

# MUFON

Mutual UFO Network

## UFO Journal

March 2003

Number 419



Fort Worth Star-Telegram Photograph Collection,  
The University of Texas at Arlington Libraries

*After many attempts by several individuals to decipher the "message" in the hand of Brig. Gen. Roger Ramey, have researchers learned anything of substance? David Rudiak feels that there is enough agreement on key words among knowledgeable researchers to label the document a Roswell "smoking gun." Others, such as Kevin Randle, are still calling for additional "independent" research. The articles begin on page 3.*

AND THE VICTIMS OF THE WRECK  
 IN THE "DISC" THEY WILL SHIP

Copyright 2001 by David Rudiak

**MUFON  
UFO Journal**

(USPS 002-970)  
(ISSN 0270-6822)  
Post Office Box 369  
Morrison, CO 80465-0369  
Tel: 303-932-7709  
Fax: 303-932-9279

**International Director**  
John F. Schuessler, M.S.

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

**Columnists:**  
Walter N. Webb, B.S.  
George Filer, M.B.A.  
Jenny Randles  
Stanton Friedman, M.S.

**MUFON on CompuServe**  
"Go MUFON"  
to access the Forum

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

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

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

**Table of Contents**

March 2003

Number 419

**In this issue**

**Update on the Ramey message .....3**  
**Houran/Randle study flawed by David Rudiak.....7**  
**Object hovers over truck reported by Mike Driscoll.....11**  
**Filer's Files by George A. Filer.....12**  
**UFO Press.....14**  
**View from Britain by Jenny Randles.....17**  
**Perceptions by Stanton T. Friedman.....19**  
**The Night Sky by Walter N. Webb.....21**  
**Calendar.....21**  
**MUFON symposium information/form.....22**  
**Director's Message by John Schuessler.....24**

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

**Copyright 2003 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 2003 by the Mutual UFO Network, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369" is included.

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

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

The *MUFON UFO Journal* is published monthly by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Morrison, CO. Membership/Subscription rates are \$35 per year in the U.S.A., and \$40 per year foreign in U.S. funds. Second class postage paid at Versailles, MO.

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

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

## Roswell smoking gun?

# Update on Ramey message

One aspect of the Roswell case that continues to interest ufologists is the famous "message" or "memo" which Brig. Gen. Roger Ramey is holding in his hand in the photo taken by J. Bond Johnson on July 8, 1947. The setting was a press conference called by the military to explain the "solution" to the previously-announced recovery of a "disk" by the Army. With Gen. Ramey is Col. Thomas J. DuBose, as well as debris described as a Rawin Target and weather balloon.

In 1991, a greatly-enlarged copy of the message portion of the photograph was sent by researcher Don Schmitt to Dr. Richard Haines, a former NASA research scientist, to see if Dr. Haines could read any of the message. Despite the use of a microscope Dr. Haines said he could see that the message contained words, but that he could not determine many individual letters.

In 1994 the Air Force reportedly had "a national laboratory" look at the memo. Supposedly the unnamed lab could not decipher the message.


There the matter rested until Johnson launched his own investigation in 1998, putting together a team, including Ron Regehr, which would use more modern methods of deciphering the message. The team deciphered the message as follows:

AS THE... 4 HRS THE VICTIMS OF THE... AT  
FORT WORTH, TEX... THE "CRASH" STORY... FOR  
0984 ACKNOWLEDGES... EMERGENCY POWERS  
ARE NEEDED SITE TWO SW OF MAGDALENA,  
NMEX... SAFE TALK... FOR MEANING OF STORY  
AND MISSION... WEATHER BALLOONS SENT ON  
THE... AND LAND... ROVER CREWS... [SIGNED]...  
TEMPLE.

While much of the message was unclear, ufologists were intrigued with certain words which the team came up with, especially "victims," "Ft. Worth, Tex.," "crash," "emergency powers are needed," "Magdalena, New Mexico," and "weather balloons," which seemed to clearly tie the message to the July, 1947, Roswell incident which the military claimed was nothing more than balloons and instrumentation carried by those balloons.

This report encouraged other researchers to become involved. Neil Morris, a technician at the University of Manchester in the UK, and part of Johnson's Roswell Photo Interpretation Team (RPIT), organized the message line by line and used capital letters to represent the letters of the message of which he was sure, lower case letters to represent his best guess at some letters, an asterisk to indicate a letter he could not decipher, and a dash where there was something present that seemed impossible to decipher.

Morris' interpretation was for the most part different



*While this enlargement of the message held in the hand of Brig. Gen. Roger Ramey offers few clues at this magnification level, researchers have utilized special computer software to decipher key information.*

from that of the first group of Johnson researchers, although the key word "victims" was present, as was "Fort Worth, Texas." He was also perhaps the first person to propose that "victims" was part of the phrase "victims of the wreck."

Other researchers have since gotten involved, including David Rudiak, Tom Carey (working with Schmitt), and Don Burleson, who has done several articles about the message for the *MUFON UFO Journal*. Initially Carey worked partly in conjunction with Burleson but later with Rudiak. Thus there was some sharing of work, though generally the researchers worked mostly independently.

Rudiak worked primarily from high-resolution scans of 20X print enlargements. He claims to have deciphered almost the entire message, including the address header, which he says shows the message being addressed to General "Vandenberg" at the Pentagon.

There are also many differences from the initial RPIT group. For example, he was the first to pick out the word "disc" where RPIT initially claimed to see the word "crash." In place of "Magdalena" he has the word "Roswell." In place of the mystery man "Temple" signing the message, he has "Ramey."

Rudiak has been critical of RPIT and others for not adhering to proper word letter counts, contending that words like "Magdalena" and "crash" are too long for the actual words. He has also been critical of others for not coming up with coherent and sensible interpretations that read like proper grammatical English.

Nonetheless, there were important points of agreement with RPIT, particularly on the key word "victims," and others like "Fort Worth, Tex.," "weather balloons," "meaning of story," and "land ... crews." Another important phrase of agreement with others was "the victims of the wreck you forwarded to the ?????? at Fort Worth, Tex."

Burleson, who has also spent a great deal of time working on the message, utilized special computer image enhancement software, including LUCIS, and came up with new interpretations—but again "victims" ("victims of the

(Continued on page 5)

## Interpretations of Ramey message by various researchers

Capital letters are those that the interpreter believes to be accurate. Lower case letters represent best guess.

M = Neil Morris

MII = Neil Morris (in a later review)

R = David Rudiak

RII = David Rudiak (in a later review)

B = Don Burleson

C = Tom Carey

(A) = Agreement by majority of those researching the document and sharing their interpretations.

(M) (1) \_\_\_\_\_ \*\*\*ARY WERE \_\_\_\_\_ AS

(MII) (1) \_\_\_\_\_ reco VERY Was ROSWELl Head olc giveN AS THE

(R) (1) \_\_\_\_\_ officer

(RII) (1) \_\_\_\_\_ NEAR OPERATION AT THE

(B) (1) RECO - OPERATION WITH ROSWELL DISK 074 MJ-

(C) (1) RECO... OPERATION... AT THE

(A) (1) OPERATION

(M) (2) \_\_\_\_\_ fxs 4 rsev1 VICTIMS OF THE WR eck and CONVAy ON TO

(MII) (2) [n]ext 4hs Exp VictlMS of THE WR eck and CONVAy ON TO THEy

(R) (2) \_\_\_\_\_ (jul)y 4th the VictlMS of tHE weECK you fOrWArEd TO The

(RII) (2) RANCH AND THE VICTIMS OF THE WRECK YOU FORWARDED TO THE

(B) (2) -AT THE () THE VICTIMS OF THE WRECK YOU FORWARDED TO THE

(C) (2) JULY 4TH. THE VICTIMS OF THE WRECK YOU FORWARDED TO THE

(A) (2) VICTIMS OF THE WRECK

(M) (3) \_\_\_\_\_ \*\*\* AT FORT WORTH, Tex.

(R) (3) \_\_\_\_\_ EaM At FORT WORTH, TEX.

(B) (3) TEAM AT FORT WORTH, TEX.

(C) (3) ... AT FORT WORTH, TEX.

(A) (3) AT FORT WORTH

(M) (4) \_\_\_\_\_ \*\*\*S\*\* smi Ths \*ELSE\* \*\*\*\*\* unus-d\*\*e T&E A3ea96 L\*\*\*\*\*

(MII) (4) W-S- SorTei -e \_\_\_\_\_ thAT - ONUS raaf T&E A# 9 \_\_\_\_\_ Landparty

(R) (4) \_\_\_\_\_ 5 pM THE "DISC" they will ship [swap?] FOR A3 8th Arrived.

(RII) (4) THE "DISC" THEY will ship FOR A3-AS2 Arrived

(B) (4) () ON THE "DISK" MUST HAVE SENT LOS ALAMOS ADVANCED ()

(C) (4) SSOR ON THE "DISK" MUST THUS SAVE FOR THE ATOMIC LABORATORY

(A) (4) DISK or DISC

(M) (5) \_\_\_\_\_ SO ight CRASHE s pOw\*\*\* \*\* N\*\*\*\*\* SITEOne IS reMotely \*\*\*\*\*

(R) (5) \_\_\_\_\_ or 58t(h) bom(ber) sq(?) Assit [Assess] offices? AT ROSwe(lI) AS for

(RII) (5) BY B-29 ST OR C47. WRIGHT AF ASSIST FLIGHTS AT ROSWELL. ASSURE

(B) (5) URGENT. POWERS ARE NEEDED SITE TWO AT CARLSBAD, NMEX.

(C) (5) URGENT POWERS ARE NEEDED SITE TWO NW ROSWELL, NMEX.

(Continued on the following page)

(M) (6) ———— \*\*\*D\* bAsE ToLd \*\*\*a\* for we\*\*ous BY STORY are 8\*\*\*\*\*  
(MII) (6) MIDDAY 509# TOLD newsPaPer segment of STORY Adv——  
(R) (6) —54th SAID MISTaken———[meaning? weather? balloon?] of [is] story And said  
(RII) (6) THAT CIC-TEAM SAID THIS MISTAKEN MEANING OF STORY AND THINK  
(B) (6) ( ) SAFE TALK NEWSPAPER MEANING OF STORY AND  
(C) (6) SAFE TALK WANTED FOR MEANING OF STORY AND

(M) (7) ———— lly thry even PUT FOR BY WEATHER BALLOONS n\*d\*\* were  
(MII) (7) LLY ThrY EVEN PUT for AF WEA TA TN BALLOONS raDar WERE  
(R) (7) news [clip, chat, dirt] out is OF WEATHER BALLOONS which were  
(RII) (7) LATE TODAY NEXT SENT OUT PR OF WEATHER BALLOONS WOULD WORK  
(B) (7) ONLY SHOW ( ) BY WEATHER BALLOONS ( ) WAVE ( )  
(C) (7) MISSION [OR OBJECTIVE] NEXT CREW OUT TODAY WEATHER BALLOONS  
(A) (7) WEATHER BALLOONS

(M) (8) ———— \*\*\*\*. \*\*|a\*\* l\*\*\*denver\*\*\*\*  
(MII) (8) And Land L denver offw3  
(R) (8) — Add [And, Ask] land d———[dirt cover?] crews.  
(RII) (8) BETTER IF THEY ADD LAND DEMO RAWIN CREWS  
(B) (8) L - DENVER CREWS  
(C) (8) 509 HAS LAND SURVEYOR CREWS  
(A) (8) LAND

Line (9) is blank.

