

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

NUMBER 175

SEPTEMBER 1982

Founded 1967

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.

\$1.50



MUFON ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

FROM THE EDITOR

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

ROSETTA HOLMES
Promotion/Publicity

GREG LONG
Staff Writer

TED PHILLIPS
Landing Trace Cases

JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
Medical Cases

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 1982 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.

The NOVA "Case of the UFO" broadcast (see Open Letter and Guest Editorial) is a victory for the skeptical propagandists, and an important one because of the prestige of this public broadcasting science series. The one-sided treatment is nothing new for TV or film "documentaries" in the U.S., but severely disappointing coming from NOVA. What will it take to get the sort of documentary outlined by Dr. Hynek in his editorial? TV and other media producers need to be educated to the large middle ground between the sensational and outrageous tabloids, on the one hand, and the skeptic-debunkers on the other, as to the nature of truly puzzling UFO reports. If we don't do it, who will?

UFO reports are not *all*, by any means, unexplainable in conventional terms, but neither are they *all* (the skeptical position) readily explainable. We have to start talking about and focusing attention on the *some* that are truly puzzling, and differentiating sharply between categories. Otherwise, the skeptics will continue to get away with burying the serious cases among the trivial, drowning out the potential "signal" with the "noise."

In this issue

NOVA: DIRECTOR'S OPEN LETTER	3
By Walt Andrus	
NOVA: GUEST EDITORIAL	4
By J. Allen Hynek	
UFOs AND THE RAAF--THE INSIDE STORY: PART 1	6
By Bill Chalker	
UFO GENESIS	10
By John Prytz	
CALIFORNIA REPORT	15
By Ann Druffel	
PROPOSED FEDERATION OF UFO GROUPS	17
By Rick Hilberg	
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 1982 by the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas" is included.

NOVA: DIRECTOR'S OPEN LETTER

September 29, 1982

To: An Open Letter to all State and Provincial Directors and Board of Directors of the Mutual UFO Network, Inc./MUFON

From: Walter H. Andrus, Jr., International Director

Subject: Public Broadcasting System NOVA Program titled "The Case of the UFOs" to be aired October 12, 1982

After requesting a private showing of the program on September 20, 1982 via WTTW in Chicago, Dr. J. Allen Hynek called Walt Andrus to express his displeasure with the program and to share a proposed editorial that will appear in the CUFOS monthly publication. I have attached a copy of the publicity release to MUFON from the WGBH Public Information office in New York City, which sounds exciting, but does not mention the names of any of the participants. To do so would disclose that the program is a "debunking effort" and would automatically reduce the number of viewers, since the general public is seeking solid information on the UFO phenomenon.

The featured participants are James E. Oberg, Philip J. Klass, Michael A. Persinger, Ph.D. (Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada), Dr. Brian Brady (U.S. Bureau of Mines, Denver, CO), W. "Bill" Ireland (New Zealand Dept. of Scientific and Industrial Research) with brief edited appearances by Dr. Bruce S. Maccabee and Alan Hendry. Dr. Hynek advised that four reels of film were made about himself and the work of the Center for UFO Studies, by the film crew, however none of this was used and his name was never mentioned in the program. Both Dr.

Maccabee's and Alan Hendry's contributions were edited in such a manner that it was made to appear that they agreed with the aforementioned debunkers.

When John Groom was in Houston, Texas making the program, he filmed over two reels of video tape of John Schuessler, discussing the Cash/Landrum case at the site that was also not used. During his visit, Mr. Groom spent considerable time at the home of James Oberg in nearby Friendswood, Texas filming sequences which are featured in the program. This created suspicion in Mr. Schuessler's mind concerning the integrity of John Groom's production as a legitimate UFO program. His suspicions have now been confirmed.

Dr. Hynek is submitting a guest editorial for publication in the MUFON UFO Journal expressing his disgust and contempt with this obvious UFO debunking program since only the vocal minorities were featured. MUFON in Seguin was never contacted to provide material or suggestions for the filming. A telephone call, after the film was completed, from Miss Elise Katz, WGBH in Boston, seeking publicity photographs on August 10, 1982 to publicize the program and for their news release kit was the first time your Director had heard about the program. When I quizzed her concerning who was in the film, she noted that it included Travis Walton, the 1978 New Zealand motion picture films and the Deputy Val Johnson incident in Warren, Minnesota. She avoided naming the participants, only the cases to be discussed.

Needless to say, Dr. Hynek and your International Director, Walt Andrus, were more than mildly concerned with the unfavorable impression that the general public will receive after viewing and hearing the debunker's viewpoints, regardless of

how farfetched their theories and explanations may be when the program has been billed as a scientific expose. I telephoned the WGBH Public Information Office, 609 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10017, telephone number (212) 759-8851 and asked for the Press Contact, Wilma Hill. In her absence, I talked to Cindi Jessen, Promotion Assistant, who was also a party to the News Release dated August 26, 1982. When I asked her if she had screened the program before writing the publicity release, she replied in the affirmative. When I pointed out to her that only the major debunkers were featured in the program, she admitted that the film would be objectionable to serious UFO researchers and possibly the general public. I asked her to arrange for an advanced private showing in San Antonio through KLRN-TV, the PBS outlet, as she had done for Dr. Hynek, but she refused. (After having eliminated Dr. Hynek from the finished program, they may have felt a little guilty.)

Upon further quizzing Cindi Jessen on how the participants were selected for the filming, she said that the list was provided by Kendrick Frazier to the producers. As most of you know, Kendrick Frazier is the Editor of "The Skeptical Inquirer, The Zetetic" published by the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal. Whether John Mansfield or John Groom (BBC) were fully aware of the biased backgrounds on these men I do not know, however their editing of the film, leaving out the people who could contribute positive information was very obvious and appeared intentional.

When pressed further, Cindi Jessen said that all complaints must be filed in writing with the Executive Producer for NOVA, John Mansfield, since "The Case of the UFOs" is a

(continued on next page)

By J. Allen Hynek, PhD.

WGBH/BBC co-production, produced by John Groom (BBC/British Broadcasting Company).

Since any statement that your International Director could make in the Journal or Dr. Hynek's guest editorial could not be published and received by our members before October 12, I am resorting to this open letter to key MUFON Directors throughout the U.S.A. and Canada.

I personally called Mr. Howard Gutin, General Manager of KLRN-TV in San Antonio, Texas and asked permission to do a rebuttal immediately after the PBS airing on October 12th. He thought it was a fine idea, but declined since their October program schedule has already gone to press and could not be changed at this late date. He has invited me to do a UFO segment for airing in November that will present the positive aspects of the UFO phenomenon and investigative activities of MUFON. He was very receptive to my objections and felt that PBS should "flag" their stations if they anticipated a program that would create complaints.

How can the recipients of this letter help in neutralizing the negative opinions of the vocal debunkers in the minds of the general public and WGBH in particular?

1. Please contact the general manager of your PBS outlet that carries the NOVA series and volunteer to work with them as I have done in San Antonio, expressing your dissatisfaction with the October 12th program.

2. Communicate the information in this letter and WGBH news release to not only the MUFON members in your state, through the State Section Directors or directly through your own mailing list, but also to the news media.

3. Write and file a letter of complaint immediately after the program is aired on October 12th expressing your displeasure with the fact that the NOVA series on PBS would present such a biased program utilizing only the opinions and hypotheses of the members of the UFO Sub-Committee of "The Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal," who have dedicated

One should perhaps sympathize with the producers of the NOVA series. They really bought a pig-in-the-poke when they purchased the program "The Case of the UFO" with which they opened their new TV season on Oct. 12. One can hope that they have better luck with ensuing programs, and also, one can hope that they do not continue to produce misleading advance advertising.

