area set to be cut down, but he was not expecting this part to be immediately deforested. The base in the woods was told to do this by the head office in Cambridge. And Cambridge told us that the timing of the felling for the day after the discovery of the “crash site” by Brownlea was merely chance. “It was a coincidence. These trees were simply the next in line to be felled.”

So, as you see, there was a site that had some anomalous evidence suggesting that a heavy object had fallen through it from above and, by accident or design, it was removed from any possible scrutiny the minute that a civilian had found it.

A scare tactic?

From Gerry Harris’ notes the “radiation” story seems to have been something of a scare tactic, as it was used as a basis to advise any locals who heard about the UFO sightings not to go near the forest. Possibly that was its main function. After all, the radiation doesn’t seem to have bothered the USAF men when out there. You don’t hear them on the tape expressing any concerns (and as radiation levels fall off exponentially they would have been much more at risk than weeks later when the trees were felled).

So it cannot reasonably have been concluded as a threat to their health, and it is inconceivable that an irradiated forest would have been left *in situ* for thousands of locals to wander through during the three or four weeks between the UFO sighting and the eventual felling. Public safety would have required at the minimum some sort of ruse, such as a chemical dump scare, being invented to keep people out of the woods, even if the real truth could not be advised to them.

But there was no public warning. Only these rumors of radiation offered to anyone who heard about the UFO. There is a definite pattern here suggesting that the USAF did not want people snooping around the landing site, which they may have chosen to do after hearing that a UFO was supposed to have landed there.

So the radiation saga may have been used as a convenient deterrent to inquiring locals. Then, once the site was identified by locals, it was rapidly put out of commission. A curious thing to do if nothing much had happened there.

Another twist to the case

However, there is another remarkable twist to this story because there are reasons to suspect that a false trail was left for the locals to follow—just in case anyone stumbled over the truth. Between 1981 and 1983 we heard several stories filtering off base that there was a “false

landing site" placed in the woods. This wasn't the real one (presumably that was destroyed early on). Instead it was put there as a ruse to distract airmen who had heard the rumors (the UFO incidents were the talk of the base).

Many were going into the woods looking for UFOs. A New Years Eve skywatch party was supposedly held, for example. So there is a good case for someone planting a bogus set of traces near the real landing site just to take attention away from the true one.

A popular site

Our sources on base told us this site was quickly visited by airmen, and that someone scratched an arrow into the ground to demark this spot as the place to go. This is very hard to believe if the site was the real location of a then still secret UFO event. But it makes perfect sense if someone on base was trying to fob off airmen and locals with what they wanted them to believe were the real traces left by the rumored UFO landing.

The story takes a vital new turn at this point because forester Vince Thurkettle found what he took to be the landing site whilst he was out walking his dog. We think this was at about the end of January 1981. He did not tell of this until October 1983, the day after the Rendlesham Forest case became a front page story in Britain's biggest selling newspaper (the *News of the World*).

Thurkettle approached the highly respected *London Times* to report what he had seen nearly three years earlier and offer an alternative, rational viewpoint. He described finding a site with scuffed up ground and some holes in a rough triangle that he believed from inspection at the time were rabbit holes. From this site you could see the Orford Ness lighthouse shining through trees. Perhaps that was the UFO mistaken by the airmen. It was, he admitted, just an idea. But as one of the few people claiming to have seen the landing site—and being very dismissive—his story was extremely influential.

Even now many people in the UK think this case was solved that day by this forester's story. I talked to Thurkettle soon after. He showed me rabbit marks, explained his ideas, and impressed me as a clearly honest reporter. But here's the rub. He didn't describe to me seeing a big hole in the tree tops over the site. But he did say there was an arrow in the ground nearby.

Now less convinced

According to Georgina's Bruni's new book, Thurkettle has become less convinced he was right as more witnesses have surfaced describing what they saw. He is keen now to emphasise that he never said this case WAS resolved as just a lighthouse (and I can confirm that in 1983 he was merely offering speculation because, he told me, he found the tabloid media talk of spaceships and aliens to be premature and over the top).

If we take seriously those circulating tales on base about

the false landing site seeded into the forest, suddenly Thurkettle's story takes on an eerie new light. For if he saw the false site, not the real one, maybe he was an innocent pawn in the eventual discrediting of this case.

