

# THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL

NUMBER 160

JUNE 1981


Founded 1967

\$1.50

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.



**M.I.T.: Site of 1981 MUFON Symposium**

*The MUFON*  
**UFO JOURNAL**  
(USPS 002-970)  
103 Oldtowne Rd.  
Seguin, Texas 78155

**RICHARD HALL**  
Editor

**ANN DRUFFEL**  
Associate Editor

**LEN STRINGFIELD**  
Associate Editor

**MILDRED BIESELE**  
Contributing Editor

**WALTER H. ANDRUS**  
Director of MUFON

**TED BLOECHER**  
**DAVE WEBB**  
Co-Chairmen,  
Humanoid Study Group

**PAUL CERNY**  
Promotion/Publicity

**REV. BARRY DOWNING**  
Religion and UFOs

**LUCIUS FARISH**  
Books/Periodicals/History

**MARK HERBSTTRIT**  
Astronomy

**ROSETTA HOLMES**  
Promotion/Publicity

**TED PHILLIPS**  
Landing Trace Cases

**JOHN F. SCHUESSLER**  
UFO Propulsion

**DENNIS W. STACY**  
Staff Writer

**NORMA E. SHORT**  
**DWIGHT CONNELLY**

**DENNIS HAUCK**  
Editor/Publishers Emeritus

The MUFON UFO JOURNAL is published by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas. Membership/Subscription rates: \$15.00 per year in the U.S.A.; \$16.00 foreign. Copyright 1981 by the Mutual UFO Network. Second class postage paid at Seguin, Texas. POSTMASTER: Send form 3579 to advise change of address to The MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155.

## FROM THE EDITOR

We had hoped to have this issue published before the 1981 Boston MUFON UFO Symposium, but most people will receive it after the meeting is history. Printing delays and vacation schedules intervened. Coverage of the Symposium will be included in the August or September issue.

As an example of cooperation among UFO groups, we introduce this month the first of a series of quarterly plotting maps for U.S. sightings. We congratulate Gayle McBride of the Tarheel UFO Study Group, North Carolina, who persuaded the represented parties to share sighting data for this purpose.

### In this issue

KLASS AND FRIEDMAN DEBATE.....	3
By Dennis Stacy	
AIR FORCE "MODEL" UFO.....	5
By Don Berliner	
OPEN LETTER TO ROBERT SHEAFFER.....	7
By James M. McCampbell	
UFO AND OCCUPANT AT SANTA MARIA AIRPORT, AZORES.8	
By Ted Bloecher	
FOGARTY ON KLASS: A COMMENT.....	10
By Jennie Zeidman	
GERMAN UFO LITERATURE NEEDS TRANSLATION.....	11
By Michael Sinclair	
CALIFORNIA REPORT.....	13
By Ann Druffel	
FIRST QUARTER 1981 UFO SIGHTINGS MAP.....	16
By Gayle McBride	
IN OTHERS' WORDS.....	19
By Lucius Farish	
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE.....	20
By Walt Andrus	

The contents of The MUFON UFO JOURNAL are determined by the editor, and do not necessarily represent the official position of MUFON. Opinions of contributors are their own, and do not necessarily reflect those of the editor, the staff, or MUFON. Articles may be forwarded directly to MUFON. Responses to published articles may be in a Letter to the Editor (up to about 400 words) or in a short article (up to about 2,000 words). Thereafter, the "50% rule" is applied: the article author may reply but will be allowed half the wordage used in the response; the responder may answer the author but will be allowed half the wordage used in the author's reply; etc. All submissions are subject to editing for style, clarity, and conciseness. Permission is hereby granted to quote from this issue provided not more than 200 words are quoted from any one article, the author of the article is given credit, and the statement "Copyright 1981 by the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas" is included.

# KLASS AND FRIEDMAN DEBATE

By Dennis Stacy  
(Staff Writer)

A formal debate was staged in the halls of Trinity University, San Antonio, between UFO proponent, Stanton T. Friedman, and arch saucer critic, Philip J. Klass on February 21, 1981. Nearly 400 people attended the debate in Trinity's Laurie Auditorium sponsored by the Trinity Students Activity Committee and Professor of Astronomy, Dr. Michael Hart. Hart also chaired last year's University of Maryland astronomer's conference on the question of extraterrestrial life, "Where Are They?"

Friedman was the evening's first speaker and led off by arguing that the evidence that *some* UFOs were indeed spacecraft of an extraterrestrial origin and manufacture was now overwhelming. Various parties, Friedman charged, including U.S. government and military intelligence agencies, were actively involved in a Cosmic Watergate, an on-going coverup designed to keep secret the knowledge that UFOs exist in physical reality.

Friedman, a nuclear physicist with 14 years research experience in various government and industrial highly classified projects, is probably the country's foremost proponent of the theory of extraterrestrial UFO origin. He claims he is the only *known* space scientist devoting full time research to the UFO phenomenon.

His opponent was Philip J. Klass, senior avionics editor of *Aviation Week and Space Technology* journal. He is also an original UFO panel member of the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP), a panel which also includes well-known UFO skeptics, Robert Sheaffer and James Oberg. Klass is the author of two flying saucer books, *UFOs - Explained* and *UFOs - Identified*, and also serves as an editor for the

Committee's quarterly journal, "The Skeptical Inquirer."

Klass maintained that there has yet to be a UFO reported that, when subjected to close enough scrutiny, does not fail to have behind it a prosaic, if admittedly sometimes exceedingly rare, source or stimulus. According to Klass, UFOs can be anything from meteors to more exotic meteorological phenomena like "sundogs" and atmospheric plasma, or ball lightning. They can be hallucinations or misapprehensions of untrained witnesses. They can be temperature inversions on a radar screen or common celestial objects seen under unusual conditions. They can even be outright fabrications and hoaxes, said Klass. In fact, they can be just about anything at all except convincing proof that the planet is being surveyed or visited by extraterrestrial intelligence capable of interstellar travel.

As a classic example of how even the best of high-strangeness UFO reports can turn out to have a mundane explanation, Klass spent the first 30 minutes of his time analyzing the famous near collision between a cigar-shaped, redly glowing UFO and an Army Reserve helicopter piloted by then Captain Lawrence J. Coyne the night of October 18, 1973, near Cleveland, Ohio. A Blue Ribbon Panel of "The National Enquirer" newspaper later awarded the helicopter crew \$5,000 as a prize for "the most scientifically valuable UFO report of 1973."

Klass admitted that, on the surface, the circumstances seemed to be strange enough. The October night in question, Captain Coyne had been at the controls of a Bell UH-1H (Huey) helicopter on a routine flight from Columbus, Ohio, to the crew's home base in Cleveland. Three other crewman were also aboard. The

chopper was traveling at a speed of 90 knots, 2500 feet above sea level. 1200 feet above the actual ground surface below.


At 11 pm, one of the crewman noticed a curious red light off to the east. Coyne told him to "keep an eye on it." Thirty seconds later, the red light shot straight for the helicopter on a collision course. Its speed was estimated at 600 knots, or about 700 miles per hour. Coyne tightened his grip on the controls and urged the helicopter into an abrupt dive. Now the red light had stopped directly above them and the entire crew looked up through the helicopter's roof panel windows in wonder.

The thing remained motionless for 10 or 12 seconds. One of the crew said it looked like the "hull of a dark submarine" as its oblong form blotting out the easily visible stars. All aboard could see the red light at the nose of the odd object, and several other attached lights reflecting off its dark surface.

Suddenly, a pyramidal, or triangular-shaped beam of green light shone down on the helicopter, lighting up the interior. Coyne now noticed that his chopper, instead of descending, was rising, at almost a thousand feet a minute! Whatever the thing was, it abruptly shot off to the west and disappeared from view, having been in continuous sight for a period of 4 to 5 minutes.

And what it might have been, of course, depends on which side of the UFO debate the individual interpreter happens to fall. To Philip Klass, not unexpectedly, the explanation was obvious. Coyne and his crew had seen a particularly brilliant and sustained fireball emanating from the annual Orionid meteor shower which generally occurs on

(Continued on next page)



Phil Klass

the nights of October 21st and 22nd. And it is entirely understandable, Klass continued, that the helicopter crew should react in alarm and confusion to the startling sight, so much so that they obviously misinterpreted the subsequent events and time factors involved. The green light flooding the cabin of the helicopter, for example, was caused not by a beam of light of that color, but because the flash of the fireball itself was filtered through the rooftop window panels which are themselves tinted green!

Klass also focused on several other discrepancies he said he detected in the crew's account of the frightening encounter after a passage of two and a half years. Coyne, in particular, later said that the helicopter's magnetic compass had begun to spin wildly in the course of the near collision and had to be replaced. Another crewman said the compass had not been affected during the event. The chopper's radioman had also tried to contact one of several nearby military installations at the time of the sighting and had failed to raise a response. Nothing overly mysterious about that, either, Klass noted; the onboard radio unit had a short range and simply could not cope with the distances involved.

encounter, a fact that Klass "conveniently" failed to mention.

Rather than engaging in a lengthy rebuttal of Klass' explanation, however, Friedman quickly moved on to material he considered more urgent, including a review of numerous law suits undertaken by individuals and saucers groups alike under the Freedom of Information act. One such suit currently under way seeks the recovery of 135 classified documents in the archives of the National Security Agency (NSA). Government attorneys have already admitted that the documents do exist, but have taken strenuous steps to see that they are not released to the general public. A 21-page summary of the documents was shown to the presiding judge in a closed-door session. Friedman, of course, alleges



Stan Friedman

Friedman was courteous and succinct in his rejoinder. Since his UFO encounter, it was pointed out, Coyne had been promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel, hardly the kind of recognition the Army Reserves would bestow upon a helicopter pilot guilty of the errors of observation and judgment with which Klass charged him. Friedman also noted that several independent ground observers had confirmed the UFO sighting at the time of the Coyne

that the legal maneuvers are the latest in a series of on-going cover-ups conducted by the government to withhold conclusive evidence of the physical existence of UFOs.

