

THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL

NUMBER 159

MAY 1981


Founded 1967

\$1.50

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.



**SPECIAL UFO CAMERA FOR TRIANGULATION AND SPECTOGRAPHY,
DESIGNED BY TAKAO IKEDA, JAPAN**

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

RICHARD HALL
Editor

ANN DRUFFEL
Associate Editor

LEN STRINGFIELD
Associate Editor

MILDRED BIESELE
Contributing Editor

WALTER H. ANDRUS
Director of MUFON

TED BLOECHER
DAVE WEBB
Co-Chairmen,
Humanoid Study Group

PAUL CERNY
Promotion/Publicity

REV. BARRY DOWNING
Religion and UFOs

LUCIUS FARISH
Books/Periodicals/History

MARK HERBSTTRITT
Astronomy

ROSETTA HOLMES
Promotion/Publicity

TED PHILLIPS
Landing Trace Cases

JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
UFO Propulsion

DENNIS W. STACY
Staff Writer

NORMA E. SHORT
DWIGHT CONNELLY
DENNIS HAUCK
Editor/Publishers Emeritus

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

FROM THE EDITOR

We are pleased to confirm that there are MUFON members out there who pay attention, read and think. Their responses to various Journal articles have appeared in recent issues, and will be incorporated in this and future issues increasingly whenever they add new insight or perspective on a given topic. A Journal, above all, should be a forum for exchange of ideas and information.

We will continue to feature factual articles, discussions, and reviews as before, but the give and take of critique and debate is an important element in truth-seeking. UFO skeptics, debunkers, or "demoters" certainly are welcome to participate in rational discourse. We hope they will do so, since the Journal is not for "believers" only.

In this issue

PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BELIEF AND DISBELIEF . . . 3	By Peter Delin
REPORT FROM AFRICA 5	By Cynthia Hind
NOTE ON THE TRAVIS WALTON EXPERIENCE 8	By Willard D. Nelson
HUMANOID REPORT FROM CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 9	By Ted Bloecher
FURTHER NOTES ON CANAL ZONE RADAR CASE 14	By J. Richard Greenwell
LETTERS 15	
MESSAGE FROM THE AIR FORCE? 18	By Paul C. Cerny
IN OTHERS' WORDS 19	By Lucius Farish
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE 20	By Walt Andrus

The contents of The MUFON UFO JOURNAL are determined by the editor, and do not necessarily represent the official position of MUFON. Opinions of contributors are their own, and do not necessarily reflect those of the editor, the staff, or MUFON. Articles may be forwarded directly to MUFON. Responses to published articles may be in a Letter to the Editor (up to about 400 words) or in a short article (up to about 2,000 words). Thereafter, the "50% rule" is applied: the article author may reply but will be allowed half the wordage used in the response; the responder may answer the author but will be allowed half the wordage used in the author's reply; etc. All submissions are subject to editing for style, clarity, and conciseness.

Permission is hereby granted to quote from this issue provided not more than 200 words are quoted from any one article, the author of the article is given credit, and the statement "Copyright 1981 by the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas" is included.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BELIEF AND DISBELIEF

By Peter Delin

(Reprinted by permission of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, South Australia Division, 141 Rundle St., Adelaide, SA 5000, Australia, from an October 30, 1971 UFO Symposium. Copies of the condensed papers of the symposium are available at \$A10.00 each.)

Scientific thinking has been with us for a relatively short time, historically speaking. During that time it has been responsible for fantastic changes in the mode of living of a considerable proportion of the world's population. But this proportion is not as great as we who are the most affected tend to suppose. Furthermore, only a small proportion of those whose life is affected by the products of science are in any important way infected with scientific thinking.

A number of things follow from these observations. Firstly, given that the scientists represent such a minority view, it is surprising that we accord them as much reverence as we do. Secondly, and for the same reason, it is surprising that they so obviously see themselves as representing the sane, "normal" viewpoint. Thirdly, they must always be on the defensive against more popular alternative ways of viewing and handling the universe; for instance the magical and mystical viewpoints.

Many different and conflicting philosophical positions have been stated in the attempt to make explicit the distinction between scientific and non-scientific thinking. Both the scientists and the philosophers are unclear about the processes involved in discovering and demonstrating phenomena. On the other hand, the processes of organizing and collating information about the universe once one has attained it are relatively well established. This situation is a source of strong motivation towards skepticism about new phenomena. Another source of motivation towards skepticism lies in the tradition of resistance to authority as a source of

information established by Descartes. So one characteristic one might reasonably expect to find in scientists is a tendency towards skepticism. Since a position of skepticism is one that is relatively easy to take up, without special training, it will not be surprising if we find that it also characterizes those people who have little scientific training or aptitude, but who, for reasons related to their personality structure, wish to think of themselves as being scientific.

Whether for the reasons suggested or as a result of some other process it is clear that there are some people, and particularly people with scientific pretensions, for whom skepticism is a personality characteristic. Similarly, there is a class of people, who tend not to be scientists, for whom credulity appears to have become a habitual mode of response. These people seem to attempt, like Lewis Carroll's White Queen, to believe at least one impossible thing each day before breakfast.

I have been speaking as if these two types of people were discrete categories, whereas they are probably at the two ends of a continuum. There is however, a tendency for the people who represent the two extremes to be highly vocal, not to say vociferous, in response to each other. The area of their dispute tends to be one in which a phenomenon is being recognized by one and denied by the other. The dispute itself tends to become highly acrimonious, with all sorts of personal comments and accusations being leveled at each side by the other.

That this is so is not surprising. Each side finds the behavior of the other incomprehensible in common-sense terms, and as a result finds it

difficult to believe that the other is being entirely honest. The skeptic is accused of bolstering up a system in which he has high status, of pandering to the repressive demands of governmental authority, of protecting his neat little, tight little, ship. The believer is accused of not really believing, but jumping on some sort of financial bandwagon, of striking back at the scientific system he has not been allowed to join, of being a deliberate agent for chaos. The atmosphere becomes full of personal criticisms ranging from pig-headedness through stupidity to insanity.

Part of this acrimony springs from mutual lack of comprehension, but part of it is justified, in that there are nuts on both sides. Some of the skeptics are clearly more than a little obsessive. Some of the believers are clearly classifiable as paranoid schizophrenics. Unscrupulous people do jump on bandwagons and capitalize on the credulity of others. Governments do try to exercise control on the beliefs of the public, and sometimes they use scientists in this endeavor. This last point brings me at last to UFOs. However justified may be the conclusions of the Condon report (University of Colorado UFO Project report, 1969—Editor), there is little doubt that it was conceived and executed with a strong bias towards reaching negative conclusions, and that the governmental institution of the investigation and selection of its personnel was intended to produce this bias.

If one does succeed in taking a viewpoint midway between those of the believers and the skeptics some

(Continued on next page)

(Psychological, Continued)

interesting points of similarity between the two emerge. Both show a tendency to confuse and amalgamate observational and theoretical issues. Thus the statement that an observation was made of a lenticular formation moving in a particular way is not the same as the statement that an extraterrestrial vehicle was observed.

Evidence and Theory

The reasonable grounds for believing or disbelieving the two statements are quite different. Again, the believer may be putting forward a theory which has a very low intrinsic probability, for instance that the earth has been under observation and guidance from outside for a period of millennia, but the skeptic trying to explain away an observation is often putting forward a rather extraordinary theory, for instance that three astronomers could spend several hours observing the planet Venus, and thinking that it was a flying object. The fact is that a position of skepticism is one which requires some justification as does a position of belief, and there seems often to be as capricious a basis for the skeptic's disbelief as for the believer's credulity. In exactly the same way as the credulous person sometimes seems to go out of his way to find extraordinary things to believe in, the skeptic often seems to be trying very hard to find things to disbelieve.

A good example of this occurs in relation to E.S.P. In this area skeptics often try to deny the phenomena by suggesting that they run counter to established laws of physics. In fact the only thing the evidence clearly suggests in this area is that sometimes people appear to demonstrate access to information that is difficult to account for their possessing. This does not seem a very extraordinary claim. Very much weaker evidence faintly suggests that, for instance, the inverse square law for the propagation of energy is not being obeyed. The skeptic seems prepared to accept this weak evidence in order to give himself grounds for being skeptical about

"Governments do try to exercise control on the beliefs of the public, and sometimes they use scientists in this endeavor."

the phenomenon it is supposed to be evidence for. This reasoning is as zany as anything the most cranky believer is likely to come up with.

An interesting comparison can in fact be made between psychical research claims and those made in relation to UFOs. And it is one which ought to give some pause to the skeptics. If one tabulates claims for spontaneous psychical phenomena in relation to the qualifications of those making them, excluding all those claims which fall down on grounds of internal consistency, one finds that the most detailed claims come from those people whose credibility as witnesses is lowest. If one does the same in relation to UFO claims one finds that the most detailed reports come from just those people whose status as observers of aerial phenomena should be highest; pilots, astronomers, meteorologists, etc. Similarly, if one carries out a content analysis of the claims that are made by observers of psychical phenomena one finds that the bigger the sample one takes the more different types of claim one can recognize. A similar exercise carried out into UFO claims leads to a much more restricted collation of categories. These are observations that the conscientious skeptic should include in the theory with which he backs up his skepticism.