We assume that Brownlea found the real site (there was no arrow at his, but there was a big hole in the trees as described on the Halt tape) As soon as his discovery was reported, someone ensured that the area was deforested ASAP. If we assume that Thurkettle found the bogus site (and it looks as if at least it wasn't the same site from his description) then what was this location?

A clone?

Quite feasibly a hastily concocted "clone" forged out of convenient forest marks such as rabbit holes by the powers that be. These may accidentally have misled this forester into thinking he knew the answer to this case. This is admittedly a speculative argument as to what might have happened—or why. But it is based upon a lot of facts that fit rather neatly together.

And I dare say some will wonder if the false site was not even deliberately put where it was to lay the template for the future explanation that was offered up by the skeptics. I am not so sure of that idea. The skeptics arguments as to explanations for parts of this case do still have grounds, regardless of the traces, and have to be taken seriously.

The truth about the landing site is only one part of the whole story. It is also hard to see anyone in the USAF thinking that far ahead strategically enough as to plan for a possible future skeptical theory. Nevertheless we do now have a whole new question to face up to over what one wag on the internet dubbed during the recent debate "Neverendlesham" (!) That is whether someone deliberately sought to mislead the public by creating a bogus landing site that has led so many astray.

If so, where was the real site? Could you see the lighthouse from here? Were the traces left there identical to the ones that Thurkettle identified as rabbit holes at the site he found? And was the destruction of the real landing site so rapidly after discovery merely a coincidence?

Disinformation?

There is evidence for tactics in force soon after the event that probably involved USAF intelligence and base public affairs engaging in disinformation. Several angles of the events in the aftermath of this case point to their direct association with sowing out confusion into this case and using UFOlogists (including myself) to do it for them.

Can we conceive of anyone here deliberately fabricating a bogus site so as to compromise this case? Perhaps that's a question that readers of this magazine who are former USAF personnel can best answer for the rest of us. You know the sort of tactics that they employed. Is this conceivable?

Perspective

On the UFO Abduction Mystery

By Richard H. Hall

Having spent countless hours interviewing and working with abductees, attending and participating in scholarly conferences on the subject, and studying the works of the leading investigators (most of whom are personal friends), I can only say one thing: I have no idea whether the phenomenon is "real."



Richard Hall

Like David Jacobs, I certainly hope not because the implications are scary as hell. If it is really happening, then we are being manipulated by mysterious outside, secretive and amoral (by our standards) beings who do whatever they wish to us without any "informed consent." Our future and destiny is not completely under our own control. My college degree is in philosophy, and I have formally studied the issues involved in "free will" vs. "predestination," and similar questions.

My respect for the major abduction investigators (particularly Budd Hopkins, David Jacobs, and Ray Fowler) is unbounded. Their work has been thoughtfully and ethically conducted. Yet, when you compare the interpretations and conclusions of these investigators, all working pretty much from the same "data base" and sharing a common set of assumptions, they come out very differently.

My respect for the major abduction investigators (particularly Budd Hopkins, David Jacobs, and Ray Fowler) is unbounded. Their work has been thoughtfully and ethically conducted. Yet, when you compare the interpretations and conclusions of these investigators, all working pretty much from the same "data base" and sharing a common set of assumptions, they come out very differently.

What this suggests to me is that something is wrong methodologically. I think I know what that "something" is: we can only go so far in interpreting the largely subjective, self-report data before we run up against a wall and have to begin speculating beyond what the objective data can support. I think something closely akin to confabulation under hypnosis comes into play, and that the investigators (in all sincerity) try to fill in the gaps when, perhaps, they should simply admit that there is no easy way to get the final answers.

On the other extreme we have the debunkers, primarily represented by the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP), who claim to be open-minded skeptics. Sorry CSICOP, I know open-minded skeptics (I am one) and you are not open-minded skeptics.

I was very amused by the announced formation of the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Debunkers (CSICOD) in the current issue of *IF: The Bulletin of the Intruders Foundation*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (although I wish they would put the year of publication on their reports, or else librarians worldwide will silently scream and the timing of their comments will be lost).

I was on the program committee and a presenter at the UFO abduction conference held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1992. After a session in which I participated on a panel discussing the international scope of abduction reports, a certain prominent, loud-mouth debunker cornered me in the hallway and began ranting: If abductions are real, why are they only reported in North America? I saw him in the auditorium during the presentation, so can only assume that he must have been wearing earplugs.

On the theme of perspective, *The UFO Evidence, Volume II* provides 30-plus years of UFO history since 1964 and an essay by Dr. Eddie Bullard addressing the question of how UFO abduction reports emerged from the "background noise" of regular or "routine" UFO sightings.