(M) (10) Temple  
(R) (10) rAMEy  
(RII) (10) RAMEY  
(B) (10) TEMPLE  
(C) (10) R RAMEY

---

## Ramey letter...

(Continued from page 3)

wreck") was part of the analysis. He also found such key words as "Fort Worth, Tex," "disk," "weather balloons," "meaning of story," and "crews," which nearly all researchers now agree on. (Another key word was "operation," which Rudiak also found, but in a different location on the same line, as part of the phrase "near operation at the ranch." In place of Burleson's "operation," Rudiak believes it instead reads either "at location" or "in addition.")

Interestingly, Burleson also found "Los Alamos" and "Carlsbad, NMex," which other researchers have not found. In discussing "Carlsbad," he noted that he was as surprised as anyone, since it seemed to have no relevance to the Roswell incident, but was the only interpretation that made sense, given the letters, spacing, length of words, and context.

In contrast, Rudiak has strongly objected to "Carlsbad"

for the same basic reason he objected to RPIT's "Magdalena," noting that "Carlsbad" is one letter too long for the actual word, whereas "Roswell" is not. Further, the fact that "Carlsbad" has no known relevance to Roswell he considers to be additional negative against Burleson's interpretation.

Veteran researcher Stan Friedman, who first opened the Roswell inquiry after a conversation with Maj. Jesse Marcel, Sr., became interested in the interpretation of the message, and had a high resolution scan made of the original negative of the Johnson photo.

The scan was sent to Rob Belyea of ProLab to examine, who said he could not see "Magdalena" in the text, but indicated he could not spend the time necessary to fully examine the scan (which is available from Friedman on a special CD).

### The Houran study

The most recent research on the document is a psychological study by Jim Houran, a psychologist at Southern Illinois University, who attempted to "estimate the de-

gree of bias that suggestion and expectation have played in previous interpretations.”

Houran suggested that “such findings would be helpful for determining whether more refined analyses of the memo are needed, as well as what type of research design for deciphering the memo would promote maximum reliability, objectivity, and meaningfulness.” Houran and two research assistants recruited 176 people—93 men and 83 women—for the study, dividing them into three roughly equal groups.

**Group 1** was made up of 59 individuals who were asked to “carefully study and try to read the contents of a photograph of a military memo that could contain information about the crash, retrieval, and subsequent cover-up of an extraterrestrial craft near Roswell, New Mexico, in July of 1947.”

**Group 2** was made up of 58 individuals who were asked to “carefully study and try to read the contents of a photograph of a military memo that could contain information about atomic testing.”

**Group 3** was made up of 59 individuals who were asked to “carefully study and try to read the contents of a photograph of a document.” This group was given no clues about what the document might contain.

The study, which was reported by both Houran and Kevin Randle, indicates that “a person’s age and knowledge (belief, alleged experience, and exposure to UFO information) significantly influenced the number of words deciphered, irrespective of the suggestion condition.

“The suggestion condition also affected the number of words deciphered,” says the authors. “Analysis revealed that subjects in the Pro-Roswell and Atomic Bomb Suggestion conditions deciphered a similar number of words in the document, and both of these conditions elicited significantly more words than in the blind control condition.”

Participants in Group 1 (Roswell), who spent an average of 20 minutes on the document, “tended to interpret some words in accordance with earlier interpretations of the same words in the same positions by ufologists,” Houran and Randle reported. This included “remains,” “weather balloons,” and “land.”

Group 2 participants (atomic bomb) spent an average of 16 minutes trying to decipher the document, finding words such as “flash,” “glasses,” and “atomic.”

Group 3 participants (no subject matter) spent an average of 14 minutes on the document. “Only a few interpretations were noted,” reports Houran, “and the content of these efforts did not strongly reflect any particular scenario.”

Houran and Randle note that “even without sophisticated analytic software, the subjects across all three conditions found parts of the document legible. Moreover, despite the statistically significant effects of cognitive style and suggestion, subjects across the three groups did show consensus on several words that previous investigators also agreed upon: ‘Fort Worth TX’ (n = 52), ‘story’ (n = 61), and ‘weather balloons’ (n = 27).

“Another word of relative agreement, ‘land’ (n = 47), was noticed by the two primary suggestion conditions, in which people were perhaps more motivated or discrimi-

nating in their interpretations than in the blind condition. Finally, subjects across all suggestion conditions perceived punctuation marks within the document.

Houran and Randle reported that “the surprisingly high agreement between our subjects and previous investigators on some words in certain locations in the Ramey document suggests that some of it is indeed legible, even without computer enhancement. However, the meaning or context of those specified words remains ambiguous because the degree of interpretation of the document is strongly influenced by suggestion effects and a person’s cognitive style. Ufologists, therefore, are probably among the least effective people to be trying to decipher the document.”

Houran and Randle suggest that “it seems reasonable to pursue research on the memo only if certain methodological criteria are set. We offer some thoughts about such a protocol, based on discussions with the Illinois State Archives and David Rudiak, a well-known investigator of the document.” (Rudiak, however, does not agree with the proposed methodological criteria, as we shall see later.)

“First,” say Houran and Randle, “to be methodologically consistent we recommend that standardized computer enhancement be used on the best raw data that we have (Stanton Friedman’s CD of scans of the negatives), using comparable software programs. Analysis should be conducted by at least three independent and blind laboratories that specialize in the area of reading and transcribing archival documents.

“With this triangulation approach, we can reasonably estimate the inter-rater reliability (and hence validity) of the resulting interpretations (i.e., do the laboratories show statistically significant agreement on specific words in precise locations in the text).

Houran notes that “it is possible at this point to calculate an intra-class correlation on the solutions published thus far, but we feel this would be inappropriate, since the majority of the previous investigators did not follow a standardized analytic protocol, and were not blind to the context and thus possible content of the document.

“Second, we must be cautious in interpreting any statistically significant outcomes of a blind, triangulation study. Prior to having independent laboratories decipher the message, we might also request them to perform preliminary analyses on the structure of the document. This might reveal some insights into what kind of document it is, even if the same laboratories cannot decipher the content of the document. David Rudiak proposed some lucid guidelines in this respect:

“A. Determine the letter spacing and position through alignment of columns of clearly visible text and extrapolating to poorly visible letter positions.

“B. Determine length of words, assuming no typographical errors and misspellings, and adhere to those word counts.

“C. Assuming initially that the message is written in proper English instead of some type of cryptic military (or other) shorthand or jargon, the sentences should obey rules of English grammar and obey rules of syntax and semantics. In short, the message should make sense and be

consistent in content instead of sounding disjointed. Although, if the memo is, in fact, a military message, then assumptions about the military shorthand and jargon could complicate and possibly invalidate the conclusions being drawn."

Houran concludes, "What the present and previous studies have demonstrated is that parts of the document are readable and perhaps even ultimately interpretable. What is needed at this stage is outside corroboration that can only come from triangulated, blind analyses from well-qualified laboratories and a set of stringent guidelines to evaluate any of their positive findings....It seems that a call for funding of such a large-scale investigation of the document is justified.

"While such a study would admittedly be expensive, it would have a long-lasting effect on the Roswell case from this point on, and it might also have a healing effect for the field."

Another well-known UFO researcher, Richard Hall, commented, "Clearly, something far more unusual than a Mogul balloon, and certainly far beyond a standard weather balloon, crashed near Roswell." But he also suggested that different interpretations of the Ramey message "seem substantial."

He comments that "the few key words" which most researchers agree on "are interesting, but not conclusive. I am not aware that there is much agreement about the alleged word 'wreck.' Whatever happened to peer review?"

As noted, Rudiak does not agree with the approach suggested by Houran and Randle, and he questions the "peer review" suggested by Hall. He has also pointed out that some of Hall's beliefs are clearly in error, such as lack of agreement about the word "wreck," noting that "wreck" was the consensus work of 4 out of 6 researchers mentioned in the Houran and Randle article. (RPIT came up with no word and the 6th person came up with "material," which was 3 letters too long and easily discounted.)

Further, Rudiak said that what Hall terms "substantial differences" are not that significant when one considers that there were consensus readings on critical words like "weather balloons," "the victims," and "the 'disc,'" and phrases like "the victims of the wreck you forwarded to ...Fort Worth." More of Rudiak's reactions are presented in the following article.

**Ryan and Bob Woods  
Majestic Documents**

**Now Available from MUFON:**

Majestic Documents Book (190 pgs) \$18 + \$2 p&h

SOM1-01 Manual (Reproduction) \$8 + \$2 p&h

CD-ROM - The Secret \$16 + \$2 p&h

For orders outside the U.S. please add \$4 p&h per document. Order from MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369

# Houran/Randle study missing key elements

**By David Rudiak**

The psychological study by James Houran, as reported by him and Kevin Randle in the *Journal of Scientific Exploration* (JSE), was flawed in many ways.

Images of the "Ramey message" were not of optimum resolution nor enhanced beforehand for readability. Subjects were thus double-tasked with both trying to read the document and doing their own enhancements. Only 17 minutes average was spent per participant (about 15 seconds per word), totally inadequate to the task, and also suggesting little motivation on the part of most. And two-thirds were hindered in their readings by not knowing the proper context.

However, the most serious problem was that there was no numerical data supporting the primary conclusion of the researchers. Houran and Randle stated they "expected" that different contextual situations "would elicit significant differences in the participants' interpretations." They also claimed the results "supported our expectations." But the critical data was missing from their summary table.

Remarkably, they then sheepishly admitted that a referee had asked for the data, but that a research assistant had thrown it out. (Randle on the UFO Updates Internet discussion list added that these were his personal score sheets. It is hard to understand why a research assistant would throw out a senior investigator's personal data.)

This begs the question of how one can arrive at a conclusion without the data and then write a paper about it. It is also remarkable that the paper would then be allowed through peer review.

The numbers that were provided in the paper also do not support the conclusion. E.g., the two groups that were given context deciphered an average of fewer than 5 words per person. This does not suggest a lot of guessing based on "wishful thinking" going on.

Further, only 10 anecdotal examples of context-sensitive or "exclusive" words were given in these two groups out of some 550 total deciphered words. Four of these words ("remains," "fundamental," "meaning," and "morning") had no obvious contextual connection to either the "Roswell" context (misleadingly labeled the "Pro-UFO Condition") or alternate "atomic bomb" context. E.g., the word "meaning," one of the so-called words "exclusive" to the atomic testing context, was also a consensus word of various Roswell researchers (in the phrase "meaning of story").

There were also no numbers to tell us how many times these words were seen, since this was part of the trashed data. Thus it could be as few as 6 context-sensitive words out of 550, or slightly more than 1% of all words. Even generously assuming that several people came up with each of these words, we seem to be dealing with only a few percent maximum of all words, which hardly qualifies

as a significant “priming” effect at all. Houran and Randle did discuss that a few words were common to all three of their experimental situations; therefore, some words were more readable than others and likely there. These were “Fort Worth, Tex.,” “weather balloons,” “land,” and “story,” also seen by the initial Ramey memo researchers.

However, totally missing from the discussion was a very obvious effect that was supported by the surviving numerical data. Readings of these “common” words were greatly enhanced in the group knowing the correct Roswell context. The Roswell group read these words two and a half times more often than the group given the misleading “atomic bomb” context (196 vs. 78 words), and over four times more frequently than the control group (196 vs. 42 words).

Thus their data supported what many other studies in the perceptual literature have shown for a long time—namely the vital role that proper context plays in correctly interpreting ambiguous data. This was a very robust effect and definitely merited discussion, but there was none.

This also completely undercut their arguments, both in the paper and on the UFO Updates discussion list, that proper context and knowledge of the subject matter were “confounding” and decreased reliability. Exactly the opposite was true.

It likewise undercut their argument that the only valid way to test the presence of words in the message was to turn over readings to independent analysts who were kept completely ignorant of all circumstances surrounding the message.

