

MUTUAL UFO NETWORK

# UFO JOURNAL

MARCH 1997

NUMBER 347 \$3

## SPHERE FROM DELTA II LAUNCH VEHICLE



***Todd P. Friesenhahn (left) and Stephen Moore  
Guadalupe County Deputy Sheriffs***

# MUFON UFO JOURNAL

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE MUTUAL UFO NETWORK SINCE 1967

## CONTENTS

MARCH 1997

NUMBER 347

STAGE TWO OF DELTA II ROCKET LANDS IN TEXAS	Walter H. Andrus, Jr.	3
NEWS OFF THE NET	CNI News	8
ABDUCTION REPORT CONSISTENCIES AS SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE OF ALIEN ABDUCTIONS	Stuart Appelle, Ph.D.	12
THE UFO PRESS	David M. Jacobs, Ph.D.	17
MUFON FORUM	Todd, Hamilton, Stoecker	19
READER'S CLASSIFIEDS		21
THE APRIL NIGHT SKY	Walter N. Webb	22
CALENDAR		22
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE	Walter Andrus	24

COVER — SPHERE FROM DELTA II Photographs by Walt Andrus

### MUFON UFO JOURNAL

(USPS 002-970)  
(ISSN 0270-6822)  
103 Oldtowne Rd.  
Seguin, TX 78155-4099  
Tel: (210) 379-9216  
FAX (210) 372-9439

#### EDITOR

Dennis Stacy

#### ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Walter H. Andrus, Jr.

#### COLUMNISTS

Walter N. Webb  
John S. Carpenter  
T. David Spencer

#### ART DIRECTOR

Vince Johnson

*Copyright 1997 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 1997 by the Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155." is included.*

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

*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., Seguin, Texas. Membership/Subscription rates: \$30 per year in the U.S.A.; \$30 foreign in U.S. funds. Second class postage paid at Seguin, TX.*

*POSTMASTER: Send form 3579 to advise change of address to: MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155-4099.*

# Stage Two of Delta II Rocket Lands in Texas


by Walter H. Andrus, Jr.

The United States Space Command issued a News Release No. 1-97 on January 22, 1997, from Colorado Springs, CO, announcing that a Delta II rocket body entered the Earth's atmosphere at approximately 3:30 a.m. central time this morning over the south central portion of the United States. The Delta II was launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base, April 24, 1996, carrying the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's (BMDO) Midcourse Space Experiment satellite.

The January 23rd edition of *The Daily Oklahoman* reported "It was like something from the movies—a fireball crashing from the sky. The spectacular event was seen early Wednesday in five states as a small piece of a military rocket reentered Earth's atmosphere. It looks like an airplane on fire and crashing," said Wayne Wyrick with the Kirkpatrick Planetarium in Oklahoma City. The rare occurrence led hundreds of residents in Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and Kansas to report the sighting. (Even a MUFON member in Oklahoma City, Timothy L. Stanford.)

The object burst into flames about 3:30 a.m. CST as it came within 50 miles of Earth's surface, said Major Steve Boylac, spokesman for NORAD, the North American Aerospace Defense installation in Colorado Springs, CO. NORAD reported the cylindrical tube of the Delta rocket was about 7 feet long and about 4 feet in diameter.

This may have been a spectacular event for eyewitnesses, however, it was even more exciting for Texas residents who found an unusually well-preserved piece of the second stage of the Delta II launch vehicle lying on their property the next morning. Even though they did not hear the crash of the tank-like object that fell within 100 feet of their home, Steve and Verona Gutowski were amazed to find a piece of space junk lying just outside of their fenced front yard. The Gutowski residence is 3 miles east of Georgetown, Texas, on State Highway 29. Their neighbors about 200 yards east, Joe and Joy Bohanan, abruptly sat up in bed when they heard the sonic boom and crash



**Coincidences happen! Pieces of a Delta II rocket launched in Vandenberg, CA, rain down near the MUFON office in Seguin, TX.**

**Photo: The initial Delta II 7925 commercial launch occurred on January 7, 1991, successfully orbiting NATO IV-A, the first of a new generation of NATO satellites. Photo provided by John F. Schuessler and MDSSC.**

The major portion of the second stage of the Delta II launch vehicle fell less than 100 feet from the residence of Steve and Verona Gutowski, pictured center and right. The man on the left is the cameraman from TV station KEYE in Austin, TX.



of metal at 3:37 a.m. Joe's brother-in-law, who lives a short distance north, was also disturbed by the noise.

Lieutenant Randy Traylor of the Williamson County Sheriff's Office called NASA in Houston, Texas, to report the crumpled tank on the Gutowski's property. NASA spokesman Ed Campion said it seemed unlikely that the object could be from space. Franki Webster, a spokeswoman for the U.S. Space Command in Colorado Springs said her agency hadn't heard about the case, but it would look into the matter. She said the Air Force uses radar to track all the 8500 man-made objects in Earth's orbit, making sure that falling objects are not mistaken for missiles.


The author was alerted by Austin, Texas TV Station KEYE. Walt conducted an interview and made photographs on January 29th of the 6 feet diameter and 9 feet long tank with round ball-shaped ends. The bottom was crushed due to impact and was so heavy that several men could not move it. BMDO said it weighed 1500 pounds. It was constructed of heavy aircraft steel nearly 1/8th inch thick with inside reinforcing ribs for added strength. Several brass fittings were noted, but in particular the circular heavy brass flange, containing 28. 1/4 inch brass screws, which apparently held the exhaust nozzle of the stage 2 rocket motor. The brass flange also contained a four-finned exhaust fixture noted in one of the photographs. Walt removed four of the

Allen head screws with his fingers as souvenirs.

The major physical damage during the reentry was a burned-away triangular-shaped hole three feet long by one foot alongside one of the seams in the front. (Phillips head screws were used as expanding type rivets to fasten both round ends to the tank.) Another split, three feet long, was noted on the bottom, but it could have occurred on impact, since no metal was burned away.

Dr. Nick Johnson, a NASA orbital debris scientist, visited the scene on February 3rd and definitely identified the large capsule-shaped tank as part of the second phase of the Delta II satellite carrying rocket launched on April 24, 1996. (See drawing of the Delta II 7925 Launch Vehicle manufactured by McDonnell-Douglas Astronautics.) Dr. Johnson said in the last five years, scientists have documented 328 man-made orbiting space objects that have crashed into the Earth's surface, and fewer than 12 have landed on the continental United States. (Considering the rare occurrence of such events, the editors of the *MUFON UFO Journal* felt the three items recovered warranted a feature article.)

The Air Force expressed an interest in picking up and returning the tank to the contractor for analysis, however, it was still lying in the field at the time this article was written.



The exhaust end of the second stage booster. Note brass fitting with screws and configuration of miniskirt and support truss. (bottom view)

All photos by Walt Andrus except page 3.

### FUEL SPHERE RECOVERED IN GUADALUPE COUNTY

The metal sphere 23 inches in diameter found by rancher Ed Longcope in a pasture was the item that received national attention for Seguin and MUFON when it was released by the Associated Press. The *San Antonio Express-News* gave the metal ball front page coverage on three occasions. All three San Antonio TV stations covered the event for several days.

The Guadalupe County Sheriff's office was called by rancher Ed Longcope at 1:40 p.m. on January 24, 1997, to report that a UFO had landed in one of his pastures. Deputy Sheriff's Todd P. Friesenhahn and Stephen Moore were immediately dispatched to Wade Road and FM 3353 to respond to the incident north of Kingsbury, Texas (sixteen miles northeast of the MUFON office in Seguin). Mr. Longcope stated that he was feeding his cattle and noticed a metal sphere imbedded in the field. Deputies Friesenhahn and Moore pulled the sphere out of the depression and examined it. They noticed that the sphere was scorched and pitted on one side and appeared to have the remains of a valve or pipe that was burned-away. They made Polaroid photos of both the sphere and the ball-shaped hole that was eight inches deep.


When I interviewed Ed Longcope, he found it humorous that the deputies treated

the ball like a potential bomb dropped from an aircraft. Upon returning to Seguin, they took the ball to the National Weather Service, who could not identify it and advised them to contact NASA. Todd contacted NASA in Houston (281-483-3111) and they advised they would contact the proper authorities. Friesenhahn then received a call from Colorado Springs stating they think they knew what it is and would have someone pick it up on Monday, January 27th.

Walt Andrus was contacted by Roger Croteau, a staff writer for the *San Antonio Express-News* about 3 p.m. and was asked to help identify the ball at the Guadalupe County Sheriff's office in Seguin.

He immediately drove to the sheriff's office with a minimum of equipment to measure the ball's dimensions, metallic content, etc. The ball measured 23 inches in diameter and 75 inches in circumference. It had two flanges with three hex Allen head screws on opposite sides; one with a burned-off pipe protruding and the opposite side covered with a flat plate. (The screws were well-preserved and could be rotated with my thumb and finger.) A neat welded seam united the two half spheres. A magnet indicated that the ball was constructed of a non-magnetic metal and weighed an estimated 60-75 pounds. Some heating from the reentry showed a copper color on one side and aluminum on another surface. It may

View of the sphere showing where helium or nitrogen tank was connected to bottom of stage 2 booster. The tank was constructed of titanium and other metals.



have been brass, but this was not determined at the scene. I photographed the ball and receptacles for the record. It could be rolled around with ease, but was too heavy and clumsy-sized to lift easily. Deputy Moore jokingly told me that he might lose his hair due to possible radiation.