Frankly, I wish abduction reports would go away and let us deal with the measurable, physical aspects of UFO reports as top priority. However, the abductees I have interviewed and talked with face-to-face have convinced me that they are telling the truth to the best of their ability, and that something of potentially overriding importance is going on. Exactly what it is I don't think anyone knows with certainty.

I hope it proves to be some form of delusion or imagination, but part of my background is in psychology and social sciences research as an abstractor and editor, and I have interacted extensively with professionals in these fields. Their formal papers and private comments give me little hope that there is some simple explanation for all this. Wishful thinking will not do. We drastically need a broad-scope scientific study of UFOs, an outline for which is included in *The UFO Evidence, Volume II*.

MUFON Merchandise

Wear official MUFON T-shirts (royal blue printing on white cotton), sizes S, M, L & XL. Two styles of baseball caps (royal blue with white logo or dark blue with blue logo on white front). T-shirt price \$12.00 and baseball caps \$8.00. S/H for each is \$3.00 or if both ordered together is only \$3.00.

MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369. (Check, money order, travelers check, or cash in U.S. dollars.)



March 2001

Bright Planets (Evening Sky)

Venus (magnitude -4.4 in midmonth) can be seen low in the W at dusk early in March and then becomes more difficult as it nears the Sun. It moves into the morning sky on the 30th.

Jupiter (-2.2) and Saturn (-0.2) still form a nice pair in Taurus. They become visible in the SW at twilight and later set in the WNW, Saturn first about 11 PM (mid-March) and then Jupiter about midnight. The two giant planets lie in the Moon's vicinity on the 1st and again near the lunar crescent on the 28th and 29th.

Bright Planets (Morning Sky)

Mars nearly doubles in brightness during March, from 0.5 to -0.2 magnitude. The red planet slides from Scorpius into Ophiuchus. This is a good time to compare its color and brightness with the nearby reddish star Antares (which means "rival of Mars"). The 1st-magnitude star is somewhat fainter than the planet.

More Life Signs on Mars

In December NASA scientists announced two separate findings relating to the debate about life on Mars. Mars Global Surveyor images have shown layers of sedimentary rock along the walls of craters and canyons, providing evidence that ancient lakes and seas were once widespread on Mars. Such places on Earth are prime sites for fossils. This find greatly increases the regions on Mars where signs of past life can be checked out.

The second report involved the same meteorite that furnished controversial possible evidence for ancient Martian life. (See Night Sky, Nov., 1996) The 4-lb. rock has yielded improved data about one of the argued lines of evidence in the meteorite, the presence of magnetites. The magnetic crystals were found to be chemically pure and defect-free, something that can be produced only by microscopic life forms such as Earth bacteria.

The scientists believe, however, the crystals came from Mars and were not produced on Earth by contaminating bacteria. The depth of the embedded crystals and an indication that they were formed in a low-oxygen environment (such as on Mars) would appear to exclude an Earth origin, according to the announcement. It is clear that the

red planet once had a strong magnetic field. That era was about the time the crystals were formed—nearly 4 billion years ago.

The concurrent announcement about evidence for ancient lakes on Mars may link the two findings: The bodies of water may have furnished a habitat for the crystal-growing bacteria.

Moon Phases

First quarter—March 2
Full moon—March 9
Last quarter—March 16
New moon—March 24

The Stars

As spring approaches on March 20, Leo the Lion creeps higher in the SE sky. The lion is rather easy to make out. A reverse question mark or sickle of stars outlines the beast's head and mane. The dot in the question mark, the bright star Regulus, is Leo's heart. A stellar triangle E of Regulus indicates the lion's rear haunches and tail.

The brilliant stars of Orion and the Winter Circle are still prominent in the SW. On March 29, from eastern North America, the V-shaped Hyades star cluster in Taurus will be covered, or occulted, by the Moon for about two hours beginning about 8 PM.



Feb. 10, MUFON Central States meeting, Kansas City, Missouri, 1-800-489-4UFO.