A long history of interaction with people expressing belief and disbelief in fringe phenomena ranging from faith healing to the possibility of faster than light space travel has convinced me that the extremely credulous and the extremely skeptical are brothers under the skin, displaying

"... the extremely credulous and the extremely skeptical are brothers under the skin, displaying similar faults of reasoning..."

similar faults of reasoning, biased observation, and capricious assignment of a priori probabilities, and displaying similar evidence of strong internal motivation unrelated to the subject matter under discussion but predisposing them to the point of view they take up.

Science may have made enormous strides in recent years, but we are still a long way from being in a position to assign confident a priori probabilities to occasional phenomena. We may never be in a position to do this. This being so, any claim to have observed a new phenomena must be judged in a way independent of our immediate ability to make it cohere within the structures that have already been elucidated. What this amounts to is that the credibility of witnesses must be assessed by the same sorts of techniques as might be used in a court of law, with the same scrupulous separation of the witness's report from his interpretation of that report.

It is in fringe areas like psychical research and the investigation of UFO claims that our ability as a species to make sense of our universe is under test, and it is my belief that if we are unable to prevent our psychological weaknesses from muddying the water we will fail that test.

MAINICHI DAILY NEWS, Tokyo, Japan
Nov. 12, 1980 CR: Y. Matsumura

Many UFOs In China?

PEKING (Kyodo)—What is commonly known in other countries as an unidentified flying objects (UFO) have been observed by the Chinese people on more than 100 occasions, according to a Shanghai magazine.

The Nature Magazine said people, in 15 provinces, cities and autonomous regions have sighted the UFOs, most of them round-shaped pans or balls emitting silver glare in the daytime and orange light at night.

REPORT FROM AFRICA

By Cynthia Hind
(MUFON Field Investigator)

(Note: The CE-III case of Meagan Quezet, Mindalore, nr. Krugersdorp, South Africa, was reported in MUFON UFO Journal March/April 1979 and October 1979.)

It was my intention to have Meagan further regressed by Dr. Bernard Levinson of Johannesburg and also to try and persuade her son, Andre, to undergo hypnotic regression, and with this object in view I again visited Johannesburg in late 1979.

Accompanying me on the investigation was Walter Pople, Chairman of CONTACT, Durban, South Africa and Chief Research Scientist in Marine Biology with the Anti-Shark Measures Board in Durban. Pople is an M.Sc. in Zoology (distinctions), and a neuro-physiologist.

Meagan was generally cooperative at this session, although there were times of non-cooperation, and Pople soon gained her confidence. To such an extent indeed, that she sent Andre and her younger son, Gary, to stay with Pople during the school holidays. Unfortunately, neither of us could persuade Meagan nor Andre to undergo hypnosis.

With Dr. Levinson's permission, I played the tape recording of the earlier hypnotic regression to Meagan, something she had not heard before. I omitted Levinson's final summing up.

Meagan's reaction was completely unpredictable.

"It's a lot of nonsense," she said. "I never went inside the craft."

"How then do you account for what you said?" I asked. (In the tape she referred to the craft interior and her fears while inside.)

She laughed. "Well, it sounds like me but how do I know it isn't faked?"

As the British would say, "A

proper turn-up for the book!"

Dr. Levinson had told me at this stage, that he had become extremely interested in the case. He offered to regress Megan and/or Andre, during the weekend in his spare time, without charge. However, both subjects were adamant that they had no intention of allowing him to do so, although Meagan did promise me she would "think about it."

Andre was even more "anti." He had changed schools as he was now a senior and the Quezet family (partly due to pressure and bad publicity after the UFO incident) had moved to another home. Andre was now at a Catholic Senior School run by priests. He had been given a silver cross attached to a heavy chain and he fingered this constantly while speaking to Walter and myself.

"The brothers have told me that it is all the work of the devil," he said.

Although we discussed the matter further, both Pople and I felt there was no point in pursuing our request further at this stage.

During the playback of the tape, at one time Meagan says "I can't go away. I've got children. I don't think my husband would mind, but what about my child?"

At the point where she referred to her husband, Andre looked up anxiously at his father. Then he stood up quickly and went to sit beside him, as though comforting him. Both Pople and I noted the reaction.

I have since written to Meagan on two occasions but have received no reply. I feel she was disillusioned with the bad press, the ridicule, the hostile reporting and wants to put the whole incident behind her.

As far as I could ascertain, there were no after-effects, apart from some nightmares that Meagan reported. But she did confide to Walter Pople that the reason she did not complete

her nursing exams was because she was subject to epileptic attacks, which are now kept under control. An interesting sidelight to this is that I have spoken to a doctor and apparently the one drug given for epilepsy does produce a side-effect of hallucination! I passed Dr. Levinson's report on to one of our own MUFON experts, Grey Woodman, M.D. (Psychiatry). Following is the complete, unabridged reply received from Dr. Woodman.

I want to thank Mrs. Hind for the opportunity to comment on the hypnosis of Meagan Quezet.

Firstly I would like to say that the transcript has been edited and some of Dr. Levinson's questions have been eliminated: perhaps to listen to the unedited tape would have been rather better. But within the parameters of what is available I would like to make the following comments.

My first observation is that there seems quite a discrepancy between the consciously recalled description by Meagan and the hypnotic recall. Dr. Levinson appears to have done an excellent job in avoiding leading questions, but of course at the expense of a host of detail that the woman might have been expected to be able to produce. For in the conscious state she shows herself to be intelligent and observant (e.g., noticing that the man's eyes were translucent and in evaluating the fact that their white suits only looked pink from the reflection of pink light). Thus my feeling is that if her hypnotic description is an hysterical fantasy than I am indeed surprised that she has such a paucity of detail in her description of the events.

Rather it seems to me that Meagan had a great deal of anxiety about the whole event, from her initial refusal to enter into hypnosis, to her meeting with the hypnotist and during the hypnotic session itself. It does seem that Dr. Levinson used none of the well known techniques for distancing the patient from what appears to have been a very anxiety provoking situation—whether real or fantasied. If such techniques had been used and combined with open-ended but focused enquiry I feel more would have been learned of the details.

(Continued on next page)

(Africa, Continued)

Assuming for the moment that Meagan's anxiety was occasioned by a real event which frightened her a good deal, was not in fact reassured by the hypnotist, then this would account for her extreme separation anxiety (under threat of being kidnapped) and the few details of the events and environment recalled—very different from the hysteric's need to dramatize herself.

The New York Police Department has a full time officer who uses hypnosis in helping witnesses to recall details of observed crime. As he has said recently, "A witness who is looking down the barrel of a gun is a very poor observer of detail." Thus also, one would expect with a witness to a UFO event.

There is no doubt that a hypnotic subject unfamiliar with UFOs can come forth with remarkably elaborate descriptions of UFOs—that has been documented. On the other hand the quality of information obtained from alleged UFO contactees, obtained under hypnosis, is likely to be affected by the value/belief systems of the hypnotist.

I submitted the transcript to two friends, both practicing hypnotists in the medical field (one a physician); the first felt the questions were too leading and agreed with Dr. Levinson's opinion that the material was an hysterical fantasy; the second felt that the questions were not at all leading and the encounter "could well have happened." The first frankly rejects the idea of UFOs completely; the second describes himself as a "hard-nosed skeptic but willing to be convinced."

From the literature of CE-III's, it does seem a common experience that the contactee is left with a very firm post-hypnotic injunction from the "space folk" that they will not remember the encounter, that this is broken by the hypnotist only with the greatest difficulty. In one unpublished case of my acquaintance the full uncovering of the repressed material took some 20 sessions.

It would seem, therefore, that Meagan Quezet was considerably frightened by her experience, that her anxiety in the hypnotic session was real and accounted for her poor recall and description, and the injunction she was given that she would not remember was real and was not materially breached by the present hypnotic session and that much more repressed material is likely to be in her unconscious mind, which perhaps could be elucidated by further sessions. Let us hope that the opportunity will present itself to Meagan and Mrs. Hind.—Grey M. Woodman M.D.

CASE: Danie van Graan, Loxton, Cape, South Africa. CE-III. 31st July, 1975. (UFO REPORT, issue March 1978)

I have received a letter on the 10th February, 1981 to say that Danie van Graan died of cancer on the 4th January of this year. For those who are not familiar with this case, I will report briefly. Van Graan woke early on the 31st July, and went down to examine his sheep *kraal* (enclosure). It was a cold and misty morning. Loxton is partially surrounded by a 3 meter earthen wall and as he topped this, van Graan saw, about 185 meters away, what he took to be the aluminum roof of a caravan. Government prospectors had been working in the area (uranium was present) and van Graan assumed it was these people in their caravan.