The program was advertised widely as "a rigorous, scientific investigation of the fact, fiction and hoax of unidentified flying objects," and the press release stated, "NOVA takes a penetrating look at several famous UFO reports. . . and proves that

themselves to explaining away the UFO phenomenon with their own preconceived opinions. Please address your letter to:

Mr. John Mansfield
Executive Producer for NOVA
WGBH Educational Foundation
125 Western Avenue
Boston, MA 02134

Be sure to identify the program date, and the PBS station where you viewed the program. The WGBH Public Information Office in New York, NY has recommended this as the proper procedure in which to voice complaints.

The program should be more appropriately titled "The Case Against the UFO," instead of being billed as "The Case of the UFOs."

This is an opportunity for everyone interested in securing answers and resolving the UFO phenomenon to take positive action by getting actively involved as suggested in your own communities. This open letter will be published in a future issue of the MUFON UFO JOURNAL.

Sincerely yours,

Walter H. Andrus, Jr.
International Director

serious study of these mysterious phenomena is very much alive, and may just now be on the verge of significant discoveries." A come-on if there ever was one! The actual program, however, gave the impression that anyone spending time on broad-based investigations of the UFO phenomenon was not playing with a full deck of cards.

I had the opportunity of previewing "The Case of the UFO" through the courtesy of WTTW, the PBS station in Chicago, several weeks before its airing, and was shocked at the unfair treatment the subject was given. Having been involved, with Allan Hendry, in several days of taping for this program at the Center for UFO Studies, I was amazed to see how much material was edited out, making for a very biased presentation. For example: we had been asked for a "really good case" to re-enact for taping. Hendry, using our criteria for good cases, (a close encounter, completely independent witnesses, and preferably a daytime occurrence) suggested a case he had carefully investigated some years ago, the Joliet case of May 8, 1977 (see *UFO Handbook*, p. 114) in which a research chemist and her husband, in one car, and a physician and his wife in another car, 15 miles apart but on the same road, saw at about 2 p.m., a silver "straw hat" as large as the moon, fly silently over the top of their cars (moving rapidly and against the local wind direction).

The four witnesses were kind enough to give up a day of their lives to re-enact the event for NOVA in the interests (they thought) of science and truth. But NOVA never used this, I imagine, not because they could explain it, but because they couldn't! Instead, they used their time on the fake pictures from Warminster, England, UFOs which are easily shown to be Soviet space shots, and on one astronaut (Conrad) downplaying astronaut sightings in general. (No mention, of course, was made of

(continued on next page)

UFOS AND THE RAAF--THE INSIDE STORY: PART I

By Bill Chalker
(© 1982 - Bill Chalker)

On Monday morning, January 11, 1982, I arrived at the Russell Offices of the Department of Defence, in Canberra, to undertake a review of the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) /Department of Defence UFO files. This was the first time that a civilian researcher had been afforded this sort of access.

For almost 30 years, the RAAF has been the official body invested with the responsibility of investigating reports of UFOs or unusual aerial sighting (UAS) reports in Australia and its territories¹. No clear and unambiguous picture has emerged about the role the RAAF plays in the UFO controversy in Australia.

On one hand there are supporters of the "cover-up" scenario. That is, the RAAF is covering up its high level involvement, perhaps in concert with the alleged United States Air Force censorship conspiracy². On the other hand, we have the position that suggests that the RAAF is bureaucratically locked into a responsibility it has long since decided is a waste of time, but continues as a service to the general public.

The only public record of case investigations by the RAAF has been the "Summaries of Unusual Aerial Sightings." These consist of data, time, location, very brief details of the event, and "possible cause." Nine of these were produced, covering the years from 1960 up to and including 1977. However, the 1977 Summary was the last to appear and it was not until 1980 that the Department of Defence advised interested parties that:

"the practice of compiling annual summaries of UAS reports was discontinued in 1978. This was in line with the Department of Defence policy of the RAAF now investigating reports purely as a "service to the general public." All reports are still retained for record purposes and are available to whoever seeks access to them.³

However "access" did not mean direct access, but instead referred to

the often unpredictable and incomplete compliance to requests, with the dispatch of individual reports (in which the personal details of witnesses are normally deleted) and/or standard public relation replies.

After signing in at the police desk, I was escorted from Building A to Building C of the Russell Offices Defence complex in Canberra, by Mr. Noel Tanswell of Defence Public Relations — Research Press. In the office of the Directorate of Public Relations — Press Section, Mr. Tanswell showed me the files that had been made available. There were 18 all together. Four were given to me to examine first.

I was shown to a desk in a quiet corner by a window, which looked out into the rest of the Russell Offices complex. During that day and for the next 3 (the latter in the office of the Director of Public Relations, the director being on leave), I conducted an exhaustive examination of the RAAF UFO files. I was given free access to a photocopier and was allowed to make notes, both written and with a tape recorder. In short, I was permitted a completely open review of the 18 files made available.

Two types of files have been maintained by the RAAF/Department of Defence, namely:

- (1) "Unidentified Flying Objects - Reports of Sightings," and
- (2) "UFOs — Enquiries from members of the public and Flying Saucer organisations."

The sightings largely consist of RAAF report forms (generally containing the standard 3 part forms, namely Part 1 — Report by Observer, Part 2 — Unit Report, and Part 3 — Investigating Officer's Evaluation), covering memorandums, letters, telexes, and communications from other Government bodies (e.g. Department of Transport, Meteorological Bureau, and police).

The "Enquiries" mainly hold letters of enquiry from the general public,

civilian UFO groups, individuals, and others, documentation searches, internal memorandums and minute papers, draft replies to requests, and miscellaneous documents.

The files made available to me during my January 1982 visit consisted of 7 Enquiry files covering the period from April 1966 to date, and 11 sighting files containing reports from 1975 to 1981.

Although the Enquiry files (through documentation searches to answer requests) and my own research prior to this officially sanctioned review provided me with considerable information on RAAF investigations prior to 1975, I was disappointed with the lack of pre-1975 sighting files.

Squadron Leader Ian Frame, the Air Force Liaison Officer responsible for the handling and compilation of UFO sightings in Canberra,⁴ gave this explanation of the situation, in a letter enclosed with the files given to me for review:

These are all the files readily available. We are hampered by the fact that the Department changed from Melbourne to Canberra in the early 60s. Files prior to this period have been very hard to locate.

I hope that you appreciate that the RAAF examines UASs primarily for their Defence content. If occurrences have no obvious import we have very few resources available for checks other than initial cursory examinations. I hope that you are not too disappointed. I'm afraid that UAS are only a very minor secondary role for all people involved in the chain. Best of luck with your endeavours but these files are all that I have been able to recover from our system.