In his own rebuttal, Klass would reply that the NSA was the government intelligence agency charged with the translation of classified communications intercepted from

(Continued on next page)

# AIR FORCE "MODEL" UFO

By Don Berliner

The first major study of a large collection of UFO reports was the puzzling "Special Report 14," which covered more than 3,000 reports received by the U.S. Air Force in the first 5 years of its Projects Sign, Grudge and Blue Book — 1947-52. The data used in the reports were the Air Force's, but the conclusions were those of Battelle Memorial Institute, a private scientific research organization in Columbus, Ohio, which performed the study on a \$100,000 Air Force contract.

When it was released to the public in 1955, Special Report 14 attracted little attention, as the press chose

to base its stories on the report's very conservative conclusions and summary, rather than on the intriguing but hard-to-read tables, graphs, and charts. As a result, few people realized at the time that almost one-quarter of the 3,201 sightings had been declared "Unknown" by the Battelle scientists. Instead, the public had little choice but to accept the conclusions of the accompanying Air Force press release which implied that only 3% of all the sightings had not been explained as conventional phenomena or illusions.

One of the more interesting ideas explored in the report was the attempt to construct a model of a UFO,

using the descriptions of what they felt were the "Best Unknowns" among the hundreds they had determined were unexplainable. The Battelle conclusion was that it was impossible to derive a model of a "flying saucer" that fit all the requirements of consistency. The implication was that this reduced the chances of there being a category of real, unknown devices responsible for a significant number of reports.

The validity of the effort can be called into question on several accounts, any one of which causes one to wonder if the study was truly objective. The statement that "suffi-

(Continued on next page)

---

## Debate, Continued

Soviet, Chinese and other foreign powers. To reveal their contents, he charged, would show the public not so nearly much about flying saucers as about America's intelligence gathering capabilities. Klass then showed slides of numerous already de-classified documents from various security agencies which indicated that if a saucer conspiracy were indeed in effect, individual agencies such as the CIA and the Department of Defense were as ignorant of its existence as everyone else. Klass also said that it would be a physical impossibility to maintain a secret of such magnitude as the supposed fact that the U.S. government has in its possession a crashed saucer or retrieved alien corpses.

Friedman also stated that the famous Barney and Betty Hill abduction case offered convincing proof that an extraterrestrial intelligence was engaged in biological experiments involving human specimens. The single most convincing element of the case, Friedman reiterated, was Betty's ability, two and one half years after her frightening abduction experience, to redraw an alleged star map she had seen while on board the alien spacecraft. The

map was sketched out while Betty was under the influence of a post-hypnotic suggestion. Astronomer Marjorie Fish later constructed hundreds of three-dimensional star maps of our near-neighbor suns using recently corrected star distance data before she arrived at a controversial verification of Betty's map. Fish's work indicated that the aliens were from either Zeta One or Two Reticuli, two sun-like stars separated by a gap of only 3 light weeks. Friedman contended that such a situation of relative proximity between one solar system and another would be highly conducive to the development of space travel technology by an intelligent life form inhabiting a planet in either system.

After Friedman had finished speaking, Klass scored one of the more dramatic points in the debate by approaching Friedman's table with his own "star map." If Betty Hill could accurately recreate a map from memory two and one half years after the alleged incident, would Friedman be willing to subject his own memory to a small scientific test? Would he kindly glance at the drawing Klass held up to the audience, study it for 30 seconds, and then recreate it from

memory?

Friedman declined, of course, after noting that Betty Hill had redrawn her map while under the care of Dr. Benjamin Simon, a prominent New England psychologist and trained hypnotist. The fact of the map's existence spoke for itself, Friedman concluded.

So who really won the "inside" debate? Probably no one. As no less an authority on the subject of UFOs than Dr. J. Allen Hynek once said: "I was trained as a scientist, not as a lawyer, and in any case I don't see how a difficult scientific question can be properly addressed within the limitations of the debate format, which reduces everything to a simplistic either-or position and makes no allowances for the real complexities of an issue."

The only thing that does seem clear at this point is that the UFO debate is bound to continue until a satisfactory resolution is made. It will continue in the front pages of the world's newspapers and in the hallowed halls of academia. And it will continue in the woods and fields of the world whenever people look up and see something strange in the nighttime sky. Something they can't readily identify. □

## AF Model, Continued

ciently detailed descriptions were given in only 12 cases" makes absolutely no sense to anyone who has taken a more than casual glance at the accumulated cases of the first 5 years of the official investigation. There are many scores of reports containing as much, if not more information than the dozen selected for this special study. Just why these were chosen and others ignored cannot be determined at this late date. But even using these cases, a better job could have been done. In fact, there are so many errors in reporting and drawing the objects from the 12 cases that serious doubt arises as to the capability and sincerity of those who prepared the section entitled, "The 'Flying Saucer' Model."

In an effort to show how distorted the attempt to derive a model was, we offer comments on each, along with considerably better identification of each case than was presented in Special Report 14.

### Best Unknowns

Case I. July 29, 1948; Indianapolis, Ind. Non-Technical witnesses James Toney and Robert Huggins. The two men said the object was propeller-shaped, yet the drawing in Report 14 looks like no known propeller. The witnesses refer to round cups on the object, yet the drawing shows most cups to be clearly oblong. The written description is of an object 6'-8' long and 2' wide; the dimensions with the drawing say it was 1½'-2' wide. The description is of an object with a radius-to-thickness ratio of 3 or 4:1; the dimensions are of an object with a ratio of 3 to 5:1; and the drawing has a ratio of just over 2½:1. The final Project Blue Book conclusion was: Unknown.

Case II. Apr. 20, 1952; Flint, Mich. The prime witness is described as a Naval aviation student, but the case file says he was a university student who had been a naval aviator. The description is of objects "shaped like conventional aircraft," yet the drawing in Report 14 shows an airplane clearly lacking a tail!

Despite the shape and the red glow surrounding the many glowing objects, the official USAF conclusion was that the several witnesses had been watching birds.

Case III. Jan. 20, 1951; Sioux City, Iowa. The witnesses were Mid-Continent Air Lines Capt. Lawrence Vinther, First Officer James Bachmeier, and control tower operators. The description is of an object "like an airplane with a cigar-shaped body and straight wings." The drawing is of a pair of crossed hotdogs, with the "wings" shaped exactly like the "fuselage." Despite some rather violent maneuvering, the USAF decided the excellent witnesses must have been observing an enormous B-36 airplane.

Case IV. July 19, 1952; Madison, Fla. The witness was Ollie Daniel, a former U.S. Navy airplane mechanic. He described two "cigar-shaped" objects. The drawing is of an oval with a thickness ratio of just over 3:1, which is pretty fat for a cigar. Even though Daniel said the objects were lighted, had visible exhaust at one end, and maneuvered, the USAF said they were "possible balloons."

Case V. July 24, 1948; Montgomery, Ala. Witnesses were Eastern Airlines Capt. Clarence Chiles and First Officer J.B. Whitted. Their description was of a rocket-shaped object with two rows of lighted windows, and yet the pilot's drawing shows only vertical divisions with no indication of light, as in his copilot's drawing. Even though the object was said to have climbed away steeply, the USAF said it was a meteor, apparently on the urging of the late Dr. Donald Menzel.

Case VI. Dec. 22, 1952; Banning, Calif. The witness was instrument technician Michael Fajack. This case file is missing from the Project Blue Book collection and so no analysis is possible.

Case VII. June 6, 1952; Kimpo AFB, Korea. The witness was an unnamed USAF Flight Sergeant (a term apparently coined by the authors of Report 14). The case file is missing from the Blue Book records, but is listed as "Unidentified" on a summary sheet. It was described in

Report 14 as a thick disc: The drawing shows a thickness ratio of 3.4:1 and mentions proportions of 7:1, referring to dimensions from the observer's drawing, but never stating any specific figures.

Case VIII. July 31, 1948; Indianapolis, Ind. Witnesses Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Swigert. (No notice is taken that it occurred less than 48 hours after Case I and in the same general area.) It is described as "cymbal" shaped, which suggests a flat bottom, but the drawing shows an upwardly curved bottom. Using the witnesses' dimensions, the object would have a thickness ratio of between 2.5 and 3.3:1, but the drawing is of a thinner object with a ratio of 3.7:1. The official USAF conclusion is: Unidentified.

Case IX. Aug. 13, 1947; Twin Falls, Idaho. The witnesses were A.C. Urie and his sons Kenneth and Billie. The dimensions are of an object having a thickness ratio of 2:1, yet the drawings show ratios of 3.2 and 3.4:1, with no explanation for the variance. The witnesses described pods on the sides, while the side-view drawing shows loops or handles. There is no sign of flames coming from the pods, as mentioned by the witnesses. The USAF explanation of "atmospheric eddy" is credited to Dr. J. Allen Hynek, who subsequently disowned the idea.