NASA alerted the Air Force in Colorado Springs who in turn called Randolph Air Force Base to arrange for the pick up of the ball before 6 p.m. It was loaded on a pickup truck, and driven to Randolph AFB, where it is still being held. A major announced on television that the sphere would be returned to Ed Longcope via Sheriff Melvin Harborth the following week, but to-date this has not been done. Ed Longcope promised that he would donate the metal ball to the MUFON UFO Information Center and Museum after it was returned to him.

A diagram of the Delta II 7925 Launch Vehicle shows four spheres containing helium and nitrogen attached to the bottom of the second stage of the launch vehicle, thus the mystery has been solved. Since MUFON is very serious about adding this metal sphere to our UFO Information Center, I have contacted Lt. Col Rick Lehner, the press officer for the Ballistics Missile Defense Organization, and Major Peter Kurucz, the program manager at the Pentagon. I was advised by Lt. Col. Lehner

that Major Kurucz would make the final decision on the release of the sphere.

#### **NOZZLE OF STAGE 2 RECOVERED NEAR SEGUIN**

On February 7, 1997, Burl III, Burl and Jennie Little who live on a farm three miles east of Seguin on U.S. Alternate 90 reported to Walt Andrus that some unusual debris had fallen into a pasture alongside their home. The cone-shaped section of the stage two booster rocket nozzle was found intact, however, the fiberglass and gasket material was pulled away where it was formerly attached to the brass flange on the bottom of the stage two tank found at Georgetown, Texas. The bottom end of the nozzle and top end were both damaged on impact. Of course, the internal portion of the nozzle was burned black during the burn-period of stage two. The nozzle is composed of special fiber circular gaskets stacked on top of each other and further insulated with sheets of fiberglass. The well-preserved portion of the cone is 10 inches in diameter at the top, 15 inches at the bottom and 21 inches in length. The cone is covered with layers of silver colored fiberglass.

Keith Hutson, a fiberglass engineer-consultant and MUFON State Section Director for Guadalupe County, is conducting a study of the sheets of fiberglass to deter-

mine if they were manufactured in Seguin by Hexcel Corporation, a nationally known producer of space and defense textiles.

If fewer than 12 out of 238 man-made orbiting space objects have fallen upon the continental U.S.A. in the last five years, this is indeed a relatively rare event, especially considering the pristine condition of the recovered objects. For this to occur, the second stage had to reenter the atmosphere at a very shallow angle so as to be subjected to the minimum amount of friction and consequential heating. Objects entering the atmosphere at a slighter angle are known to have skipped off the planet Earth's atmosphere never to return or else go back into orbit for a later fall. This is the same problem that our Mercury, Gemini and Apollo astronauts faced upon their return to Earth after each flight.

In the eventuality that the recovered sphere is not returned to Mr. Ed Longcope and subsequently the UFO Information Center, a secondary plan is being instigated. Since three check points have been established where the above items have been recovered, the other three fuel cells should have fallen on this same line, probably in Guadalupe or possibly Caldwell County. Walt prepared a map of Guadalupe County for distribution, showing the exact location line where the three missing spheres should have fallen. Melvin Harborth, Sheriff of Guadalupe County, has alerted his deputies to be on the lookout. Articles will be published in the *Seguin Gazette-Enterprise* newspaper bringing this to the attention of county readers. News announcements on radio station KWED in Seguin will also be utilized to advise their listeners. Since the spheres are only 23 inches in diameter and will be partially imbedded into the soil, one must be reasonably close to observe them. If the balls were to hit a residence, they would penetrate not only the roof and ceilings, but damage the contents of the room due to their weight and speed. We can be reasonably certain that this has not occurred. For updates on our progress, please read the *MUFON UFO Journal* and wish us luck in our quest.




The exhaust nozzle of the second booster rocket on display at the MUFON UFO Information Center.

Portions of the damaged circular gasket rings from the top and bottom are also on display.

The preserved portion of the nozzle weighs over fifty pounds.

### Delta II 7925 Launch Vehicle



The Delta II Launch vehicle was manufactured by:  
**McDonnell Douglas Space Systems Co.**  
 McDonnell Douglas Commercial Delta  
 5301 Bolsa Avenue  
 Huntington Beach, California 92647

The images accompanying this article were downloaded from the CNINews Web site at: <http://www.cninews.com>

Other stills, including video clips with sound, are available at the same site.



## NEWS OFF THE NET

From: CNINews1@aol.com  
Date: Wed, 26 Feb 1997 13:32:22 -0500  
(EST) Subject: EXTRA! CNI News SPECIAL EDITION — February 25, 1997

This is a special unscheduled edition of CNI News, reporting on an important new development in the "alien autopsy" investigation. This edition also corrects two errors which appeared in the February 16 edition of the news.

The subject matter of CNI News is inherently controversial, and the views and opinions reported herein are not necessarily those of the editorial staff.

### CNI NEWS BEGINS "MANHUNT" FOR THE AUTOPSY CAMERAMAN

CNI News has launched a full-scale search for the man who claims to have shot Ray Santilli's controversial "alien autopsy" film

footage. Our hunt for the mystery cameraman will use the interactive power of the worldwide web as its primary asset, supported by the latest and best evidence we can acquire.

Full details of the CNI News Manhunt are now posted on our web site at [www.cninews.com/Manhunt.html](http://www.cninews.com/Manhunt.html). Featured at this site are still and motion pictures of the man, as recently shown on Japanese television.

CNI News urges all our readers to examine the evidence presented at our web site and to send us any information that might help to identify the mystery cameraman. A direct-response page is included in the new Manhunt section of the site. We also urge all related web sites to announce this initiative and link directly to CNI News to assist in this search.

The stakes are high. Despite the best efforts of dozens of top researchers in the U.S. and





*Image as captured from Japanese video.  
Deinterleaved, mild contrast stretch.*



*Hand shades backlight.*



*Straight shot, no glasses.*

elsewhere, the autopsy controversy has resisted solution since it began in early 1995. Resolving the cameraman's identity will surely help to resolve the greater mystery of the footage itself.

CNI News "Manhunt" is comprised of the following parts:

- Background on the new cameraman video
- The cameraman images — stills and video with sound
- Two versions of the cameraman's story, as told by Ray Santilli and the man himself
- A history of the cameraman's possible whereabouts, past and present
- A response page, for you to tell us what you know

Robert Kiviat, executive producer of the 1995 FOX TV special "Alien Autopsy: Fact or Fiction," has strongly encouraged this new CNI News initiative. In a recent interview, Kiviat said:

"This project at the CNI News site... may well be where the story breaks. We respect the direction you're going and we would like to help in every way we can to find this individual and to cover that on our [next] show."

#### BACKGROUND ON THE LATEST VIDEO EVIDENCE

As long ago as January, 1996, CNI News reported rumors that the alleged autopsy cameraman would participate in an interview with U.S. television producer Robert Kiviat, in cooperation with English producer Ray Santilli.

Although Kiviat publicly acknowledged that he was negotiating to do an interview, it was not clear that the cameraman had actually been videotaped until U.S. researcher Bob Shell announced in September, 1996 that he had been shown the taped interview in Ray Santilli's London office.

At Santilli's invitation, Kiviat had written 25 detailed questions for the cameraman to answer. On tape, the cameraman responded briefly to about half of these questions, but Kiviat himself was not present for the taping.

**Kiviat: "This is the first time that anyone has shown the footage to the American public through some media outlet. People need to see this face and see if they know who this person is."**

**On February 21, 1997, producer Robert Kiviat spoke with CNI News editor Michael Lindemann about this latest development in the alien autopsy case and the new search for the mystery cameraman.**

The video was reportedly shot by the cameraman's own son on a non-professional camcorder. However, due to an apparent mistake in lighting, the cameraman's plan to obscure his own face failed. Though the son did turn this tape over to Santilli, he requested that it not be shown unless the face and the voice could be suitably disguised.

Despite the cameraman's wishes, Ray Santilli soon decided to sell the unaltered video to a Japanese television network. The Japanese aired the footage in Japan in December, 1996. Soon, copies of that broadcast arrived in the United States. CNI News acquired a copy in early February. Though the video quality was poor, the cameraman's face was visible and his voice was clear.

On February 21, 1997, producer Robert Kiviat spoke with CNI News editor Michael Lindemann about this latest development in the alien autopsy case and the new search for the mystery cameraman. Excerpts from that conversation follow:

Michael Lindemann: When and how did you first see the cameraman's videotaped interview?

Robert Kiviat: We got the footage in mid-July, 1996. The alleged son of the cameraman brought the footage to me in New York. I and one of Santilli's associates met the son. He seemed to be very nervous and concerned that the father had gone through a lot. He handed us the tape. The son said he felt the father had had enough, and the family wished the guy had never come out with the footage because it caused a lot of problems. Subsequent to the son leaving the hotel room, we—myself and Ray Santilli's associate—watched the tape, which is what eventually aired in Japan.