Objections were also raised by Houran and Randle to interpretations of the Ramey letter by various researchers. They suggested there was almost no agreement among researchers as to the wording of the document, and multiple times over several pages of discussion claimed the readings amount to little more than researcher bias, wishful thinking, or seeing “faces in the clouds.”

I too have criticisms of the methodologies of other researchers, such as failing to adhere to correct word letter counts or making their readings sensible. However, it is misleading to limit discussions only to differences, and not note the important agreements on key words amongst various researchers.

Houran and Randle did include a useful table comparing interpretations of different researchers. If one bothers to study this table, it turns out there was consensus on about a third of the 70 or so words out in the open (i.e., not obscured by obstructions, page tilt, and/or in shadow).

Literally everybody agrees that the words “weather balloons” are present in the memo. This is important because it establishes that the message is about Roswell in some way, despite early objections by naysayers like Philip Klass, and also Kevin Randle.

How does one know the message is about Roswell and not something else? Because the odds of Gen. Ramey simultaneously dealing with an unrelated message concerning “weather balloons” is about zero, given the historical context.

Another key word that most people agree on is “victims,” in the phrase (which most people also agree on)

“the victims of the wreck you forwarded to the ?????? at Fort Worth, Tex.” That’s the key to the entire message. If there were “victims,” then this was no balloon wreck, and the testimony concerning body recovery at Roswell is now documented.

Anybody who thinks the word “victims” isn’t there should check out the following graphic: [http://www.roswellproof.com/Victim\\_compare.html](http://www.roswellproof.com/Victim_compare.html)

The other key word is “disc” (with quotes around it) in the sentence immediately following (also present for comparison in the above link — see also [http://www.roswellproof.com/critical\\_phrases.html](http://www.roswellproof.com/critical_phrases.html)).

Most people agree that word is there as well. These words, in addition to “weather balloons,” only reinforce that this message must be dealing with the concurrent Roswell situation in some way. (Note: The inflammatory press release from the Roswell base that a “flying disk” had been recovered had first gone out over the news wire only about two hours before the photo in Fort Worth was taken.)

Thus we have a military telegram about Roswell (“weather balloons”) mentioning “the victims” and an object called “the ‘disc,’” and most people who have taken the time to actually study what is there agree on this, despite disagreements elsewhere. In other words, there is already peer group verification of critical parts of this message. (Other issues concerning “peer review” will also be discussed below.)

Despite the obvious, Randle and Houran continue to dispute that this message is about Roswell. E.g., “The message could be about almost anything;” “There is currently no consensus on either the source or content of the message;” “...it is not clear under what context the document was written.”

Even after conceding that words like “weather balloons” are there, they come to the remarkably absurd conclusion that such words “could be interpreted as having nothing to do with the case.”

To arrive at that conclusion, one would have to assume that Gen. Ramey routinely handled messages concerning “weathers balloons,” and by some remarkable coincidence just happened to be holding such an “unrelated” message while simultaneously having his picture taken with a weather balloon during his attempt to debunk the reported “flying disk” find at Roswell.

Randle also dusts off another of his old objections to the message (also made by Klass), claiming Ramey never would have been holding a message of any import in his hand, especially while having his picture taken:

“...it seems strange that Ramey, a general officer who had handled classified material long before this event, would be so cavalier in handling this message. ...he would have given it to his aide, he would have set it in his desk drawer, or would have had it locked in the same by his secretary. That is the proper way to handle classified material, and Ramey would not have likely made such an elementary mistake, especially with a camera and a reporter in his office.”

This is a classic example of circular reasoning, akin to the Air Force in their 1994 Roswell report. There was no



need to consider the reports of alien bodies, they wrote, because the crash was of a Mogul balloon, which had "no 'alien' passengers therein." Here Randle was saying the message couldn't be important, because Ramey wouldn't be holding an important message.

The fact of the matter remains that Ramey was holding the message, whether he should have been holding it or not. No allowances seem to be made for other possibilities, such as Ramey might still have been dealing with the message (such as planning his next move) when the photographer arrived for Ramey's weather balloon photo. Perhaps Ramey's display of the message was a momentary lapse on his part. E.g., in three of four photographs taken that day showing Ramey holding the message, the message side was turned away from the camera.

In a similar vein, Randle also tries to raise the specter of the message being a typewritten draft instead of an actual telex. "If that is the case, then there is no reason for it to be typed in all capital letters and the interpretations are suddenly changed."

Again, this argument is easily dismissed by simply examining the message closely, such as the unanimously agreed-upon, clearer words like "FORT WORTH, TEX" and "WEATHER BALLOONS," which are obviously in all-caps. Oddly, earlier Randle had noted that nearly everyone agreed that the message was a teletype and in all capital letters. Why later confuse the issue when there was no evidence whatsoever to support the idea of the letter being typewritten?

About the only side-show objection missing in this paper was whether the message could have been written in Hungarian. I have read literally hundreds of scientific papers, but I can honestly say I have never read one where obviously critical data and discussions were omitted while a large percentage of the paper was devoted to obviously irrelevant, illogical, and/or fallacious arguments. Again the JSE peer review process failed badly in editing out such material and keeping the paper on point.

#### **Civilian or military?**

Another thoroughly frivolous argument advanced by Randle was that the message was really a civilian rather than a military message, and therefore again of no import. Randle's primary argument was that the message lacked "typical" military telex word punctuation, namely PD for a period, and CMA for a comma.

Previously Randle had argued that because this was a military message and nobody was seeing PD or CMA in the message, they had to be reading it wrong. Now he was flipping the argument on its head.

He finally conceded the punctuation was indeed normal, but because of this, "*it would seem that we are not dealing with a military memo.*" (Emphasis his) To this was added, "We suggest ...that we make no assumptions about the context or content of this document..." In other words, Randle and Houran were deliberately trying to strip the document not only of its obvious Roswell context, but of its military context as well.

What's wrong with this argument? First and foremost, it assumes that literally *all* military telexes used word abbreviations for punctuation. This is demonstrably false,

with innumerable counterexamples.

E.g., in a recent UFO Updates debate with Randle, I mentioned going through the Appendices of Timothy Good's "Above Top Secret." I found six military telexes, dated 1954 to 1980, using standard punctuation, and only one from 1953 that used the word abbreviations. Researcher Brad Sparks also e-mailed me with the following pertinent information:

"Let me point out something that may help: The CMA and PD spelled out words for punctuation were used for RADIO voice and radiotelegraph Morse Code messages where it was thought the chances of mishearing the punctuation was too great. It was generally NOT used for telexes."

Another of Randle's arguments is that the message, if it were military and classified, should definitely have security stamps at the top and bottom of the sheet. "If those markings are not present, it means that the document is not classified, and therefore, is not very important..."

The expected presence of classification markings is a valid point, and was originally raised by Randle in e-mail to me about 2-3 years ago. What it overlooks is that such stamps are often partial, faint, and indistinct, even in clear, flat photostatic copies of declassified documents.

Readability of such stamps in the grainy, shadowy, and unflat Ramey message is inherently going to be much more difficult. E.g., the top half of the paper is sharply turned away from the camera and in shadow. The top left of the sheet is actually completely hidden from the camera by paper curvature. Even if a security stamp was located there, it would be invisible.

There are also clearly stamps of some kind at the top/right center of the page (Randle is well aware of this, since we discussed them in e-mail). However, I do not believe that these are security stamps. One I am fairly sure reads "ARMY CABLE." (The other may read "BELL CBL" or possibly "BELL TEL.") Whatever, they do indicate the presence of some stamps on the page and thus are suggestive of the possible presence of others.

Prompted by Randle's e-mail remarks, I turned my attention away from the message proper and closely examined the lower part of the page. There I do believe is a faint "SECRET" or "TOP SECRET" stamp. The "S," "C," "R," and "T" in "SECRET" can be made out with a little effort; the other letters are much less distinct. (A graphic showing this can be found at the following link: [http://www.roswellproof.com/Top\\_Secret.html](http://www.roswellproof.com/Top_Secret.html))

It is unlikely that everyone will accept the presence of this faint security stamp, but I believe a reasonable case can be made for it being there. On the other hand, Randle has the unenviable task of trying to prove a negative, that there are no security stamps to be found anywhere. It is not possible to prove the absence of the expected security marking at the corresponding top-left part of the page because this portion is hidden from the camera, as already mentioned above.

The other argument for civilian origins that Randle advanced even he doesn't take very seriously. These were claims of the photographer, James Bond Johnson, that he

might have handed Ramey an AP teletype that he brought with him from his newspaper.

Johnson has since retracted this statement, saying he was merely speculating. And as Randle notes (and knows better than anyone) Johnson has had numerous changes and elaborations of his story since Randle's original interviews with him in 1989. However, let's ignore the various misstatements and corrections by Johnson over the years and concentrate on the hypothesis that this was actually a civilian news document.

Portions of these wire service bulletins ended up as wire service stories in various papers, with the editors doing some "cut and paste" jobs, but retaining most of the original wording. We can see this in the early United Press stories when we compare them with the originals retained by Roswell radio announcer Frank Joyce.

And we have a pretty good idea of what AP wrote, even though we don't have the originals, because the *Daily Illini* newspaper wrote a summary chronology of how AP reported the story on the newswire. The point here is that there are no wire service stories which have wording even remotely resembling what is present in the Ramey memo. (I have compiled an extensive collection of these 1947 Roswell news stories, which may also be viewed at my website: [www.roswellproof.com/press\\_coverage.html](http://www.roswellproof.com/press_coverage.html) )

There would also be the additional problem of trying to make sense of phrases like "the victims of the wreck you forwarded ...to Fort Worth." If this was a military message, then "you" would refer to the recipient of the message. But if this were a civilian message, then it should have been written in the third person: "they forwarded" would have used instead of "you forwarded." Reporters certainly would not have been forwarding anything to Fort Worth.

The evidence taken collectively overwhelmingly points to the message in Gen. Ramey's hand being a military, not a civilian teletype.

### **"Ramey" or "Temple"?**

The fact that this is a military teletype also clearly implicates Gen. Ramey as being either the sender or recipient of this message. This bears directly on whose name is on the signature line.

The original "Roswell Photo-interpretation Team" assembled by photographer J. B. Johnson interpreted the signature as coming from somebody named "Temple." So did some others who followed them, such as Neil Morris and Don Burleson. However, this always struck me as unlikely.

Nobody knew of a mystery man named "Temple" in any way associated with the Roswell case. Ramey, on the other hand, was a known quantity, was in charge at Fort Worth, was holding the message, and had at least a 50/50 chance of being the sender. To my eye, the signature always looked a bit "Rameyish" (although I could also see how it could be legitimately interpreted as "Temple").

Nonetheless, I was a fence-sitter on the issue for some time. The following factors finally swung me strongly over into the "Ramey" column.

One issue is the number of letters in the word. I think the confusion in number stems from handwriting beneath the signature line slanting up and crossing over the end of the signature.

There is also clearly some other handwriting beneath the last line of the message (appearing to say "photos yes" and perhaps "stage"). The second letter in the name is also clearly an "A" in high resolution and when enhanced. That would rule out "Temple."

"Ramey" is also self-consistent with what I read in the message header, namely the teletype being directed to General "Vandenberg" at "HQAAF" in "Washington," and being "From: HQ 8th (AAF)." The message also may begin with "FWAAF acknowledges..." All of this points to the message coming from Fort Worth and being sent to the Pentagon, i.e., this really being Ramey's message.

Furthermore this has some historical backing from the press accounts. Newspapers reported that acting AAF chief Vandenberg was involved, dropping into the AAF press room at the Pentagon and personally directing phone calls to both Roswell and Gen. Ramey at Fort Worth after the story broke. Ramey's phoned comments were also reported.

It is certainly logical, therefore, that Ramey would be reporting up the chain of command, and even directly to Gen. Vandenberg for something of high import, and after already being contacted by phone.