Case X. May 24, 1949; Rogue River, Ore. The witnesses were several employees of the Ames Aeronautical Laboratories. The object was described as "like a fifty-cent piece," "pancake-like... somewhat thicker in the center," "either completely circular or somewhat oval... thin near the edges and thicker in the center." All witnesses described a small triangular fin extending from the middle and getting larger as it approached the rear. The drawing shows a fairly thick circular disc with a fin resembling the one described by the witnesses. Estimated dimensions ranged from 25' in diameter, to the size of a C-47 transport plane (95' wingspan and 64' length); no

(Continued on next page)

**AN OPEN LETTER TO  
ROBERT SHEAFFER  
CONCERNING HIS NEW BOOK,  
"THE UFO VERDICT,  
EXAMINING THE EVIDENCE"**

May 4, 1981

Dear Bob,

It was a pleasure to meet you and your family last week and I appreciate having a copy of your book. Your suspicion that I might not like it was correct. It would take too much time to tick off each item of weakness that I noted, but here are a few general comments:

(a) The title and subtitle imply that the book is a comprehensive study of the subject leading to a rational conclusion. It falls far short of that.

(b) You start with an unstated, but none the less obvious, promise that UFOs do not exist, then search for the necessary solutions to certain cases. With very strained arguments that ignore essential details you "explain" the cases. Therefore, according to the book, you have proved that UFO's don't exist. We both know that you have an impossible mission, that is, to prove that UFOs do not exist. On the other hand, I may be able to prove that they *do*. I prefer to hold my cards in this game.

(c) Your debunking techniques are the old familiar ones of Blue Book, Condon, and Klass. They don't wash.

(d) You treat ufology as a social phenomenon exclusively, whereas

its proper thrust is the study of UFOs themselves.

(e) The arguments ad hominem are inexcusable. (Perhaps you are merely trying to antagonize people to gain notice.)

(f) The single reference to my work concerning Adamski and implying that I think there are cities on the back side of the moon is ridiculous. It suggests that the scientific theory of the book and the technical details passed over your head.

(g) You give great lip service to the scientific method, but fail to apply it.

(h) In a number of instances I found the logic to be faulty. Actually, Bob, the book is so bad that I find it easier to believe in flying saucers than that you are serious.

Sincerely,

/s/ Jim

James M. McCampbell  
MUFON, Director of Research  
12 Bryce Court  
Belmont, CA 94002

**MUFON**

103 OLDTOWNE RD.  
SEGUIN, TX 78155

**STAMP CONTRIBUTIONS**

We are grateful to the MUFON members/subscribers who continue to contribute cancelled foreign stamps. Proceeds are applied to help underwrite international exchange of UFO information. Recent stamp contributions have been received from —

Don Berliner, Arlington, Va.; Larry Bryant, Arlington, Va.; Jerome Clark, Lake Bluff, Ill.; Robert Davis, Dallas, Texas; R. Bruce Jordan, Palo Alto, Calif.; Project Starlight International, Austin, Texas; Tarheel UFO Study Group, Winston-Salem, N.C.; and Diane Tessman, St. Petersburg, Fla.

**Were 'fuzzies'  
really from  
UFOs?**

DANVILLE — One person described them as resembling "hundreds of fuzzies" and another said they looked "like falling cobwebs."

Some people in Danville's 2nd Ward were talking about shiny little white particles that seemed to be falling from the sky at about 2:30 p.m. Monday. Some were still coming down at 4:30 p.m., they said.

It appeared that the silklike particles were being shot from saucer-shaped crafts in front of the sun, said William F. Hummer who lives at 222 Honeymoon St. He said he and about six of his neighbors witnessed the objects. Two neighbors said they agreed with Hummer's account, but they wouldn't give their names.

Hummer said the saucer-type crafts seemed to have round domes on top. He said it looked like the saucers were exploding or "hatching" in front of the sun and releasing the smaller particles.

The particles seemed to disintegrate as they fell to the ground, he said.

**AF Model, Continued**

one estimated the thickness ratio. The descriptions and drawing are therefore in reasonably close agreement. The Air Force, in its inimitable fashion, listed this case twice, once explaining it as "kites" and once as "aircraft."

Case XI. Mar. 20, 1950; Stuttgart, Ark. Witnesses were Chicago & Southern Airlines Capt. Jack Adams and First Officer G.W. Anderson. They described the object as disc-like, but the drawing in Report 14 is of a flat cylinder with sharp edges, like a hockey puck. The des-

cription says there was a ring of lights 3/4 of the distance from the center to the edge, but the drawing shows them 9/10 of the way to the edge. The official conclusion: Unidentified.

Case XII. Aug. 25, 1952; Pittsburg, Kans. The Witness was radio station employee William Squyres. His written description gives a thickness ratio of 5:1, the drawing dimensions work out to 3 to 3.8:1, and the drawing shows 2.8:1. Squyres described a pair of oval meat platters placed together, but the drawing is of an elongated football with pointed ends. Squyres described several windows' extend-

ing from the top to the rear edge; the drawing shows several parallel lines from the center line to the top of the object, but with no color differentiation to suggest windows. Squyres described a series of 6"-12" whirling propellers along the outer edge, while the drawing shows them only as small circles. The written description plays down Squyres' references to apparently intelligent motion in some windows, though the official conclusion was: Unidentified.

With such sloppy work going into the study, is it any wonder that no model of a UFO could be found?

## From the Humanoid Study Group Archives-IV

# UFO AND OCCUPANT AT SANTA MARIA AIRPORT, AZORES

By Ted Bloecher

Date of Sighting: Tuesday, September 21, 1954.

Local Time: 10:45 p.m. (2245 military time).

Locale: Santa Maria Airport, Azores (Portuguese Territory).

Primary Witness: Vitorino Lourenco Monteiro, civilian guard at Santa Maria Airport.

Duration: From two to three minutes.

Closest Proximity: Face-to-face, within arm's length.

Investigator: Lt. Henrique da Costa Pessca, Commander of the Portuguese International Airport of Santa Maria.

HumCat Classification: Serial #0252, Type B (entity observed getting in and/or out of UFO).

### Background

Among the humanoid cases from the U.S. Air Force UFO files that Richard Hall and I examined at the Air Force Office of History, in Washington, D.C., during the Fall of 1974, was a CEIII case from the Azores. The incident took place on September 21, 1954, during the wave of UFO reports that was centered in, but by no means limited to, France. The Air Force concluded that this UFO event was "Unidentified," although it was not a U.S. Air Force representative who conducted the investigation.

So far as can be determined, there is only one published source for the Azores case: a brief abstract can be found in the Appendix of Jacques Vallee's book, *Passport To Magonia* (Regnery, 1969, p. 210), where it is misdated as September 20, 1954. Vallee has identified the witness as Vitorino Lourenco Monteiro (his name is not included in the Air Force report). The official version of the case is published here for the first time.

Since the event occurred on Portuguese territory, the official inquiry was conducted by a representative of the Portuguese government, Lt. Henrique da Costa Pessca, Commander of the Santa Maria Airport facility. The information contained in Lt. Pessca's report was made available to Wing Intelligence Officer Robert D. Gammell, 1st Lieutenant, U.S.A.F., head of the U.S. Intelligence Operations at the Azores Air Transport Station in Lajes Field. Lt. Gammell prepared and submitted his report to Air Force Intelligence in accordance with the official UFO reporting format, AFR 200-2, the procedure used from 1953 through 1966, when it was revised for use in conjunction with the Condon Committee inquiry. (For an example of the revised form, see Appendix B, p. 819, in the Bantam paperback edition of *The Condon Report*.)

### The Official Report

The official report includes the usual Project 10073 Record, or covering summary sheet, not reproduced here. Air Force Form 112, the Air Intelligence Information Sheet, provides the following information on the case:

USA-MATS; IR-225-54; AF 640037

Subject: (Unclassified) Unidentified Flying Objects

Area Reported In: Azores

From Agency: Intelligence Section AATS, ATLD-MATS

Date of Report: 18 October 1954

Date of Investigation: 13 October 1954

Evaluation: B-6 (Unidentified—TB)

Preparing Officer: Robert D. Gammell, 1st Lt., USAF

Source: Lt. Pessca, Mr. Gowman, Mr. Correla

Reference: BAIR #3-A

Summary: Attached herewith is an

unidentified flying object report submitted by the Intelligence Officer, Azores Air Transport Station, Lajes Field, Azores. The information submitted herewith comprises statements made by Lt. Henrique da Costa Pessca, commander of the Portuguese National working for FAA at Santa Maria Airport; and a newspaper article translated from the Portuguese. The report follows the format outlined in paragraph 6b, AFR 200-2, subject: "Unidentified Flying Object Report" (Short Title: UFOB), dated 26 August 1953.

Prepared by Robert D. Gammell, 1st Lt., USAF, Wing Intelligence Officer. Approved: H. L. Smith, Colonel, USAF, Commander. Distribution by Originator: Orig, HQ USAF; 1cc, MATS, ATLD, CINCLANT, American Consul; 2cc, Air Attache.

The following is from Part II of AF Form 112, reorganized from the original itemized format into a more readable description:

The shape of the object was oblong (or "pecan-shaped"), 10 feet in length by 5 feet in height, and of a light metallic blue in color. There was a plexiglass-type section in the forward end, also blue, which contained the "pilot." There were four pole-like appendages, two at each end, which supported parallel aerials, and there was an orange light in the nose of the object.

The civilian guard, Senhor Monteiro, was alerted to the presence of the object by a humming or whirring noise, similar to the sound made by the wind passing over wire cables or telephone lines. The object ap-

(Continued on next page)



## Azores, Continued

proached and landed approximately 30 feet from the guard post, making a slight nose-down approach to land; it levelled off, hovered a few feet above the ground, then settled straight down. The witness was unable to see any landing gear. A blond-haired man, 5 feet, 10 inches in height, got out of a door located in the plexiglass section; he approached the witness, but "attempts to converse failed." The encounter lasted from 2 to 3 minutes and was terminated by the approach of an automobile. After the pilot reboarded and "belted up," the UFO ascended almost vertically and then accelerated rapidly into the night sky, disappearing in the darkness.