Of particular interest was that copies of previously unavailable Department of Defence (Air Force Office) Unusual Aerial Sightings Summaries for reports in 1978, 1979 and 1980 (Summary Nos. 10, 11 & 12 respectively) were provided for me. This is despite the previously

(continued on next page)

RAAF, Continued

Table 1. — Breakdown of RAAF UFO Investigations

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total no. of reports</u>	<u>No. "Unknowns"</u> **	<u>% "Unknowns"</u>	<u>Source of information</u>
1960	20	0	0.0	Summary No. 1
1961	14	0	0.0	Summary No. 1
1962	25	0	0.0	Summary No. 1
1963	17	0	0.0	Summary No. 1
1964	17	1	5.9	Summary No. 1
1965	52	2	3.9	Summary No. 1
1966	74	1	1.4	Summary No. 1
1967	95	0	0.0	Summary No. 1
1968	101	0	0.0	Summary No. 1
1969	94	2	2.1	Summary No. 2
1970	37	4	10.8	Summary No. 3
1971	52	6	11.5	Summary No. 3
1972	87	11	12.6	Summary No. 4
1973	193	4	2.1	Summary No. 5
1974	67	2	3.0	Summary No. 6
1975	39	4	10.2	Summary No. 7
1976	39	4	10.2	Summary No. 8
1977	25	6	24.0	Summary No. 9
1978	118	30	25.4	Summary No. 10
1979	45	15	33.3	Summary No. 11
1980	47	10	21.3	Summary No. 12
	<u>1258</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>8.1%</u>	

*Some "unknowns" are not included due to low weight status, i.e., insufficient information or possible explanation provided was probable.

mentioned policy change which discontinued the summaries in 1978. These documents allow me to provide an updated summary of the RAAF's investigation of UFOs (See Table 1).

Classic Case Enquiries

It is interesting to see what the RAAF files say about "classic" cases. The "enquiry" files contained information on a number of these due to file searches undertaken to answer requests for information from various sources. For example, the controversial Drury film affair of 1953, was covered in the files with some surprising details, and the presence of several copies of frames of the film.

The RAAF files described the famous Tully incident in the following manner:

At about 9.00 a.m. on 19th January 1966, Mr. G.A. Pedley, a banana grower of Tully, Qld, observed a light grey non reflecting dull object, reported to be about 25 feet long and 8 feet deep, rise vertically then climb on an angle of 45° from a height of about 30 feet

above marshland which was situated about 25 yards away from his position. There was an associated hissing noise which decreased as the "object" rose. The apparent shape was described as "two saucers, face to face," but no structural detail was observed. The duration of the observation was approximately 15 seconds and it disappeared in mid air whilst receding into the distance (not assessed).

A clearly defined near circular depression remained in evidence in swamp grass at the point from which the object was seen rising, and measured about 32 feet long by 25 feet wide. The grass was flattened in clockwise curves to water level within the circle and the reeds had been uprooted from the mud. There was no scorching of grass or surrounding trees and the observer stated that there was no smell of combustion. . . .

Although a conclusive determination could not be made, the most probable explanation was that the sighting was of a "willy willy" or circular wind phenomenon which flattened the reeds and sucked up debris to a height of about 30 feet, thus forming what appeared to be a "flying saucer," before moving off and dissipating. Hissing noises are known to be associated with "willy willies" and the theory is also substantiated by the clockwise circular

configuration of the depression.

I summarized the controversy about the Tully incident in "Tully (Australia) 'saucer nests'," pgs. 370-371, *The Encyclopedia of UFOs*⁵.

Other documents in the Enquiry files were requests for information on cases, which ostensibly it seems the RAAF did not know about. For example, a 1967 enquiry related to an alleged UFO event, thought to have taken place over Butterworth RAAF airfield, Malaysia, back in the first week of July 1959, would be extraordinary if true. The enquiry referred to two F-86 fighters being scrambled to investigate a UFO. The aircraft fired on the UFO, which exploded and ash fell to the ground. The ash was allegedly retrieved and sent to Canberra for analysis. Another UFO appeared the following day, apparently looking for its "lost mate." When two F-86 fighters were again sent up, the planes allegedly disintegrated within a mile of the UFO.

(continued on next page)

RAAF, Continued

According to the story, the aircraft and pilots were never found. The files contain internal memorandums between Butterworth RAAF base and Canberra in 1967, which appear to indicate that they were unaware of the events. My own enquiries, ably assisted by John Prytz of Canberra, have failed to elicit any further information or to confirm whether any aircraft were lost at the time. I would certainly be fascinated to hear whether anyone has anything concrete on this diverting tale.

Even the book *Alien Honeycomb*⁶ had some references to it in the files. An internal memorandum dated 1 Aug 80 from DEFAIR CANBERRA to HQOC — SOINT regarding "Confirmation of Data in Book 'Alien Honeycomb'," stated:

The text of the book is sufficiently vague to make tracing information from service records a very tiring and difficult task. A check of files held at Air Force Office has proven negative.

Unfortunately, a "no comment" or "no information" response from the RAAF is only going to encourage this type of journalism. Accordingly, it is requested that HQOC initiate a check of records (including those at HQ AMB (Amberly B.C.) for data which could relate to this matter.

In a telex dated 5 Sep 80 and categorized as "unclassified/routine," from HQOC to DEFAIR Canberra, the following information was given:

FURTHER TO REF A THE FOLLOWING RETRANS OF INFO RECEIVED FROM HQ AMB. QUOTE: 1. SUMMARIES OF UNIDENTIFIED AERIAL SIGHTINGS PREPARED BY DEPT OF AIR BETWEEN MID 1968 AND MID 1969 HAVE BEEN CHECKED FOR MENTION OF THE CASE. NO MENTION OF THAT PARTICULAR SIGHTING APPEARS IN THE SUMMARIES. 2. THIS IS UNUSUAL BECAUSE IT IS OUR UNDERSTANDING THAT THE SUMMARIES WERE COMPREHENSIVE AND NOT EDITED LISTS OF REPORTED SIGHTINGS. 3. UNLESS REQUESTED BY COMMAND THIS HQ DOES NOT PROPOSE TO TAKE THIS MATTER FURTHER.

As it turned out it appears nothing further was done. My own opinions on *Alien Honeycomb* are well known⁷. The "Enquiry" files contain documents

related to what appear to be retrievals of mundane debris, but none of them relate to the "Alien Honeycomb" affair (e.g. "Suspect Air Vehicle Wreckage — Perenjori, W.A. — 1974"). More than likely the key to "alien honeycomb" (subsequently identified as predominately woven fibreglass!) lies not in a UFO (or UAS) file, but in files related to aircraft accidents and investigations.

Several surprising finds were made in the files, most notably documents which gave insights into RAAF and Australian government policies on the UFO subject.

A RESTRICTED Foreign Affairs document about "UNGA 33: SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE: ITEM 126 — ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AGENCY OR DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR UNDERTAKING, CO-ORDINATING AND DISSEMINATING THE RESULTS OF RESEARCH INTO UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS AND RELATED PHENOMENON" contained a review by P.A. Jackson, for the Australian UN delegation, of the attempts by Sir Eric Gairy to obtain UN concurrence for his idea of a UN UFO agency. The document summarizes the negotiations that took place, noting that the result was "a much more modest draft decision," which was subsequently adopted by consensus of the Special Political Committee on 7 December 1978. The document concludes:

The outcome was a satisfactory one from our point of view and from the points of view of those other countries who did not want to accede to the demands of the Grenada draft resolution but at the same time did not want to offend the Government of Grenada. The draft decision did not commit the Outer Space Committee to do more than receive and consider documents from Grenada and permit Grenada to present its views to the Committee. This is something which Grenada, or any other country could have done at anytime without a decision of the General Assembly, but Grenada was satisfied. Most importantly, the draft decision did not inscribe the item on the agenda for UNGA 34.

In retrospect, it would have been far more expedient for Sir Eric Gairy to have devoted more time to domestic matters, for before long, he was

deposed in a coup.⁸

With regard to RAAF UFO policy, two 1966 documents were especially illuminating. These were RESTRICTED Department of Air (later Department of Defence) Minute Papers entitled and dated, "UFOs — RAAF HANDLING OF PROBLEM, 16 Aug 66, and "UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS — RAAF POLICY", 12 Oct 66.