Additionally, the press accounts and Vandenberg's daily log indicate this occurring within one to two hours of when the Roswell base press release first hit the wires. The photos were taken very soon thereafter. Obviously the message had already been written before the photos were taken, and probably already sent, considering the folds in the paper and the added handwriting. The handwriting may be short notes by Ramey or a staff member addressing issues raised by phone soon after sending of the message.

E.g., I interpret the last line of the message as recommending follow-up debunking weather balloon demonstrations to bolster Ramey's weather balloon story. There were indeed a number of these in various parts of the country, including one at Fort Worth base two days later.

The handwritten words "photos yes" directly beneath this may possibly refer to a suggestion that press photos of the debunking demonstrations should be added.

One can additionally speculate that this may account for Ramey still handling the message. Ramey was having his photo taken with the weather balloon in his office, but he was also simultaneously planning his next moves.

One has to remember that the total time between the first public announcement of the "flying disk" recovery at Roswell and the story-killing official identification as a weather balloon by Ramey's weather officer was only 3 hours. Ramey had to take care of a lot of business during this short time frame, and thus might be doing multiple tasks simultaneously.

**Next month the conclusion: "Peer review."**

# Object hovers over witness and truck

Investigated and reported by Mike Driscoll  
Illinois MUFON SSD/FI

Following is a description of the sighting by the witness:

On the night of Oct. 11, 1989, I left Kewanee, IL, and was driving home after a meeting. I was alone and driving on IL A 81. At a few minutes after 9 PM I was about 4 miles west of Kewanee on a section of Rt 81 (near the intersection of Tower Rd). On the right (east) is hills and broken timber/pasture and on the left (west) are flat open tilled farm fields. I would have been traveling north.

I suddenly noticed a red (red/orange) flashing light, thinking an emergency vehicle or deputy sheriff had suddenly come up behind me. I had just purchased a new (1989) Ford F 150 pickup truck and had a fiberglass "topper" installed that day. I was unfamiliar with the somewhat obstructed field of view and the still new vehicle. I had not been drinking or using any drugs. I do recall being somewhat fatigued after a long and busy day.


I slowed and moved over to the shoulder of the road. As I came to a stop on the shoulder I was thinking I was being pulled over for some reason. I then realized the red or red/orange light was reflecting in the space between the back window of the truck and the topper. I shut the engine off at this point, thinking I had some kind of electrical problem.

I opened the driver's door at about the same moment I realized the light was also reflected on the hood of the truck. I stepped out of the open driver's door to stand on the ground and realized that a large glowing sphere was positioned almost directly overhead. I estimated the object to be approx 50-70 ft above ground and approx 20-25 ft diameter.

It was smooth and glassy appearing on its surface, which was most noticeable between the brighter intensity pulses. I want to emphasize that these "pulses" were not flashes, as in on-off, but were pulsations of brighter-dimmer, never shutting off completely. I also noticed a strong definite static field that increased in unison with the pulses of brighter light.

I could not visualize the surface of the object when the light pulses were at peak intensity. During the less intense/dim phase of the light pulses the surface was clearly visible and totally featureless from my point of view. The surface was very smooth and glass-like, transparent, and within appeared a swirling, smoky or viscous liquid type substance against the inner surface.

From what was visible to me, I would insist this object was a perfect globe or sphere and emitted light from its entire outside surface. Over the next 1-2 minutes the quality and duration of the bright/dim light cycle changed to a longer bright and shorter dim, but the frequency of the light cycle seemed constant—it did not pulse faster, just longer and brighter pulses with shorter dim intervals until it approached constant bright "ON."



I could feel the static field intensify also. I did not move from my position next to the truck between the open door and cab. I had the feeling that something was going to happen with the changes in the light emissions and static field, but did not know what to expect.

When the light pulses became a constant "ON," the object very suddenly shot west with a departure so rapid that there was a vacuum "POP." I can only describe it as being like a huge cork violently pulled from a bottle. I was aware of no noise prior to this moment.

The object stopped very suddenly in the western sky for a few seconds (3-5 miles away?), then seemed to change directions approximately 90 degrees to due north for a couple of miles, stopping suddenly again for only a moment, then disappearing to the western horizon.

My next recollection was the realization that I was sitting in my parked truck in my back yard (approx 2 miles north of the site described) with the truck pointing west and watching the western sky where the object disappeared. This was not where I would typically park.

I walked into the house a few minutes before 1 PM, so I was evidently in the truck for some time. It was a very pleasant evening, both in temperature and weather, and I recall an overall feeling of stunned amazement. I do not recall ever feeling fear or apprehension.

I realize that some time is unaccounted for, but I have attributed that to some kind of emotional shock. I have remained in excellent health.

Until recently I was not aware of MUFON, and I have only told three close friends or family members about this incident in the past 12+ years. I do not want my name used publicly, but I do want to report this to those who might compile information of this type. I am an active member in my small town community and I don't desire attention. Mr. Driscoll has interviewed me in a most professional manner, and for that I am grateful.



# Filer's Files

By George A. Filer  
Director, MUFON Eastern Region

Unless otherwise noted, these reports have not been verified by official investigations.

## Unidentifiable object near shuttle disaster?

ATKINS — The Director of NUFORC, Peter Davenport, spoke with an eyewitness to the Shuttle disaster, who reports that both he and his grandchildren had witnessed a green, self-luminous object move toward the Space Shuttle very quickly, seemingly from the southwest, as the Shuttle streaked across the Texas sky.

The witness estimated that they first noticed the object an estimated two seconds after they had first seen the Shuttle in the sky to the northwest, and just prior to the shuttle's explosion. He was there with his grandchildren watching for Columbia's re-entry and watched as it crossed from horizon to horizon.

The witness stated, "I can't imagine having a better overall vantage point than the spot where we stood. I saw...green light, explosion, sonic boom, etc."

CNN and radio (700 WLW) said, "The Air Force reported tracking an 'object' moving alongside Columbia on Jan. 17, 2003, one day and 20 minutes into the mission while the shuttle was still in space. They said it 'may' have been a piece of the shuttle, but they don't know yet." NASA officials confirmed that military radar at Eglin Air Force Base spotted a mysterious object near Columbia. The object moved away from the Shuttle at 10 miles per hour.

During the first few hours of the coverage of the disaster, released video showed an object following the Shuttle about an estimated thousand feet behind the Shuttle that seemed to launch a bolt of lightning like plasma toward the Shuttle.

David Perlman of *The San Francisco Chronicle* viewed the photos later that night, and on Sunday the *Chronicle* reported an electrified discharge seen around the track of the shuttle's passage. "They clearly record an electrical discharge like a lightning bolt flashing past," said the photographer.

NASA dispatched former shuttle astronaut Tammy Jernigan to acquire the camera. A *Chronicle* reporter was present when Jernigan arrived. "It certainly appears very anomalous," she said. "We sure will be very interested in taking a very hard look at this."

DALLAS - Another viewer writes, "While watching the news on CNN Saturday morning about the explosion

of the Shuttle, CNN showed a video of the Shuttle coming in from a front view. In the video the shuttle is coming from the left top hand of the screen downwards towards the right.

"There was a cloud in front of it with the sun reflecting on it, making it glow. All of a sudden from the bottom left hand corner of the screen, dark-shaped objects zipped upwards across the sky towards the right hand corner. It was moving quite fast and disappeared in seconds.

"My 14-year-old son and I looked at each other and both said at the same time, 'What the heck was that?' We watched all day long for them to show the particular clip again, but they never did. It was very clear to us, and we are wondering why it was never shown again."



George Filer

## Planes investigate Texas object

DALLAS — The witness reports, "At 7 AM, on Jan. 16, 2003, I noticed a large lit object almost directly overhead and I called to my wife to see the VERY bright planet. When we looked again some ten minutes later, it had moved about a foot at arm's length, which is too far for a celestial object to move in a short time frame.

"Fifteen minutes later, we both saw that it had disappeared! As I drove her to work, we saw contrails of two very fast moving jets converging on the exact spot where the light had been. They crossed this same patch of sky over and over again in an 'x' pattern. They seemed to be searching for the object for about fifteen minutes.

"I returned home, got binoculars to observe, and could only make out the contrails (puffy, and definitely corkscrewed) converging again and again on this same spot for at least 30 minutes.

"Then the light reappeared, and I saw it was round with a shadow! Both jets made tight turns and converged on the spot again. They were a foot away at arm's length when the light blinked off! As the planes crossed each other, I saw the light reappear to the south two feet away at arm's length! Again, the jets executed tight turns and converged on the same spot, only to have the light disappear again.

"This occurred two more times, and then the light disappeared totally. I witnessed the short, jagged contrail-producing jets crisscross that patch of sky repeatedly until 10:30 AM. I saw a multitude of Sweets and American Airlines planes flying low producing no trails." NUFORC

## Connecticut object turns night into day

FARMINGTON — The witness reports, "This is the first time anything so strange has happened to me. I was out walking my dogs in the back yard when, as I looked toward the treetops, a huge, intensely-colored, neon-green sphere was slowly rising. Once it got above the tops of

the trees and was completely visible, it quickly shot upward even more, and within a matter of seconds had moved from one side of the sky to the opposite, leaving behind it a distinct crackling sound, like a jet leaves a sound trail.

"For the duration of this experience, the entire sky lit up neon green, and was brighter than day. I could see everything, and given the circumstances, thought we were being bombed. Once everything was back to normal, and the object was no longer visible, I could see flickering trails that were the same color as the UFO, disappearing almost as quickly as they were able to be seen. This all happened within a matter of seconds.

"As I went back inside to tell my family, there had been reports of transformers blowing around the county, and a wire down on a nearby street. I know what I saw, and I've never seen or heard of anything that comes close to being like it. The entire sky was brightened even brighter than normal daylight." Thanks to NUFORC.

### **UFOs in Virginia chemtrails?**

BURKE — The witness reports, "At about 1 PM on Jan. 31, 2003, I was outside, camcorder in hand, filming the chemtrails, and after five minutes of taping I saw what I thought was a passenger jet flying through a chemtrail.

"I rolled tape on it for about 30 seconds. It first looked like the sun reflecting off the wings of a jet. When I reviewed what I taped, I was astounded to see 4 or 5 rotating spheres traveling in a straight line within the chemtrails." Thanks to Peter Davenport, NUFORC.

### **Strange object viewed off Florida coast**

ORCHID ISLAND — The witness reports, "I am a security guard for an exclusive gated community and a retired police officer who is inherently skeptic about most non-factual things. This is my first known sighting.

"I was on the ocean side of the beach club on Jan. 31, 2003, at 11:30 PM, checking the club's beach access boardwalk. I routinely look up and down the beach for small boats or boats out in the ocean because there is a lot of drug smuggling along the Treasure Coast.

"It was clear, and the sky was full of stars. I saw a light on the horizon of the ocean, almost due east. At first I thought it was a fishing boat out on the Gulf Stream. However, I noticed the light seemed a little high off the horizon for the mast of a fishing boat.

"It was pitch black out there, and all of a sudden the light shot up into the sky, going very high. It looked like an amber star—a small star or one that is very far away. Of course I was astonished and began observing it. It appeared to be stationary in the sky, then all of a sudden moving right, then left, and making loops like a helicopter.

"This went on for a while, so I went back to my cruiser and got out the 10X binoculars, and this object emitted its own source of light and had red areas on its surface and was oval in shape. I had another officer observe the object and he said, 'That thing is dancing.' I locked my arms in a bipod position, holding the binoculars in one position.

"The object would move out of my field of view and come back. The next two nights I saw the object in the

eastern sky 45 degrees above the horizon. The third night I also noticed one, maybe two, more objects at the same altitude that looked like the first object." Thanks to Peter Davenport, NUFORC.