The weather, according to the witness, was fair, with visibility unlimited. The official weather conditions for Terceira Island (142 nautical miles to the northwest of Santa Maria Island) reported the ceiling at 200 feet, with a one/eighth cloud cover at that altitude. The wind direction was 230 degrees at 14 knots, at 6,000 feet. There were no balloon launchings in that area at the time.

### Comments by

#### 1st Lieutenant Gammell

The above information was related by Lt. Henrique da Costa Pessca, Commander of the Portuguese International Civil Airport at Santa Maria, Azores, during a personal interview with the reporting officer.

According to the story reported by Lt. Pessca, the guard saw the strange object land. A blond-haired man, approximately 5' 10" in height, got out, walked over to him and spoke in a strange language which the guard did not understand. The guard attempted to converse in French, without success. After a minute or so of this, the headlights of a car were seen approaching the guard post, which is in the middle of an intersection with roads leading to the only port on the island, the town of Villa do Porto and the airport.

The strange man patted the guard on the back of his shoulder in a friendly fashion and got back into his "flying cigar" (the term used by

Pessca), fastened a safety belt across his middle and some shoulder straps, then seemingly pushed a button. The craft took off with its nose raised a few degrees from the horizontal, traveled a few feet, then levelled off and shot almost straight up.

The occupants of the car, whose headlights caused the departure of the strange man, stopped to ask the guard what the strange light was they had seen above his post. The guard related a part of his story to the people in the car. Later, the guard decided he would not report the incident to his superiors for fear of not being believed. However, the persons in the car began spreading the story around the small island of Santa Maria. In view of the stories being circulated, the guard made an official report of the incident late on the following day. The guard stated he was too scared while the strange man was present to think about arresting him.

Lt. Pessca stated (that) he had interrogated the guard three days in a row and received the same story on each occasion.

Pessca had a folder full of statements and drawings of this incident, which he kept in his safe. He displayed a rough drawing of the object taken from this file, to the reporting officer. In this drawing, the pilot of the object was seated approximately in the middle of his craft at a slight backward slant from the vertical. The shape of the object was similar to that of a pecan nut or a football except it did not have as pronounced a point at the front and rear.

The guard is 25-28 years old and originally from a town near Lisbon. He is reported by the Santa Maria Airport Director to be a good worker with no police record, a steady, reliable man and not a nervous type. Pessca further stated there was no evidence to indicate the Guard would invent the story for personal publicity.

When asked for his personal views on the sighting, Lt. Pessca stated: "I personally don't believe." Then he indicated he had nothing to support this belief except that the guard remembered too many details for a two or three minute period of

time. Then he shrugged and said, "I don't know; maybe it is true. It is very strange indeed."

A Mr. Correira, a Portuguese national working for Pan American Airways at Santa Maria, told a representative of the AATS Intelligence Office he had been on the opposite side of the island at approximately 2230Z the same evening and had seen some strange white lights above the island. Some fishermen coming into the island at approximately the same time also are reported to have seen some strange lights above the field.

Mr. Owen Gowman, FAA Director at Santa Maria Airport, told the reporting officer several of his American employees saw strange lights above the airfield during the latter part of September. Additional information as to time, color, number, dates, etc., has been requested and will be forwarded separately when received.

Since the sighting of the "flying cigar" was made at a Portuguese civil airport by a Portuguese guard, the reporting officer did not have the opportunity to personally interrogate the principal. However, it is my opinion that Lt. Pessca cooperated to the fullest extent in relating the facts of the case as he knew them. This is not another incident of someone thinking he saw something; the guard either saw the object as reported, or he saw nothing and concocted the entire story for reasons of his own. In the absence of information to indicate the latter, the former seems to be the answer to the facts so far presented.

The following article appeared in a local newspaper on this island (Terceira) on October 3, 1954, and is reported as additional information on unusual sightings in the Santa Maria area.

Santa Maria, Sept. 28: A PAA DC-6B commanded by Captain Freeman, radioed shortly after leaving Santa Maria Airport that at approximately 3:20 a.m. (9/28), while flying at 6400 meters altitude with the weather exceptionally clear (no clouds) at 38° 36' W longitude, he sighted above the ocean a large

(Continued on next page)

# FOGARTY ON KASS: A COMMENT

By Jennie Zeidman  
(© 1981 by Jennie Zeidman)

It is invigorating and satisfying to debate one's peers, to engage in intellectual battle over a problem mutually defined. Sometimes whole new avenues are opened, and solutions are shown where before, blind spots clouded the issue. Arguments among ufologists are common—but they are arguments within the bounds of decorum—of respect for the intellect and integrity of one another, of recognition of the research and documentation provided by one another, and most importantly, they are arguments within the rules of logic and rationality.

It has become abundantly clear, in written and verbal exchange, that Philip Klass is unwilling (or perhaps unable) to abide by those standards normally considered proper for debate. He speaks his own private tongue, while serious ufologists speak the language of logical, rational inquiry. I have yet to see any positive results from these exchanges—although one might note that they have provided "comic relief" or amusement from time to time.

As Quentin Fogarty has indicated (No. 157, March 1981) Klass and his ilk feed upon the publicity we, the

serious ufologists, provide for them (they do little investigating of their own, but swoop, like vultures, upon cases we have already brought down). The tape transcript cited by Quentin displays what we all know so well: rational, productive discourse with Klass is impossible.

Enough of this waste of time, of giving audience to childish tantrums, attempted diversions, and unscrupulous ploys, which have contributed nothing to ufological knowledge.

During the 2½ years I worked on the Coyne helicopter case,\* I don't recall ever responding directly to Klass's voluminous attempts at correspondence. I would no more attempt disclosure with him than with a tantrum-throwing, hysterical 6-year-old. As with a 6-year-old, I walk away. When negative behavior is not reinforced with recognition, sooner or later it ceases. We all know everything we need to know about Mr. Klass. Now, let's move on to something worthwhile.

\*"A Helicopter-UFO Encounter Over Ohio," by Jennie Zeidman, Center for UFO Studies, P.O. Box 1402, Evanston, IL 60204. \$9.00 including postage and handling.

## FUND FOR UFO RESEARCH

At the London International UFO Congress, May 24-25, Dr. Bruce S. Maccabee, chairman of the Fund for UFO Research, presented a check for \$500 and an International Science Achievement Award certificate to the UFO Phenomena International Annual Review (UPIAR) ". . . for their contribution to the scientific study of UFOs and in particular for the consistently high quality found in their publication." UPIAR is the only international refereed journal devoted to a scientific examination of UFOs and has been published since 1976. It is published in English. For subscription information, write to UPIAR, c/o Editecs Publishing House, P.O. Box 190, 40100 Bologna, Italy.

The Fund has also sponsored an investigation by Allan Hendry of the December 1980 Betty Cash, Huffman, Texas, radiation injury case (See MUFON UFO Journal No. 158, April 1981). John Schuessler, Deputy Director of MUFON, is coordinating the investigation, and Dr. Peter Rank (radiologist, Fund Board Member) has lent his expertise to the ongoing study. Contributions to the Fund are deductible from U.S. income taxes: Fund for UFO Research, Box 277, Mount Rainier, MD 20822.

### Azores, Continued

lighted area of abnormal brilliance, a fact for which no explanation was available.

At any rate, it didn't seem possible that it could have been a ship. It gave off a greater amount of light than any illuminated ship could possibly have given.

The phenomenon was also observed by passengers aboard, who unanimously affirmed that it was a flying saucer (or should be termed a flying saucer). The plane didn't attempt to come any closer to the strange object which, as the plane continued onward, still remained above the water. *Diario Insular*, 3 Oct. 1954.

Mr. Gowman, the FAA Director, personally talked to Captain Freeman on his return trip from Lisbon to the States and, when shown the above article, the Captain stated it was essentially correct except that

the altitude of the aircraft was 15,000 feet. Mr. Gowman stated Captain Freeman was positive the 40 to 50 very bright lights he sighted above the water were not ships at sea. He stated that he has flown across the Atlantic many times and has seen hundreds of lighted ships, but these lights were much brighter than any he has ever seen.

### Comments

It is probably unnecessary to add any comments to the above, but I find myself unable to resist mentioning one aspect of this remarkable report, a feature guaranteed to stick in the craw of most serious UFO researchers—that is the pre-

sence of an entirely human UFO-naut. "Extraterrestrials," as all reasonable "ufologists" know, are not supposed to be human. Unfortunately, the guard at Santa Maria Airport didn't know what everyone else knew in 1954. But that airport guard wasn't the only one not paying attention in 1954: on the afternoon of August 20, just one month before the event in the Azores, a similar incident occurred in the Oeydalen Valley of Norway. The next report of the Humanoid Study Group archives will describe it in detail.

# GERMAN UFO LITERATURE NEEDS TRANSLATION

By Michael Sinclair, Ph.D.  
(MUFON International  
Coordinator)

Recently, I had the privileged opportunity to spend 4 days in West Germany as the very well treated house guest of the distinguished UFOlogist, Mr. I. Brand, Coordinator of MUFON-Central European Section (MUFON-CES). MUFON-CES consists of our German-speaking colleagues in Austria and Switzerland as well as West Germany. (Membership is by invitation only.) Since the early 1970s a small though dedicated and highly research-oriented group of professional scientists has been working through MUFON-CES towards a better understanding and eventual resolution of the UFO phenomenon (perhaps we should say phenomena).