As he approached, he realized it was not a caravan, but an oval-shaped object with 3 visible straight legs. (Later, it was obvious that there were 4 legs on the outside perimeter of the object and a center leg) As van Graan drew closer, he observed 4 occupants, and at 5 meters, he could see them clearly. They were small "pale and thin" with long faces, slanting eyes, and high cheek-bones coming down to a sharp chin. They wore cream-colored overalls with hoods attached. The hoods were hanging down and the hair was fair. Suddenly, they became aware of van Graan (as though he had triggered off an alarm) and they looked up in unison. At the same time, van Graan heard a "tck" sound and a brilliant beam of light hit him. Blinded, confused, and nauseated, he moved out of the light of the beam and the craft took off immediately at a 45° angle, nearly hitting a windmill on his land.

Van Graan showed me a small piece of glass (sand solidified on site) which he picked up immediately afterwards and despite the cold of the morning, was still warm in his hand. (I have been trying to obtain access to this for analysis, but van Graan would not part with it. I have now written to his widow asking for a loan of the "piece of glass.")

The craft left 4 outer marks and a center mark. Nothing grew in the center mark for a period of 2-3 years, despite good irrigation. A sample of this soil showed a high alkaline content. From the marks, the craft would appear to have been approximately 9 meters in diameter.

At the time of the incident, van Graan was 67 years old, fit and healthy, a thin, wiry farmer who had no record of serious illness.

Over the past 18 months, there have been no reports of any particular significance from Southern Africa. My colleague, Sgt. C. Powell, of the SA Police, stationed at Uitenhage, Cape, has sent me a few "light" reports from his area and I have added two of some significance from Zimbabwe.

DATE: 9th December, 1979.

WITNESSES: Mrs. J. Brittain (52) and R. Doak (44) E. Sutter (63)

REPORT: A nocturnal ball of light was noted moving across the sky at 23:00 hours. The brilliant white light turned to green. Moved from the east to the northwest. One of the witnesses described the light as a "streak." Sighting lasted 30 seconds to 1 minute.

CONCLUSION: After thorough examination, insufficient evidence allowed no conclusion. Possibly meteorite.


DATE: 14th January, 1980. Then on 15/16/17th Jan., 1980.

WITNESSES: G.F. Rautenbach (76) F. Rautenbach (25) Miss S.M. du Preez (22)

REPORT: Bright white light, slightly larger than a tennis ball, travelling through the sky from south to west. Rautenbach Snr. also noticed a strange mark on the surface of the road outside his house.

CONCLUSION: Could have been satellite (known to be in that position on the 14th of January). The mark on the road appeared to be an oil leak from Rautenbach Jnr's car.





DATE: 28th March, 1980.

WITNESSES: D. Cora (Chief cotton-ginner at Banket, Zimbabwe)
Orlando Martinn (Foreman of the Rhodesia Wattle Company in Inyanga, Zimbabwe)

REPORT: The light in the sky was first seen at approx. 20:00 hours. Cora drew his son's attention to it. It was hovering at the time just above some trees at the bottom of their garden. At one time, Cora noted sparks (orange in color) emanating from one side of the object and a strong smell of "soldering acid." The light was in position for about 2 minutes when it moved off rapidly. Martinn reported the light at the same time, where he noted it hovering in a stationary position before it moved up into the clouds. A beam of light from the object shone up into

the clouds; the light was similar to a searchlight. There was no smell. (There were 4 friends with Mr. Martinn).

CONCLUSION: The cloud was low on the night of the 28th March, and stars only intermittently visible. No aircraft activity in either area at that time. Object Unknown.

DATE: October 10th, 1980.

WITNESSES: Carol Baron (13) in Fort Rixon, near Bulawayo, Zimbabwe. Pat Hesketh at White Rhino Motel, near Bubyee River, Zimbabwe.

REPORT: Both women, unknown to each other and in widely apart areas, reported noticing a brilliant light in the sky at 3:30 a.m. Miss Baron was feeling ill and had gone onto the front porch of the house to

get some air when she saw the light. It hovered and then moved off rapidly in a northwest direction. Pat Hesketh (a well-known Zimbabwean artist) was awake when the light appeared in the frame of the window of her room in the hotel. It was very bright and reminded her of a "frosted light bulb." It moved rapidly across the frame of the window and soon passed out of sight.

CONCLUSION: No aircraft (known) in the area at the time. Satellite would not have "hovered." Unknown.

DATE: Between 15-20th December, 1980. (Our nearest investigator is checking into this report at the moment.)

(Continued on next page)

A NOTE ON THE TRAVIS WALTON EXPERIENCE

By Willard D. Nelson

"One of the most perplexing aspects of abductions is their curious absence of corroborative witnesses and physical trace evidence." These recent words in a book review by Dennis Stacy seem all too true, yet the Walton case defies easy explanation as psychological. There are the seven witnesses, including Travis, who have all passed, so far as I know, the law enforcement lie detector tests, verifying the presence of a UFO, if not the abduction. Some investigators still hang up on the abduction, maintaining that Travis could have been stumbling around in the woods, out of his mind for several days until he came to just outside Heber, and that the abduction story was a confabulation of the hypnosis. Others, not as knowledgeable of the case, consider the whole episode to be a made-up story, or that it was some misidentified natural phenomena, or that Travis—at least—was subject to an "as yet unidentified psychological process."

It is refreshing, then, to be able to offer what may qualify as physical trace evidence to supplement this famous case and add credibility to the UFO sighting itself.

During the 1980 Christmas holiday, my wife and I visited a family who lives atop the Mogollon Rim of Arizona in Forest Lakes Estates, a small community of a hundred-plus

(Africa, Continued)

WITNESSES: Several residents of Colesberg, Cape, South Africa.

REPORT: A "cloud-like" object, emitting a brilliant light with a hazy funnel reaching the ground. Officials claim it was a small thunder cloud obscured by mist and dust. Residents deny this. Sky was cloudless and no wind about.

people, approximately 15 miles from Heber and only 7 miles from the Walton abduction site. Our friends showed us the area in their four-wheel-drive vehicle, including the stretch of road above Heber where Walton was supposedly released by UFO entities after his 5-day disappearance in 1975. We talked UFO's as we drove from Heber toward Black Canyon Lake on a rutted dirt road. One of our friends spontaneously mentioned a local woman who had said that television reception had "gone out" on the day of the abduction. If true, I recognized this as a significant physical event which I had not heard before about the Walton case.

The woman referred to is well known for her real estate business in the area and not likely to be making statements without foundation. She prefers to remain anonymous in this article. "Yes," she said when I contacted her later. "I remember it because it made me mad. I was trying to watch the 6 o'clock news and the picture went out for about 20 minutes, right after 6:15. At first we thought the power had gone off, but we checked that. A lady in Heber later told me that she lost the picture too, and they have a different power company, so it wasn't a power outage." Later, when the local excitement about the UFO and the Walton disappearance broke into the news, the two ladies wondered if television interruption might have been connected to the UFO. They had no idea that electromagnetic effects sometimes accompany UFO events.

It remained for me to check the timing. According to Walton's own description of the affair in *The Walton Experience* (Berkley Medallion Paperback, 1978), the seven men quit their cutting work in the forest at 6 p.m. on November 5, 1975. Loading

the truck, they left the work area by 6:10 p.m., and in a few minutes they sighted the glowing, jewel-like shape hovering among the trees. Dumbfounded, they watched as Travis approached the UFO and was struck by a blue beam of energy or light. The others panicked, escaped in the truck, but soon regained their senses and returned, only to find Travis and the UFO missing. The correspondence in time with local interruption of TV reception is notable. Forest Lakes Estates and Heber are about equidistant, 7 miles, from the Turkey Creek abduction site. There is no cable TV, so all reception from distant Phoenix depends on the height and quality of one's antenna.

As described in *The Walton Experience*, the Navajo County Sheriff drove from Heber to a higher place to achieve radio contact with the County Seat in Holbrook during his investigation. Heber is in a hollow. However, both Heber and Forest Lakes Estates would be within line-of-sight reception (or disruption) from a radiation source on the Rim.

I have written to the Navajo and Gila County Sheriff's Departments requesting information about interruption in communications on that day in 1975. Considerable time has passed and they have not responded. The Police Department of the City of Payson, 35 miles from Forest Lakes, graciously responded, stating that their records do not go back that far. Law enforcement agencies are required by FCC regulation to retain records of interferences in communications, according to a friend who is a radiation specialist. He says that anything radiating electromagnetic waves in the TV spectrum of frequencies (from about 75MHz) with a

(Continued on next page)

From the Humanoid Archives-III

A HUMANOID REPORT FROM CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

By Ted Bloecher
(© 1981, Ted Bloecher)

Date of sighting: Thurs., April 8, 1954
Time: 4:30 p.m. (1640 CST)
Locale: 3121 N. Sheridan Rd.,
Chicago, Illinois
Witness: Mrs. Lelah H. Stoker
Duration: 30 minutes
Closest Proximity: Uncertain, but
probably no more than 500 feet.
Investigator: Counter Intelligence,
Fifth Army, Chicago, Illinois (invest-

Walton, Continued)

signal stronger than the received TV signal, could cause the observed interruption. It was described by the real estate lady "as though the station went off the air but the set remained on," implying a snowy screen and static hiss for sound.