March 4-10, 10th Annual International UFO Congress Convention & Film Festival, Laughlin, Nevada

March 31-April 1, 12th UFO/ET Alien & Abduction Congress, Days Inn, Bordentown, NJ

April 6-8, 13th Annual Ozark UFO Conference, Inn of the Ozarks Conference Center, Eureka Springs, Arkansas; \$35/person (advance through April 1), \$40/person at the door. email: ozarkufo@webtv.net Web site: www.ozarkufo.iwarp.com 501-354-2558

May 25-28, First Annual Northwest UFO/Paranormal Conference, Seattle, WA 206-329-1794 email philipson@hotmail.com

July 20-22, MUFON 2001 International UFO Symposium, Hyatt Regency Irvine, Irvine, California. Theme: Joining the Cosmic Neighborhood. See Director's Message on page 24 and article on page 3 for details.

Nov. 17-18, Third Annual International UFO & New Age Symposium of Eastern Europe, Balkans, & Istanbul.

Director's Message...

(continued from page 24)

Joseph Cambria has stepped down as State Director for Massachusetts and has been replaced by **Dr. Reinhard H. Bartelmann** of Worcester, MA. Joe will now serve MA MUFON as Assistant State Director. We thank Joe and Reinhard for their continuing service to MUFON.

Skip Schultz has stepped down as State Director for Oregon and has recruited Assistant State Director **Anthony Elgin** as his replacement. We thank Skip for his service as State Director and look forward to working with him in other MUFON roles.

We are pleased to announce that **Ike Bishop** will resume his position as State Director for Idaho. Ike is looking forward to rebuilding a strong MUFON presence in Idaho. Thank you Ike.

New Consultants and Research Specialists

MUFON is always pleased when members volunteer their talents by taking on special assignments. This month we have two new consultants in Law. They are **Jay H. Floyd, Jr.** of Midland, Texas and **Larry K. King** of Sedan, Kansas. In addition, we have two new Research Specialists. **Richard L. Sumner** of Vincennes, Indiana, is a Research Specialist in Geology. **Walter F. Billings** of Missoula, Montana, is a Research Specialist in Electrical Utility Distribution.

New State Officers

We have a belated announcement that **Anthony F. Allotta**, of San Antonio, Texas, is the State Section Director for Bexar County. Tony has been serving in this role for several months.

David Marler, Illinois State Director, has identified **Forest Crawford** as Assistant State Director and State Section Director; and **John J. Betta** as State Section Director for Madison, Jersey, Calhoun, Montgomery, Bond, Greens and Macoupin Counties.

Michael Curta, Colorado State Director, has named **James F. Nelson** as Assistant State Director. Jim is a past state director.

Bruce Widaman, Missouri State Director, has named **Adrian Roberts** as State Section Director for St. Louis County.

Ike Bishop, Idaho State Director, has named **Chris Altman** as State Section Director for Canyon, Ada, Boise, Elmore and Owyhee counties.

Police Officer Publication

Georgia State Director **Tom Sheets** reached out to the Georgia police community with an article published in the December 2000 issue of *Georgia Police Officer*,

the official publication for the Police Officers Association of Georgia. The article is titled "Unidentified Flying Objects and Law Enforcement: You Want to Report What?"

In it, Tom addresses the situation where police officers are faced with receiving UFO reports and how they should address them. The four-page article explains MUFON's role in UFO investigations and the serious nature of the UFO problem. I would like to see this information published for police officers in every state.

Trucker reports interaction of several objects

By **J. R. Gillis**, Field Investigator

On Nov. 28, 1990, a 62-year-old truck driver had just left Boise City, OK, headed SE on US 287. He was close to the OK/TX line, near the town of Kerrick. Out of the left front of his cab window, he noticed a large dark, blue/gray cloud. After a second or two, he noticed there were 4 blue/gray objects in the cloud. He slowed his truck down to about 45 mph to get a better look.

All 4 objects were one behind the other. They were oval shaped and blue/gray in color. In front of the objects was another UFO the same shape and color, but it was larger. As the objects passed to the right of his windshield they all stopped and hovered. The larger object appeared to drop below the clouds.

Now, the other objects were spaced around the larger one, but it looked like they were still in the clouds. One at a time the smaller UFOs were drawn into the larger craft by a beam of white light. After this was completed, the UFO shot straight up into the clouds. The witness states he observed the objects for about 2 minutes.

I interviewed the witness at his home. He is retired from the US Army and resides at the Navy Home in Gulfport, MS. He was an aircraft/missile mechanic in the service. He said he had read some info on UFOs, but most of it was from newspaper accounts. He stated he always wondered why if there were UFO's he never saw one before.