This article provides some details of the large volume of German-language material, published by MUFON-CES, on their investigations of UFO reports and consequent research endeavours. MUFON-CES has held an annual congress from 1974 to 1980, inclusive, and the proceedings have been published in German for the first five of these gatherings. Each year the volumes have become successively larger—no doubt due to the success and untiring efforts of Mr. Brand and his associates. The proceedings of their 1979 and 1980 congresses are being prepared for publication. (Mr. Schneider's paper about instrumental UFO research, presented at the 1979 MUFON-CES conference, is long enough—about 200 pages—for a separate publication.)

Unfortunately, English summaries or abstracts of the presented papers are contained only in the publication of their 1975 congress, held in Icking, West Germany. To acquaint Journal readers with the nature of the research results and research proposals published by MUFON-CES, this article reviews

the 240-page publication of their 1975 congress. The quotations which appear below are from the summary abstracts, in English, of the published papers.

## *Electromagnetic and Gravitational Effects of UFOs*

In a 70-page article Dipl.-Ing. A. Schneider, another distinguished European UFOlogist, and MUFON's representative in West Germany, presents a detailed non-technical discussion of "Electromagnetic and Gravitational Effects of Unidentified Flying Objects." This paper is concerned "with a few UFO effects that have been observed over and over again," including effects which "have been automatically recorded by instruments." "With the help of selected characteristic examples that often come from numerous independent witnesses, the author attempts to prove that the electromagnetic and gravitative interactions must be essentially correlated with the propulsion system of the unidentified flying object." Mr. Schneider discusses various "physical secondary effects" reported in association with UFOs, also "primary effects, which are presumably of a gravitative nature, ... presented by means of exemplary cases" (e.g., reports of UFOs which "hover or accelerate directly over the ground or over water" causing "crater or cone-like movement... that cannot be explained by aerodynamic air movement alone."

He also relates cases of close encounter witnesses who "sometimes speak of a strange force that hinders their freedom of movement," e.g., as in the famous October 1973 case in Pascagoula, Miss., when "the gravitative force seemed to have affected the kidnapers as well as their victims." The paper's appendix in-

cludes "approximately 350 coded cases" and a bibliography of about 100 sources.

## *New Theories of Gravity and UFOs*

The paper "New Theories of Gravitation and the Qualitative Explanation for Some Physical Effects of UFO's," by Dipl. Phys. I. Brand, is the longest (62 pp.) in the publication of the 1975 MUFON-CES congress. This often highly technical and mathematical article, "directed mainly to theoretical physicists," is based on new theories of gravity and "the attempt is made to support the extraterrestrial hypothesis as the explanation of UFO phenomena. For this purpose, gravitation theories are introduced which predict accompanying electromagnetic effects that have been observed in the vicinity of UFO's."

Mr. Brand discusses "the development and the most important characteristics of the theories, ... in abbreviated form." This provides an "overview of the main directions of gravitational research" as a background to enable readers to "judge the theoretical path and the importance of the... unified quantum theory of matter and gravitation by Burkhard Heim." (This theory is discussed in the July 1979 issue of the Journal.—Editor.)

The detailed abstract concludes with this statement: "Finally, it will be shown how, according to Heim's theory, it is possible, in principle, for a space ship traveling at less than the speed of light, to reach the mantle of the light cone. The result provides the extraterrestrial hypothesis (ETH) and a theoretical basis." Thirty-six illustrations and photographs (including several well-known to English-speaking UFO

(Continued on next page)

German, Continued

researchers), 22 bibliographical references, and 117 non-UFO-related citations accompany this article.

#### *Use of Mathematical Models in UFO Research*

"Mathematical Procedure for Analyzing Theoretically Unpredictable Phenomena" is the title of a brief article by Dr. Leo Ferrera. Through historical examples he analyzes the problem of "typical reactions of men to spontaneous phenomena. . . On the one hand one finds a tendency toward mysticism while on the other hand the factual nature of the phenomena is denied. Because of this, the reception the data receive is scarcely influenced by the objective quality of data and evidence." Thus, an essential question to ask is to "what extent mathematical methods of evaluation can be helpful for an objective judgment."

Acknowledging that "from the mathematical viewpoint, spontaneous phenomena present a series of peculiarities that can make use of these procedures difficult," the author proposes "a practical strategy. . . to start from a special classification of spontaneous phenomena. . . based on the presence or absence of an intelligent originator of the phenomena and on the existence and nature of an underlying intention to communicate." Dr. Ferrera then outlines "the application of probabilities for composite events and cluster analysis," and briefly sketches two other methods—"game theory and the theory of fuzzy sets."

He reviews "the smoothing and compensation of the observational errors that can be expected from mathematical methods as well as the nature of the interrelations between observation and theory development." The author concludes that mathematical models, assuming that "the correct choice and application have been made, can not only serve to derive inferences from the material on hand," but also can "indicate

strategies for further research." Also, he says, "the introduction of mathematical methods for the analysis of spontaneous phenomena is useful, even in a relatively early phase of the research." (p.68) This short and comparatively non-technical article should be a prime candidate for translation into English.

#### *Other Papers*

A few other short papers are contained in the 1975 conference proceedings. "Misinterpretations and Forgeries" by Ostudrat.a.D. H. Malthaner, discusses photographs which, "because of misinterpretation, have been related to UFOs." He also analyzes twelve such "clever forgeries" which "show methods of intentional deception that were adopted into the UFO literature as genuine." The article concludes with "criteria. . . that allow one to test the authenticity of UFO photos." (p.33)

Luis Schonherr's article analyzes "the particular phases in the development of scientific research" and discusses "the particularities of UFO data. . . (for example the problems of sources, reliability, strangeness)." He also reviews the difficulty in obtaining UFO report information because of "the complexity of the phenomenon and. . . the pollution of the information channels." He proposes "a structure of a documentary system" and data procedures, and briefly sketches "the problems of automatic classification" of UFO data. (p.54)

#### **Translation Services Needed!**

The above information should illustrate the wealth of published German-language UFO material available to the international UFO community. MUFON has a copy of each of the five published proceedings of the MUFON-CES congresses. Moreover, we have permission from MUFON-CES to get this voluminous material translated and published (with, of course, an appropriate reference to individual copyrights, and acknowledgement—and thanks—to MUFON-CES).

Therefore, MUFON would like to secure the voluntary translation

services of people prepared to translate some of this material from German into English. As we fully recognize that language translation is a very difficult and time-consuming task, we hope to interest different people to translate relatively small pieces (i.e., specific articles). Thus, we are not asking anyone to translate a large amount of material. Hopefully, some offers of translation will be forthcoming.

We are asking MUFON-CES to recommend which papers they think would be most useful to have translated first. Consideration should be given to articles they might be especially keen to see disseminated to UFO researchers. A priority listing might also suggest early translation of articles about the results of their UFO case investigation. Another approach is that publication of English abstracts of all articles in the published MUFON-CES proceedings would enable potential translators to offer to translate an article of particular interest to them.

Can you help in this important task in UFO research? If so, please contact MUFON (108 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Texas 78155, U.S.A.) Even an offer to translate only one small article would be of enormous benefit.

Let us break down the barriers of language which prevent dissemination of scientific UFO research. As UFO reports are essentially the same throughout the world, we are all working towards a resolution of the same puzzling enigma which has baffled mankind in all corners of our planet.

#### **VOLUNTEERS NEEDED**

MUFON has a constant need for foreign language translators, as well as specialists in other fields (science, technology, field investigation, documentation . . .). Members are invited to write to Walter H. Andrus, Jr., International Director, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155. Your special skills can make a contribution toward solving the UFO enigma.

# "California Report"

By Ann Druffel

## Comments on the Tujunga Canyon Contacts

By Timothy Lee King  
(Guest Columnist)

I would like to comment on the recently published book, *The Tujunga Canyon Contacts*, written by Ann Druffel and D. Scott Rogo, and in particular the two concluding chapters in which the joint authors express differing, but compatible, views about the nature of UFOs.

In my opinion, truth is truth. It does not change, but man sees more as he develops. "Absolute Truth" will always be "Absolute Truth." If the entire UFO history has shown changes in the patterns of man-UFO interactions, then changes in that pattern (steps or jumps to keep just ahead of man)<sup>1</sup> is certainly the result of higher direction, even higher than the entities in direct control of the UFOs. The essential nature of the mystery certainly hasn't changed in any way whatsoever.

If we had "absolute proof" of the history of the UFOs to 30,000 B.C., as the cave drawings of UFO shapes in southwestern France and Cantabrian Spain indicate,<sup>2</sup> then we could start saying some of our hypotheses are now laws. For an example: if we could photograph all of the UFO-connoted images in these caves, then we could index and digitally analyze by computer for shape, frequency, etc. Even those images considered psychosexual should be catalogued secondarily for an ability to add and subtract the numerical weight to a finding.

Monotheism was born long before 6,000 B.C. as an oral history, be-

fore man could put his symbols into writing. The first written "biblical" books came from the Aramaic culture, into which Jesus Christ was born. We also have hints that the Aramaic culture came from an earlier one that lasted about 15,000 years. The sum total of these two cultures encompasses about 30,000 years, which is the same as the cave drawing records.

The early oral history was shrouded in apochryphal mystery by dedicated cults who, it is supposed, named their groups after the phenomena(non) which transmitted the knowledge to man. One such cult's name translated as "we who descend to the chariots." This title was used long before we had chariots in our civilizations.