Lindemann: Now that Ray Santilli has released the footage to the Japanese, what would you like to see happen?

Kiviat: At this point, my goals would be to have the cameraman's image shown on national television to the widest possible audience, so that if somebody knows who this person is, they would contact me or the network or anyone connected to the program, and we would have an answer. This basically is where we are headed. My company

is now in preproduction on a possible new FOX UFO special. This is not official, but I can say fairly certainly that there is going to be a UFO special that will recap the alien autopsy/cameraman issue in every way possible, based on what is known at the time we finalize the show for airing. And my guess is, this show would be timed to air, as one would guess, around the anniversary of Roswell and the 1947 UFO wave.

Lindemann: Does the man you met, who claims to be the son, look enough like the man on the film to be family-related?

Kiviat: Ironically, yes. He does look like the father to some degree. I could say, if he's an actor, they probably picked an actual father and son. It struck me right away. The second the tape was popped in the machine in the hotel room, when the son left and we started watching it, I thought immediately that it looked like him.

Lindemann: Was this meeting specifically for the purpose of handing over the tape?

Kiviat: It was supposed to be a meeting where I would both meet the cameraman and receive a copy of the tape from him. Ray even promised there would be an opportunity for me to discuss with the cameraman the potential of him doing a full interview with me. Unfortunately, that never happened. A last minute "emergency" came up and Ray couldn't make it. So he sent a representative. And that, according to Ray, is the reason the father himself did not come. When Ray said that he couldn't make it, the cameraman apparently decided he wouldn't come either. So the emissaries met with me.

Lindemann: Who is in possession of the first generation copy of that film?

Kiviat: Ray Santilli controls the actual material, the first generation airable copy of the interview. I have not maintained any position, publically at least, as to what the rights are to that. At this point, what's done is done, and he did give it to the Japanese. Unfortunately for Ray, it is now appearing on this [CNI News] web site. I think Ray would prefer that it not be on the web. However, I have no way of inhibiting anyone, and I don't think I would choose to inhibit anyone from sharing this man's image.

I'm the one, from the beginning, who wanted every possible clue, because we were approaching this as a detective story, and this is not closed yet. So any clue I could possibly get would be used in the upcoming show that we're in preproduction on, and that's why I think it's imperative that Ray consider the importance of sharing more information about this individual with me, the network and everybody else. It is critical, for everyone, to close this out.

Lindemann: Ray Santilli evidently sold the videotape to the Japanese with no stipulation that the man's face and voice be disguised. Is it your impression that the cameraman is OK with this, or has Ray Santilli now broken faith with this man after allegedly protecting his identity for nearly two years?

Kiviat: That's an issue right now. I can say for sure that at one time the cameraman wanted to be silhouetted. But now it appears he doesn't mind not being silhouetted. I think the most proof-positive thing you could say about that is that he himself shot the interview. He could watch it. You've got to figure that someone who took this much time to think about coming out, while Ray and I courted him, would take the time to adjust the contrast on his television to see if his face shows. I'm wondering what's going on here, because to me, this man and his son were bright enough to know that they could have guaranteed silhouette, but they didn't do that. They sent it in as is. That may well be the biggest clue to his willingness to come out.

Lindemann: Was the cameraman paid to do this interview?

Kiviat: My understanding was that he was paid. I have absolutely no idea how much money, but my understanding is that there was an exchange of money for tape.

Lindemann: As you know, CNI News is now determined to do everything possible to discover the identity of this man. Not only are we posting still images and a short video clip of the cameraman on this website, but we have also created an interactive area so that people who may have information on this man's identity or whereabouts can enter that information in the new database we've built for this purpose. We will

then compile and distribute information from this database to key researchers, of course including yourself. For the benefit of all visitors to this web site, especially potential eyewitness contributors to our search, would you please explain your own view of, and involvement in, this effort?

Kiviat: Since I'm in preproduction on a potential new UFO special for FOX, it's very important to view this as a possible element in the show. If we can close this thing out during preproduction, we'll cover how this web site and this project led to a closure. This is the first time that anyone has shown the footage to the American public through some media outlet. People need to see this face and see if they know who this person is. This is a big step, in my opinion, because the internet is going to become a major source for cooperation between television shows like mine and the viewing public. This project at the CNI News site is a great beginning — I can't stress that enough — to get information out to the public and to help close some of these nagging issues in one of the greatest mysteries of perhaps the last 25 years. It's time to close this out now.

We want daily reports on anything that comes in. Eventually, this may well be where the story breaks. So we respect what you're doing at CNI News. We respect the direction you're going and we would like to help in every way we can to find this individual and to cover that on our show.

#### WHO IS THE MYSTERY CAMERAMAN?

Almost from the moment the autopsy film first came to light in early 1995, questions were raised regarding its authenticity. In the two years that have elapsed since then, the majority of researchers involved with the film have labeled it a probable hoax. Still, some researchers are staunchly convinced the film is exactly what it purports to be — actual military footage of an alien autopsy — and most others concede that the claim of hoax has not yet been proven.

Now, a man has proclaimed himself to be the cameraman. We have his face, his voice and his words. The identity of this man is now the critical link in establishing, once

**You've got to figure that someone who took this much time to think about coming out, while Ray and I courted him, would take the time to adjust the contrast on his television to see if his face shows.**

# Abduction Report Consistencies as Scientific Evidence of Alien Abductions

Stuart Appelle, Ph.D.

Stuart Appelle is the editor of the *Journal of UFO Studies*.

1. Wright, D. Sorting entities. *MUFON UFO Journal*, June, 1996, 3-6.

2. Appelle, S. Abduction report consistency and statistical inference. *MUFON UFO Journal*, September, 1996, 9-12.

3. Wright, D. Dan Wright replies. *MUFON UFO Journal*, September, 1996, 12-13.

## Background

In the June 1996 issue of this *Journal* [1], Dan Wright describes consistencies in abduction report content as found in the MUFON Abduction Transcription Project (MATP) database. He argues that these consistencies occur at a frequency so beyond "chance" that scientists' failure to accept the reality of alien abduction can be understood only as a reflection of their "herd mentality," and their being "plainly afraid to contemplate" the possibility of extraterrestrial visitation.

In a subsequent commentary [2] I suggested that limitations in meeting the standards of science, rather than limitations in the personalities of scientists, could account for this lack of acceptance. Wright, however, continues to reject this possibility [3]. Although his comments indicate no quarrel with my view that the MATP deviates from strict scientific methodology (e.g., obtaining normative response measures, controlling for conventional sources of influence, etc.), he argues that such an approach should not be considered necessary because of the statistical significance of his findings. In fact, he defends his position by re-arguing the case for statistical significance, suggesting my call for stricter scientific methodology stems from three "serious oversights" in understanding the mathematical probabilities involved.

However, my position was argued in terms of two issues of statistical inference, only one of which was about the determination of chance (discussed in regard to the individual commonalities Wright reported). The other dealt with problems of interpretation where a non-chance outcome is granted (such as the "correlations" to be discussed later). To quote from my original article:

"Even if a set of data cannot be attributed to chance, what they can be attributed to may still be unclear. That is, a non-chance outcome only precludes a random event. It does not, in itself, identify the cause of the event.... Interpreting the results of the [MATP] database as proof of alien visitation is by no means necessary *even if the results*

*were unquestionably beyond chance* [original emphasis]."

I went on to give examples of this problem. But because of his singular focus on establishing a non-chance outcome, Wright characterizes those examples as "sidebars" and my commentary as a "lecture on probabilities."

It may be useful, therefore, to elaborate on my original discussion while addressing the "oversights" Wright mentions. In doing so, I do not discuss the reality of alien abductions per se, nor any data pertaining to the abduction experience other than the data reported by Wright.

Instead, I take the position that (a) a fundamental responsibility of science is to evaluate alternative explanations for a phenomenon, (b) where the data do not permit such an evaluation, the scientific community cannot responsibly accept any particular explanation, (c) scientific evaluation follows certain rules; if you don't play by the rules of science, you can't expect the support of science. With this perspective, I argue that *whether or not commonalities in abduction reports reflect common experiences with alien abductors, these data as reported so far do not meet traditional scientific standards of evidence*.

## The Cited "Oversights"

1. "At no point does [Appelle] ever address the correlations of odd factors" (i.e., instances where the same set of two or more content items appear in two or more abduction reports).

In fact, the "correlations" were addressed. They just were not addressed in terms of statistical probability. Because, as Wright stresses, the correlation findings are clearly beyond chance, probability is not an issue here. What is at issue is *why* correlations appear at a frequency beyond chance, not *whether* they do.

Even the phenomenon's critics concede that abduction report content can't be attributed to a random process. The MATP data are very useful in confirming that impres-

sion; but they do little to establish why these consistencies occur. Their appearance means only that certain items are associated with each other (in statistical parlance, those items are "non-independent"). They do not distinguish between associations established through actual experience with aliens, associations established through mundane experience (e.g., through conventional medical routines), and associations that may exist in the psychodynamics of the human mind (e.g., the association of "fog," or "cloak" with the mysterious).