It is tempting to speculate that UFOs radiate microwaves in the "hovering mode" since many stories suggest it, but the effect is usually noted only locally. The radiation specialist suggests that such effects could propagate for up to 150 miles if the source was high enough and strong enough. I know of no cases where this has been reported. Nor do all hovering UFOs interfere with TV. The "range of influence" in the present case appears to be at least 7 miles.

If radio amateurs in the area had "repeaters" on the air at the time (the two meter amateur band is about 145 MHz) they should also have noted interruption, as would police and citizens band radio operators. Since I believe that this information could lend credibility to the incredible Walton experience, I appeal for confirmation from any such sources. Perhaps radio amateurs of the MUFON NET know of amateurs in the Heber area.

Even if this TV interruption event cannot be authenticated, the spontaneous manner in which the story arose tends towards self-authentication.

igating agent not identified in report -tb).
HumCat Classification: Serial No. 0231, Type B (entity seen getting off/on UFO).

Background

During the Fall of 1974, Richard Hall and I had the opportunity to examine a number of CEIII reports from the U.S. Air Force "Project Blue Book" files. The Blue Book material was at that time being stored at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, Alabama; we submitted our requests for the case files through the U.S. Air Force Office of History, in Washington, D.C. The case files were then flown up from Maxwell AFB for our examination.

We looked at more than three dozen case files, and secured photocopies of most of them. Many of the cases are well known, but among the lesser-known reports is that of Mrs. Lelah Stoker, of Chicago. It is one of seven "Unidentified" humanoid cases included among the official UFO reports and is of special interest for that reason; in addition, it is an observation made in a densely populated, urban locale. To underscore this unusual feature, we include a photocopy of a report from a Florida newspaper, describing a similar report from the same Chicago lakefront some 11 years after Mrs. Stoker's observation. This latter case, so far as is known, was not investigated at first hand.

The official report of Mrs. Stoker's sighting is reprinted here in its entirety, and consists of four documents: I: Project 10073 Record (a brief summary sheet of the case); II: Letter of 26 May 1954, from Col. Roberts P. Johnson, Jr., to Commander, ATIC; III: Letter of 26 April 1954, from Major Clare T. Jensen to Navy Intelligence, OSI (AF Intelligence), and

the FBI; IV: Summary of Information, 16 April 1954 (consisting of a 3-page report prepared by an unidentified Army Intelligence investigator).
(Continued on next page)

Project Starlight Director

Addresses Scientists

Ray Stanford, director of Project Starlight International (an instrumental approach to the physics of UFOs), and a MUFON state section director in Texas, was an invited speaker in the general physical sciences section at the annual meeting of the Louisiana Academy of Sciences, Friday, February 6, 1981.

Invited by Dr. Csaba P. Keszthelyi, general physical sciences program chairman, Stanford gave a paper illustrated with 86 transparencies, entitled: *A Preliminary Study of Luminous, Magnetic, and Shock-Wave Phenomena Recorded in Association with Anomalous Aerial Objects (AAO)*.

An abstract of Stanford's paper is reproduced herein because it may interest MUFON readers:

"A study of optical and electronic recordings of anomalous aerial objects (AAO) has indicated possible cause-to-effect relationships between luminous, magnetic, and shock-wave phenomena associated with the objects. Optical images and correlation of magnetic effects with radio frequency disturbances suggest magnetohydrodynamic action (MHA) adjacent to AAO."

Stanford reports that the presentation was well received. Questions from the floor afterwards indicated, rather than blind skepticism, an intelligent interest in further understanding the matters discussed.

(Humanoid, Continued)

I. Summary Cover Sheet

1. Date-Time Group: 8 April 1954/2230Z (Greenwich Mean Time)
2. Location: Chicago, Illinois
3. Source: Civilian
4. Number of Objects: One
5. Length of Observation: 30 minutes
6. Type of Observation: Ground visual
7. Course: Varied
8. Photos: No
9. Physical Evidence: (unchecked - tb)
10. Conclusion: UNIDENTIFIED
11. Brief Summary and Analysis: See Case File. Lady observed a saucer. Saucer landed and little green man got out, walked around and climbed back into his saucer and took off. UNIDENTIFIED.

II. Letter from Colonel Johnson to ATIC Commander

Letterhead: Department of the Air Force, Headquarters, Washington, D.C., The Inspector General, USAF, 5th District, Office of Special Investigations Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

In reply refer to: 5D 24-21-138

26 May 1954

Subject: UNKNOWN SUBJECT

(stamped)

Unidentified, Flying Object

UNCLASSIFIED

Belmont Yacht Club Area

Chicago, Illinois

SPECIAL INQUIRY

To: Commander, ATIC

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

Attn: ATIAA-2C

1. Attached hereto for your information is one (1) photostatic copy of letter, Headquarters Fifth Army, dated 26 April 1954, which forwards a Summary of Information relative SUBJECT.

2. The above material was furnished to this District Office by the District Commander, 24th OSI District (IG), Chicago, Illinois.

3. Attention is invited to the fact that the information contained in the attached enclosure has been derived from a source other than USAF; therefore, in accordance with paragraph 8b, AFR 205-1, dissemination of the information contained therein must not be made outside of USAF Channels, and such information contained therein will be safeguarded in accordance with provisions of AFR 205-1.

1 Inc.

/s/ Roberts P. Johnson, Jr.

Photocopy, 5th Army Ltr

Colonel, USAF

Dated 26 Apr 54 w/Incl

District Commander

cc: Dir OSI w/o Incl

(stamped on bottom)

DOWNGRADED AT 3 YEAR INTERVALS; DECLASSIFIED AFTER 12 YEARS.

DDD DIR 5200.10.

(In ink) 5D-F-8118 54MC-176793

III. Letter from Major Jensen to Navy Intelligence, OSI & FBI

Letterhead: HEADQUARTERS FIFTH ARMY

1660 East Hyde Park Boulevard

Chicago 15, Illinois

ALFGB-CI

26 Apr 1954

SUBJECT: Unidentified Object

TO: District Intelligence Officer, 9th Naval District, Room 903, U.S. Custom House, 610 South Canal Street Chicago 7, Illinois

District Commander, 24th District OSI, USAF, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 4, Illinois

Special Agent in Charge, FBI; 1900 Bankers Bldg., Chicago 3, Illinois

The inclosed Summary of Information, subject as above, is forwarded for your information.

For the Assistant Chief of Staff, G2

1 Incl
S/I, 16 APR 54
Subject as above

Clare T. Jensen, Maj GS
GORDON D. BUCKLEY
Lt. Colonel, GS
Chief, Counter Intelligence Div

(stamped) UNCLASSIFIED

IV. Summary of Information

Preparing Office: Fifth Army Regional Office
1660 East Hyde Park Blvd.
Chicago 15, Illinois

16 April 1954

Subject: UNIDENTIFIED OBJECT

Code for Individual Paragraph Evaluation:

Of Source
Usually reliable... B
Reliability not
known... F

Of Information
Probably True... 2
Possibly True... 3
Truth Cannot be
Judged... 6

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION

On 12 April 1954, pursuant to information received by this office, this Agent contacted Mr. Arlie R. Neal, Engineman 1, Service Number 286-410, Chicago Coast Guard Station, Navy Pier, Chicago, Illinois, concerning an alleged parachute-like object skimming over the waterfront, seen and reported by a Mrs. Lelah H. Stoker, 3121 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, on 8 April 1954.

At 1645 hours Neal stated Mrs. Stoker reported by telephone the aforementioned mass with a suspended human-like form hovering over the water in the vicinity of the Belmont Yacht Club (3200 north) at an estimated altitude of 200 to 300 feet and at an approximate distance of 2000 to 3000 feet off-shore. Within five minutes, Neal, accompanied by other coast guardsmen, proceeded by seacraft to the area, arriving there about 20 minutes later. On the northward trip they scouted the area about a half-mile off shore until they reached the 4500 block north and then returned, following a course about 1500 feet off shore. Search was negative. On the following day, Neal stated that Mrs. Stoker again telephoned to inquire whether anything was learned. (B-2)

This agent subsequently interviewed Mrs. Lelah H. Stoker, apartment 706, 3121 North Sheridan Road Chicago, Illinois, concerning her reported observation on 8 April 1954. In substance source imparted that she had returned home from the library about 1630 hours on the aforementioned date and in a sober frame of mind saw from her apartment window a very brilliant white parachute-like object with a suspended human-like form skimming over the water in all directions at an altitude level with her window and at a distance of about 3000 feet, traversing within the purview of a 45-degree angle.

Source commented that because of her doubt she asked two apartment tenants, Mr. and Mrs. William Baruszak, apartment 703, who were awaiting the apartment elevator, to confirm her observations, which they reportedly did for about five minutes. Source then notified the US Coast Guard at 1645 hours. However, as the searching seacraft neared the area the object descended and became condensed in size until it landed on the shoreland (3050-3100 north) among the sporadic foliage, thus becoming less conspicuous and detectable.