The first of these minute papers, arose out of a conflict between the Intelligence and Public Relations Directorates of the Department of Air, over whether "the distribution of interested members of the public of the 'Summary of Unidentified Aerial Sightings Reported to Department of Air From 1960'" was to cease. The Directorate of Air Force Intelligence was "keen to softpedal the UFO business" and gave "the reason for this cessation (as) the undesirability of whetting the interest of the public in UFOs."

The "Summary..." grew out of a requirement for certain statistical UFO information to provide material for a ministerial reply to a parliamentary question. OPR (Directorate of Public Relations - B.C.) willingly undertook to draft an answer for the Minister (a task which entailed folio-for-folio research through some four or five parts of the relevant file), because it felt that the otherwise burdensome task had a distinct side-benefit, namely, the collation of an unclassified and innocuous summary of UFO "sightings" in AUSTRALIA for the past five years.

DPR envisaged the day when it would be able to reply to all public UFO enquiries by the mere dispatch of the "Summary..." covered, if thought necessary, by a letter in which we explain that we are not prepared to engage in any subsequent disputation (i.e., take our "Summary..." or leave it; we have told you all we know). In order to keep this "Summary..." current, D/DAFI (Ops) was good enough to agree to provide DPR with the basic information which DPR would expect to have been security cleared for general release before adding the information to the "Summary..."

In this 16 Aug 66 Minute Paper, DPR directed at DAFI (Directorate of Air Force Intelligence), "a plea to remove the present restriction on the sharing of our unclassified UFO

(continued on next page)

RAAF, Continued

information with the public, for the following reasons:

(a) The RAAF really has no right to act as an arbiter of the subjects in which the public may or may not take an interest. Those members of the public who care to concern themselves with UFO facts and fancies all know that the Department of Air is the official, governmental examiner of reports of sightings in this country and any attempt by us to suppress public interest (however misguided we may think that interest to be) only helps to support the general impression that we are sitting on fat files of information, vital to our security. This, I submit, is the last thing we want to happen.

(b) The USAF is believed not to be adverse to making public its unclassified UFO findings, which it does in sheer self defence and, while it is true we do not have to defend ourselves against the same sort of pressure for information as that applied to the American air force, it seems self evident that we should, in our defence, devise some simple piece of administrative machinery to cope with that steady flow of UFO enquiries, anti-authority (RAAF?) press innuendos and statements verging on public accusations of duplicity which we will never be able to dodge, as long as we continue to play our unclassified UFO cards too close to our chests.

(c) DPR, which bears the brunt of the current pressure by replying to most of the public UFO enquiries, feels that unless we come out into the open we always will be the subject of occasional (and unnecessary) adverse publicity.

(d) The cat is already out of the bag (a reference to the situation that the existence of the "Summary..." was not widely known, but that a AFSRS (Australian Flying Saucer Research Society — a civilian group) representative had written, asking for a "brief assessment of sightings," implying that the existence of the "Summary..." was becoming common knowledge - B.C.).

In sum: by continuing with the old policy of playing our UFO cards close to the chest, we only foster the incorrect (but nevertheless widely held) belief that we have much vital information to hide. On the other hand, by maintaining a current "Summary..." (which OPR is prepared to do, with your continued help) we dispose in one blow, of the UFO enthusiasts belief that (a) he is not being taken into the RAAF's confidence; and (b) the RAAF is desperately determined to suppress UFO information to prevent national panic...

The Director of Public Relations

concluded his Minute Paper to the Director of Air Force Intelligence, by stating, "while security is not DPR's affair, our relations with the general public (cranks and all) certainly is and I feel strongly, from the PR point of view, that we are handling this whole business in an unnecessarily rigid and unimaginative way."

The second Minute Paper, dated 12 Oct 66, continued the same theme, but confirms that uncertainty and/or confusion were keynotes in RAAF UFO policy during 1966 — hallmarks that would continue, albeit waxing and waning, right up to today. It stated, in part, that:

There appears to be some confusion concerning Department policy over UFOs...On file...there is a ministerial statement to the effect: "Anyone who is interested in sightings of UFOs can apply to the Department of Air for information on the subject and is welcome to a synopsis of UFO sightings which includes a very brief assessment of the probable causes." This statement was made in answer to ministerial representation. It would appear however that the policy represented by this statement may not have reflected the view of DAFI, despite earlier, although inconclusive evidence of his concurrence.

...DAFI has proposed to DGPP who in turn referred to DCAS that our approach to UFO reports be liberalised. It does not appear that either DGPP or DCAS were aware of the Minister's statement. In my opinion we must either comply with the terms of that statement or inform the minister of our "new" approach, if it is not intended to provide the synopsis of sightings and on this I am not at all together clear from reading the files....

As it turned out, in addition to the perennial press release, the "Summary..." did become the public front of the RAAF involvement in the Australian UFO controversy. By the end of the sixties, the Summary crystallised as a largely annual affair. No. 1 covered reports from 1960 to 1968. No. 2 covered the 1969 accounts, while 1970 and 1971 reports appeared in Summary No. 3. From 1972 up to 1977 inclusive, the Summaries appeared somewhat erratically, but covering each year separately (namely Summaries Nos. 4 to 9).

RAAF Bureaucracy

The RAAF had ostensibly become locked into a bureaucratically orchestrated formula for handling the "UFO problem." Part of a 1980 "Brief for the Minister for Defence on RAAF policy for reporting of UAS...", describes the formula:

Each RAAF base in Australia has an officer responsible for the investigation of UAS. Under present arrangements, anyone who sees (or thinks they have seen) an aerial object which cannot be identified should contact the nearest RAAF base, or if this is not possible, the nearest Police Station. Reports received at RAAF bases are thoroughly investigated and the results onforwarded to Department of Defence (Air Force Office) where they are checked and filed. The person making the original report is advised by the appropriate RAAF base of the findings of the investigation if so requested.

Although the UAS files are unclassified they are not made available to the general public in their complete form as many of the people submitting reports wish to remain anonymous. However, a summary of the findings of any particular case can be made available.

In summary, the RAAF does not conceal facts about UAS and are quite prepared to release details of particular reported sightings to the general public on request. This assumes that the case has been reported and investigated by the RAAF in the first instance.

Variations upon this recent expression of the RAAF UFO formula has led to an amplification of the problems noted in the 1966 Minute Papers already discussed. The RAAF interest in UFOs vacillated around a publicly stated low priority base.

While the RAAF investigations remain the only known official study of UFOs, with all its perhaps understandable bureaucratic and military trappings, the scientific investigation of UFOs takes second place to the resolution of any defence and/or political implications. Since nearly three decades of involvement have probably confirmed for the RAAF that there is a limited defence content and that the majority of reports are misidentifications of prosaic phenomena, such investigations have

(continued on next page)

By John Prytz

taken on a low priority.

The aspect to suffer first is the effort to establish whether something really interesting is at the heart of the small residue of cases referred to as "unknown" or "unidentified." Instead, for the RAAF they remain just that — "unknown." In fact one gets the impression from the files that the RAAF simply does not know what to do with the really provocative reports it receives. The fact that these "unknowns" are few in number is probably convincing enough evidence for the RAAF that perhaps such cases are ultimately resolvable, but the problem of possible nil return for effort expended argues against their detailed investigation.

However, the quality of investigations in both prosaic and significant reports has drawn criticism from many sources, perhaps none more pointed than that of Dr. Claude Poher, as expressed in a letter located in the RAAF UFO Enquiries files. Poher led France's first major official UFO research group — Group d'Etude des Phenomenes Aérospatiaux Non Identifiés (GEPAN) — under the auspices of the French equivalent to NASA. In 1976 he addressed this response to the RAAF's UFO investigation, after the Department of Defence had sent him some of their Annual Summaries:

May I suggest, for transmission to personnel responsible for this work, that some of the "possible causes" mentioned in these summaries are not acceptable....