**I**ndeed, it is not the presence of commonalities, but their absence that would require an exotic explanation. This is because correlations are to be expected regardless of whether abduction accounts stem from actual or imagined events. First, any large collection of stories based on a highly specific theme (e.g., "abducted by aliens") should have many content items in common, whether similarities in actual experience or commonalities in imaginative and social influence are the source of those stories. Second, in any story, certain content elements will tend naturally to go together (e.g., an "examining table" and "restraining straps"). Therefore, item correlations are also to be expected within any collection of theme-specific stories.

By way of comparison, consider a series of reports about conventional "abductions" (i.e., terrestrial kidnappings). Across a large number of reports, certain commonalities would be expected in either real or fictional reports (e.g., vehicles of the same color, make, vintage, etc.; the same restraining devices — rope, duct tape, etc.; the same type of weapon). Across a large number of kidnapping accounts, some will share more than one of these specific content factors. These correlations may occur with a frequency well beyond chance, but their presence cannot distinguish between accounts based on real kidnappings and made-up accounts.

As another illustration, consider the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). This is a psychological instrument in which subjects are asked to make up a story associated with a simple picture (for example, a drawing of an elderly woman standing with her back turned to a young man). Even though the "theme" for such a story is far more ambiguous than that of alien abduction (for each test stimulus it is only sug-

gested by the picture, and may be perceived differently by each subject) normative data from these tests indicate many commonalities found across subjects' stories in regard to the characters mentioned, their described behaviors, reported motives, associated emotions, environmental details, and numerous other factors [4]. But the stories reflect consistencies across subjects' psyches, not consistencies in precipitating events.

One might argue that "alien abduction" is a subject so far beyond normative experience, that unlike kidnappings or responses to conventional drawings, abduction report commonalities could not plausibly be attributed to imagination or the human psyche. In actuality, the unusual nature of the subject matter only makes it more difficult to anticipate (predict) content for fictional reports in advance, a fact that makes determining what a control population would generate more important, not less.

In summary, the basis of any "story" can be memory of actual events, imagination, or various psychosocial influences. Therefore, where the basis of the story is unknown, an appropriate research protocol must be followed that can distinguish among the potential causal alternatives. In the absence of such methodology, the inferences drawn (correctly or incorrectly) stem from subjective judgment, not experimental validation. And validation is the core of the scientific method.

*2. The "comparison of odd-factor correlations with the... four primary characteristics [of] entity height, skin tone, garment type and garment color" was ignored.*

This approach to the data should be ignored. Each of these four characteristics is quite commonly portrayed in abduction accounts, and as indicated by Wright each is mentioned in over half of his 216 cases. Accordingly, they fit neither his descriptive definition of an "odd" ("obscure") factor ("rarely if ever mentioned in print or electronic media") nor his operational definition ("repeated in at least four cases, but not so often as to be considered common"). Since Wright's entire argument rests on the premise that only "obscure" items are being analyzed, using familiar factors to bolster a case for obscure ones is methodologically inappropriate.

**Indeed, it is not the presence of commonalities, but their absence that would require an exotic explanation. This is because correlations are to be expected regardless of whether abduction accounts stem from actual or imagined events.**

**4. Henry, W. E. (1987). *The analysis of fantasy*. Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company.**

**5. (No author).  
Aliens: Silver  
Lining.  
Newsweek,  
September 16,  
1996, p.10.**

**6. Gabriel, T.  
Alien beings  
abduct pop  
culture. *New  
York Times*,  
September 12,  
1996.**

**7. Associated  
Press. UFO hys-  
teria invades  
holy land.  
(September 22,  
1996).**

3. *"The potential universe [of abduction report factors] is not just 2174 factors [the number of factors in the MUFON database]; in fact it is infinite."*

Conventional measures of statistical probability use the sample size associated with the study. In this case the 2174 items in the MUFON database is the correct sample size and any interpretation of probabilities must be based on it. (If the number of content items evaluated were indeed infinite, normal predictive tests of probability would not be possible. The probability of any potential content item being mentioned would be  $1/\text{infinity} = 0$ ; i.e. for all practical purposes there would be zero probability of any particular content item appearing!)

Besides, the number of potential abduction reports is not "in fact infinite" (a number which is greater than that of all words in the English language). Even to be recognizable as an "abduction report" an account must be consistent with a highly specific theme (i.e., being kidnapped by non-human entities) which places considerable constraints on potential report content.

### **The Issue of Factor "Obscurity"**

One of the more popular hypotheses for abduction report consistency is familiarity with the abduction report scenario. Because of this possibility, Wright uses factor obscurity as a control for such concerns. Since obscurity is so central to Wright's arguments, it is important to examine this characteristic more closely.

*Item selection.* Wright selected 68 content factors as meeting his definition of "obscure." However, he provides no information about his factor selection protocol. For example, he indicates that "a hundred more [obscure factors] could have been selected". On what basis then, were these particular 68 chosen? How did Wright determine that a factor was "obscure"? Did he just use his subjective impression based on his own exposure to media sources? If not, what media sources were surveyed? What time period did this media search cover? What actually constitutes "rarely mentioned"? For example, did a single ("rare") mention in a widely accessed media source still meet the criterion of "obscure"?

These are not unreasonable questions. In just the week during which Wright's objec-

tions to my comments appeared in the *MUFON Journal*, TBS had a two-hour special chronicling the events in five abduction experiencers' lives, a major insurance house in Britain began offering insurance for alien abductions [5], a story in *The New York Times* [6] highlighted a rash of art exhibits in SoHo, each focusing on an alien abduction theme, and an Associated Press article [7] reported that "Israeli media join craze of ... alien abductions." With the abduction phenomenon this well established in American and international culture, evidence that content items are indeed "obscure" must be established by much more definitive means than an investigator's declaration.

*Control for familiarity with abduction report content.* Even if properly determined, factor obscurity (as defined by Wright) is only a control for media influence, not other possible sources of influence. As just one example, I discussed in my original article that obscurity in the media does not equate to obscurity among those contributing to the MATP database. Specifically, I pointed out that opportunities exist for social influence between experiencers and investigators.

Wright insists that such contagion is minimal and can easily be dismissed, suggesting that "a very strong commitment of confidentiality" among his database investigators precludes this possibility. The issue of investigator confidentiality is simply not a persuasive argument against exposure to abduction report content. Factors identified by Wright as obscure (including examining tables, flashlight-like instruments, railings and tunnels, feelings of love for the abductors, items of apparel, etc.) are all widely cited in the abduction community. Through support groups, conventions, newsletters, UFO publications, abduction books, etc. the potential for sharing specific details among investigators and experiencers is considerable.

In addition, I know of experiencers who have "worked with" more than one investigator, investigators who have shared hypnosis session transcripts with each other (albeit with abductee consent), and at least one case in which a transcriber for the MATP itself is an abduction experiencer. Given that the MATP database is derived from repeated sessions covering months or years of

an experiencer's interaction with investigators and other experiencers, the opportunity for such information exposure to influence the data is very real indeed.

Of course, I don't know the extent to which any of these influences have actually affected the MATP database. And that is just the point. In the absence of appropriate controls and a careful description of data collection protocols, one can only guess what effect this information mill has had on abduction report commonalities.

Among other things, Wright's analysis provides no information on how commonality frequency varies with time (i.e., from the earliest abduction reports to the most recent), or across multiple hypnosis sessions (i.e., from initial sessions to later sessions), or for cases common to a particular investigator (as compared to cases from different investigators). No comparison is provided between MATP data and earlier descriptions of abduction report content (e.g., Bullard's massive review). Science requires procedures that can clarify these matters, not simply Wright's guess as to their importance.

*Factor specificity.* A corollary of factor obscurity is factor specificity. Can one argue that repeated mention of an unusually specific item (let's say a particular uniform insignia) is prima facie evidence for abduction report veridicality? Certainly such specificity argues against the likelihood that its mention is due to chance. But without control data we cannot know if the frequency of its mention is in fact greater than that for the general population (for reasons not immediately apparent), or the degree to which awareness of this factor exists within the experiencer community. Is the researcher who waits for control data on this reflecting (as Wright suggests) a bad attitude, or just a legitimate concern for good science?

### **Quo Vadis Ufology?**

Research in ufology has been (perhaps by necessity) more of an investigative enterprise (fact finding through the examination of case studies, documenting facts and testimony, categorizing and tabulating descriptive data) than a scientific one (hypothesis testing through systematic observation and experimentation). This investigative work is absolutely necessary, and (like the work of Wright with the MATP database) should be

applauded, supported and encouraged. It has helped establish that experiences of unidentified flying objects and alien abduction are widespread. It has clarified the characteristics of those experiences. It has demonstrated that sometimes those characteristics cannot be easily accounted for with prosaic or conventional explanations.

Some have argued that even in the absence of scientific verification, this body of evidence would be enough to establish an extraterrestrial basis for these phenomena in a court of law. That proposition has not been tested. Clearly, however, the evidence has been enough to convince many in the court of public opinion. Like law and public opinion, science also deals with evidence. Like law and public opinion, science also has its own unique standards of evidence. And like the jurist who is asked to separate conclusions based on personal standards from those based on legal ones, scientists too must separate personal belief from belief based on science.