Source's first belief was that the

unidentified matter would become entangled with the trees; however, its form was now small and resembled a piece of newspaper 2 to 3 feet in length. The human-like form, now alighted on the ground and described as being short but natural stature and dressed in a green one-piece suit with a simple tight-fitting head and chin headdress, walked up and down the frontage behind the low stone wall and blended with the grasses. Source commented that her observations are very similar to those illustrated on pages 112, 177, and 209 of the book entitled "Flying Saucers Have Landed," by Demund (sic) Leslie and George Adamski, which subsequently was given to her by her son, a prominent Chicago engineer and reportedly a former Army-Navy Intelligence Liaison officer. Previous to this occurrence, source stated she disbelieved in "saucers" and therefore had never read nor become interested in them.

According to the source, the event lasted approximately 30 minutes, and when after the seacraft passed, the foreign structure again became enlarged, rose to its former level, and hovered over the water until the suspended airman reentered

(Continued on next page)

ed the structure. In a matter of seconds the aircraft departed with a tremendous burst of speed eastward and without noise. During a tilt of the mass, source observed two narrow parallel bar-like formations on the underside of the spherical umbrella which were protected by the peripheral caves of the form (sic). Due to the structural nature and setting of the buildings extending eastward, source commented that any slight noise is grossly amplified and therefore was surprised that the strange object was so soundless. Unless the matter was given some importance, source was of the opinion that the above witnesses would not reveal their knowledge and observations of the above occurrence. (F-3)

On 13 April 1954, two attempts were made by this agent to interview Mr. and Mrs. William Boruszak, apartment 703, 3121 North Shredan Road, Chicago, Illinois, concerning their witnessing of the above event. During the first attempt, made by telephone, Mrs. Boruszak manifested a hostile attitude and insistently (sic) denied she knew anything of the Thursday evening occurrence without ever being told by this Agent exactly what was being referred to. Although Mr. Boruszak was not available for immediate comment during the second interview, at her home, Mrs. Boruszak admitted then that she and her husband were awaiting the apartment elevator when Mrs. Stoker asked them to look out her window. However, because of their haste, source denied entering Stoker's apartment and paid little attention to the matter. She further stated that she remembers nothing of what she might have seen and did not recall if her husband entered the apartment. Source commented that Mrs. Stoker must or might have been using binoculars; however, (she) had no reason for her comment. Source remarked she knew nothing of Mrs. Stoker other than that she resides in apartment 706. She inquired whether Mrs.

Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Saturday, March 6, 1965

Brooksville Story Prompts Report

Tourist Sights Twin To Robot

By RONALD WEST

Sentinel Staff

NEW SMYRNA BEACH — A Chicago tourist yesterday reported to The Sentinel he had seen a robot-type creature very similar to the one supposedly sighted by a Brooksville man earlier this week.

Harvey Keck, a retired milkman, stopped by The Sentinel's bureau here yesterday after reading the report in Friday's edition about the landing at Brooksville. He was en route to Miami.

KECK SAID he had seen a creature which fitted the description of the Brooksville robot about a month ago.

"I saw something just about like this man and the same type of saucer while walking along the shores of Lake Michigan on an isolated stretch about sunrise one morning," Keck said.

"I didn't report it, because I figured everybody would think I was crazy or drunk," the Chicago man explained.

"I TOLD MY WIFE about it, but she never has believed it. She keeps telling me I dreamed it up. Then when I read about this fellow in your paper, I thought I better tell somebody about it."

According to Keck, the only difference between the creature he saw and the one in Brooksville was the camera angle. Keck said the robot he saw didn't have any camera.

He also said his creature didn't write anything on a slip of paper and leave it behind him, as the one in Brooksville was reported to have done.

Other than that, Keck said the creatures were about identical.

"I'd say the one I saw was about the same size, 5-feet tall and stocky, just like the one in Brooksville," Keck said.

"HE ALSO had dark tan flesh, the same glass dome helmet and his eyes were farther apart than normal. He even had the same pointed chin as this one in Florida.

"And that description of the saucer was right on the button. About six feet high and the same four-legged landing gear."

The supposed sighting near Brooksville had been reported by John F. Reeves, a former longshoreman from Brooklyn.


HIS REPORT, and two pieces of paper which the robot was said to have left behind him, have been turned over to officials at MacDill Air Force Base at Tampa.

MacDill officials have said a routine investigation would be made.

When Keck was asked if he planned to report his sighting to the military, he told The Sentinel, "No, I don't want to get involved in this thing.

"I JUST happened to be passing through here on my way south and I read it in the paper and thought you newspaper folks might want to know about it.

"I wouldn't have said anything but the resemblance between this robot and the one I saw was so remarkable, I thought I should report it to someone."



Stoker was trying to make an issue of the affair or to gain publicity. (F-6)

On 15 April 1954, Mr. William R. Boruszak, vice-president, Western United Dairy, 1451 West Grenshaw, Chicago, who resides in apartment 703, 3121 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, was interviewed concerning the unidentified object reported by Mrs. Lelah H. Stoker on 8 April 1954. In substance source stated that at approximately 1630 hours he and his wife were awaiting the apartment elevator when Mrs. Stoker entered the hallway and asked them to look out her window at something which appeared peculiar to her. Source stated he did not enter the apartment but made his observation from the doorway. Though source was wearing glasses for his nearsightedness and did not know

exactly where the shore line was he estimated the distance of the floating and bouncing object to be about 100 yards off shore. At his time he regarded it as an inflated experimental balloon and described it as being a large oval-like white pancake (cleft) mass; too large to be a kit (sic - kite?) and no markings to signify it was a weather balloon. Because of his previously mentioned presumption he paid little heed to it and does not recall whether it had any suspensions. Source asserted had he not been in a hurry and given more thought to the event he would have returned to his apartment to acquire his binoculars. Little is known of Mrs. Stoker other than she is believed to be a travel agent, appears to be quite intelligent and considered by Mrs. Boruszak to be slightly erratic

and "squirrelish" (sic). Squirrelish is used by Mrs. Boruszak to denote one who is talkative. (F-3)

AGENT'S NOTE: Mrs. Stoker impressed this agent as being a woman of apparent leisure, culture, and greater than average financial means, devoted to intellectual research and knowledge. As a youngster she asserted she had a governess for fourteen years, and graduated from high school at the age of twelve. Continuing on she subsequently attended the National Park Seminary, Washington, D.C., for two years preparatory medical missionary work in China. She claims fluency in several languages: Chinese, Hindustanic, Greek, Italian, Latin, German, French, Russian and some basic

(Continued on next page)

FURTHER NOTES ON CANAL ZONE RADAR CASE

By J. Richard Greenwell

This concerns Richard Hall's article "A Radar Case in Point" (No. 154, Dec. 1980, p. 9-10), which refers to the UFO radar events observed by military personnel in the Panama Canal Zone, March 9-11, 1958 (not March 9-13 as mistakenly stated by Air Force captain Vernon D. Adams). I am puzzled by the statement that the case report was obtained recently by civilian UFO investigators through Freedom of Information Act litigation.* This case report, based on information provided by the U.S. Army to the U.S. Air Force, was declassified on May 13, 1968, and a copy was obtained by University of Arizona atmospheric physicist James E. McDonald on May 26, 1970, from Project Blue Book files then at the Air Force Archives at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Unless it was taken out for some reason, the case report should be included in the Blue Book files

*The report was released separately by the Army-Editor.

now in Washington, D.C., and available on microfilm.

I would like to take this opportunity to add some of my own comments to Mr. Hall's review. The Air Force case report states that, during the first event (1959-0210 hours, March 9-10), involving two objects first detected by search radar 3,000 feet apart, "an attempt was made by members of Radar Site, Flamenco Island, to observe the objects by searchlights. When the light touched the objects, they travelled from an altitude of two thousand feet to ten thousand feet in five to ten seconds" (about 500 to 1,000 miles per hour).

The rapid ascent and physical properties of the targets was confirmed when "...the Track Radar, which was locked on targets broke the Track Lock and was unable to keep up with the ascent of the objects. As Track Radar can only be locked on a solid object...it was assumed that the objects were solid."

Furthermore, "... personnel stationed at (radar) sites reported seeing red and green lights," making this event a radar-visual sighting, despite the fact that a commercial aircraft was unable to obtain an airborne visual confirmation.

During the second event (1012-1412 hours, March 10), a single object was tracked moving away from an approaching T-33 jet aircraft (which had been sent up to investigate) at 1,000 miles per hour. Its movement was described "at times to be evasive action."