Dr. Poher gave an example of an innocuous observation at Wickham, NSW, on 4th April, 1975, of a "silver object about the size of a cricket ball," which the "Summary" lists as Venus for the "possible cause." Poher concluded:

...for the 4th April, 75, the planet was under the horizon so the cause Venus is ridiculous. There are many other impossibilities like this in the papers you sent me. I think one should avoid publication of these documents without a careful check by specialists of the different scientific disciplines involved, so as not to have, one day a journalist or a scientist holding the Services of the Australian

The modern UFO phenomena flowered, indeed exploded, into public awareness, world-wide, in the late 1940's. What's new you ask? Nothing. But what I want to know is why? Was it an almost inevitable fad (a "fad" which just will not go away, which in itself tells us something about the nature of the phenomena) given the climate of the times, which needed only the smallest of triggering mechanisms to set the train of events in motion, or, was this ultra-flap (of world-wide, decades-long duration) something which no historian, sociologist, or psychologist would or could have predicted in advance, even in their wildest dreams, nor can retrospectively find a solid and definable cause for?

To answer this question would go a long way toward defining whether the bulk of the hard-core, bona fide, UFO case histories, at least at that time (the late 1940's), were the products of internal or external intelligence. I say "at that time" because in order to find socially, historically, culturally, and psychologically unpolluted UFO cases, an environment where UFOs were not

part and parcel of the public consciousness, one has to go back to that beginning. (In addition, the earlier cases are valuable in weeding out various physical explanations such as satellites, etc.) It's too easy today to say that people have UFOs/space flight/ETI, etc. on the brain, hence state that X% of today's UFOs are internally generated by the mind. But was that, could that have been, true in the late 1940's?

Of course, there was the airship mystery near the turn of the century but:

Disappointing as it may seem, there is little doubt that the airship waves of 1896-97 were a product of hoaxes, wishful thinking, and downright fake journalism.²

And of course the foo-fighter mystery of WWII and the "ghost-rocket" phenomena of 1946 predated the "modern" UFO era, not to mention an every now and again isolated UFO sighting scattered throughout the first half of the 20th Century. None of these

(continued on next page)

Department of Defence up to ridicule.

Such "impossibilities" are all too familiar to observers of RAAF UFO investigations, e.g. Cressy (1961) — "Astronomical"; near Moe (1963) — "Tornado like meteorological manifestations"; and Vacluse Beach, Sydney (1965) — "tornado." (UFO sightings from RAAF files will be included in Part II.)

REFERENCES & NOTES

1. Chalker, W.C., "The Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) Investigation of UFOs," A.C.O.S. Bulletin (now the *Journal of the Australian Centre for UFO Studies*) No. 20., August, 1979, pgs. 3-8, and *MUFON UFO Journal*, No. 143, January, 1980, pgs. 3-6.
2. See for example the books of Donald Keyhoe and *The UFO Controversy in America* by David M. Jacobs, Signet, 1976.
3. Letter to B.C. from L.A. Lavers, Director of Public Relations, Department of Defence (Air

Force Office), dated 6 August 1980.

4. Sqd. Ldr. Frame explained to me that his "UFO duties" were only a part of his duties. He had 3 basic duties, one of them being co-ordinating UFO sighting (handling & compilation), and this was the most minor of these. His UFO duties in fact were fill-in activities during other duties. The position, normally in the domain of Air Force Intelligence, is assigned generally on a more or less 3 year duty.

5. Story, Ronald D. *The Encyclopedia of UFOs*, Doubleday, 1980 & New English Library, 1980.

6. Pinkney, John & Ryzman, Leonard, *Alien Honeycomb - the First Solid Evidence of UFOs*, Pan Books, 1980.

7. See "The Great UFO Debate (on "Alien Honeycomb") "The Case Against" by Bill Chalker and "The Case For" by John Pinkney & Leonard Ryzman, *People Magazine*, January 21 & 28, 1981. See also "Not so 'Alien Honeycomb'?" by Bill Chalker (including Stop Press), *UFO Research Australia Newsletter (UFORAN)*, Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1981, pgs. 12-15.

8. See for example: Bowen, Charles, "UFOs Debated at United Nations", *Flying Saucer Review*, pgs. 5-11, Vol. 24, No. 6, 1979.

UFO Genesis, Continued

triggered the exponential upswing in UFO sightings around the world starting mid-year or psychological conditions to internally generate UFOs, or for ETI to invade and undertake reconnaissance of Earth on a large scale, depending upon your point of view.

Something very special happened in the mid-year of 1947 in general and to Kenneth Arnold on 24 June in particular, a particular case which neutral researchers still list as a bona fide unidentified. The Arnold UFO

...was an exciting story in 1947 and the one that triggered public interest and official U.S. Air Force involvement in the UFO controversy. It is also a sighting that must remain perhaps forever in the category of UFO reports that have never been satisfactorily explained.³

It is satisfying that the UFO sighting which triggered off the modern era is still an unknown, but what triggered off that sighting (and until such time as UFOs became a part of our image of the world, those UFO cases immediately following the Arnold one)?

Was that happening due to some physical environmental quirk which resulted in the rapid production of some unknown and unknowable in advance natural phenomenon? There is no evidence for this. The only new environmental factor at that time was the introduction of nuclear weapons testing in the atmosphere, but hardly on a large enough scale to alter the physical and chemical properties of the atmosphere to a degree large enough to produce the then "flying saucers." No, atmospheric testing of N-bombs doesn't seem a likely physical, hence environmental, candidate for massive UFO production. But perhaps an atmospheric physicist would like to comment on what, if any, changes our atmosphere underwent in the latter 1940's.

Was that happening due to a rapid step up in Extraterrestrial Intelligence (ETI) surveillance of Earth and Earthlings, perhaps due to that very quantum leap in terrestrial technology — the atomic bomb as so many before

me have suggested — but possibly for another unknown reason(s) which only the ETI are privileged to know? This I personally hold as the most likely. It at least fits the facts as we know and understand them, and no credible objection which is ironclad and unassailable has yet been lodged against it.

The final alternative, the social, cultural, psychological climate of the times being ripe to produce an imaginary (internal intelligence) phenomena does not hold much credibility as we shall soon see.

Unfortunately, there are very few (if any) UFOlogists who have extensive qualifications and/or experience in sociology, psychology, etc. and who are students of history (including the in-depth knowledge of the scientific, science fictional, and astronomical aspects), knowledgeable about mass media influences, and who themselves lived through the late 1940's as mature adults.

Was the overall public consciousness saturated with thoughts of and exposure to the concepts of space travel and ETI in the latter 1940's? Based on what data I've uncovered, I'd conclude it most unlikely.

But first of all, it would be most instructive and enlightening to go back to the press of that time, just to get a feel for the times. Time and space don't permit an exhaustive reading of every newspaper for every day in the 2 or 3 years prior to June 1947, but, as a random example 24 June 1947? I checked the microfilm. I didn't expect to find any stories about mysterious atmospheric objects, space flights, trips to the moon, NASA, satellites, bug-eyed monsters sending radio waves in our direction, and SETI programs awaiting the arrival of same. And guess what? I didn't! Those sorts of stories were not to be for another entire decade! The major stories were:⁴

BILL CURBING LABOR BECOMES LAW AS SENATE OVERRIDES VETO, 68-25; UNIONS TO FIGHT FOR QUICK REPEAL MARSHALL AND PATERSON APPEAL FOR SPEEDY ARMS AID TO AMERICAS ASCAP SUED BY U.S. AS A WORLD TRUST

U.S. IS ENCOURAGED OVER PARIS MEETING
TENEMENT CRASHES AS BOYS' WARNING SAVES OCCUPANTS
20,000 HALT WORK IN SHIPYARDS HERE
HIGH COURT CURBS PETRILLO POWERS
SOVIET WELCOMED TO PARLEY ON AID BY FRANCE, BRITAIN
ANALYSIS OF THE LABOR ACT SHOWS CHANGED ERA AT HAND FOR INDUSTRY
NAM ASKS INDUSTRY TO HELP LABOR LAW WORK SMOOTHLY

In a word, "boring" as this was to be *the day* which saw the ultimate reason for you readers reading this now! We shall return to this issue of the *New York Times* shortly for more insights, but thus far things don't look too hopeful to those looking towards internal intelligence.