**M**indful of this, the present article is not about personal standards of evidence nor legal standards. It is about the standards of science. Its purpose is two-fold: to encourage a fair-minded perspective on why the scientific community at-large has not embraced the idea that alien abductions are taking place; and to illustrate what approaches to the data need to be taken before the scientific community can realistically evaluate that possibility. The case I make is not predicated on the well known skeptic dictum that "extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence." Nor is it based on the suggestion by Budd Hopkins that "an extraordinary phenomenon requires an extraordinary investigation." While the evidence Wright has presented falls short of either goal, more importantly, it falls short of basic scientific protocol as applied to mundane claims and phenomena.

Of course, the reader may choose to reject traditional scientific standards. The reader may insist that a compelling case has been made in spite of these standards. Or the reader may argue, as do some, that the abduction phenomenon is "beyond" science altogether. My comments do not address these perspectives either. Instead, they are aimed at those who wish the field of ufology to measure up to scientific standards and, thereby, increase the involvement of

**Through support groups, conventions, newsletters, UFO publications, abduction books, etc. the potential for sharing specific details among investigators and experiencers is considerable.**

**Some have argued that even in the absence of scientific verification, this body of evidence would be enough to establish an extraterrestrial basis for these phenomena in a court of law.**

the scientific community in the study of these phenomena.

For this reason, it is unfortunate that Wright continues to attribute the failure to accept the reality of alien abductions to scientists' personalities, rather than to shortcomings in the way the evidence has been collected and presented. Not only does he defend his earlier ad hominem remarks about the scientific community, he persists with additional insults — this time stereotyping scientists as "entrenched" individuals lacking in "common sense." This is a cheerleader's come-on, not the kind of reasoned comment one would hope for (and expect) from a representative of an organization that promotes itself as dedicated to the *scientific* study of UFOs, prides itself on the *scientists* in its membership, and holds annual conventions to address the *science* of ufology.

For the same reason, it is disappointing to find a MUFON representative rejecting "adherence to a strict scientific method of organizing control groups...replicating... findings and so forth," in favor of "the need to move on" with other projects which presuppose alien abductions as established fact. This lack of concern for scientific rigor seems inconsistent with the public image MUFON is trying to present.

If MUFON's promotional message is a true reflection of its attitude toward science, its representatives should speak as advocates of science, not as detractors. Alternatively, MUFON can accept the metaphor advanced by Wright: Ufology as a "train" having long since "left the station" of scientific accountability.



*John Schuessler is presenting Dr. Clyde Tombaugh with a picture of the NASA space station.*

## **DISCOVERER OF PLUTO DIES**

**by John F. Schuessler**

Clyde Tombaugh, the astronomer who discovered the planet Pluto, is dead at the age of 90. Tombaugh died at his home in Mesilla Park, New Mexico on Friday, January 17, 1997.

Dr. Tombaugh has the distinction of discovering a planet, reporting two UFO sightings, and finding 3,969 asteroids, 1,807 variable stars, a large globular cluster, a couple of comets, and 29, 548 galaxies.

Tombaugh was born in Streator, Illinois in 1906. While in his early twenties, sketches he had made of Mars attracted the attention of V. M. Slipher, Director of the Lowell Observatory in Flagstaff, Arizona, and he was invited to join the staff of the observatory as an observer. His assignment was to find Planet X, the then unknown ninth planet outside the orbit of Neptune. For six months, he would photograph the sky during the dark of the moon and "blink" the planets the rest of the time. He would look at an average of 35,000 stars per day. Finally, on February 18, 1930, he made his discovery. His examination of photographic plates of the sky near delta-Geminorum revealed a dim object, moving at the predicted rate for a trans-Neptunian object. It was Pluto.





by **David M. Jacobs, Ph.D.**

**M**ost readers of the *MUFON UFO Journal* will instantly recognize the "Linda" Case. It occupies an unusual position in UFO history because the UFO community has engaged in a passionate debate about it without knowing much about it. Because the case is so complex, Budd Hopkins has been able to discuss only limited aspects of it in his presentations at UFO conferences. As a result, the case is well-known but the vast array of details and the main threads within it have not been generally known.

I am not a dispassionate observer in the Linda case and therefore this review must be read with that in mind. It started for me in 1991, when Hopkins called me up and told me that he had received a stunning letter. Two "police officers," Richard and Dan, wrote that they had witnessed a UFO abduction. They had seen several "people" floating out of a window of a high-rise apartment building in the middle of Manhattan and into a hovering UFO. When he read the letter to me we both puzzled over whether this could have been Linda Cortile, an abductee who lived in the immediate area and with whom Hopkins had been having a series of hypnotic regressions. He remembered that she had been abducted sometime during that time period. I said that the chances were against it because there might be many abductees living in that area, and we were not even sure that they were looking at Linda's apartment building.

A short time later, to our astonishment, the two police officers knocked on Linda's door and told her what they had seen. The chances that they could have known that Linda was an abductee were extremely remote. The chances that they knew Linda had been abducted on that particular night were astronomically small—only Linda and Hopkins knew this. Thus begins the case that would ultimately see print as *Witnessed: The True Story of the Brooklyn Bridge UFO Abductions*, one of the most extraordinary abduction cases of all time.

During the course of his investigations, Hopkins would spend five years tracking

down every lead, every fact, and every witness. Working with a loose team of people expert in different areas of investigation, he discovered that there were a number of witnesses besides the two police officers. For instance, there were people on the Brooklyn Bridge, just a few blocks away, who had seen the event. He traveled to upstate New York to interview one of them, a retired woman who had absolutely no stake or connection to this abduction other than as a witness.

Hopkins also learned that Richard and Dan were not actually police officers. Rather, they were security officials accompanying an important world leader to a helicopter pad. The "Third Man," as Hopkins calls him, was also a witness and an important participant in the unfolding events. In the end Hopkins uncovered more than twenty players to this abduction drama, some direct witnesses, and others witnesses or participants to events surrounding the abduction's aftermath. The case is so complex, that when writing the book, Hopkins had to "corral" the enormous amounts of information he had collected, eliminating many aspects of the case that would have made the book into two long volumes.

Unfolding like a detective novel, *Witnessed* takes the reader through the labyrinth of events as they happened to Linda and to Hopkins. Each event tends to confirm the centrality of the abduction with a cohesion that is astounding. Each chapter leads to more revelations and more evidence. Each witness adds more depth and more veracity to the case.

*Witnessed* contains multi-layers of fascination in the complex series of events. The actions of the two officers toward Linda, the relationship between Richard and Dan, the role of the third man in the abduction phenomenon, the relationship of the third man to Linda and her family, the relationships of all the participants to each other, and all the participants' relationships to Hopkins, compose a rich and extraordinary journey into the countless facets of this landmark case. To this day, Hopkins has never met Richard or Dan, but their lives will forever be intertwined with his. He has met the alleged third man. In a short but dramatic encounter in an airport, Hopkins' conversation with the world leader speaks volumes not only for what was said, but perhaps even more for what was not said.

**Witnessed:  
The True  
Story of the  
Brooklyn  
Bridge UFO  
Abductions  
by Budd  
Hopkins.**

**Pocket Books,  
New York,  
1996, 401 pp,  
illus., appen-  
dices, \$23.00**

**David Jacobs, a professor of history at Temple University, is the author of *Secret Life: Firsthand Accounts of UFO Abductions* (Simon & Schuster, 1992)**

Hopkins also uncovered some important facts about the abduction phenomenon. He found that aliens will sometimes put abductees together as youngsters. They form friendships while children and then as they grow older their friendships turn into sexual partnerships. That this happened to Richard and Linda is not surprising in light of the unusual bond that formed between them when they met. As such, it brings up the degree of intrusion into the lives of abductees that the aliens have accomplished—it suggests that the abduction phenomenon is far more intimate and all-encompassing than we had believed. It also implies that the phenomenon's long-term aspects might be far more extensive than most people are aware.

The case also speaks to professionalism, or lack thereof, in the UFO community. Amateur UFO sleuths and debunkers succeeded in muddying the waters of this case by publishing misleading and false material about it after a superficial examination of only a few facts. The debunkers spread their inaccurate findings on the Internet and in UFO publications. Before long other UFO buffs made up their minds that the case was suspicious even before Hopkins had completed his investigation. Thus, it is with relief that *Witnessed* has finally been published and the record can be set straight. The expert professionalism with which Hopkins conducted this investigation is in sharp contrast to the misleading and shoddy work of the amateurs. Hopkins answers every criticism made of the case and puts to rest the qualms that some researchers may have had about it.

It is also important to remember that this case is dynamic and ongoing. Events have happened past the writing of the book.

We can only hope that the even more complex story of this case and its peripheral actions will someday be told. In the meantime, we are indebted to Hopkins for adding another giant step forward in our quest for clarity and truth about the UFO and abduction phenomenon.

---

**News Off The Net -**  
*Continued from Page 11*

and for all, whether or not the Santilli autopsy film should be taken seriously.