### **Unlighted cylinder in New York**

PORTCHESTER — The witness reports, "I observed one large dark cylinder-shaped object heading north on Jan. 16, 2003, flying very slow at 1:34 AM. The cylinder turned west and started going towards that direction.

"The object the whole time had no lights. It was dark, but appeared to give a slight water shine for maybe half a second. Shortly after that happened, I lost it as if it blended itself with the night sky." Thanks to Peter Davenport, NUFORC, [www.ufocenter.com](http://www.ufocenter.com)

### **Disc with rotating lights in Oregon**

BEND — The witness reports seeing a disc with rotating colored lights at 2 AM on Jan. 28, 2003, in the southwest skies in the direction of Mount Bachelor. "We watched it for 15 minutes until it dropped below the roof-top line of our neighbor's house," the witness reports.

"There was one single disc/saucer that was dropping in altitude and moving away during a fifteen-minute period. It was as if it was going sideways, as it did get smaller and did drop in altitude a little.

"It was fairly large, as seen at a distance, and had a rotating outer circle of lights that would change colors from green, to all red, to all blue, and to all white. Most of the time, they were all red or all green as it rotated. With binoculars it appeared to be a white thin undefined mass with some sort of field that made it unobservable.

"I am 49 years old and a professional, and my 20-year-old son is a college student, who originally spotted it." Thanks to Peter Davenport, NUFORC.

### **Red lights in the Netherlands**

KROMMENIE — The witness reports, "Just before I went to sleep on Jan. 30, 2003, I closed the ventilation hatch at 10:33 PM and observed a light which was hovering over a couple of houses in the distance. This light was colored red, and hovered for about a minute.

"When I grabbed my binoculars to take a closer look, the object was gone. I observed the object move east for about three minutes, and I couldn't see it any more. I stayed up the rest of the night to see if the object came back, but this did not happen.

"The next day I checked with the residents where I spotted the object, but they had not observed anything, but they did hear a long lasting loud rumbling noise. They did not pay any attention to it because they thought it was an old Russian airliner landing."

### **MUFON MUGS**

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

**Apollo 11: The NASA Mission Reports, Vol. Two**, compiled and edited by Robert Godwin, Apogee Books, Box 62034, Burlington, Ontario, L7R 4K2, Canada, 7X10 soft cover, 168 pages, plus a CD ROM, \$13.95.

**Reviewed by Dwight Connelly**

In the wake of the latest disaster in the NASA space program, the courage and danger which were part of the 1969 voyage to the moon takes on even more significance. If there is still danger in 2003 in something as seemingly routine as landing a shuttle, consider the potential problems in getting to the moon and back without a mishap more than 30 years ago.

This book is basically a transcript of a discussion between the three astronauts, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, during the debriefing which followed their historic journey.

The topics ranged from technical concerns to the problems they had shaving—but also included descriptions of an unknown object.

The debriefing was closed to the press, and was originally classified material. This is the first publication of the debriefing, which was obtained under the Freedom of Information Act. A comprehensive listing of acronyms used by the astronauts is provided by Godwin, and this is very helpful in understanding the discussion.

Of special interest to ufologists is the following conversation, which begins on page 38:

**ALDRIN** - The first unusual thing that we saw, I guess, was one day out or something pretty close to the moon. It had a sizeable dimension to it, so we put the monocular on it.

**COLLINS** - How'd we see this thing? Did we just look out the window and there it was?


**ALDRIN** - Yes, and we weren't sure but that it might be the S-IVB [Saturn third stage]. We called the ground and were told the S-IVB was 6000 miles away. We had a problem with the high gain about this time, didn't we?

**COLLINS** - There was something. We felt a bump, or maybe I just imagined it.

**ARMSTRONG** - He was wondering whether the MESA [Modular Equipment Stowage Assembly] had come off.

**COLLINS** - I don't guess we felt anything.

**ALDRIN** - Of course, we were seeing all sorts of little objects going by at the various dumps, and then we happened to see this one brighter object going by. We couldn't think of anything else it could be other than the S-IVB. We looked at it through the monocular, and it



seemed to have a bit of an L shape to it.

**ARMSTRONG** - Like an open suitcase.

**ALDRIN** - We were in PTC [Passive Thermal Control] at the time, so each one of us had a chance to take a look at this, and it certainly seemed to be within our vicinity and of a very sizeable dimension.

**ARMSTRONG** - We should say that it was right at the limit of the resolution of the eye. It was very difficult to tell just what shape it was. And there was no way to tell the size without knowing the range, or the range without knowing the size.

**ALDRIN** - So then I got down in the LEB [Lower Equipment Bay] and started looking for it in the optics. We were grossly misled, because with the sextant off focus what we saw appeared to be a cylinder.

**ARMSTRONG** - Or really two rings.

**ALDRIN** - Yes.

**ARMSTRONG** - Two rings. Two connected rings.

**COLLINS** - No, it looked like a hollow cylinder to me. It didn't look like two connected rings. You could see this thing tumbling, and when it came around end-on, you could look right down in its guts. It was a hollow cylinder. But then you could change the focus on the sextant and it would be replaced by this open-book shape. It was really weird.

**ALDRIN** - I guess there's not too much more to say about it, other than it wasn't a cylinder.

**COLLINS** - It was during the period when we thought it was a cylinder that we inquired about the S-IVB, and we'd almost convinced ourselves that's what it had to be. But we don't have any more conclusions than that really. The fact that we didn't see it much past this one time period—we really don't have a conclusion as to what it might have been, how big it was, or how far away it was. It was something that wasn't part of the urine dump, we're pretty sure of that. Skipping ahead a bit, when we jettisoned the LM [Lunar Module], you know we fired an explosive charge and got rid of the docking rings and the LM went boom. Pieces came off the LM. It could have been some Mylar or something that had somehow come loose from the LM.

**ALDRIN** - We thought it could have been a panel, but it didn't appear to have that shape at all.

**COLLINS** - That's right, and for some reason, we thought it might have been a part of the high gain antenna. It might have been about the time we had high gain antenna problems. In the back of my mind, I have some reason to suspect that its origin was from the spacecraft.

**ALDRIN** - The other observation that I made accumulated gradually. I don't know whether I saw it the first night, but I'm sure I saw it the second night. I was trying to go to sleep with all the lights out. I observed what I thought were little flashes inside the cabin, spaced a couple of minutes apart, and I didn't think too much about it other than just a note in my mind that they continued to be there.

I couldn't explain why my eye would see these flashes. During trans-earth coast, we had more time and I devoted more opportunity to investigating what this could have been. It was at that point that I was able to observe on two different occasions that, instead of observing just

one flash, I could see double flashes, at points separated by maybe a foot. At other times, I could see a line with no direction of motion, and the only thing that comes to my mind is that this is some sort of penetration. At least that's my guess, without much to support it—some penetration of some object into the spacecraft that causes an emission as it enters the cabin itself.

Sometimes it was one flash on entering. Possibly departing from an entirely different part of the cabin, outside the field of view. The double flashes appeared to have an entry and then impact on something such as the struts. For a while, I thought it might have been some static electricity, because I was also able, in moving my hand up and down the sleep restraint, to generate very small sparks of static electricity. But there was a definite difference between the two as I observed it more and more.

I tried to correlate this with the direction of the sun. When you put the window shades up there is still a small amount of leakage. You can generally tell within 20 or 30 degrees the direction of the sun. It seemed as though they were coming from that general direction; however, I really couldn't say if there was near enough evidence to support that these things were observable on the side of the spacecraft where the sun was. A little bit of evidence seemed to support this. I asked the others if they had seen any of these and, until about the last day, they hadn't.

**ARMSTRONG** - Buzz, I'd seen some light, but I just always attributed this to sunlight, because the window covers leak a little bit of light no matter how tightly secured. The only time I observed it was the last night when we really looked for it. I spent probably an hour carefully watching the inside of the spacecraft, and I probably made 50 significant observations in this period.

**ALDRIN** - Sometimes a minute or two would go by and then you'd see two within the space of 10 seconds. On an average, I'd say just as a guess it was maybe something like one a minute. Certainly more than enough to convince you that it wasn't an optical illusion. It did give you a rather funny feeling to contemplate that something was zapping through the cabin. There wasn't anything you could do about it.

**ARMSTRONG** - It could be something like Buzz suggested. Mainly a neutron or some kind of an atomic particle that would be in the visible spectrum.

Even aside from the preceding discussion of the unknown object and the light flashes in the cabin, this is a very interesting book which provides insights into the mission that are normally missed by the public. The accompanying CDROM is also fascinating, and includes such scenes as the planting of the American flag on the surface of the moon.

### Check your label for expiration date

Please check your mailing label periodically for the expiration date of your MUFON membership and *MUFON UFO Journal* subscription. Renewing prior to expiration saves MUFON needed funds, and assures that you will not miss an issue of the *Journal*.

*Science Meets the UFO Enigma* by Desmond Bragg and Paul Joslin, Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 2002, 7X10 hardback, 252 pages,

### Reviewed by Dwight Connelly

This book would make a very good textbook or reference book for a high school or college course on ufology. Unlike many books, this one lives up to its title: i.e. scientific methods are actually used in evaluating UFO cases.

The authors are retired professors from the college of education at Drake University in Des Moines, IA. Joslin worked in the sciences, and Bragg in the social sciences, which may account for the scholarly approach. Bragg has been a member of MUFON for more than twenty years, so is no newcomer to the field.

The book is well organized, with a good introduction to ufology, moving from a historical summary to specific cases. One of the highlights is the chapter reviewing UFO literature, classified into six categories: general, extra-terrestrial, abductions, scientific, and skeptic.

The reviews include 68 books and papers, most described briefly, but some descriptions covering multiple

pages. The reviews feature many of the Who's Who of ufology, such as Kenneth Arnold, Ted Bloecher, Edward Ruppelt, Jacques Vallee, Leonard Stringfield, Coral & Jim Lorenzen, Donald Keyhoe, Ed Walters, Bruce Maccabee, Raymond Fowler, Stanton Friedman, Isabel Davis, J. Allen Hynek, Ted Phillips, Kevin Randle, Donald Schmitt, Philip Corso, Colin Andrews, Linda Moulton Howe, Tom Adams, John Fuller, Budd Hopkins, John Mack, Whitley Strieber, David Jacobs, John Carpenter, Carl Sagan, Richard Hall, James McCampbell, Edward Condon, James Harder, Richard Haines, Peter Sturrock, Paul Hill, Philip Klass, and Donald Menzel.

Bragg and Joslin are kinder to skeptics Klass and Menzel than these two "bunkers" deserve, and the authors apparently still feel that Col. Corso may be legitimate, but overall their judgement is sound in reviewing the numerous authors.

Bragg and Joslin tackle the problem of applying science to the study of UFO cases in Chapter 3, opening with a brief history of science, then discussing some of the currently-accepted processes of scientific investigation. They look at six possible hypotheses regarding UFOs, and set up the criteria which they will use in determining if specific UFO cases are genuine.

They determine that "the null hypothesis" is the most satisfactory approach, contrasting it with the positive hypothesis.

For example, a positive hypothesis might be stated as: "UFOs exist as real physical objects about which there are no current scientific explanations." If stated as a null



hypothesis it would be: "Flying objects presently identified as unknown can be identified as known and explained with known scientific principles."

This second hypothesis, the authors explain, turns all UFO reports into IFOs. "If all UFOs can be explained as known objects, the null hypothesis must be accepted," say Bragg and Joslin, but "if even one substantiated case is found that cannot be so explained, then the null hypothesis must be rejected. The advantage of the null hypothesis is that only one case is required to refute it."