The altered state of reality hypothesis, discussed in *The Tujunga Canyon Contacts*, is valid to a degree. That is, perhaps a lone individual has the elusive psychic ability that draws out the UFO phenomenon from its own "Space-time-continuum," but others in the vicinity can also clearly see the UFO. That does not mean "innocent bystanders" are in an altered state of consciousness/reality to the degree the original operant is. For example, about 3 years ago a very large UFO buzzed a town near Bakersfield, California. It was seen by dozens, perhaps hundreds, of people. All of them could not have been in an altered state.

I believe the "hard" and "soft" evidence found in UFO research

isn't really contradictory. This UFO reality game may, to humanity, seem a game, but something surfaces that smacks of *planned* alteration. I believe we need not think about how bizarre or how simple the manifestations have been, because that would/could sidetrack us from the underlying principle and drown us in detail.

Regarding the "aspect" history, as outlined in Druffel's concluding chapter, the physical, psychological, and psychic aspects in the history of the modern UFO wave seem valid. However, Step 4 — the philosophical aspect — began around 1965 or so, in my opinion, and Step 5 — the cosmological aspect — seems to have already begun. Our physicists/scientists are treading heavily, deeper and deeper, into the truth. The work we see beginning at CERN, our own "transistor valley," and other places demonstrate this. I see a pattern of recent scientific research which confirms the existence of God.

The "detail reflectivity" discussed in the same chapter seems to hit some hardcore truth. It might be, however, that this hypothesis is arbitrary. I don't know, of course, and don't intend to be ambiguous on the subject or to invalidate Druffel's ideas about "d-r" (detailed reflectivity).<sup>3</sup> But perhaps "d-r" occurs as a *by-product* of interaction and communication between UFOs and humans, rather than being an essential ele-

(Continued on next page)

## Contacts, Continued

ment in close encounters and abductions.

I feel that Druffel's conclusions regarding the nature of UFOs and their motives for being interested in the human race are proper and merit careful thought and study. I don't think they are presumptuous in any direct way; indeed, they may be soft and innocent in comparison to the hard and cold realities they confront.

To the book's joint authors' credit, there is a generous overlap of two points of view. Druffel's viewpoint may be a philosophical one, while D. Scott Rogo's view is statistically derived. Both conclusions express beliefs personal to their private personalities, and as such, the subject (UFOs) itself is seen through their own "d-r" senses. The two authors seem to have a distinctive taste of the Absolute Truth.

Regarding Rogo's conclusions, whose hypothesis regarding UFOs is that they are the result of an intelligent, but essentially unknown Phenomenon which responds to human psychological needs, I'm not arguing against his conclusion *per se*, but the Phenomenon does not always mold itself exactly to the victim's predispositions. Referring back to the matter of detail reflectivity, which Rogo addresses by another literary term, we can see certain aspects of the Betty Andreasson case which is rich in this. Mrs. Andreasson tells us that she had a childhood rich in Christian Church ceremony. There is much "d-r" especially regarding her religious faith. The entities have their own "glowing paged" book, and she meets on her journey an intelligence of such magnitude that she asks if it is Jesus, or God. After Betty's abduction was recalled under hypnotic regression, she divorced her husband. Could it be that she was under psychological stress prior to the divorce? Was this solution the best way a Phenomenon could have responded to her needs?

A close correlation between the Tujunga Shaw-Whitley case and other classic cases concerns certain

furniture, mainly chairs, seen in UFOs. Betty Andreasson was specifically clear about glass chairs and glass covers, and the hoses attached to the chairs/boxes when the top and bottom was united in one assembly. Far away in Brazil, Antonio Villa-Boas reported the same thing. His description of identical glass chairs was withheld from the public, according to Raymond Fowler. Betty Andreasson's and AVB's abductions occurred in the same decade, although Andreasson did not report her experience until long after the AVB Brazilian case came to light.

On page 251 of *The Tujunga Canyon Contacts*, Sara Shaw's drawing of the "conference room" evokes a curious image echo of Andreasson's drawing of tubes leading down to the glass chairs. Here we have what might be called a rhythm of vision. Were the Shaw-Whitley case and the Andreasson/Boas cases conducted by the same intelligence?

These similar details neither invalidate Rogo's hypothetical crux or support it to the degree they should. The diversity and complexity of all UFO incidents cannot, in my opinion, be encompassed by a singular hypothesis.

If there is a real symbiotic link between man and higher UFO intelligences, you could paraphrase Biblical writ in the Old Testament, wherein God told the Israelites they were an errant race and if undisposed to heed his threats, they would get a lesson. And, they *did* receive a lesson. Now, if you jump ahead thousands of years to the present, it is obvious man as a race has gone haywire.

There is a pattern in Holy Writ — a pattern which hints that "the supermind" (entities/phenomenon/spirits/God) is having to employ some bizarre phenomena to illustrate something to a bizarre race of beings. I personally do not think the bizarre nature of some UFO phenomena is haphazard. Considering the detail reflectivity fact in many close encounters/abductions, would not this account for the sometimes awful experiences of the UFO victims? This

is the sinister aspect. There exists the benevolent aspect also, but both aspects imply *objectified*, albeit temporarily, UFOs and beings.

If some of our contemporary ufologists have truly given up the idea that UFOs are nuts and bolts craft, they could be simplistically viewing very complex craft, for a complex subject such as UFOs would have complex "machinery" to carry out their mission, whatever it is. I consider myself a "nuts and bolts man," but only to the extent that the craft are "physical" while choosing to manifest and to operate in our environment and before human witnesses. We cannot ignore the extreme velocities, maneuvers, and the implications of strong and unique applications of EM forces. Despite the fact that many UFO researchers suspect that the UFOs are very real, but only temporarily physical, the ships *are* very advanced, and as far as we can tell are piloted by very advanced intelligence(s).

We have all heard reports of "mother ships" and we know that some entities have reportedly talked about enormous carrier craft in orbit above Earth and also stationed millions of miles away. It logically would be more "cost-effective" to take one large ship containing several smaller recon/surveillance vehicles.

We know that time dilations occur at the speed of light. I mention this because an implication of time dilation is illustrated by UFO history. The last 100 years of UFO history — roughly from 1896 to 1981 — could be just seconds or minutes or days to any intelligence operant at extremely high velocities. In the Hill incident, the beings didn't understand aging. And considering the time span between the Andreasson Affair, the Tujunga Contacts, and the Brazilian AVB incident, the very obvious geographical distances between all three reports, and mentioning again the similarity of certain furniture aboard all three craft concerned in these three cases, we can suspect that time dilation may be

(Continued on next page)

## Contacts, Continued

part of the existence of UFO entities.

The "reinforcement schedule" by which UFOs seem to be helping mankind think in new and original terms should wash well with our philosophers, psychologists, and perhaps our theologians also. How else could man develop or even hope to survive unless his concepts are updated and rearranged?

The last poll on UFO belief places a "belief threshold" at about 68-75%. I suspect the remaining 32% have a hidden body of about 15% more believers who are too timid to admit their beliefs to themselves, much less to the poll taker! Perhaps we can guesstimate the UFO mechanism has generated 84% acceptance. If this is so, then we could logically expect such a dynamic to swing/spin or polarize to a larger mass, for example, 99.99 percent!

With this in mind, it isn't illogical to expect a new wave of UFO phenomena in the near future. The next wave should be more intense and contain different manifestations. What we should see is that the symbol has undergone social diffusion. I think the phenomenon and its social diffusion has reached criticality. I agree the "Phenomenon" is abusively, and socially, chaotic as well as being psychologically damaging to most individuals at various degrees.

Mr. Rogo's amalgamation of several theories has a real "bite" to it, especially when he mentions that the manifestations have obviously physical qualities. Rogo (and Clark, et al) say. In a nutshell then, we do *not* think that the UFO mystery is directly produced by our own minds. It is physically, though only temporarily, created by "The Phenomenon" in answer to our needs.

Then Rogo takes the germinal theory a step further. A nexus permits the UFO drama to unfold. UFO abductions/dramas occur when the witness is in a state of psychological need. Once contacted by a human mind in such a state, the supermind creates an experience for the witness, by drawing upon information and

preoccupations buried deep within the human mind.

Rogo is to be congratulated for bringing this modality/operant mechanism to the attention of the public in that format and regarding the subject of UFOs in particular.

I think UFO-CE-Abduction statistics tell us that man has an innate ability to think about solutions to his problems — an innate connection via his subconsciousness to tap a supermind that is, while part of him, also external to himself. We should be beginning to comprehend his truly innate ability to tap an incredible and nearly incomprehensible source that will help him mature — but seemingly only step by careful step. That the subconscious can leach out to the conscious mind just what it wants known, and that the subconsciousness is also linked to an infinite mind, supermind, or to an "energy dynamic," should be increasingly clear. Man has a beautiful instrument — the human brain — that has the capacity for infinite knowledge.

I believe mankind approaches a definite change toward a spiritual plane, via an appreciation of his innate spirituality. Overviewing our new physics demonstrates the extreme likelihood of subatomics existing and acting at velocities far exceeding the speed of light.

I realize my belief is not necessarily comprehensible to others who have their own subjective reality structures. I do feel, however, that objective and subjective reality is intermeshed with quantum/quantaic phenomena, and the complexity of "the phenomenon." I haven't reached an affirmed, unshakeable conclusion, but I am fearful that whatever we are dealing with appears to desire residency among us. Its hesitancy is caused by what we have done in the past, or what we are doing presently, or will do in the future. Whether or not I am mistaken isn't of consequence in the long run. Norms are to be respected and sought after in all phases of life, but I've the cynicism to say — "nothing happens by accident."