NOTE: He said at the time of the sighting, he was going by the name of George Mercer, because he was also writing country music. He couldn't recall the name of the trucking company, but said he had the info in his files if I needed it later. I asked him how he could remember the date and details of the sighting but not the name of the trucking company. He said that was easy. It was Thanksgiving Day, and it is not every day he observes a UFO.

The witness appeared to be of sound mind, with no reason for a hoax 10 years later, and he doesn't want his name to be used.

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

By **John Schuessler**
MUFON International Director

MUFON 2001 UFO Symposium

The MUFON 2001 Annual UFO Symposium will be held at the beautiful Hyatt Regency Irvine Hotel in Orange County, California, on July 20-22. Symposium Chairman **Jan Harzan** has announced the theme of the event as "2001—Joining the Cosmic Neighborhood."

Speakers will be addressing the premise that "we are not alone" and how that is changing our world-view. The following are confirmed speakers for the July event: **Dr. John Mack, Dr. Roger Leir, Dr. Eric Davis, Dr. Bob Wood, Bob Pratt, Daniel Sheehan, Dr. Barry Downing, Stanton T. Friedman, Ryan Wood, Dr. Steven Greer and Jaime Maussan.**

The symposium committee has established admission rates for attendees at one-half to one-fourth the cost of most UFO conferences. In addition there is a significant price break for early registration. The admission price for the whole conference is \$89 per person prior to April 29, 2001, and \$99 per person prior to July 1, 2001. Admission at the door will be \$109 for all speaker presentations. Please send your symposium registration to MUFON ORANGE COUNTY, 19744 Beach Blvd., PMB 264, Huntington Beach, CA 92648. Make checks payable to "MUFON."

MUFON 2002 UFO Symposium Call

MUFON Headquarters is in the process of selecting a MUFON state or city group to host the MUFON 2002 UFO Symposium. Interested groups should contact MUFON Headquarters by mail at P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369, by FAX at (303) 932-9279, or by telephone at (303) 932-7709.

MUFON Board of Directors

Although we publish a listing of the MUFON Board members in the front of the annual *MUFON Symposium Proceedings* each July, I find that some of our members are unaware of who sits on the Board. Current Board members are as follows:

- * International Director: **John Schuessler**
- * Corporate Secretary: **Thomas P. Dueley**
- * Treasurer: **Tom Whitmore**
- * International Coordinator: **Antonio Huneus**
- * Editor - *MUFON UFO Journal*: **Dwight Connelly**
- * Director-at-Large: **John E. Mack**
- * Director of Abduction Res.: **John S. Carpenter**
- * Director of Field Investigator Training: **Kathleen F.**

Marden

- * Director of Government Affairs: **Larry W. Bryant**
- * Director of Legal Affairs: **Herbert L. Prouty**
- * Director of Public Relations: **Robert H.**

Bletchman

- * Director of Publications: **Irena Scott**
- * Director of Research: **Robert M. Wood**
- * Director of Special Investigations: **Stanton T.**

Friedman

- * Regional Director, Eastern USA: **George A. Filer**
- * Regional Director, Central USA: **John C. Kasher**
- * Regional Director, Western USA: **Virgil C. Staff**
- * National Director, Canada: **Michael J. Strainic**

MUFON E-Mail Directory

One of the many fine services provided by MUFON volunteers is the MUFON E-Mail Directory. **Bob Long**, Assistant State Director of New York MUFON, saw a need for a directory and began collecting member addresses. He assembled the addresses into a state-by-state listing and his latest directory contains approximately 500 member addresses.

To be included, MUFON members must contact **Bob Long** at Alienchasr@aol.com and volunteer their addresses for the listing. It is then up to member participants to assure their listings are current by notifying Bob of any changes as they occur. We thank Bob for taking the leadership role on this important communications tool.

New Field Investigators

Kathleen Marden, Director of Field Investigator Training, has announced the following Field Investigator Trainees have successfully completed the Field Investigator's Exam and are now certified MUFON Field Investigators: **Larry Thacker, Jr.**, Harrogate, Tennessee; **Claudio A. Del Rosario**, Buenos Aires, Argentina; **Flo McClain**, Phoenix, Arizona; and **Whitney Chebegia**, Long Beach, California.

New State Directors

Tom McFarland has stepped down as State Director for Vermont and has been replaced by **Oscar La Fuente** of Londonderry, VT. We thank Tom for his past service and look forward to working with him in other roles in Vermont MUFON and we are pleased that Oscar has accepted the state leadership role.

(Continued on Page 23)