What about space/ETI oriented science fiction films? Alas, not a single motion picture with any science fictional theme was playing in the New York City cinemas on 24 June 1947 according to the amusements section of the *Times*. Now of course by that period motion pictures, including those with space/ETI content, were all established. An analysis does show that there was an exponential increase experienced in space/ETI science fiction films over time.

In fact, according to the essay from which I took this data⁵ the space/ETI sci-fi film closest in time to, yet preceding the genesis of the modern UFO era, was the 1945 film *The Purple Monster Strikes!* I somehow doubt that this was the internal intelligence trigger! That essay also states:

After (my emphasis) the Kenneth Arnold sighting in the State of Washington and subsequent flying saucer wave of 1947, saucers shared the stage with rocketships (in motion pictures)⁶

Thus, prior to June 1947, with one 1930's Flash Gordon exception, space flight/ETI was associated with traditional rocketships and *not* oval, cigar-shaped (with no fins), saucer-like, etc. objects. Therefore, UFOs, if internally generated yet associated with space travel/ETI, should have reflected

(continued on next page)

UFO Genesis, Continued

the popular and traditional concept. It didn't!

Perhaps based on the data in Table 1, one could make a stronger case for UFOs being the trigger for the increase in space/ETI sci-fi films; vis-a-vis what pro-Imagery advocates would desire!

What about science fiction on television? Television did exist (barely) in 1947, and a brief history of this major influence upon our lives is in order.

Many scientists contributed to the development of television, and no one person can be called its inventor. However, Vladimir K. Zworykin probably made the most important contribution to television as we know it today and he first demonstrated the first completely electronic, practical television system in 1929. Many experimental telecasts took place in the late 1920's and early 1930's, of which the BBC in London and CBS and NBC in New York were the leaders. The first American telecasts on anything like a regular basis began in July 1936 following the installation of 150 TV receivers in homes in N.Y. City. However, WWII quickly killed off TV experiments and broadcasting in both Britain and New York in America.

Following the War's end in 1945, the American national networks, all based in N.Y. City, resumed broadcasting. At first, their telecasts reached only the area between Boston and Washington, D.C., but by 1951, this was extended coast-to-coast. At the time of the Arnold UFO sighting, then, there was no television in that area or anywhere in the American west where the first UFO flap was experienced. In 1945, there were fewer than 10,000 TV sets in the United States, which soared to about 6 million by about 1950, and to almost 60 million by 1960. Thus, at the time of the UFO genesis, there were only about 2 to 3 million TV sets in the country, which may seem like a lot, but not relative to America's population, and the TV set density of today. Thus, if TV did have an influence in triggering off the UFO phenomena, it would have been quite minor — too minor in fact to be able to explain it all.

But what could have been on the

Table 1. — Space/ETI Motion Pictures as a Function of Time

5-Year Time Periods	No. of Space/ETI Sci-Fi Films
1900 - 1904	2
1905 - 1909	8
1910 - 1914	2
1915 - 1919	2
1920 - 1924	2
1925 - 1929	1
1920 - 1934	1
1935 - 1939	6
1940 - 1944	2
1945 - 1949	5
1950 - 1954	34
1955 - 1959	53
1960 - 1964	31

box at that time (June 1947) to even contribute in a minor way? According to the *New York Times* for the 24th of June 1947, N.Y. City had only 3 TV stations (as compared to today's 9 or more) and (as an aside) over 20 AM radio stations and 9 FM stations. On the day two TV stations had "no programs scheduled" and the third started to broadcast at 6:15 p.m. with "News from Washington," "Movies for Small Fry," "Cash and Carry," "Film: Serving Through Science," "Sports Names to Remember," and finally at 8:40 p.m. "Baseball: Yankees vs Cleveland at Yankee Stadium." End of broadcast.⁷

Needless to say, Arnold did not watch any TV in the period prior to that flight as there was no TV to view in his geographical location. But even if there had been, would or could there have been anything of a nature that would have triggered off visions of "flying saucers" zipping through the air? In short, was there any sci-fi on the box in 1947?

The first sci series to appear on American TV, *Captain Video*...began in 1948 (my emphasis)⁸

So, there were no Little Green Men, rocketships, Space Shuttle launches being broadcast live at anytime prior to the genesis of the UFO mystery, via what today must be the means for shaping the public consciousness. Scratch television too as a possible trigger!

From the 1920's through the early 1950's, radio was the major mass media

influence for shaping the public's image of the world. And from the 1930's on, in both the U.S. and Britain, sci-fi, and thrillers incorporating sci-fi and supernatural elements were fairly common on the radio (the best known example probably being the Orson Welles broadcast of the H.G. Wells classic *War of the Worlds* on 30 October 1938). Thus, it could be said that radio was what finally triggered off the UFO fad. Although this would be a theory worthy of intense (but difficult) research, a final proof of cause and effect (radio: UFOs) an interesting result, my immediate reaction and objection would be the time lag of nearly two decades between the start of the cause (radio) and the start of the effect (UFOs). Anyway, I'll leave this ball for someone else to kick around.

Having (to my satisfaction at least) eliminated 2 of 3 mass media influences (motion pictures and television) as triggers for the genesis of the UFO phenomena, let me turn briefly to the print media. Firstly, non-fiction.

As with sci-fi motion pictures, articles, and books about ETI and space flight existed well before the modern UFO era, and as with sci-fi films, these articles and books underwent an explosion by the numbers. However, and also parallel to sci-fi motion pictures, this explosion or exponential increase, happened after and not before UFOs appeared on the scene (and screen).

Perhaps the UFO phenomena helped to stimulate interest in space

(continued on next page)

UFO Génesis, Continued

flight and ETI. That would be a more logical conclusion from the data above than to suggest the reverse!

Moving along to sci-fi and the print media doesn't give the Imagery advocates much room to maneuver either. All throughout the "golden age of science fiction" (which paralleled the golden age of sci-fi on radio), the means of delivery to what readers there were were via the pulp magazines. The circulation of these weren't high; display on the newstands was not prominent; writers weren't paid very well (in those days not even Isaac Asimov could make a living by writing sci-fi); the slick journals wouldn't touch the subject with a 10-meter pole; what books were published were usually published by small speciality publishing houses and never made the top 10 best seller lists. To the masses, science fiction was not the "in thing" to read and no bookstore ever had a separate section devoted to the subject.

Bul all of this is well-known and well-worn history to today's sci-fi buffs. It is hard to contrast this era just before and during the 1940's with today's intense interest in, and the marketing and packaging of, science fiction — now an "in thing." But again, that transition took place *after* UFOs were an established facet of our society, not before.