Is he an actual military cameraman? Once his identity is known, we might be able to substantiate his military service record and his actual whereabouts during the crucial period of the late 1940s.

On the other hand, is he actually an actor? Is he possibly involved in the special effects industry? Is he younger than he is supposed to be? How deeply involved has he been with Santilli's project?

CNI News again urges all our readers to assist in resolving these questions. We will report on every new development as soon as possible.

Except as otherwise noted, the entire text of CNI News is copyright 1997 by the 2020 Group. As a condition of receiving CNI News, all recipients agree not to post CNI News on any Newsgroup, Web site, BBS or similar electronic location, nor redistribute CNI News by any electronic means, except for the express purpose of encouraging others to subscribe, or unless with prior permission of the editor. In general, electronic posting or redistribution of single articles or short excerpts from CNI News will be approved, provided credit is given to the author and CNI News in every instance. Hard copy (paper) reproduction and redistribution of CNI News, in whole or part, for educational purposes is permitted.

**MUFON COMMUNICATION NUMBERS**

MUFON Headquarters: Seguin, TX  
Telephone: (210) 379-9216  
Fax: (210) 372-9439

MUFON UFO HOT LINE 1-800-UFO-2166

THE INTERNET --  
mufon.com

MUFON e-mail address --  
mufonhq@aol.com

MUFONET-BBS (901) 327-1008

MUFON On CompuServe -- "Go MUFON"  
to access the Forum

MUFON Amateur Radio Net  
40 meters - 7.237 MHz - Saturday, 8 a.m.  
Eastern Time

## MUFON FORUM

### Letters to *Mufon UFO Journal*

#### Who Saved What?

This is in regard to Ed Stewart's E-mail (reprinted in the January 1997 *Journal*, p. 19) in which he claimed that "ufologists have Carl Sagan to thank for the preservation of the Blue Book files." Stewart stated that, "After the Condon Report and the Air Force announcement that they were discontinuing Project Blue Book, rumors ran rampant that the Air Force was going to destroy the Blue Book files. Dr. Edward Condon tried to use his influence to do just that."

Where else but in the UFO field would rumor be taken as fact? Where is the evidence that the Air Force planned to destroy the Blue Book files? The fact is that Air Force regulations required that the project files be maintained permanently, so the Air Force would have had to violate their own regulations — and invite the wrath of the Archivist of the United States — to destroy the files.

Likewise, where is the evidence that Dr. Condon "tried to use his influence" to have the Blue Book files destroyed?

Released with the so-called "Bolender memo" were copies of other records concerning the termination of Project Blue Book and the disposition of the Blue Book files. One of these documents, a letter dated June 21, 1968, from Secretary of the Air Force Harold Brown to Dr. Condon, stated:

"In your letter of 2 May 1968, you recommended that the UFO files at Wright-Patterson AFB (and possibly also the current files and working office of Project Blue Book) be relocated to the Washington area."

As I understand it, the Air Force announced the termination of Project Blue Book in December 1969, more than a year and a half *after* Condon's 2 May 1968 letter expressing concern about the Blue Book files.

Furthermore, paragraph 8 of the "Bolender memo" says:

"Project Blue Book has accumulated records on over 13,000 sighting cases. During his study, Dr. Condon expressed concern about [the] possible loss of these records and their relative inaccessibility at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. He was

assured by Secretary Brown we would look into the feasibility and desirability of relocating the files in the Washington area and that no action would be taken until the Colorado report was released ..." Secretary Brown's June 21, 1968 letter informed Condon that the Air Force would continue negotiations with the Library of Congress and the National Air and Space Museum "with the intent of eventually transferring the old cases to one of these organizations."

None of the records released to me made any mention of Dr. Sagan. Dr. Sagan may well have circulated a petition to preserve the Blue Book files, but I haven't seen a shred of evidence to show that that petition had any effect on the disposition of the files, or even that the Air Force seriously considered destroying the files in the first place. If Stewart — or anybody else — has such evidence, I would very much like to see it.

As shocking and as radical as this may sound, rumors are not facts. Equally shocking is the idea that, based on the available documentation, ufologists have Dr. Condon to thank for the preservation of the Project Blue Book files — *assuming* some villainous scheme actually existed within the Air Force to dispose of the Blue Book files to begin with, in violation of Air Force regulations and guidelines established by the Archivist of the United States.

Incidentally, it appears that Secretary Brown's June 21, 1968 letter was one of the sixteen attachments to the "Bolender memo," although it was not identified as such when these records were furnished to me.

— Robert Todd  
Ardmore, PA

#### Guncamera Picture

I would like to comment on the News & Views article, *Weirdness on the Web*, in the February 1997 *MUFON Journal*. There is no doubt there is weirdness on the web, but there are also an incredible number of data sources.

Unfortunately, just as in oral communication, messages get altered as they pass from one person to another. When I first met Lee Shargel in Philadelphia and saw the photos

he projected on the screen of a craft seen over Roswell, NM in 1947 by some unspecified pilot, I was receptive and interested. When I heard Shargel's explanation, it seemed reasonable at that time. I forwarded the picture taken by Dr. Bruce Cornet at that conference in Philadelphia on November 17, 1996 to Mr. Strieber who displayed it on his website. I expressed the opinion that it was probably authentic, but it would have to be examined further.

After I saw Lee Shargel's second presentation and additional photos, I had growing doubts about his photos and his data. When I got a close look at the photos, I became convinced they were fabrications. I now believe that the photo published on page 13 of the *Journal* is an object (someone suggested it was identical to a panel found on a vacuum cleaner) that was placed on a glass surface (such as a light table) and then photographed. There is a streak of light that runs across the surface of the metal object right into the sky which made me believe that the streak was a reflection off a supporting surface. I do not support Shargel's claims or photos.

I must add this note. Lee Shargel, to my knowledge, never claimed this object looked like the one that crashed near Roswell. As a matter of fact he originally said that this object had a different shape.

I just want to state for the record that I do not make claims unless I have some degree of certainty that I can back such claims with facts. This picture was deliberately posted on my website with the heading Roswell Craft? (note the question mark) for the purpose of eliciting responses.

Thank you,

—Bill Hamilton  
Ass't State Director  
MUFON, AZ

### MILABs

Victoria Alexander (Forum, 2/97) thinks the claims of Debbie Jordan and others that, having been abducted by UFOs, they were later harassed and/or abducted by the military are "fantasies of lonely women." Yet these women say they either told no one of their UFO abductions, or only told a few close friends or relatives—yet the military seemed to know all about it.

Years ago, I reported to Richard Boylan and others (and later to MUFON) that I was abducted by strange beings in 1955 and, years later, harassed and driven out of a

government job by former members of the USAF UFO retrieval unit. If I was lying or hallucinating, how did I describe this unit in some detail *before* Kevin Randle's article on it was published?

And if Debbie Jordan and the others are fantasizing, how did they, having never heard my account, make the same improbable claim that the military somehow knew of their (often unreported) abductions — just as the military apparently knew of mine? Since abductions often run in families, could the military have been simply tracking the families of potential abductees for well over 30 years?

—William B. Stoecker  
Sacramento, CA

### DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE -

*Continued from Page 23*

for \$25.00 plus \$3.50 for postage and handling from MUFON in Seguin.

Congratulations to the people who have recently taken the Field Investigator's Exam and received a passing grade. Kathleen Marden now grades the exams and forwards the name and score to MUFON headquarters, where Phyllis Hutson records the grade on your membership application, revises the application, and mails the new Field Investigator their new I.D. card.

### ADDITIONAL EVENTS AT GRAND RAPIDS

A press conference for all speakers is scheduled for Friday, July 11th from 1 to 3 p.m. The annual State/Provincial Director's meeting will be held from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on July 11th with Dr. John C. Kasher, moderating. Time will be allocated for short activity reports from each State and Provincial Director. If the State Director will be unable to attend, he/she should designate someone to represent them. The MUFON Annual Board of Directors meeting will take place on Sunday, July 13th from 9 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

All State and Provincial Directors will submit their annual reports to Dr. Kasher at the meeting if they or a representative attends. If they do not attend, the reports should be mailed to Walt Andrus. Here is your opportunity to share with your colleagues your accomplishments and ideas in promoting MUFON.

## READER'S CLASSIFIEDS

### THE ANOMALIST 4

Articles by Colin Wilson ("An Egyptian State of Mind"), Hector Quintanilla ("Project Blue Book's Last Days"), Montague Keen ("Crop Circles"), Michael Cremona ("Forbidden Archeology"), Steven Mizrach ("Wired Spirits"), Paul Schlyter ("Earth's Second Moon"), Larry Dossey, Loren Coleman, others. 144 pp., illus. Only \$9.95 plus \$2.50 s/h. Checks payable to Dennis Stacy, Box 12434, San Antonio, TX 78212.

### FLYING SAUCER DIGEST

Publishing for over 30 years. The number one privately published UFO magazine in the world. Free offer with each 4-issue subscription: 10 different UFO maps & 4 unique UFO illustrations, ready for framing. \$10.00 to UAPA-M, Box 347032, Cleveland, Ohio 44134.