Mr. Hall does not refer to the third event (0400-0536 hours, March 11), but this again involved radar and visual sighting, came from a Pan American Airways pilot at 0400 hours; he described the object as larger than his DC-6. It is important to note that he could not have been influenced by the sightings of the previous two days because these, being military events, were classi-

(Continued on next page)

(Humanoid, Continued)

knowledge of others. She has crossed the ocean fourteen times and made extensive travels through the Northern Hemisphere. During World War I, according to the source, she worked for the Morale Clinic, Jefferson Barracks, Missouri, and later organized and headed the Department of Psychiatry, Jefferson Barracks, during World War II with noted psychiatrists. Allegedly she has received wide acclaim for her writings and lectures on such topics as Child Psychology, Russia and Communism, her private religious collection of "The Black Madonna," and her authoritative-ness on Cricket and Cricket Lore. She has appeared in articles of American newspapers, namely two, the Chicago Tribune and the Detroit Times, has appeared on television, and spoke for the conservative Party

in England under Lord Chamberlain. Numerous lectures have also been made on the above subjects in the United States and Canada. Classified CONFIDENTIAL
UPAR 380-5 Para 13
(stamped) UNCLASSIFIED

Only information derived from Army sources is included in the above summary.
(Reporting agent is unnamed - tb)

Conclusion

This is an unusual UFO incident made by a fascinating and impressive witness: one wishes to know more about each. It might be possible to find useful biographical information about Mrs. Stoker in the Chicago library, since she appears to have had such an active and varied

career in public life. About the sighting itself, a number of questions may be raised, but the most significant one concerns the reported reduction in size of the UFO once it had landed among the bushes on the lakefront beach. Is this a description we can take at face value, and if it is, what are the implications of such a detail.

Regarding the investigation, one may ask why it was the Army Intelligence and not the Air Force who conducted the inquiry. The fact that Air Force and Navy Intelligence, as well as the FBI, were given copies of the Army report, should not be ignored. Based upon the information compiled by the unnamed G2 agent who interviewed Mrs. Stoker, it would be hard to disagree with the Air Force when they concluded that this UFO incident is "Unidentified."

(Radar, Continued)

fied and unpublicized. Several Hawk radar tracks of the object occurred until 0536 hours. During the period of these tracks, while the Pan American DC-6 approached, the Hawk radar site personnel were asked if it (the DC-6) was the same track as picked up previously. The answer was negative.

Although there was ground-radar, ground-visual, and air-visual components in these events, Colonel Gordon C. Hoffman, in his October 30, 1958, analysis of this case report, prior to its deposit in the filing cabinets for posterity, concluded that balloons and "false targets" were responsible for the events.

The first event could be attributed to balloons because the targets "... were more or less stationary except for the altitude changes," and that "... the radar could have broken lock on a balloon at relatively low altitude and then locked on another at higher altitude which would have given the impression that a rapid ascent of the target had occurred." This ignores the case report's own statement that the balloon possibility had already been investigated at the time and it was determined that no balloons had been airborne. Furthermore, there was no wind at the time, and the objects were not "more or less stationary" — their flight was described as a "steady, slightly circular path over the vicinity of Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone." It also contradicts the case report statement to the effect that the track lock was broken *after* the upward movement of the objects began, and that track radar can only be locked on a *solid* object.

And if all this were not enough, Colonel Hoffman's "analysis" ignores the fact that *two* objects were on track radar when the ascent occurred. He talks of losing track of a low altitude balloon and locking on a higher altitude balloon. However, in order to accept his proposition, one has to envision the track radar mysteriously breaking track locks on two balloons at 2,000 feet — which were not there in the first place and could not be tracked by track radar

even if they were — and then coincidentally locking-in on two other balloons at 10,000 feet — which also were not there and could not be tracked on track radar even if they were.

Colonel Hoffman decided that the second event could be attributed to "false targets," despite the fact that the object was tracked taking 1,000 mile per hour evasive action when approached by a military jet aircraft, and despite the fact that "interrogation of scope operators has indicated that returns were strong and easily distinguished from cloud formations." One may wonder if the term "false targets" is not simply a more genteel way of saying "unidentified flying object."

But even more surprising was Colonel Hoffman's *complete omission* of the third event, which, besides radar tracks, included a very definite airborne visual observation of the object by a professional civilian pilot who could not have known about the previous military sightings and radar tracks.

Also puzzling is the final assignment of the case report. It was originally carried as "Unidentified" in the typed "Conclusions" box of the case report's Record Card, but subsequent handwritten changes were made: "Unidentified" was crossed out and replaced by "False Targets," and a check mark was placed next to the "Possibly Balloon" space. The final typed statement in the "Comments" box, which read: "However, there is insufficient data to confirm this analysis (balloons and false targets) — the sightings were considered UNIDEN." was also crossed out by hand.

I have often wondered why this particular report has not been reviewed in the UFO literature, and I welcome this opportunity to comment on it. It is a limited number of cases like this one which intellectually forbid me to close the door on the UFO question. However much one may wish to find conventional explanations for nettlesome UFO events, inventing solutions which are inconsistent with — or even contradict — the reported data (in

Letters

ETH Hypothesis

Editor,

In regard to Mr. Campbell's analysis of the ETH hypothesis (No. 156, Feb. 1981), I follow him up to the point that it is based on the assumption that alien intelligence exists, but depart from his line of reasoning on the grounds that he has accepted assumptions and theories that rule out this existence whereby it is just as easy to rule in by acceptance of other assumptions and theories. He states that "there is no evidence that in the whole Universe there exists any intelligence other than the human race (does he mean on earth?)" and yet does not present any evidence to the contrary.

As for the assumption that aliens would now have found us, it may also be true to assume that they really hadn't lost us. In other words, our existence may have always been known at one time or another — no big deal. But, I really am tired of hearing that they cannot get here from there and invoke all of Stanton Friedman's fine arguments as rebuttal, plus ask the man, "according to whose theory?" Certainly not according to physicist Alan Holt who believes that vast distances can be crossed in the twinkling of an eye by magnetic resonance. If a human of the twentieth century can think of it, why not an archetypal alien?

As to attacking the way UFOs behave based on the ETH assumption, I see nothing inconsistent in their behavior with such a hypothesis. Sightings, landings, sample collecting,

(Continued on next page)

scientific circles known as "fudging the data"), is irresponsible, regardless of how learned or esteemed such individual may be, or how important the organizations they represent are.

I hope that others more knowledgeable in radar technology, including perhaps Mr. Philip Klass, can throw some light on this interesting case.

(Letters, Continued)

human abductions, and examinations seem all perfectly reasonable, but why the caution in contact? Since Mr. Campbell is accepting so many other assumptions of his choosing, let us make one of our own and test its validity. If they really have made contact and the government bureaus are aware of this, there may be as many reasons to treat this event as top secret, all of which has been delineated in many UFO books and publications. We may seem a little savage to them (examine our behavior) and they may feel very cautious about contact with us and probably would divulge little we could fully understand. After all, how much interest do we have in contacting aboriginal tribes, especially those intent on waging war and would love to steal our guns as the American Indians did to repel our territorial invasion. Would we repel their territorial invasion given a chance to steal their guns?

Our scientists are glutted with theories and theory junkies are craving for answers. I would like to see us paying a little more detail to the process of discovery and sifting and analyzing facts rather than all these theories. For instance, I have a Hollow Earth Theory you would just love. You see, it's based on Newton's mistake concerning the gravitational formula, but...well who is going to listen? Maybe if I could bend the ear of that alien who just landed over there...

William Hamilton
Glendale, Ariz.

Editor,

Mr. Campbell (No. 156) attempts to lead us down the primrose path of doubt and dilemma with his evaluation of assumption and hypotheses. He states "By 'assumption' I mean the taking for granted of statements which are unsupported by any evidence." He then guides us through a standard UFO sighting chart, eliminating sources one by one, until he is left with only a single possibility: An alien object. He then goes on to state that any attempt to relate the alien object to an alien intelligence should be assigned a "very low cred-

ibility rating." Mr. Campbell fails to assign a source to the alien object and leaves the entire matter in limbo.

Three paragraphs are devoted to the opinions of some quoted and unquoted scientists on the extreme improbability of the existence of intelligent life forms elsewhere in ours or other galaxies. All without a shred of supportive evidence of the type he insists on for UFO evaluation. There follows a lengthy explanation of how a series of accidents caused the evolution of such a unique species as homo sapiens, including the giant meteorite extinction of the dinosaurs. Here again, we observe the acceptance of a recently advanced theory with naught but the most ethereal assumptions to back it up. He then continues with the statement, "It would be rash to claim that we are unique, but equally rash to claim that we are not unique." Again he repeats the process of attempting to make a point and then concluding with an ambiguous statement which further reduces his credibility.

Under the heading "Do Aliens Exist" Mr. Campbell concludes that since we have not been the personal recipient of alien vistingation, then aliens do not exist. Let us remind him that 200 years ago many south sea island natives watched large ships passing their tiny homelands at a distance, ultimately concluding that since they were the sole inhabitants, these objects were giant fish. This type of assumption is typical of Mr. Campbell's reasoning.

An attack is then levelled at the fuel requirements of an interstellar journey, quoting Marx' figures on anti-matter. Any consideration of the use of exotic fuels or more highly efficient propulsion systems by an advanced society are relegated to the category of drastic assumptions. We are then treated to a critique concerning the massive number of craft required for an exploratory mission, the number of launches necessary, the immensity of the time required and the relative impossibility of exploring one million planets.