The sf magazine world reached a publishing peak in 1953 when 34 different magazines were being issued in the United States alone....By the mid-1950's however, the death-knell was sounding for many magazines, especially the pulps. A combination of causes such as television, the slick magazines and a blossoming paperback field, made the pulp magazine seem outdated, and, almost as one, they died....Alas, all good things come to an end, and by the early 1960's paperbacks were making their presence felt on the magazine market.¹⁰

Another point of view:

By the early 1920's, however, a number of established publishers had become aware of the *commercial* (my emphasis) potential of sf....Where paperback sf remained, with certain exceptions, largely worthless ephemera in Britain until the late 1950's, in the USA it more quickly became an established part of publishers'

Table 2. — Space/ETI Non-Fiction References as a Function of Time⁹

Time Periods	No. of References (5-year average)
1900 - 1919	3.5
1920 - 1929	11
1930 - 1939	15
1940 - 1945	11
1945 - 1949	15
1950 - 1954	63
1955 - 1959	174
1960 - 1964	539

lists....Through the 1960's and 1970's sf continued to grow in strength as a published category. The last of the important specialist sf publishers, Gnome Press, died in the early 1960s....¹¹

The point is this. It wasn't until *after* the era which saw the genesis of the UFO had come and gone, that science fiction in any sort of large-scale commercial and profitable form emerged. The hardcore, but small in number, readers of sci-fi prior to 1947 could not have been of high enough quantity with massive enough influence to trigger off the UFO phenomena, even if that sci-fi had reflected what we now view UFOs to be. As a form of prophesy, pre-1947, sci-fi did not overall view many, indeed most, of the modern-day UFO facets, with any degree of accuracy — and why should they have reflected what UFO characteristics have been documented today, way back then, given that UFOs are a product of external intelligence? But a problem exists if UFOs are internally generated and yet their traits do not (with rare exceptions¹²) parallel the internally-generated fictional concepts which existed prior to the UFO era.

In short, with respect to items relating to space flight, ETI, etc. as expressed through fiction or nonfiction, there is no evidence on which to base a conclusion that these sorts of concepts were common enough in pre-1947 days to be day-in, day-out part and parcel images for the public.

But that's not quite the end of the story. Some further observations on this issue are in order.

The UFOs as ETI manifestations, if internally generated, should have been apparent immediately — that is, including occupant sightings and abduction cases by the end of 1947,

accompanied by massive publicity. That wasn't to be. The initial theory, gut reaction, was the UFOs were no doubt a logical extension of weapons development following WWII — the "secret weapons" theory — and many popular articles followed that line in the early years^{13 14}. It wasn't until January 1950 that the idea that "UFOs=ETI" was given prominent public exposure, starting with Donald Keyhoe's *True* article, quickly followed by his book of the same title, *The Flying Saucers Are Real*, and a host of other articles and books by other authors which followed the initial Keyhoe theory.

From about that time, the "what" of UFOs was polluted as far as any subsequent reports and investigations were concerned. From that point maybe all UFO reports, as equated with ETI, were internally generated. But before? From mid-1947 through 1949, UFOs did not equal ETI for all practical purposes, but secret weapons. As there were no secret weapons, and no likely internally generated ETI UFOs during that period, what were the mysterious objects sighted? Internally generated secret weapons? Or, perhaps externally generated ETI UFOs!

What was so special, in a cultural, social, and/or psychological sense in the years and months leading up to June 1947? Nothing! What was so special about the latter 1940's that all of a sudden the citizens of the United States (and Canada, Europe, Australia, etc.) would by the hundreds emulate the experience of one man (Arnold) who nobody had ever heard of before? It wasn't as if the President of the United States had reported the very first "flying saucer"! The entire genesis of the UFO "fad," given the climate of

(continued on next page)

UFO Genesis, Continued

those times, I suggest was therefore externally generated. And, as a complement to that, I further suggest that if there ever was an ideal time to imagine alien spaceships, one would make a more convincing case for one of two non-1940's historical periods.

If there was an ideal time for the public to have mass hallucinations about extraterrestrial spaceships, it would have been in the late 1950's and early 1960's. That 5-year period of 1957 through 1961 saw the birth of NASA, the start of the space race, Sputnik, Ranger, Project Mercury, the announcement of Project Apollo, Mariner 2 launched to Venus, and Project Ozma (the first attempt at SETI). The press, journals, electronic media, and books were full of space news, announcements, and achievements. The "canals" of Mars were still viable as Mariner 4 had yet to be launched. Science and science education exploded upon the American scene mainly out of fear of the Russian space achievements. The introduction of the mass market paperback book, not only in science fiction but in presenting science for the masses, was off and running. None of the above (with the exception of the Martian "canals") was true on and shortly before "flying saucers" entered our culture. But of course the flowering of space, ETI, even science in 1957-1961 could not have produced ETI UFOs as they were already ingrained in our minds. So, that's all just academic!

But that wasn't so if we go back to the first decade or two of this century, in my opinion another ideal period for UFOs to have been produced by the collective human mind.

Some have suggested that it was the emotional conditions shortly following WWII which contributed, indeed was responsible for, the bloom of internally generated UFOs. But why didn't it happen following WWI, which I would have thought to have been more of an emotional shock to the world than round two, two decades away? WWII at least had a precedent!

Above and beyond that, the early years of this century witnessed the birth of manned powered flight. It was when

the concept of intelligent life on Mars peaked; when Percival Lowell popularized the "canals" of Mars through numerous books and popular articles; when Marconi was searching for Martian radio broadcasts; when a reward was offered for the first proof of the existence of intelligent alien life — excepting Mars as that was too obvious and easy! Further, it was the era when the H.G. Wells novels such as *War of the Worlds* and *First Men in the Moon* were all the rage, whether in hardback for the elite, or the pulp magazine reprints for the others. But where were the innate, instinctive, internally generated UFOs? These are facts which advocates of internal intelligence just cannot ignore or gloss over.

In summary then, we see that there was nothing overly special about the era which saw the genesis of UFOs and in fact other time periods would have been better placed to produce imaginary alien spaceships; there were few, if any, influencing factors of the sort that would mirror the UFO characteristics before the fact, and in fact a strong case could be made for the UFO genesis having something to do with the growth and interest in sci-fi, ETI, and space travel instead of the reverse.

The timing of the genesis of the modern UFO phenomena, which cannot be logically accounted for, is yet another forceful argument for the external nature of, an external intelligence behind, the UFO, and yet another nail in the coffin of the pro internal intelligence advocates.

REFERENCES

1. Prytz, John. "Significance of early sightings," *ACUFOS Journal*, Feb. 1980, p. 9-10.
2. Story, R.D. *UFOs and the Limits of Science* (William Morrow, N.Y., 1981, p. 42).
3. *Ibid.* p. 52-53.
4. *New York Times*, 24 June 1947, p. 1.
5. Simon, A. "Zeitgeist of the UFO Phenomenon" in Haines, R.F. (editor), *UFO Phenomena and the Behavioral Scientist* (Scarecrow Press, Metuchen, N.J., 1979, p. 52-56.)
6. *Ibid.* p. 47.
7. *New York Times*, 24 June 1947, p. 46.
8. Nicholls, P. (editor) *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction* (Granada, London, 1979, P. 595).
9. NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility - *Extraterrestrial Life: A Bibliography: Part II: Published Literature: 1900-1964*, NASA (SP-7015), Washington, D.C., Dec. 1965, 335 p.
10. Holdstock, R. (editor) - *Encyclopedia of Science Fiction* (Octopus, London, 1978, p. 61, 65).

NEBRASKA FORTEAN CONFERENCE

Ray W. Boeche, a MUFON State Section Director in Nebraska, has provided the following information about a conference on unexplained phenomena (including UFOs and other Fortean phenomena as reported by Charles Fort, chronicler of borderline science events) in Lincoln, Nebraska, on November 13-14, 1982.