**VIDEO/AUDIO TAPES** on UFOs, crop circles, aviation mysteries, NDE, Face on Mars & other fascinating topics. Free list & sample newsletter from *The Eclectic Viewpoint*. Box 802735-M, Dallas, TX 75380. Future lecture hotline (214) 601-7687

**UFO SEMINAR OF THE YEAR:** Stanton Friedman (June 21) on crashed saucers, gov't coverup and MJ-12. Dr. John Mack (June 22) will discuss UFO abductions, their social & spiritual implications. *Per day:* \$65 until March 31; \$75 thereafter. *Both days:* \$120 until March 31, \$150 thereafter. Omega Communications, Box 2051-M, Cheshire, CT 06410-5051.

**JAMES V. FORRESTAL & MJ-12?** Recently released Navy documents on the death of our first Secretary of Defense reveal new insights on this tragedy. A 40-page photocopy report examines these documents & other sources with startling conclusions! Send \$4.95 postpaid to: Brian Parks, 2818 W. 182 St. #30, Torrance, CA 90504.

Are UFOs in the Bible? Absolutely. God has the answer to the big question, *Why* are they here? Read *The Agenda* by B. Fox. Scriptures & references by John Mack, Travis Walton & others. Send check or money order to B. Fox, Offer #101, P.O. Box 6057, Walker Branch, Roswell, NM 88202. Rechargeable telephone card free with each order.

### BIBLE PREDICTS ALIEN ATTACK

<http://adams.patriot.net/~premil/we/wa/wa1.html>

### THE MAGNETIC SOUTH COMPANY

Magnetic relax products and far infrared products for people and pets. Relieve discomfort and stress. Increase energy. Non-invasive and non-chemical. Global giant new to U.S. now taking applications for distributorships. Phone 800-849-2893.

### UFO DANGER ZONE:

#### TERROR AND DEATH IN BRAZIL

By Bob Pratt. Over 18 years research. Over 200 cases. Over 1700 witnesses interviewed. "Field research as it should be done"; Dr. Jacques Vallee. Horus House Press, Inc., \$16.95 plus \$2.00 s&h. PO Box 55185, Madison, WI 53705.

### "ALIEN IMPLANTS" VIDEO

One hour nationally-syndicated live TV talk show on implants, produced by UFO-AZ, 4/96, featuring Gail Scymour of IRM. Meet three abductees. Watch Derrel Sims & Dr. Roger Leir surgically removing implants! (MUFON Journal, 4/96) Check or money order for US \$19.95 plus \$2.50 s/h to IDEAS West Marketing, 1014 Hopper Ave., Ste. 301, Santa Rosa, CA 95403-1603. Messages: 800-336-3780

### NEW!

Ron Russell Crop Circle Picture Book 68 high quality color photo copies, 45 pages, pictures, comments, references, \$46.50 includes tax & shipping within USA. (10 or more copies, 10% discount.) Send name, address & check to: Ron Russell Crop Circles, c/o Hans Holland, 1750-1 30th St. #114 Boulder, CO 80301.

### CROP CIRCLES DECIPHERED

Crop circles repeat Biblical messages! The signs are here! 52 pages, 12 illustrations. For the book that is prophetic, visit our web site: <http://www.sunshine.net/800/sn0896/crop.html> Or send \$22.20 Canadian, \$15.00 US (shipping & taxes included) to Sovot Unlimited, Site 21, Comp 4, RR5, Pell Rd., Gibsons, BC, Canada V0N 1V0.

### YOUR AD HERE!

Reach more than 5000 readers and fellow ufologists. Advertise your personal publications, products, research projects, local meetings or pet peeves here. Fifty words or less only \$20 per issue. Add \$10 for box and bold heading. Send ad copy & check, made out to MUFON, to Dennis Stacy, Box 12434, San Antonio, TX 78212. Must be MUFON member or *Journal* subscriber.

## The NIGHT SKY

Walter N. Webb

April 1997

### Bright Planets (Evening Sky):

Mercury has its best evening appearance of the year in early April, reaching a point 19° E of the Sun on the 5th. Look for an orange dot low in the WNW at dusk. (Use binoculars.) On April 8 the crescent Moon helps locate the little planet 7° to the right.

Mars (magnitude -0.8), in Leo, remains bright but fades slowly during the month as Earth leaves the planet behind. Telescope users can still find views of the Martian surface worthwhile. (See the March column.) The red planet lies in the SE at dusk and then crosses the southern sky during the night. It resumes eastward motion on the 29th. On the night of April 18-19, Mars can be seen about 4° above the gibbous Moon.

### Bright Planets (Morning Sky):

Mars sets in the W at dawn.

Jupiter (-2.2), in Capricornus, rises in the ESE about 3:30 AM daylight time in midmonth and is low in the SE at dawn. The giant stands 4° to the right of the lunar crescent on April 3.

### Comet Hale-Bopp:

For the first two weeks of April, Hale-Bopp should remain relatively bright in dark evening skies and about 20° above the NW horizon (at 40° lat.) toward the end of dusk. After that, increasing moonlight interferes until late in the month; the comet also sinks lower in the sky. (Observers above lat. 50° can see the comet all night.) Hale-Bopp was nearest the Sun March 31 (85 million miles). As of this writing, the comet's brightness is still below the early optimistic predictions. But the object may yet achieve a magnitude brighter than -1 or 0 in early April, with a prominent dust tail 10° or more in length.

Since last November the Internet has buzzed with news about a strange companion object next to Hale-Bopp. The so-called Saturn-like Object (SLO) was imaged through a Houston amateur astronomer's telescope. Despite the wild claims of some—an alien spaceship, a scientific cover-up, conspiracy—more careful observers identified the SLO as a pre-existing 8.5-magnitude star with imaged diffraction spikes (from the telescope's internal mirror system). Apparently the discoverer's star-map software failed to show the star, implying a new object: this was due to improper programming of the software.


### Moon Phases:

New moon—April 7

First quarter—April 14

Full moon—April 22

Last quarter—April 29



### The Stars:

Leo the Lion, with its prominent Sickle and stellar heart of the beast Regulus, crosses the celestial meridian high in the S at 10 PM daylight time in mid-April. Leo separates the spring constellations behind it to the E from the waning winter patterns to the W.

To the left of Leo's tail, look for a wig of long hair, a cluster of about two dozen stars called Coma Berenices—Queen Berenice's Hair. This asterism honors an Egyptian queen who cut off her hair in tribute to the goddess of beauty and to the safe return from battle of the king.

From the West Coast on April 10, the bright star Aldebaran (the eye of the Bull Taurus) vanishes behind the dark limb of the crescent Moon between 9:30 and 10 PM (PDT). After nearly an hour, the star pops out from behind the Moon's bright edge.

## MUFON 1996 SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS

### "UFOLOGY: A Scientific Enigma"

Fourteen papers — 308 pages

Price: \$25 plus \$1.75 for postage and handling, in U.S. funds  
Order from: MUFON, 103 Okotowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155-4099

## CALENDAR

**March 21-23** — 5th Annual Gulf Breeze UFO Conference at Beachside Resort, Pensacola Beach, Florida. For information write Project Awareness, P.O. Box 730, Gulf Breeze, FL 32562 or telephone 904-432-8888, FAX 904-438-1801.

**April 11-13** — Ninth Annual Ozark UFO Conference at the Inn of the Ozarks Conference Center in Eureka Springs, Arkansas. For further information contact Ozark UFO Conference, #2 Caney Valley Drive, Plummerville, AR 72127-8725 or (501) 354-2558.

**May 3** — Mid-Atlantic 50th Anniversary UFO Symposium in Bethesda, Maryland. For further information contact Bruce Maccabee, 6962 Eyer Valley Flint Rd., Sabillasville, MD 21780

**June 21-22** — Joint UFO Seminar "1997 - 50 Years On" at Riverwood Legion Club in Sydney, Australia. For information contact INUFOR, P.O. Box 783, Kogarah, N.S.W. 2217, Australia.

**June 21-22** — The UFO Seminar of the Year, Holiday Inn, North Haven, CT. For information, write Omega Communications, P.O. Box 2051, Cheshire, CT 06410-5051.

**June 26-28** — 18th Rocky Mountain UFO Conference at University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY. For information contact Institute for UFO Research, 1304 So. College Ave., Fort Collins, CO 80524 or call (970) 482-3731.

**July 11-13** — Twenty-eighth annual MUFON International UFO Symposium, Amway Grand Plaza Hotel, Grand Rapids, Michigan. Theme: "The Fiftieth Anniversary of Ufology." For further information write to MUFON 1997 Symposium, 3628 Aragon Drive, Lansing, MI 48906-3508.

**August 3-8** — Ancient Astronaut Society 24th Anniversary World Conference at Sheraton Plaza Hotel in Orlando, Florida. For further information contact Ancient Astronaut Society, 1921 St. John's Ave., Highland Park, IL 60035-3178.

**October 11 & 12** — "The UFO Experience" at Holiday Inn in North Haven, Connecticut. Contact Omega Communications, P.O. Box 2051, Cheshire, CT 06410.

**DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE** - *Continued from Page 24*

2/6/97 and shares Tom's enthusiasm. Tom's telephone number is (716) 786-0625.