Perhaps Mr. Campbell is not familiar with the technique of using

a host vehicle equipped with satellites to explore a single quadrant at a time, in which case there would likely be only 100-200 planets capable of life support, and probably far less with intelligent life. In a later statement he says "Any beings capable of crossing the vastness of space, or space-time, will have a highly developed intellect and culture." If this assumption is made, then it is also logical to assume that their increased fund of knowledge would provide them with a life span far in excess of ours, and his point of the time span is moot.

This article seems to be implying, in a somewhat confused manner, that if you are unable to prove or disprove the origin of these objects and/or aliens, then they do not exist. I refuse to accept this approach, nor do I subscribe to the practice of attempting to postulate their origin. Much undue criticism could be avoided by spurning attempts to turn speculation into theory regarding their source. Simple acceptance of their existence in our sphere and appropriate efforts to ascertain their origin would serve our purpose admirably.

Cliff Henderson
Sunnyvale, Calif.

Witness Effects

Editor,

MUFON, in its endeavors to improve ufology and accelerate solution of the UFO enigma, might take a look at what can be called the "subjective" approach. It is not impossible that valuable discoveries will result from follow-up investigation, study, research and analysis of UFO effects upon witnesses, abduction victims in particular, as regards physical, physiological, biological, emotional, sociological, mental, and theological aspects and changes. Other than the remarkable contribution of the Betty Hill/Majorie Fish 3-D Zeta Reticuli map, I am aware of no achievements in this respect except to prove that the event occurred, the subjects were kidnapped and examined, and the appearance of the ufonauts and their craft.

(Letters, Continued)

Leonard Stringfield, Leo Sprinkle, and party, performed a superior service in the case of the three Liberty, Kentucky, women, proving that they were abducted, examined, and injured, but who has delved into the potential of the subjects' contributions to UFO truth? The same must be said of the Hills, Hickson and Parker, and many more cases in which we have let slip away insight of the subjective elements. It is likely that with the addition of the subjective approach we will learn the origins of these craft and beings, their motivations and objectives, and different dimensions if such there be.

Bill Leet
Arkansas State Director

Symposium "Insult"

Editor,

As a new member reading your article on the Smithsonian UFO symposium in the October issue (No.152), I felt a need to respond to the insult (and it was) by Mr. Schaeffer's remarks. In the 2 or 3 meetings I have attended not once has witchcraft, astrology, ghosts, etc., ever been mentioned. I myself as well as many other members do not "study" fairies, werewolves, Big Foot, Loch Ness monsters or other exotic "pseudosciences" as he suggests. (Maybe we're missing out.)

Instead we "study" such "strange" things as micro-processors, and computer uses for information gathering, storage and comparison. We also have seen interesting films, discussed investigative techniques and preparations for the upcoming symposium at M.I.T. in the summer. Maybe Mr. Schaeffer should attend a meeting as an unbiased observer (if that's possible).

As to his remark of "which to throw out, UFO's or physics", I say throw out neither. Keep physics and try to determine why a phenomenon defies our "known" laws of physics. What should be thrown out are stupid remarks made by people of intelligence (supposedly), that insult others who are really trying to solve a

long existing question intelligently through research and scientific investigation.

Arthur E. Lawless
Boston, Mass.

Project Redlight

Editor,

Congratulations on the recent improvements in your publication. Having been a subscriber for about 5 years, I have one major criticism. It seems to me that we are very often promised follow up articles to various reports, but they are very seldom published. I will, therefore, supply one of my own.

I found the "Project Redlight" story in the NET NEWS column of the September 1980 issue very interesting, first because I probably knew "Matt Archer," although I can't place who it might be. In addition, I had a few similar experiences at about the same time as his. I gained no knowledge of the flight testing of a UFO, however.

I contacted a friend who had been stationed with the Air Force there to see if he could comment on the validity of the story. His reply was that he has no knowledge about the contents of the story, but he did not arrive there until sometime later. To further quote from his reply, "...in asking others who were (there), they also say NO."

Harold A. Magee
Livermore, Calif.

Editor's reply: We are aware of missing "follow-ups" that were promised, and never received. In the future we will try to do better...or stop promising.

Retrievals

Editor,

J. Richard Greenwell's critique (No. 153, Nov. 1980) of Leonard Stringfield's "The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome" clearly reveals the reviewer's general ignorance of the copious evidence for government secrecy regarding the subject of UFOs and would not ordinarily merit much comment. However, his expressed

opinion that the U.S. government intelligence agencies are incapable of conducting a sustained technical research and development program in secret seems disturbingly common these days and deserves some rebuttal.

Regarding the Manhattan Project: While it may be true that some scientists suspected that "something big was up," this is quite a different matter from knowing exactly what was going on and obtaining government confirmation. As long as the government kept a tight lip about that project it remained effectively unknown. We suspect something big is up with UFOs too, but until we get complete confirmation, it remains in epistemological limbo.

The SR-71 spy plane was designed, constructed, and flown over Soviet territory for many years in complete secrecy despite the fact that large numbers of people were involved in that project. The stealth bomber was "revealed" because it was no secret in the first place since it depends on demonstrated technology from the SR-71 combined with our well-known expertise in electronic countermeasures. Soviet intelligence analysts are quite capable of figuring out that two plus two equals four.

Finally, the cryptography secrets of World War II are only now coming to light. A good poker face combined with the Alice in Wonderland tactics of intelligence agencies can keep both the enemy and the public confused for decades if necessary. Anyone who thinks otherwise should study military history.

Terry Hansen
Minneapolis, Minn.

Carl Sagan & UFology

Editor,

I was delighted to see the Open Letter to Dr. Carl Sagan which appeared in the March No. 157 issue and I congratulate Ann Druffel for her challenge to the blatantly inaccurate Cosmos episode entitled "Encyclo-

(Continued on page 19)

MESSAGE FROM THE AIR FORCE?

By Paul C. Cerny
(MUFON Western Regional Director)

fornia with the number 1-408-737-9553. This is a cooperative arrangement between CUFOS and MUFON to provide additional west coast services. Like the MUFON headquarters telephone number in Seguin, Texas 1-512-379-9216, and the National UFO Reporting Center in Seattle, WA., none of these are toll free numbers so remember the "1" prefix when dialing.

Through the courtesy of MUFON member Paul Dong in Oakland, Calif., your director received a copy of the new magazine titled "The Journal of UFO Research" published in the People's Republic of China. Several prominent American UFOlogists cooperated with the magazine's U.S.A. Editor, Paul Dong, by providing personal biographies, photographs, information about their respective UFO organizations, and position statements for publication in the first edition dated March 1981. It was an honor to help initiate the first UFO magazine published on the China mainland and to welcome our new friends from the People's Republic of China. Mr. Dong plans to visit China starting late in June in conjunction with his work as their U.S.A. Editor.

May we extend a grateful thank you to Walter Werner for publishing an unsolicited full page ad on the 1980 MUFON UFO Symposium proceedings in a recent issue of a West German UFO magazine. Mr. Werner is Executive Director of CENAP. His mailing address is Eisenacher Weg 16, 6800 Mannheim 42, West Germany.

For the past 2 years we have experimented with a membership renewal program by inserting a Journal renewal application in the copy of the Journal that coincided with the membership expiration month. Considering the length of time that it takes for a second class magazine to arrive at the far corners of the Earth, we followed with two additional issues, each containing a Journal renewal form so that our members could maintain continuity in their monthly magazine. Continuity was thus main-

Being a science fiction fan, along with my intensive interest in the overall UFO phenomena, I took particular note this summer of what I observed as a brief insert on the popular "Galactica 1980" program. About 5 minutes before the program ended each Sunday evening during the summer months, the following brief statement

tained for our members who renewed promptly. For those subscribers who did not renew, they in essence received two free copies. With the rapid escalation of printing costs and postage, it is not economically sound to give two free copies as a means of enticing a member/subscriber to renew his or her membership. We can no longer afford this luxury. Under the new plan each member will still receive three renewal notices, however, two will be sent prior to the expiration date shown in the address, and the third containing a red check will be enclosed with the issue for the month of expiration.

The membership expiration date is part of the stenciled address on the front of the Journal. The notation "5/81" would indicate that your membership expires with the May 1981 issue. If a member renews prior to the expiration date upon receipt of the first reminder, this will in no way effect his/her renewal date, since it will be simply extended one year from the previous expiration date. If a member has not renewed after three reminders, his/her address stencil will be pulled from the file and the person will no longer be a current member. It is imperative that our foreign members take advantage of the two early reminders by sending in their dues so there will be no interruption of their monthly Journals. We feel that this new membership renewal arrangement is superior to the method employed during the past two years. Please help MUFON and yourself by responding to the early reminders.

was presented on the TV viewing screen for only about 10 seconds:

"The United States Air Force stopped investigating UFO's in 1969; after two years, they found no evidence of extraterrestrial visits and no threat to national security."

This message was inserted into the last portion of the program, usually before a commercial. The intent was obviously to inform the general public of the past and present government position with regard to the phenomena.