The authors use this approach on five specific UFO cases, setting up the following criteria for judging the validity of each case: (1) multiple witnesses, (2) credible witnesses, (3) data from instruments, (4) strangeness, and (5) link-by-link evidence. All of the five criteria need not be present for determining that a case is genuine, but each adds strength to the case.

This appears to be a good way to organize data in looking at a case—something which good researchers probably do anyway, but in a less precise manner.

One could question the choice and presentations of a couple of the cases used as examples. The first case, the Gulf Breeze sightings of Ed and Frances Walters, has hardly been free from controversy, yet the number and credibility of the witnesses is rated at "a high level." While this may indeed be a legitimate case—as supported by the very credible Bruce Maccabee and MUFON—it may not be one of the five best cases for demonstrating the scientific approach.

Case two is the Coyne helicopter sighting of 1973, case three involved scientists and instrumentation, case four is the well-documented Barney and Betty Hill abduction, and case five the Linda Cortile abduction—a case with its own share of problems, despite the high credibility of the investigator, Budd Hopkins.

Again, this is not to suggest that the Cortile abduction did not occur, but it may not have been one of the best choices for the demonstration, given some of the questions regarding witnesses.

The authors determine that all five cases are probably legitimate.

There is additional interesting and well-presented material on "Testing the Extraterrestrial Hypothesis." The authors resist the temptation to utilize wild statements by self-styled experts, presenting instead the available legitimate evidence in a careful manner.

Topping off this excellent book is a good index, extensive references, and even a glossary.

### MUFON shirts and caps

Wear official MUFON T-shirts (royal blue printing on white cotton), sizes S, M, L & XL. Two styles of baseball caps (royal blue with white logo or dark blue with blue logo on white front). T-shirt price is \$12.00 and baseball caps are \$8.00. S/H for each is \$3.00, or if both are ordered together is only \$3.00. MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369. (Check, MO, or cash, U.S. dollars.)

**"Human Reactions to UFOs Worldwide (1940-1983) and What We Have Learned from UFO Repetitions (1947-1984)"** by George D. Fawcett, UFO Store.com, 16235 SW Westwind Drive, Beaverton, OR 97007-2050 (also available from the author at 602 Battleground Rd., Lincolnton, NC 28092), 8 1/2 X 11, soft cover, 41 pages, \$22.95 ppd.

### Reviewed by Dwight Connelly

This publication is composed of two studies from the 1980's. The author is a veteran researcher who previously published *Quarter Century Studies of UFOs in Florida, North Carolina and Tennessee* (1975), now out of print.

Fawcett researched the first study—on human reactions to UFOs—by requesting reports from all over the world. After receiving these reports, he organized them into 32 categories, such as "Healings and other positive effects," "Emotional shock," "Changes in normal habits and activities," "Blind panic," and "Acts of self defense from UFOs."

Under each category he briefly describes one or more cases from the 1940-1983 time period. He notes that his four-year study indicates that human reactions to UFOs are both consistent and persistent throughout the world.

In the second study, looking at what we have learned from UFO repetitions, Fawcett discusses specific aspects of UFO sightings which had been repeated throughout the world during the 1947-1984 period of his study, and which continue today.

These include radar trackings, increases in background radiation, photos and movies, physiological effects, electromagnetic interference, specific odors, contactee reports, appearances of "little men," periodical cycles of sightings, unique UFO shapes, traces left at landing sites, animal reactions, levitation of people and vehicles, and 14 other categories of repetitions.

This is not a large publication, but it does provide historical perspective, insights from a respected veteran ufologist, and much food for thought as researchers continue to ponder what is behind the UFO phenomenon.

### New MUFON field investigator t-shirt & cap

The field investigator t-shirt has the MUFON logo over the left chest pocket and "MUFON Field Investigator" on the back. It comes in S, M, L and XL in white with a blue logo (\$12 + \$3 S&H) or black with a white logo (\$15 + \$3 S&H).

MUFON has a black cap with white MUFON logo to match the field investigator black t-shirts (The caps also look great with the white t-shirts). Screen printed is \$8 + \$3 S&H. Embroidered is \$15 + \$3 S&H. MUFON, P.O. Box 369, Morrison, CO 80465-0369. (Check, MO, or cash, U.S. dollars.)





# View from Britain

By Jenny Randles

## One in Ten

Recently I was asked on a media interview a question often posed by skeptical people when it comes to UFOs. "You say," I was politely reminded, "that perhaps one in ten sightings relate to genuine UFOs, whereas the other 90 per cent can be explained in mundane terms. Why then," the question was thrust at me like a lance being parried, "can you not accept that those one in ten are also likely to be explained if you had sufficient time or information?"

It is, of course, a good question, but one I do not think is without an answer. So, after explaining that in truth I suspected that maybe only one in five (not one in ten) represented truly unsolved UFO cases, I attempted to give my reasoning, which I thought I would share with readers this month.



Jenny Randles

### What are solved cases?

What factors cause a case to be solved? Quite simply the UFO (being an unidentified flying object) is investigated, researched, checked against various credible explanations, and an identification is found that makes good sense. It becomes an IFO (identified flying object).

Of course, it is rare that we really solve a case in any cast iron beyond all doubt sense of the term. Usually an explanation suggests itself that makes more sense of the evidence than would clinging to the expectation that it was truly unexplained.

For instance, we might say that a bright object that whizzes past the cockpit of an airliner and is reported by the crew as a rocket shaped craft was in truth a fireball meteor. If we are just guessing that is not a very adequate (although potentially plausible) resolution.

If we have evidence from scientific observations that such an object was seen at that time and date in the right part of the sky by independent observers and recorded by astronomers as a meteor, then we are on much more secure ground when arguing that our airline sighting should be considered solved.

But it is still an educated guess. The other witnesses might have seen the UFO and misinterpreted it as a meteor, for example.

All we can do, in practically every case, is make a reasoned value judgement of the evidence. Common sense, experience, and our knowledge of the universe tells us that, whilst we will occasionally consign to the label of

"solved cases" a sighting that in truth should have remained unexplained, most of the time we will err correctly on the side of caution and properly regard a dubious case as being an IFO.

There are always going to be gray areas. For instance, we might have (as I once did) a multiple witness sighting of what was very clearly a piece of space junk burning up in the atmosphere. Most of the sightings fitted the pattern of the event that was tracked by NORAD, and there was no argument.

However, in one case a witness saw something that occurred at the same time and with similar characteristics and yet which they described in graphic terms as a classic UFO. Was this merely an extremely exaggerated IFO based upon the space junk, or had a witness chanced to see a genuine UFO at the same time as many others were watching the atmospheric spectacular?

Both options are possible, and we can only form an opinion on the most credible way of interpreting all the facts at our disposal.

### Patterns within the evidence:

But do IFO cases reveal any patterns? Well, yes and no. Certainly there are key features that help an investigator look for an IFO option within the details of a reported sighting.

For instance, if a UFO is reported to resemble a pulsing light in the pre dawn sky that stays more or less in one place for an hour, but fades as the sky lightens, most UFOlogists would think right away that this was probably Venus or a bright star, and access to astronomical data would rapidly establish if that were the case.

We can identify IFO profiles for most types of phenomena—allowing, in fact, all good investigators to use flow charts and other data based on their experience to run any case through a number of options checked against the witness story to test for the main options.

Indeed, it is possible (and I am surprised no enterprising UFOlogist seems to have done it yet) to come up with a computer-based IFO diagnostic tool that could be employed by UFOlogists and witnesses (if it were placed on line) to test their sighting against the main IFO possibilities.

However, the real problem is that every type of IFO has its own unique pattern of markers that suggest this explanation. And UFO sightings are a mixture of dozens of different IFO possibilities. How do you allow for parameters that cover common place IFO such as aircraft lights as well as much rarer ones like mirages or your granny's hat caught in the wind?

This multi-faceted nature of UFOs and IFOs also makes it difficult to look for differences between the cumulative solved and unsolved data. For these are sets of evidence

built out of many different things. However, attempts have been made and offer some comfort.

### The vital difference

Studies were made in the 1950s by Batelle in the USA and in the 1970s by GEPAN in France. Both, in effect, sought any differences between (1) the data regarded as solved after careful investigation and (2) the evidence still considered unexplained. In both cases there were persuasive indications that these subsets of evidence were not the same.

One of the key findings from the atmospheric scientists working in Toulouse was that the unsolved cases increased in correlation to the clarity of the atmosphere, whereas the reverse was true for the cases considered solved. This is a remarkable finding, and one of the pieces of evidence I regard as probative.

After all, you would expect misinterpretations to grow in numbers the worse the quality of visibility became. You are less likely to correctly interpret a weather balloon or aircraft if it is misty. If the unsolved cases were simply more of the same—that is, solved cases for which we do not yet have all the necessary evidence—you would expect them to follow a similar trend.

That the unsolved cases seem to have excellent atmospheric clarity associated lessens the chances that they are simply misperceptions, and indicates a critical difference that can be measured between them and the ones regarded as being solved.

### In conclusion

In the end, of course, your belief in UFOs may come down to personal conviction—perhaps through your own sighting or a powerful case that you have investigated and that seems to defy all the odds. Whilst I do not undervalue the importance of such matters, it is wise to remember that there is no such thing as the perfect UFO.

All cases are open to explanation sooner or later if that little piece of luck or defining evidence comes along that makes an IFO solution suddenly clarify.

That there is evidence beyond the mere “gut feeling” that something strange is going on has to be important. UFOlogy is not only about individual cases, but about a collection of evidence that points towards the possibility that something beyond current scientific knowledge might be taking place.

### 2002 Symposium Proceedings

The *MUFON 2002 International UFO Symposium Proceedings* book is available from MUFON Headquarters for \$25 + \$2.50 p&h (U.S.). For deliveries outside of the United States an additional \$4.00 postage (total \$6.50) is required.

The book contains the papers presented at the annual MUFON Symposium in Rochester, NY, by **William J. Birnes, Richard Dolan, Timothy Good, Betty Hill, Bill Hamilton, Budd Hopkins, David Jacobs, Don Ledger, Peter Robbins, Jeffrey W. Sainio, Chris Styles and Richard Thieme.**

## No humans yet

# Teleportation gets a boost as scientists move laser photons

From an idea that was only considered practicable 10 years ago, scientists recently announced that they have succeeded in teleporting laser photons over two kilometers (1.25 miles), the biggest distance yet achieved.

In science fiction, teleportation involves taking someone and creating a replica of him or her a long distance away, and destroying the original. The perceived barrier to it was something called the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle.

This principle states that the more accurately you try to scan or measure an atom or other object in order to teleport it, the more you disrupt its original quantum state, and so you cannot create a true replica.

Things changed in 1993 with a landmark paper by a team led by an IBM scientist, Charles Bennett, who thought up a way of getting around this problem using photons, or particles of light, as the object to be transported.

Their answer was to exploit something called “quantum entanglement,” in which a laser beam is squeezed and split in such a way that it creates two particles of light at the same time. Particles created in this exotic process behave like psychic twins.

Even if they are far apart, a disturbance to one particle affects the other, a phenomenon once dubbed “spooky interaction” by Einstein. Their idea was to use these “entangled” particles as transporters. By introducing a third “message” particle into the light stream, one could transfer its properties to both sets of particles.


It would work like this: One of the “twin” beams is scanned, which in the process destroys its quantum state. The information is sent to the recipient via a classical communications channel, and is transformed back into a light beam. The recipient then combines this light beam with the second entangled beam he has received, and in so doing “unwraps” the original message in its virgin state.

The first concrete results from this idea began emerging in 1997, with a couple of labs in Europe and the United States transporting a small unit of information, called a quantum bit (qubit) a distance of about one meter (3.25 feet).