San Francisco Examiner  
April 18, 1952

## 'SAUCERS' SEEN AT ATOM SITE

Five Report Flying Discs Near  
Nevada Test Region

LAS VEGAS (Nev.), April 17. —(NS)—Flying saucers in the area of the Nevada test site, where important new atomic tests are in progress, were reported today.

An Air Force technical sergeant and four civilian workers at the Nellis Air Force Base, near Las Vegas, said they saw eighteen circular objects flying an easterly course which carried them over or very close to the test site.

### REPORTED BY FIVE.

Those who reported seeing the objects were T/Sgt. Orville Lawson, Rudy Toncer, sheet metal shop foreman, and sheet metal shop workers R. K. Van Houtin, Edward Gregory and Charles Rutliffson.

The objects went by at 12:05 p. m.

Van Houtin saw them first and called the attention of the others to them.

### STREAK EAST.

The men watched the saucers for about 30 seconds while they streaked across the sky in an easterly course north of Las Vegas and disappeared.

The men estimated that the craft were 40,000 feet up and flying at a speed of at least 1,200 miles an hour.

The objects flew an irregular formation with one of them off to the right, moving with a zigzag motion. They left no smoke or vapor.


(Historical clipping courtesy of  
UFO Newsclipping Service)

("Tim King" is the pseudonym for a photographic technician of 25 years' experience, who has been actively engaged in analyzing UFO pictures for MUFON investigators in the Southern California area.)

### REFERENCES

1. See THE TUJUNGA CANYON CONTACTS, published June 1980, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 201-08 for elaboration on this theory. Also see MUFON UFO Journal, No. 121, Dec. 1977, "Thirty Years Later: Thoughts in the Dark," pp. 15-16 for Druffel's original presentation of this hypothesis.
2. Book cited, pp. 197-99, original reference is from FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, Vol. 16, No. 6 (Nov-Dec 1969), pp. 311.
3. Book cited, pp. 213-14.







# FIRST QUARTER 1981 UFO SIGHTINGS

Information and map coordinated by Gayle McBride, Tarheel UFO Study Group, P.O. Box 412, Rural Hall, NC 27045.  
Through cooperation with Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas; Center for UFO Studies, Evanston, Illinois; Phenomena Research (Robert Gribble), Seattle, Washington; and Ground Saucer Watch, Inc., Phoenix, Arizona.

\* - information not supplied

Class "A" - any sighting containing any scientific information

DATE	LOCATION	NO. WITNESSES	CLASSIFICATION
1-1	Knox County, IL	5	CE 1
1-5	Stillmore, GA	*	Class "A"
1-5	Green Cove Springs, FL	*	Class "A"
1-5	Seattle, WA	*	Class "A"
1-5	Cedar Rapids, IA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
1-5	La Puente, CA	*	Class "A"
1-5	Torrance, CA	*	Class "A"
1-7	Toutle, WA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
1-8	Camino, CA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
1-9	Popularville, MS	*	Class "A"
1-10	Grand Meadow, MN	*	Class "A"- CE 3
1-10	Grand Island, LA	*	Class "A"
1-11	Faraland, AL	*	Class "A"- close approach
1-11	Corvallis, OR	*	Class "A"
1-12	Folsom, CA	*	Class "A"
1-13	Duluth, MN	*	Class "A"
1-13	Cut Off, LA	*	Class "A"
1-14	Bennettsville, SC	*	Class "A"
1-17	Sacramento, CA	*	Class "A"
1-17	San Diego, CA	*	Class "A"
1-19	Lexington, KY	*	Class "A"- CE 1
1-19	Hayward, CA	*	Class "A"
1-21	Parish, NY	*	Class "A"
1-21	Parish, NY	*	Class "A"
1-22	Jesup, GA	*	Class "A"
1-22	St. Louis, MO	*	Class "A"- close approach
1-23	Topeka, KS	*	Class "A"
1-23	Topeka, KS	*	Class "A"
1-24	Vacaville, GA	*	Class "A"- close approach
1-24	Dodge, NB	*	Class "A"
1-29	North Baltimore, OH	*	Class "A"
1-30	Felton, MN	*	Class "A"
1-31	Berkeley, CA	*	Class "A"
1-31	Chesapeake, OH	*	Class "A"- CE 1
1-31	La Mesa, CA	*	Class "A"
2-1	Merryville, LA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-1	San Francisco, CA	1	CE 1
2-2	Brooks County, TX	2	CE 1
2-2	Santa Cruz, CA	*	NL
2-2	Mullan, ID	1	NL
2-2	Troy, MI	*	NL

DATE	LOCATION	NO. WITNESSES	CLASSIFICATION
2-3	Millville, NJ	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-3	Howard County, AR	2	CE 1 (one of numerous reports)
2-5	Fairfield, CT	*	Class "A"
2-5	Windsor, VT	*	Class "A"
2-6	Shady Side, MD	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-6	Everett, WA	*	Class "A"
2-6	Salem, OR	*	*
2-6	Naples, FL	*	NL
2-7	Portland, OR	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-7	N. Babylon, NY	1	CE 1
2-8	Citrus Heights, CA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-8	Troutdale, OR	*	Class "A"
2-9	Marlton, NJ	*	Class "A"
2-9	Franklin, OH	1	NL
2-10	Renton, WA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-10	Renton, WA	*	Class "A"
2-11	Williams, AZ	*	NL
2-11	Chesapeake, VA	*	NL
2-11	Enosburg Falls, VT	1	NL
2-11	Mason, WI	*	NL
2-13	Tacoma, WA	*	Class "A"
2-13	Fullerton, CA	*	Class "A"
2-13	Furnace Creek, CA	*	Class "A"
2-13	Alton, NH	*	NL
2-14	Greensburg, PA	1	CE 1 & 3
2-16	Santa Cruz, CA	*	NL
2-17	Seattle, WA	*	Class "A"
2-17	Flushing, NY	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-19	Lilburn, GA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-19	Santa Clara, CA	*	Class "A"
2-19	Cupertino, CA	1	DD
2-20	Minneapolis, MN	*	Class "A"
2-20	Campbell, CA	*	Class "A"
2-20	Antioch, CA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-20	Tupelo, MS	several	NL
2-21	San Francisco, CA	*	Class "A"
2-21	Vallejo, CA	*	Class "A"
2-21	Oakland, CA	several	NL (8 separate reports)
2-21	Daly City, CA	1	NL
2-22	San Jose, CA	*	Class "A"

(Continued on next page)

DATE	LOCATION	NO. WITNESSES	CLASSIFICATION
2-22	Algona, WA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-22	San Antonio, TX	*	Class "A"
2-22	Eureka, CA	several	NL
2-22	Merced, CA	*	NL
2-22	Lodi, CA	1	NL
2-22	Whittier, CA	*	NL
2-22	Guadalupe County, TX	1	CE 1
2-22	Wilson County, TX	3	CE 1
2-23	Rapid City, SD	*	Class "A"
2-23	El Centro, CA	2	NL
2-23	Dallas, TX	*	NL
2-23	Roomington, NC	*	*
2-24	Marshfield, WI	*	CE 1
2-25	Norphlet, AR	*	Class "A"
2-25	Glen Ellyn, IL	*	Class "A"- CE 1
2-25	Lansing, MI	*	NL
2-25, 26	Arroyo Grande, CA	*	NL
2-26	Peckville, PA	family	CE 1- photos
2-28	San Jose, CA	*	Class "A"
2 *	Dayton, OH	numerous	several sightings in area
3-1	Lufkin, TX	*	Class "A"- from aircraft
3-1	Vallejo, CA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-2	Oscoda, MI	2	NL
3-3	Salinas, CA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-3	Belleville, NJ	1	*
3-4	Auburn, AL	5	CE 1
3-5	Bellingham, WA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-5	Gresham, OR	1	CE 1
3-5	Hawthorne, FL	*	NL
3-5	Santa Clara, CA	*	NL
3-5	Snyder, TX	1	CE 1
3-6	Caledonia, MI	*	Class "A"
3-6	Signal Mtn., TN	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-7	Napa, CA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-8	Glyndon, MN	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-9	Wichita, KS	*	Class "A"- CE 3
3-10	Alhambra, CA	*	Class "A"
3-10	Puela Park, NH	4	NL
3-10	Portland, OR	1	NL
3-11	Chico, CA	*	Class "A"-CE 1
3-11	Forestville, CA	*	Class "A"
3-11	Arcata, CA	*	Class "A"
3-12	Battle Mtn., NV	*	Class "A"-CE 1
3-11	Salinas, CA	*	Class "A"
3-12	Metamora, MI	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-14	Alameda, CA	*	Class "A"
3-14	Kingsley, MI	*	Class "A"- landing
3-14	Indianapolis, IN	*	Class "A"
3-14	Bradford, PA	4	CE 1
3-14	Limestone, NY	1	CE 1
3-14	Germantown, OH	1	NL
3-16	Santa Clara, CA	6	NL
3-16	Kennerdale, PA	3	CE 1

3-17	St. Helens, OR	*	Class "A"
3-17	Kent, WA	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-17	Thousand Oaks, CA	*	Class "A"
3-17	Bremerton, WA	*	Class "A"
3-18	Molalla, OR	*	Class "A"
3-18	Auburn, WA	*	Class "A"
3-18	St. George, UT	*	Class "A"
3-18	Aloha, OR	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-19	Tigard, OR	*	Class "A"- CE 1
3-21	Decatur, GA	*	Class "A"
3-24	Newport, OR	*	Class "A"- radar/visual
3-24	Seattle, WA	*	Class "A"
3-24	Coos Bay, OR	*	Class "A"
3-25	Gainesville, FL	1	NL
3-25	Los Angeles, CA	*	CE 1
3-28	Mt. Clemens, MI	1	NL
3-29	Scottsdale, AZ	*	NL
3-30	Alton, IL	2	NL

(Director's Message, Continued)

police chiefs, county sheriffs, state police, civil defense directors, platoon officers for the U.S.A.F., F.A.A. watch supervisors and airport control towers, Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Weather Bureau as of April 8, 1981 for his assigned counties. He also included a card which may be prominently displayed in each office providing the appropriate telephone numbers to call for reporting UFO sightings.