Within the last few years there has been speculation that the government is, on a limited basis, planning, or has already ventured forth with small segments of information through the media to pacify the constant demand of the public over this controversy. I for one am curious as to the public reaction to this televised statement on this particular program. Reaction of others directly involved in UFO investigation should be more interesting. I am also curious how many other stations across the country used this insert in the "Galactica 1980" program. Persons who observed this should notify MUFON Headquarters.

Actually, the approximate 10-second interval was so brief, it may not have been noticed by most people. One could barely read the message, after realizing it was there, before it was terminated and the program resumed. It would be interesting if MUFON members reading this would confirm any viewing of this or similar messages inserted in space programs in their sections of the country.

The observation described here was presented on KGO-TV, Channel 7, originating here in San Francisco. I called the program manager's office at KGO-TV and inquired about the Air Force televised statement. I was told the film, put out by M.C.A. Pictures, a division of TV International, was put in the production by the film

(Continued on next page)



Lucius Farish

In Other's Words

Although I am a bit late in reporting on this particular item, I highly recommend an article by Richard Wolkomir, "Close Encounters in New Hampshire," in the February issue of McCALL'S. It is an excellent account of the UFO events which have taken place in and around Hillsboro, New Hampshire since 1977.

The March 31 issue of THE STAR contains an excerpt from a new book by Greta Woodrew, ON A SLIDE OF LIGHT. Mrs. Woodrew claims to receive psychic communications from extraterrestrial beings. A feature on the activities of CAUS (Citizens Against UFO Secrecy) appears in the April 14 issue of THE STAR.

The May issue of IDEAL'S UFO MAGAZINE contains little of interest, being largely rehashing of familiar material.

The second catalog from Arcturus Book Service (263 N. Ballston Avenue, Scotia, NY 12302) is now available for \$2.75 per copy (\$3.50 for overseas airmail delivery). This is actual-

ly a combination catalog and reference guide to UFO literature, so it is of interest on two accounts. Bob Girard has done a commendable job in attempting to list most books, booklets, pamphlets, etc., which have been published during the past 34 years. There are some errors and omissions in the catalog/guide, but it would be virtually impossible to provide an error-free listing of this sort. This is certainly a far better bargain than some of the other bibliographic attempts which leave much to be desired in terms of thoroughness and which are far higher-priced.

The latest Brad Steiger publication dealing with UFOs is a paperback entitled THE STAR PEOPLE. In it, Steiger details his research into the reports of various people who claim to have a direct link with extraterrestrial intelligences. He lists a number of unusual characteristics which seem to be common to those whom he terms "Star People." These reports may seem "far-out" and unacceptable to some, but since I am a

firm advocate of the "read-anything-and-everything" school of thought, I suggest that you give Steiger's book a perusal and form your own judgment about his ideas. It is available by mailorder for \$2.50 (plus 75¢ postage & handling) from: Berkley Book Mailing Service, P.O. Box 690, Rockville Centre, NY 11570.

A few corrections and additions for items appearing in this column in the March 1981 issue of the Journal: The book by Milt Machlin from Quick Fox Publications has been re-titled UFO and is now available in a large softcover edition. Dr. Harley D. Rutledge's book, PROJECT IDENTIFICATION, is now apparently slated for release by Prentice-Hall in both softcover and hardcover editions in June. The title of Budd Hopkins' book on UFO abduction cases has been changed from INVISIBLE EPIDEMIC to MISSING TIME. It is still scheduled for July release from Putnam's under their "Marek" imprint.

(Air Force, Continued)

maker. Whether this was at the request of the Air Force or simply was added by the film company, I have not been able to find out. I was also told that one probable reason was to discourage inquiring phone calls to the station and film company relative to UFO's. To me, it still seems to smack of government influence to discourage public interest in the UFO phenomena.

(Letters, Continued)

pedia Galactica." She did a fine job in straightening out the falsifications made by the arch skeptic, Carl Sagan. I'm pleased that other lay listeners were just as disgusted with that pseudo UFO expert as I was...

Being a new member of Massachusetts MUFON I find your Journal extremely timely and most objective in its evaluations. Having been associated with APRO for nearly three years I can concur with Walt

Andrus that APRO would do well in reconsidering their isolationist attitude by establishing more cooperative and mutually rewarding rapport with MUFON. However, I would take this a step further. I'd like to see a merging of the two organizations for the benefit of UFO research and to provide greater strength in combatting the false charges leveled by professional debunkers.

Fred R. Chaffee
Belmont, Mass.

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE by Walt Andrus

The February and March issues of the MUFON UFO Journal contained an announcement for the 1981 MUFON UFO Symposium to be held July 24, 25, and 26 in Kresge Auditorium at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.) composed to provide the pertinent details on speakers, workshops, films, ticket prices, advanced registration, transportation to M.I.T., housing, reservations, and a registration form. Please make checks payable to M.I.T. and send to the Office of Special Events, Room 4-237, M.I.T., Cambridge, MA 02138 to arrive no later than July 6, 1981. For additional symposium information, please write to Miss Joan Thompson, 60 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138 or call Joe or Diana Santangelo at (617)944-2456. Even though there are other UFO Conferences being scheduled during 1981, MUFON is the only organization to conduct annual international UFO symposiums for 12 consecutive years. It seems that others would like to emulate the outstanding tradition that MUFON has established. Plan now to arrange your vacation so as to attend this prestigious and enjoyable meeting. Your Director is looking forward to renewing friendships and meeting many new members in person.

Mr. Edoardo Russo, Foreign Relations Officer for Centro Ufologico Nazionale in Italy, has advised that he and Mr. Massimo Greco of Brescia, Italy, will be attending the 1981 MUFON UFO Symposium in Boston and has volunteered to present an illustrated lecture on a most controversial "repeater-abductee" case. Since the speaking and workshop program has been completed and is ready for printing, Mr. Russo will become an alternate workshop speaker.

The workshop leaders and their subjects include the following well-known UFOlogists: Ted Bloecher,

"Close Encounters of the 3rd Kind"; Loren Coleman, "Mutilations"; Raymond Fowler, "Investigative Techniques"; Barry Greenwood, "Government Secrecy"; Dr. Bruce S. Maccafee, "Photoanalysis"; David Webb, "Close Encounters of the 3rd Kind"; and Walter Webb, "Investigative Techniques." On the international scene, Mrs. Cynthia Hind from Salisbury, Zimbabwe, in Africa will give us an update on the major UFO cases in Africa. Dr. Hauser of MUFON-CES from West Germany will report on the six very successful scientific MUFON-CES symposiums conducted in German-speaking nations of Europe—Germany, Austria, and a portion of Switzerland.

It is a distinct honor to welcome Major Donald E. Keyhoe, U.S.M.C. Retired, to the Board of Directors of MUFON. Major Keyhoe, as an author and Director of NICAP for 13 years, has been a living legend in the field of UFOlogy. He has accepted the very appropriate position of Director of Government Affairs. We are indeed happy to announce that Robert J. Gribble, Director of Phenomena Research, P.O. Box 1807, Seattle WA 98111, has agreed to become MUFON's State Director for Washington State. Bob has done a remarkable job of publicizing his "National UFO Reporting Center" 24-hour telephone "hotline" number of 1-206-722-3000 throughout the U.S.A. Retiring after 30 years from the Seattle Fire Department, Mr. Gribble has dedicated himself to UFOlogy through his UFO hotline. The majority of the significant UFO sighting reports received are forwarded to MUFON for investigation.

Peter Rank M.D., a physician-radiologist, has volunteered to serve MUFON as a Consultant in Radiology. Dr. Rank's mailing address is 406 South Blount St., Madison, WI 53703. He is also a member of CUFOS and is one of the Board of Directors of the

Fund for UFO Research. Peter is already deeply involved in the Cash/Landrum UFO medical case of December 29, 1980 near Dayton, Texas. He heads up the Department of Radiology at Methodist Hospital in Madison, Wisc.

One of MUFON's long time members, who has attended several MUFON UFO Symposiums, has agreed to serve as State Section Director for Medina County in Ohio. Steve Toth resides at 955 Guilford Blvd., Medina, OH 44256 and is also a member of two Ohio UFO groups—F.S.I.C. in Akron and C.U.P. in Cleveland.

Recognized as one of the world's leading authorities on UFO landing trace cases, a speaker at the 1981 MUFON UFO Symposium, and a member of the MUFON Board of Directors, Ted Phillips would like to take this opportunity to advise his friends and colleagues that his new address is Route One, Box 23, Reed Springs, Missouri 65737 and telephone number (417) 272-8375. Peter Tomikawa, Continental Coordinator for the Far East, has returned to Japan after completing 9 months of intensive management training at Disneyland in Anaheim, Calif. Mr. Tomikawa will head up the marketing, advertising and public relations departments for the new Disneyland in Japan scheduled to open to the public in 3 years. We will announce Peter's new address and telephone number in Japan when he and his family get settled and secure a permanent residence.

Tom Gates, Paul Cerny, Jim McCambell, Dr. Richard Haines, and Dr. Peter Sturrock have installed a new UFO telephone "hotline" with an answering service for the San Francisco Bay Area and northern Cali-

(Continued on page 18)