In order to kickoff the program, your Director supplied Tom with our computer list of every Associate Member worldwide. This will become his mailing list to send letters to associates seeking their ideas and how they could get more involved. He said one of his main goals of the project is to boost membership in MUFON. Young people are quite capable of performing in the MUFON classifications of Amateur Radio Operator and UFO Newsclipping Service in addition to Associate Member. Tom and Lynda feel that the MUFON logo T-shirts and ball caps, would appeal to young folks, presently stocked in our UFO information Center.

This is an appeal to other Associate Members that are anxious to help in this project to contact Tom Lyon at the above address and volunteer your assistance. We are also looking for adult volunteers who will act as consultants and advisors to help the new Associate Members Auxiliary in this very important venture. These people should write and offer their services to Walt Andrus so an advisory committee may be formed.

Tom has been very active in the Boy Scouts of America and high school extracurricular activities. His SAT scores indicate that he is a bright young man. At grade 6 his test grade equivalent was 11th grade and his grade 7 was that of first year of college.

**SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS COVER DESIGN CONTEST**

The success of the 1996 Symposium Proceedings cover design contest has prompted MUFON to make this an annual competition. **Fran Geremia**, wife of New Hampshire State Director, **Peter Geremia**, was the 1996 winner. The cover design should reflect the symposium theme "The Fiftieth Anniversary of Ufology" and include, in addition to the theme, the statements "MUFON 1997 INTERNATIONAL UFO SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS," the location GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN, and the symposium dates "July 11-13." The contest submissions must be "camera ready" and not simply attractive designs, symbols or artwork. The contest prize winner will receive \$100 in cash plus \$100 in MUFON publications merchandise. Please submit entries to Walt Andrus, the symposium proceedings editor. Several entries have already been received. The deadline for cover designs is April 1, 1997.

**MOTTO CONTEST**

We are searching for a motto that best exemplifies MUFON's goals and objectives, that is serious, intriguing, eye-catching, and meaningful. This contest produced more responses than any other project that

MUFON has proposed in 27 years. Five-hundred and thirty-five mottos were submitted from 58 different people. Nine judges are endeavoring to select what they consider the 25 best, in their judgment, that meets our objectives. The deadline is March 15th for the judges. I can envision a run-off vote of the mottos that rank at the top after we receive the judges' choices, therefore an announcement date for the contest winner is still pending.

**CURRENT UFO SIGHTING REPORTS**

Current UFO sighting reports in the *MUFON UFO Journal* are conspicuous by their absence. UFO investigations are being conducted and reported in state or chapter newsletters, however, they are not being submitted to the State Director via report Forms 1 and 2 for submission to the Regional Directors. It may be exciting to interview a UFO witness and relate the story to your local group meetings, however, this is only the first step. Completing the report forms, making copies for the appropriate officers and mailing same becomes the essential, but not so exciting part of the UFO report. Until our Field Investigators and State Section Directors accept this responsibility, we aren't going to be able to share your investigated cases with *Journal* readers. The Regional Directors will write short summaries in a narrative style for publication in the *Journal*. Let's dispel that ugly rumor that there aren't any UFO sightings.

**MUFON 2001 SYMPOSIUM**

**Jan C. Harzan**, State Section Director of Orange County, has submitted a bid to host the MUFON 2001 International UFO Symposium representing southern California. **Vincent H. Uhlenkott**, State Director, and **Georgianne Cifarelli**, Assistant State Director, have been contacted by Walt Andrus for their approval and cooperation.

**FIELD INVESTIGATOR'S EXAM**

Anyone who has purchased and studied the 4th edition of the *MUFON Field Investigator's Manual* is eligible to take the exam via mail when they feel qualified. The 100-question test may be secured from MUFON headquarters in Seguin and returned to **Kathleen F. Marden**, 103 Willow Road, East Kingston, NH 03827, for grading. In localities where field investigator training classes are conducted, the instructor may order sufficient quantities of the test and administer the exam at the conclusion of the training classes. However, the majority of people will study the manual like a correspondence course before taking the exam. It is an open book test and other references may be utilized to broaden the scope of your knowledge. For current members, the new manual may be purchased

*Continued on Page 20*

## DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

Walter Andrus

### NEWS FROM AROUND THE NETWORK

#### MUFON 1997 UFO SYMPOSIUM

MUFON's twenty-eighth International UFO Symposium will be held July 11, 12, and 13, 1997, at the elegant Amway Grand Plaza Hotel in Grand Rapids, Michigan, hosted by Michigan MUFON. **David E. Toth**, Ph.D., is the symposium coordinator. The symposium theme is "The Fiftieth Anniversary of Ufology." Several of the speakers will address the monumental events of 1947 to recognize the anniversary of the modern era of ufology.

Speakers confirmed are **Cynthia Hind** (Zimbabwe), **Dan Wright**, **Jan Aldrich**, **Stanton T. Friedman**, M.S., (Canada), **Vincente-Juan Ballester Olmos** (Spain), **Bruce S. Maccabee**, Ph.D., **John S. Carpenter**, **Warren Aston** (Australia), **Anna Jamerson**, **Beth Collings**, **David M. Jacobs**, Ph.D., **Budd Hopkins**, and **J. Antonio Huneus**.

The host committee has announced that pre-registration tickets are now available for \$65 for all five sessions before the cutoff date of June 21, 1997, and \$75 thereafter. Individual sessions will be \$20 per session. The cost to attend the reception Friday evening from 6 to 9 p.m. will be \$15 per person with a cash bar. Checks or money orders should be made payable and sent to "MUFON 1997 Symposium," 3628 Aragon Drive, Lansing, MI 48906-3508. Advance registrants will receive a postcard confirming receipt of the attendance fee. An information envelope with your tickets will be held at the registration desk in Grand Rapids for your arrival. Vendor tables will cost \$25 per day. Make your reservations for tables at the same address above in Lansing, MI.

The Amway Grand Plaza Hotel is located at Pearl and Monroe Streets in Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503-2666. Special guest room rates for the symposium are for a single (1 person) \$82, double (2 persons) \$89, triple (3 persons) \$96, and quad (4 persons) \$103 per night. Reservations may be made by calling the hotel at (616) 774-2000, 1-800-253-3590 or FAX (616) 776-6496.

Plan your family vacation now to visit the beautiful state of Michigan and the historical sights in Grand Rapids.

#### NEW OFFICERS

**Linda M. Galvin**, B.A. (Great Exuma) has been appointed the Bahamas Representative. Two new state section directors volunteered their attributes this month: **David R. Hill**, M.S. (Taos, NM) for Taos County and **Earl M. Cronk** (Marshalltown, IA) for Marshall, Tama and Grundy Counties.

#### NEW CONSULTANTS AND RESEARCH SPECIALISTS

To expand our growing board of consultants, seven professionals volunteered their expertise this month. They are **Raymond E. Baglin**, Ph.D. (Hampton Falls, NH) in Zoology; **Samuel J. Umland**, Ph.D. (Kearney, NE) in English; **Charles F. Giddens**, M.D. (Scottsboro, AL) in Medicine; **Saul Gonzalez**, M.D. (El Paso, TX) in Medicine (Orthopedics); **Robert B. McCown**, M.D. (Wichita, KS) in Medicine; **Charles E. Crouse**, J.D. (Algonquin, IL) in Law; and **W. Michael Harris**, M.D. (Williamson, WV) in Osteopathic Medicine. Four new Research Specialists joined MUFON this past month: **Robert D. Lyon**, M.A. (Urbandale, IA) in Education Psychology; **Claudio B. Leitao, Jr.**, M.S. (Sao Paulo, SP, Brazil) in Physics; **Rahul B. Bandyopadhyay**, M.S. (Glen Burnie, MD) in Plastics Engineering; and **Elliot Varnell**, M.S. (Epsom, Surrey, England) in Solid State Physics.

#### ASSOCIATE MEMBERS AUXILIARY

The entry on the back of MUFON's "Application for Membership" defines a Field Investigator Trainee: The person engages in an open-ended period of education in the UFO subject under the guidance of experienced individuals in order to become familiar with all aspects of case investigation. The trainee is expected to obtain and utilize the *MUFON Field Investigator's Manual* and, whenever possible, assist in conducting investigations of UFO events reported by the public. The definition of an Associate Member: The same qualifications as a Field Investigator Trainee except that the member is under the age of 18 years.

We are cognizant that the teenagers of today will be the future scientists and ufologists of tomorrow, therefore they are significant members of MUFON and should be more involved in our research activities. I have personally felt for a long time that we have not been utilizing the talent and unbridled enthusiasm of our associate members. Now is the time to remedy this situation, since we have some brilliant teenage members who are anxious to become more involved.

A 14-year old high school student **Thomas J. Lyon**, P. O. Box 310, Warsaw, New York 14569-0310, has volunteered to spearhead in what I have tentatively named the "Associate Members Auxiliary." Tom joined MUFON on February 8, 1996, and a year later started formulating a plan which he refers to as an "involvement drive." He has already enlisted the aid of **Lynda D. Pose**, another 14-year old student living in Wyoming, New York, who joined MUFON on