To formalize the investigation of UFO sighting reports submitted to MUFON by CUFOs, Phenomena Research, and by telephone calls to the MUFON administrative office, a form letter has been produced suggesting the procedure that the individual investigator should follow upon receiving one of these reports. This program was initiated in April due to the large influx of sighting reports being received from Robert Gribble and his associates at Phenomena Research in Seattle, Wash. Many of our State Section Directors and Field Investigators have already

received these form letters, and blank sighting report forms. Since MUFON has the largest network of field investigators in the United States, it is logical that the other organizations come to us with their UFO sighting reports for interviews and investigations. The results of these investigations are shared with the originating organization via copies of the reports.

A key to the success of the investigative team and the reporting function may be attributed to Ed Bowles, Jr., MUFON's new Staff Investigator. Ed and his wife Teresa reside at 305 Guadalupe River Road, Seguin, TX 78155. Ed and your Director have both personally signed letters, seeking the help of our Field Investigators and their cooperation for each sighting reported to one of our cooperating agencies. Since MUFON is dedicated to the scientific investigation of UFO sighting reports, it becomes our responsibility to respond to witnesses who care enough to make long distance telephone calls to report their ob-

(Continued on page 19)



Lucius Farish

## In Other's Words

The May 5 issue of NATIONAL ENQUIRER presents details of UFO formation flights over Ohio County, Kentucky, in late 1980. Police officers and others watched the objects for up to 5 hours on December 28.

UFO REPORT has switched back to a quarterly schedule, beginning with their third issue of 1981. They will continue publishing an Annual, as well. The new address for the magazine is: Sterling Publications, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10017.

Paul Dong's "UFO Update" column in the May issue of OMNI is a very interesting summary of UFO activity in China, as well as a report on the UFO research which is now being conducted in that country.

Soviet UFO researcher, Valerii I. Sanarov, has an article on UFOs and folklore in the April issue of CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY. Unfortunately, Sanarov concludes his article by saying that "flying saucers and little green men do not exist in objective reality." This is the type of nonsense which is found so often in the UFO literature (or what passes for same) today.

THE JOURNAL OF UFO STUDIES, Vol. II, is now available from the Center for UFO Studies for \$7.50 per copy. This issue contains articles by Richard Hall, Thomas M. Olsen, Durk Pearson, Roberto Enrique Banchs, and Richard W. Heiden and several other researchers. To my

way of thinking, Durk Pearson's article on instrumentation for analysis of physical traces left by UFOs is the most interesting of the lot. Some others would be helpful for insomniacs. The bi-annual issues of the JOURNAL are, in my opinion, greatly overpriced. It has also been a mystery to me why CUFOS does not combine its *four* periodicals (including the "International UFO Reporter" section of FRONTIERS OF SCIENCE) into *one* monthly, bi-monthly or quarterly publication. The most elementary logic should suggest that one deadline is easier to meet than four, especially considering that the publications are all dealing with various aspects of the same overall topic.

A new periodical from UFO researcher Tom Benson is THE SIXTH QUARK JOURNAL, to be published "as many times a year as possible." The subscription rate for four issues is \$10.00 (U.S. and Canada). Single issues may be purchased at \$2.50 each. The first issue contains articles by Benson, Kenneth W. Behrendt (on UFO propulsion) and O. Ray, plus news notes, book reviews, etc. More attention to proofreading is needed, as this issue contains a large number of typographical errors. However, the magazine might well develop into a useful periodical in future issues. Subscriptions and orders for individual issues should be sent to the magazine at: P.O. Box 1174, Trenton, NJ 08606.

### (Director's Message, Continued)

servations. It is in this manner that we are able to obtain the raw facts needed that will not only distinguish an IFO from UFO, but hopefully the clues that will aid us in resolving this enigma.

James McCampbell, MUFON Director for Research, was asked by

Robert Sheaffer, during a recent visit in Jim's home, to evaluate Bob's new book and express an opinion. Jim will share a copy of his letter to Robert Sheaffer for the readers of the Journal. "Leading Skeptic Investigates the Case for UFOs" is the headline for the news release and the book is described as "an incisive

**UFO NEWSCLIPPING SERVICE**

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

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

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

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

analysis of the factual case for UFOs." Basically, the book is an insult to the intelligence of any knowledgeable reader who can readily recognize the proverbial "snowjob" that Mr. Scheaffer has unleashed in the typical Philip Klass style.

# DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE <sup>by</sup> Walt Andrus

William L. Moore, coauthor of the two recent books *The Philadelphia Experiment* and *The Roswell Incident* will share the podium with Stanton T. Friedman at the 1981 MUFON UFO Symposium on July 24, 25, and 26 at M.I.T. in Cambridge, Mass. (Boston). Bill is our State Section Director in Prescott, Ariz., for Yavapai County. Lt. Col. Lawrence Coyne has rescinded his commitment to speak. This vacancy has been filled by the Program Committee by moving Mrs. Cynthia R. Hind, writer/lecturer and MUFON Representative for Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) in Africa from the Workshop Sessions. Mrs. Hind was a workshop speaker at the 1978 MUFON symposium in Dayton, Ohio.

John F. Schuessler, MUFON Deputy Director for Administration and President of VISIT, will be speaking at the CUFOS UFO Conference on September 25, 26, and 27 in a Chicago area hotel. John will relate the investigation into the serious medical effects incurred in the Cash/Landrum close encounter case of December 29, 1980, on the highway between New Caney and Dayton, Texas. His appearance at the CUFOS Conference is a reciprocating arrangement between MUFON and CUFOS, since Dr. J. Allen Hynek will be the keynote speaker at M.I.T. on July 25 at the MUFON UFO Symposium.

The 1981 MUFON UFO Symposium Proceedings will be available on July 24 in Boston for those attending our 12th annual symposium and immediately thereafter by mail for ten dollars (U.S. Funds) postpaid from MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Texas 78155, U.S.A.

The APRO sponsored "UFOHIO '81" on June 5, 6, and 7 at the Marriott Inn-Airport in Cleveland, Ohio, will be history by the time most readers receive this issue of the Journal. They did not publish

a current list of the speakers in the APRO Bulletin, therefore we are unable to provide this information. Some very competent and knowledgeable people in UFOlogy were originally scheduled.

Billed as a "Giant UFO Convention," the National UFO Conference will sponsor a June 27 event at the Howard Johnson Motor Lodge, in DePere, Wisconsin. Speakers will include James W. Moseley, co-founder of the National UFO Conference, author and researcher; William Moore, researcher, lecturer and author; Col. Wendelle C. Stevens (USAF Ret.), noted researcher and author of one of the most controversial books of modern times, *UFO: Contact from the Pleiades*; and Rick Hilberg, author, lecturer, and Chairman of the Ohio UFO Group. Mr. Hilberg publishes the UFO JOURNAL and is co-publisher of the Hilberg-Easley Report.

The book of photographs by Wendelle C. Stevens is definitely the most controversial book of modern times. This selection of words does not adequately describe the greatest sham that has been thrust upon the UFO public since the George Adamski photos. The Eduard "Billy" Meier photographs are simply suspended models placed in front of the camera, both still and motion picture, using various countryside scenes in Switzerland as a background. As a photo researcher, Col. Stevens has destroyed his own personal integrity and credibility by promoting these hoax photos and book. Your Director can document the veracity of this evaluation, therefore I challenge the people of Genesis III Productions, Ltd. to provide the evidence that these are authentic photographs of UFOs. If this firm should publish Volume II, as they have promised, they are knowingly committing a form of fraud upon the public and making a mockery of scientific UFOlogy.

Michael Brein, Ph.D., State Director for Hawaii, has appointed Paul E. McCarthy, Ph.D. as the Assistant State Director and Research Specialist. Dr. McCarthy resides at 3687 Woodlawn Terrace Place, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822 and may be contacted by telephone at (808) 988-6954. Paul earned his doctorate in Political Science with a thesis on the late James McDonald. Richard D. Seifried, M.A., was selected by Larry Moyers to become the new State Section Director for Montgomery, Preble, and Greene counties in Ohio. Richard may be contacted by writing to 7340 Calmcrest Court, Dayton, OH 45424 or telephoning (513) 233-4055. Robert Grattan III of 107 Howard Street, Ashland VA 23005 has agreed to serve MUFON in a multiple role due to his many talents. Bob becomes the State Section Director for Henrico and Hanover counties in Virginia, a French translator, and an active member of our amateur radio net, using the call letters WA4NKZ.

It is with regret that we accept the resignation of Dr. Willard P. Armstrong as State Director for Missouri on May 30, 1981, coinciding with his retirement from the engineering department of the Nooter Corporation in St. Louis. Bill and Carol, founding members of MUFON and the UFO Study Group of Greater St. Louis, have purchased a retirement home in Tampa, Florida. Bill will continue to be active in the MUFON amateur radio net as W2NC from his new QTH. After becoming settled and acclimated in the Sunshine State, he will resume his activity in a leadership role. Our best wishes to Bill and Carol.

Lew Willis, State Section Director in Texas for Collin, Dallas, Ellis, Kaufman and Rockwall counties, has mailed a letter announcing their new UFO telephone hotline to all

(Continued on page 18)