But, in a study reported recently in the British weekly journal *Nature*, scientists at the University of Geneva, Switzerland, and the University of Aarhus, Denmark, have teleported data to another lab 55 meters (178 feet) away through a 2-kilometer (1.25-mile) roll of standard fibre-optic cable.

In spite of the breakthrough, teleportation is still restricted to light particles. No-one is even close to teleporting an atom or a bacteria, much less a human being.

“The first (and, with foreseeable technologies, the only) application of quantum teleportation is in quantum communication, where it could help extend quantum cryptography to larger distances,” the authors, led by Geneva University’s Nicolas Gisin, said.



## Perceptions

By Stanton T. Friedman

### Where is the space program going?

I was driving from my home in Fredericton, New Brunswick, to my post office box in Houlton, ME, as I usually do on Saturday morning and listening to National Public Radio, when I first heard that communications had been lost with the Columbia Space Shuttle.

It felt like a kick in the head. I tried to keep tabs over the next week about what new information was being obtained. As it happened I had spoken many years ago at Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches, so at least I knew where the town was.

Because a lot of radio people know that I worked on space related Research and Development programs years ago, there were several calls from talk show hosts asking for my views about the tragedy. What was there to say that hadn't already been said? All seven astronauts were obviously the best of the best, both as talented professionals and as people.

Obviously, I didn't know what caused the disaster. But what I gradually began to focus on was the failure of NASA to provide real leadership and goal orientation, especially for the manned space program. NASA has not articulated a goal as a follow-up to President Kennedy's 1961 call for placing a man on the moon by the end of the decade.

One would think that the space station would be a stepping stone, not an end in itself. Other than keeping budget money flowing, there has been no clarion call, such as establishing a lunar base by a certain date or sending a man to Mars by a later date. I am often reminded of a meeting I was asked to attend at Aerojet General Corporation in Sacramento, CA, when I was working on the Nerva nuclear rocket program at Westinghouse Astronuclear lab near Pittsburgh, PA, in about 1968.

The purpose of the meeting, which was sponsored by the NASA Space Nuclear Propulsion Office, was to discuss "What should we do with the nuclear Rocket?" They didn't know!! Should we use it to establish a lunar base? Perhaps to ferry supplies from earth orbit to Lunar orbit? As an upper stage for a manned mission to Mars? No conclusion was reached, and the program was cancelled within a few years, not because it wasn't successful, but because there was no goal.

There were many successful tests of ground based nuclear rocket engines at the Nuclear Test site in Ne-

vada. The testing of our NRX A-6 nuclear engine was terminated at a full 60 minutes at full power (1100 Megawatts) and nominal high temperature and pressure for the liquid hydrogen cooled system. Los Alamos tested their Phoebus 2B engine, still under 7 feet in diameter, at a power level of 4400 megawatts.

But there was no program goal, no leadership, no vision. Essentially the same thing had happened when I worked for the General Electric Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Department in the late 1950s. The Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission couldn't decide what they wanted to do with the aircraft, which would have practically unlimited range since essentially no fuel was used during flight.

Should the first plane be designed to be a high altitude bomber? Or a plane to come in low, toss its nuclear bombs, and come back high? Should it be a very large cargo plane able to deliver a huge load anywhere in the world? Or a tug to tow a bunch of regular planes for most of their flight to distant places?


Without a goal and an outstanding leader, funding is lost. Werner Von Braun did provide leadership for the Apollo program. An excellent example of leadership was provided by Admiral Hyman Rickover, who directed the navy nuclear reactor development program. Despite the opposition of the battleship boys, nuclear submarines make perfect sense in retrospect, since they can remain hidden and be ready to launch their missiles anytime from anywhere.

It is easy to forget that the development of the Polaris missile occurred after the submarine's development. Nuclear powered naval task forces can sail full steam ahead for years without refuelling and are independent of the oil supply lines so difficult to maintain in wartime. Speed of oil fired ships is very dependent on supplies, since higher speeds use up fuel quickly.

The nuclear navy demonstrates Friedman's law: Technological progress comes from doing things differently in an unpredictable way. A nuclear reactor is not just a better furnace. Lasers aren't just better light bulbs.

This directly relates to my discussion about flying saucer technology. Namely that the propulsion systems of civilizations well ahead of us will use techniques about which we know nothing for both propulsion and long distance communications—one of many reasons I am not a booster of the radio telescope-based Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (SETI). The evidence already indicates that aliens are coming here. Why listen for signals with a very primitive technique?

Concerning the shuttle, we must recognize that fundamentally it is the same as all our high power rockets have been for decades: use chemical propellants to produce lift to lift the propellant to lift the propellant to finally lift a



Stanton T. Friedman

payload small in comparison to the initial launch weight.

The modern world of computers illustrates my law. We went from using vacuum tubes which use so much energy that huge amounts of air conditioning are required to transistors which substantially reduced the size, weight and energy consumption, to integrated circuits, again reducing size and weight and energy requirements, to today's tiny but very powerful micro integrated circuits which use very little energy indeed to accomplish a lot more, more quickly.

But micro integrated circuits are NOT just small vacuum tubes. Very different physics is involved.

NASA has looked fairly briefly at other approaches involving chemical rocketry techniques for launching payloads to orbit, such as starting the rocket while it is aloft hung from a large airplane. What they haven't done is try an entirely new approach. I don't recommend nuclear rocket engines for lift-off. They are not high thrust systems, and there are certain safety considerations on the ground that don't apply in the vacuum of space.

But we seem to have done very little to try to emulate flying saucers, which seem not at all to use systems which work by lifting something in order to throw it away. Even automobiles at least take advantage of the ready availability of air, rather than carry a huge tank of liquid oxygen to burn with the gasoline.

An approach of particular interest to me is the use of a magnetoaerodynamic system which ionizes the air around it and then interacts with that plasma with electric and magnetic fields to control lift, drag, thrust, sonic boom production, radar profile, and other good characteristics—especially when one can use superconducting magnets.

Such systems would, in principle, be much like the electromagnetic submarine successfully built and tested at the University of California, Santa Barbara, in 1966 by Westinghouse Research Laboratory scientist Dr. Stewart Way. A Japanese conglomerate actually operated a somewhat different design using superconducting magnets many years later.

It should be stressed that seawater is an electrically conducting fluid, as is ionized air, and there are no moving parts.

Leading up to President Bush's budget message was a lot of talk on the internet that Project Prometheus would receive a lot of funding, leading to the development of new nuclear systems to speed up manned space exploration. Some of the coverage was very confused.

There are indeed several ways in which nuclear energy can be used for space flight. All our deep space probes (Pioneer, Voyager, Cassini etc) have used Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generators (RTGs), which use alpha particles from Plutonium-238 to heat a small capsule and, because of a temperature difference between it and its surroundings, produce electricity.

These have no moving parts, are very sturdy, cannot provide a chain reaction, last for a very long time, and are very safe and reliable. Of course, unlike solar cells, they produce the same power whether near or far from the sun. There are also several different designs for a compact nuclear reactor (size of a waste basket) producing

larger amounts of power which can be used, for example, to operate side band radar for monitoring ships from orbit (The Russians used more than 30 of these), to providing power for various electric propulsion schemes, which would have low thrust, but operate for months or years, to providing power for space-based laser or ion beam weapons.

To date the US has operated only one of these reactors, a not very good system, the SNAP 10A. I still don't fully understand why the space station doesn't use a nuclear system instead of the huge solar panels. I suspect the biggest reason is lack of vision, courage, and leadership.

The current Prometheus discussion could have taken place 30 years ago! Where was the leadership and the vision of what we want man to do in space? I still don't see it. I don't see any Admiral Rickover type leading the way.

An additional question for which I have never had a satisfactory answer is why the USA didn't launch Apollo 18 and 19? The hardware was all built. The crews had been selected and trained. President Nixon said it was to save money. But almost all the bills had already been paid. Yes, I am aware that some have suggested that the aliens secretly told us to stay off their moon.... At best an idea in my grey basket.

So the big question is, do we Earthlings want to take dominion over the solar system, or do we wish to continue to be a primitive society whose major activity is tribal warfare? I am certain that the lost astronauts had greater vision than that.

## Scientist thinks Mars was once wet and warm

Recent research suggests that early Mars was cold most of the time, and warmed up only when asteroids impacted the planet, but Dr. James F. Kasting, a member of Penn State's NASA-sponsored Astrobiology Research Center, does not think this is correct.

Speaking at the American Association for the Advancement of Science meeting in February, Dr. Kasting said that Mars had to be continuously warmer to form the planet's deep valleys: "I do not think there was enough time involved to form the types of features that we see on the Martian landscape." The half-mile to more than a mile wide channel at the bottom of Nanedi Vallis is about 100 feet across, says Kasting.

The Martian surface could have received 20-30 degrees Fahrenheit additional warming from the greenhouse effect of carbon dioxide ice clouds. Researchers now think that Mars has a supply of water, which is required for all terrestrial life. Evidence of methanobacteria could be found in subsurface fossils, or the bacteria could still be there today. "What we need to do is go and take samples," said Kasting.

NASA's Mars Exploration Rover Mission, scheduled to launch later this year, will have two robotic vehicles that will sample soils, looking for signs of life.



**April 2003**

**Bright Planets (Evening Sky):**

**Mercury**, usually too close to the Sun to glimpse easily, has its best evening appearance of the year. Look for it with binoculars low in the WNW during twilight. The tiny orange planet can be found to the lower right of the crescent Moon on the 3rd. Mercury climbs to its highest position at midmonth when it is about 10 degrees up.

**Jupiter** (magnitude -2.2), in Cancer near the Beehive star cluster, is high in the S at dusk, moving westward during the night. The giant world resumes eastward orbital motion on April 4. The gibbous Moon is nearby on the 10th.

**Saturn** (0.1), still near the right horn tip of Taurus, is in the WSW at dusk, advancing westward as the night progresses. The planet's famous ring system is wide open, offering telescope observers their best possible view of this feature. Saturn is near the lunar crescent on April 7.

**Bright Planets (Morning Sky):**

**Venus** (-3.9) remains low in the E at twilight, having risen about 5 AM in midmonth. The crescent Moon is nearby on the 27th and 28th.

**Mars**, moving from Sagittarius into Capricornus, continues to brighten, increasing from magnitude 0.5 to 0.0 during April. The ruddy world rises in the ESE about 2:30 AM (midmonth) and is low in the sky at dawn. It is near the quarter Moon on the 23rd. (Both Venus and Mars can be seen to better advantage from the southern states.)

**Jupiter and Saturn** set in the NW after 3 AM and 12 midnight, respectively (mid-April).

**Moon Phases:**

- New moon—April 1
- First quarter—April 9
- Full moon—April 16
- Last quarter—April 23


**SIRTF Launch:**

This month NASA is scheduled to launch the 4th in its Great Observatory series—the Space Infrared Telescope Facility, or SIRTF. This space telescope will examine the early universe in infrared—young galaxies, star formation, and circumstellar dust discs (the latter believed to be the signatures of planets forming around other stars).

**The Stars:**

The celestial symbol of spring, Leo the Lion, is due S at 10 PM daylight time. Look for a backward question mark of 6 stars, with the star Regulus marking the dot. This sickle-shaped pattern represents the lion's head and mane. A triangle of stars, about 16 degrees left of Regulus, is the beast's rear haunches and tail.

The Big Dipper hangs high upside-down in the northern sky. Actually, the dipper's bowl forms the body of the Great Bear Ursa Major, while the 3 stars in the handle outline the animal's long bushy tail. (Real bears, of course, don't have long tails!)



**March 8** -International UFO Museum at Roswell, Robert Crow, roswellufo@aol.com, crowassoc@juno.com

**April 5**—Intruders Foundation, New York City, Richard Dolan, 212-645-5278.

**April 11-13**—Annual UFO Conference, Eureka Springs, AR, Lou Farish, ozarkufo@webtv.net, 501-354-2558

**April 12**—International UFO Museum at Roswell, Jerry Smith, jerrysmith@gbis.com

**June 14**—International UFO Museum at Roswell, Paul Davids, producer of the movie "Roswell." roswellufo@aol.com

**June 27-29**—Alternate Realities Conference, Roan Mountain, TN. www.ETconference.org

**July 3**—International UFO Museum at Roswell, July Festival, Derrel Sims. dwsims@neosoft.com

**July 4-6**—MUFON International UFO Symposium, Hyatt Regency Hotel, Dearborn, MI.

**July 5**—International UFO Museum at Roswell, July Festival, The "Roswell Dig" panel discussion, including Don Schmitt, Tom Carey, and William Doleman. schmittdon47@aol.com

<b>Journal Advertising Rates</b>				<b>Advertising deadlines</b>	
	1x	3x	6x	Issue	Ads due
Back cover	\$450	\$425	\$400	April 2003	3-1-03
Inside back cover	\$425	\$400	\$375	May 2003	4-1-03
Full page	\$350	\$325	\$300	June 2003	5-1-03
1/2 page	\$250	\$225	\$200	July 2003	6-1-03
1/4 page	\$150	\$125	\$100	August 2003	7-1-03
"Calling card"	\$55	\$50	\$45	Sept 2003	8-1-03

## MUFON 2003 INTERNATIONAL UFO SYMPOSIUM

“The UFO Continuum: Past, Present, Future”

Hyatt Regency Dearborn, Fairlane Town Center, Dearborn, Michigan.

JULY 4, 5, & 6, 2003

Attend the conference and meet with speakers. We have established very reasonable admission and hotel rates. Please visit our website for links to maps, tourism information, and PayPal registration. [www.mimufon.org](http://www.mimufon.org)  
Information Page: <http://www.mimufon.org/2003%20Symposium%20Information%20Page.html>  
Registration info & mail-in form: <http://www.mimufon.org/2003%20Symposium%20Registration%20Page.html>  
You can use PayPal for online payment and registration (PayPal fees will be reflected on your invoice)

MUFON has reserved a block of rooms for the symposium attendees at \$99.00/night for single and double, and \$109.00/night for triple or quadruple occupancy (normally about \$200.00 to \$275.00 a night). These prices are good from July 2 through July 6. Hotel reservations may be made by going to the Hyatt website or by calling The Hyatt Regency Dearborn Hotel Reservation Dept. at (313) 593-1234 or by mail to the attention of the Reservations Manager, Hyatt Regency Dearborn, Fairlane Town Center, Dearborn, Michigan 48126-2793.

Be sure to ask for rooms reserved for the MUFON Symposium to get the special rate. You MUST have your reservations in to the hotel by June 8, 2003, to get the special rate. After that date, the rooms will revert to the \$200.00 to \$275.00 range. Even if you are late, please tell the registration agent that you are here for the MUFON Symposium and we will get credit for those rooms as well. All rooms credited to MUFON go towards paying for the facilities. The menu for the Friday night Reception dinner is as follows:

Entree Choice #1 Boneless Chicken Breast with Marsala sauce

Entree Choice #2 Marinated Grilled Salmon served with Tarragon Citrus sauce

Entree Choice #3 Roast Sirloin of Beef with Wild Mushroom Sauce

House salad, vegetable, potato or rice, chef's choice of dessert. Coffee or tea will be included with each choice.

*This is a sit-down dinner with a guest speaker. There will also be a cash bar available.*

**Friday night's reception dinner is only available with the Platinum and Gold packages.**

Your choices MUST be in by June 30, 2003. You may Email the Webmaster ([webmaster@mimufon.org](mailto:webmaster@mimufon.org)) with this information if you have not stated your choice with your registration.

**Platinum Package:** Priced at \$150.00 per person and includes all workshops, admission to all regular speaker sessions, the Friday night reception dinner and speaker, and the Symposium Proceedings.

**Gold Package:** Priced at \$130.00 per person and includes all workshops, admission to all regular speaker sessions, and the Friday night reception dinner and speaker.

**Silver package:** Priced at \$120.00 per person and includes all workshops and admission to all regular speaker sessions.

These packages are available **for early registration only**. Mail-in registration must be postmarked no later than June 15, 2003. Any mail-in registrations received after June 15<sup>th</sup>, add 10% to the price per person.

Late mail-ins must be received by the night of June 29 to process your meal choices. You could also Email those choices to the Webmaster ([webmaster@mimufon.org](mailto:webmaster@mimufon.org)) before June 30.

Online registrations processed using PayPal must be in by June 30, as well as the Email requested, so that your meal reservation can be processed.

### **Registrations at the door will be priced as follows:**

All speakers for Saturday and Sunday combined will be \$160.00 per person

Workshops will be \$10.00 per person

1 Speaker: \$15.00 per person

2 speakers: \$25.00 per person

(Any more than 2 speakers per day will be \$15.00 per additional speaker per person.)

**(The registration form is on the following page.)**

# Canada had increase in sightings in 2002

A new study by an independent research group has found that more people are seeing UFOs in Canada. The group collected UFO reports from private, public, and government sources. UFO sightings continue to be reported in significant numbers each year, says Chris Rutkowski, research co-ordinator for the study.

"People still report observing unusual objects in the sky, and some of these objects do not have obvious explanations," he explains. "Many witnesses are pilots, police, and other individuals with reasonably good observing capabilities and good judgement."

Although most reported UFOs are simply lights in the night sky, he says a significant number are objects with definite shapes observed within the witness' frame of reference."

Other findings of the study:

◆ There were 483 reported sightings of UFOs in Canada in 2002—at least one sighting a day.

◆ There were about 29 per cent more UFO reports in 2002 than 2001. The number of UFO reports per year in Canada has increased almost 250 per cent since 1998.

◆ In 2002, more UFOs were reported in the late summer than any other time of the year, but February also had an unexpectedly large peak in UFO report numbers.

◆ In 2002, about 18 per cent of all UFO reports were unexplained. This percentage of unknowns falls to about 7 per cent when only high quality cases are considered.

◆ Most UFO sightings have two witnesses.

◆ The typical UFO sighting lasted approximately 15 minutes in 2002.

◆ The study is available online at: [www.geocities.com/aristotl.geo](http://www.geocities.com/aristotl.geo) For further information, contact: Chris Rutkowski e-mail: [rutkows@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:rutkows@cc.umanitoba.ca)

Note: A toll-free telephone number to report UFO sightings in Canada has recently become operational. This UFO Hotline is: 1-866-262-1989

## Mail-in Reservation Form

(Please note the number of persons per package)

\_\_\_ Platinum Package \_\_\_ Gold Package \_\_\_ Silver Package

Meal Choices (please indicate the number of persons per choice)

\_\_\_ Entree Choice #1 Boneless Chicken Breast with Marsala sauce  
\_\_\_ Entree Choice #2 Marinated Grilled Salmon served with Tarragon Citrus sauce  
\_\_\_ Entree Choice #3 Roast Sirloin of Beef with Wild Mushroom Sauce

If you, or a member of your party, are members of any MUFON organization, please include a note stating the titles that apply to all persons being registered so that this can be reflected on your name tags. If you are a member of any other UFO-related organization and would like that information on your nametag, please include that information and we can certainly print that also.

Organization \_\_\_\_\_ State/Country: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: State Director \_\_\_ Assistant State Director \_\_\_ State Section Director \_\_\_

Other than MUFON members, please state your position \_\_\_\_\_

NAME(1): \_\_\_\_\_

NAME(2): \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY: \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_ COUNTRY \_\_\_\_\_

ZIP/POSTAL CODE \_\_\_\_\_ Email address: \_\_\_\_\_

(We will notify you by Email (if you include one) and by snail mail to confirm your registration)

Mail a copy of this registration form and send a check or money order made out to:

2003 MUFON International Symposium  
PO Box 51100  
Livonia, Michigan 48151

## DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

By **John F. Schuessler**  
MUFON International Director

### Neil Freer To Appear In Dearborn

I am pleased to announce that noted author and lecturer **Neil Freer** has been added to the speaker's list for the MUFON 2003 International UFO Symposium in Dearborn, Michigan, July 4-6, 2003.

Neil's best selling book, *Breaking the Godspell*, explores the startling ramifications of the archaeological, genetic and astronomical proofs for our being a genetically engineered species.

In his most recent book, *God Games*, he answers the question, "What do you do forever?" His white paper *The Alien Question: an Expanded Perspective* originally sent to a number of UFO organizations is available on his web site at [www.neilfreer.com](http://www.neilfreer.com).

Other speakers will include **David W. Davis, Stanton T. Friedman, John Greenwald, Jim Hickman, William Leven-good, Dr. Bruce Maccabee, Dr. Jon Nowinski, Tedd St. Rain,** and **Giorgio Tsoukalos, Dan Wright.**



*John Schuessler*

### Position Announcements

Florida State Director **Bland Pugh** has announced the assignment of **Lynn Stratton** as State Section Director for Pinellas, Hillsborough, and Manatee Counties.

New York State Director **James Bouck** has announced the assignment of **Salvatore Giammusso** as State Section Director for Nassau County in addition to his present assignment of Suffolk County and the assignment of **Charles Harmon, Jr.**, as State Section Director for New York County that includes Manhattan and the Burroughs.

### New Field Investigators

**Kathleen Marden**, Director for Field Investigator Training, announced that the following Field Investigator Trainees have successfully completed the Field Investigator's Exam and are now MUFON Field Investigators: **Kenneth Ray Donnelly**, Comstock Park, MI, **Gaylord Louis Inks**, Granite, OK, **Jean Noble**, Camarillo, CA, **Walt R. Spivey**, Millers Creek, NC, and **David Tyson**, Goldfield, NV.

All Field Investigator Trainees are urged to study the *MUFO Field Investigator's Manual* and take the exam. The manual provides guidelines for UFO investigations

and reporting. It is available from MUFON Headquarters for \$25 plus \$3.50 p&h in the U.S. Add \$4.00 for orders shipped outside the United States. The exam is also available from MUFON Headquarters and is mailed free to trainees when they have completed their studies.

### National UFO Awareness Week

MUFON will observe National UFO Awareness Week from August 16, through August 23, 2003. We hope to build on the successes of the 2002 event and expand the number of activities held this year.

State groups, local groups and individuals are urged to mount an aggressive public awareness campaign by placing displays in local shopping centers and libraries, providing materials for radio and television stations and newspapers, speaking before public and private groups and societies, and a whole variety of new activities.

If you are going to be in the Denver, Colorado area on Saturday, August 23, we hope you will spend the day at MUFON Headquarters and help us celebrate UFO Awareness Week 2003.

### Donation to the MUFON Archives

We wish to thank **Gary C. Matteson** of Norfolk, NE for his donation of NICAP UFO Investigator Newsletters and a book on the Switzerland UFO Incident to the MUFON archives.

### New Level of Comfort at MUFON Headquarters

The public meeting area at MUFON Headquarters includes 50 folding metal chairs. In the winter these chairs can get a bit cold and hard, making an uncomfortable situation for people attending long meetings.

Colorado MUFON member **Gail Barton** recently remedied this situation by donating padded cushions for all the chairs. A big thank you goes out to Gail.

### When does my membership/subscription expire?

The answer to this question appears on the mailing label on each *Journal* (see example below)

01/05

Name

Street Address City, State, Zip

The first line on the label provides the answer. The first two numbers show the year of expiration (01=2001, 02=2002, etc).

The two numbers after the slash show the month of expiration and show the last issue that will be mailed (05=May, 08=Aug, 11=Nov, etc.).