Speakers include Dr. J. Allen Hynek, director of the Center for UFO Studies; Dr. Roy P. Mackal on "cryptozoology" (unidentified biological creatures); Linda Howe on cattle mutilations, including her award-winning documentary "Strange Harvest"; and Ray Boeche.

Sessions will be Saturday, November 13, 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and Sunday, November 14, 1:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Registration (including Saturday luncheon and refreshments) is \$30 per person, \$50 per couple, \$25 each for groups of three or more, and \$20 for students and senior citizens.

Registration: Terry Mahlman, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Division of Continuing Studies, Department of Conferences and Institutes, 33rd and Holdredge Sts, Lincoln, NE 68583; phone: 402-472-2844 between 8-5 Monday through Friday, Central time.

FUND FOR UFO RESEARCH

The Fund for UFO Research (Box 277, Mt. Rainier, MD 20712) is mounting a Fall fund-raising campaign featuring sales of more than 200 government agency documents on UFOs for a minimum contribution of \$30 (\$15 of which is tax deductible). Straight contributions without document sales are 100% tax deductible by American citizens. The Fund has supported research on "abduction" reports, crash/retrieval cases, the 1896-97 "airship mystery," and educational projects.

11. Nicholls, P. *op. cit.*, p. 484.
12. Simon, A. *op. cit.*, p. 47.
13. Morehouse, F.G. "Case of the Flying Saucers," *Argosy*, July 1949, p. 22-24, 92.
14. Taylor, H.J. "Flying saucer is good news," *Reader's Digest* (U.S. ed), July 1950, p. 14-16.

"California Report"

By Ann Druffel

Resolving the Issue of Hypnosis

By John DeHerrera

(© 1982, John DeHerrera)

(Note: The experiments with hypnosis involving imaginary abductees are widely referred to as the Lawson/McCall study. Those who are familiar with the study know that John De Herrera, a researcher-writer, was also involved with these experiments—in fact, he made the initial proposal. Somehow he has not been given proper credit. Hopefully, this article will correct this situation and reveal what he feels about the use of hypnosis.—A.D.)

The California Supreme Court has handed down a monumental decision in March of this year. This court decision involves the use of hypnosis by police investigators. No longer will anyone who has been questioned under hypnosis be allowed to testify in a California court-of-law.

"Hypnosis-induced testimony failed to meet a long-established legal standard requiring that scientific evidence be based on techniques generally accepted in the scientific community in which they were developed," said the justices. (Arizona and Minnesota Supreme courts also have barred hypnosis-induced testimony and in Maryland a reevaluation of the practice has been ordered.)

Statewide, the ruling is expected to weaken or destroy 59 criminal prosecutions! This situation is considered by many to be a disaster. In the act of exonerating some who may have been falsely accused, many brutal murderers could be freed. Prosecutors had relied heavily on the use of hypnosis and felt that it was reliable, especially in rape cases where the victim is the only witness to the crime. They felt that the experience could be so traumatic that details or entire

events are "repressed" from conscious memory.

Defense lawyers and researchers, rejecting the claim that hypnosis is reliable, either testified before the Supreme Court or filed *Friend of the Court* depositions documenting their views. They succeeded in proving, to the satisfaction of the court, that hypnosis is inherently unreliable and that police investigators are unaware of this.

Proponents of the use of hypnosis can point to specific cases where this tool helped solve some very difficult criminal cases. Without it, these would never have been solved, they say. Opponents also cite cases where an individual lied or "recalled" events that later were proven false. Too often hypnosis results in memory distortions or hallucinations, they say.

For over 20 years, police hypnotists had waged a battle to have hypnosis accepted in courts-of-law. They claimed a very high success rate with hypnosis. "The mind is like a videotape, recording everything you see," said Dr. Reiser of the Los Angeles Police Department, who has trained police from almost every state on the techniques of hypnosis. "We are realizing that hypnosis is just a clinical way of interviewing, a deeper way of getting at the truth," Dr. Patrick Mullany, psychologist at the FBI Academy, was quoted as saying.

Researchers now know that our mind does not record everything, as a videorecorder would do. Memory is highly selective and we only record things that are important to us. Hypnosis is held up by many as a magic cure for getting at deeply buried memories. This isn't necessarily the case. Hypnosis simply encourages a

person to relax and focus intensely on the event.

At this point it is appropriate to ask the question; is there anything that UFOlogists can learn from the evaluation of hypnosis by various supreme courts? Is our use of hypnosis based on sound knowledge and skills of this controversial tool? These and other questions must be addressed soon. Otherwise, the credibility of UFO research will sink even further than it is today.

In 1977, I was invited to observe some hypnosis regressions conducted by Dr. W.A. McCall and Professor Alvin H. Lawson. As a researcher of UFO phenomenon and hypnosis, I was interested in their hypnosis regressions. After observing some regressions that revealed a great deal of information on possible UFO abductions, there were still many questions remaining. "How reliable is hypnosis," I asked. "What would happen if we hypnotized someone who had never seen a UFO? Could they be encouraged to describe a UFO abduction also?"

Dr. McCall decided that this was a good idea and passed the suggestion on the Professor Lawson. Together, the three of us planned and conducted our "imaginary encounters study." We were enthusiastic but we did not expect much would come of this effort. Our volunteers would need a great deal of help in describing a UFO encounter/abduction we thought.

Our first volunteer, after being hypnotized, was told that he was taken aboard a UFO. Then we asked him to describe how he was taken aboard and what he could see inside? To our amazement, the volunteer gave a
(continued on next page)

PROPOSED FEDERATION OF UFO GROUPS

By Rick Hilberg

First off, I sincerely believe that the various organizations that participated in the MUFON-sponsored "UFO Summit Meeting" in Toronto have come to realize the need for better relations and communication within the UFO movement. Although similar proposals made throughout the years unfortunately died aborning, the intellectual and, however distasteful we may find it, the political climate within the field have shifted considerably in recent years to the point where the proposed federation may indeed become reality.

Perhaps Dr. Hynek's talk about how we should all plan for the next major media-reported flap hit home for many, because in past instances of massive media attention to the subject we lost much in the way of worthwhile reports and public support because there is no one coordinated voice that speaks for the UFO movement. While it is only human nature to desire our own little place in the sun when it comes to radio, television, and newspaper interviews, the conflicting and confusing statements made in past flaps have only served to turn off potential

sources of financial (as well as personal) support, but given the skeptics ample reason to loudly proclaim that the UFO movement is not worthy of attention by established scientific disciplines.

Not to mention our losses through poor public relations methods, we suffer from a lack of established standards regarding our basic investigation and data gathering. As many brought up during the Monday afternoon "rap session" in Toronto, we need such basic things as a uniform terminology for the field, a standard method of training field investigators, coordination regarding data processing procedures and software; the list could go on from here to probably fill several pages! In other words we are squandering our collective time and resources because of poor communication within the field (just imagine all the money wasted when several UFO groups each send an investigator to a well publicized UFO sighting!).

These are but a few examples of why I feel we should have some sort of coordinating body for the field. I would think that some sort of organization

police interrogation technique and works very well. I have observed that the subject cannot repeat the account in the same order of events. Some reveal an entirely new and different abduction event for the time period!

Finally we must say that researchers confirm that hypnosis, as a tool for interrogation, is unreliable. We have not found a safe way to use it. There are other ways of improving memory recall, though. Skillful use of mnemonics, free-association techniques, or memory enhancement drugs (coline, vasopressin, etc.) can be useful. And let us remember that some abduction accounts (e.g., Hickson and Parker) were revealed without the use of hypnosis. Is it possible that there really are UFO abductions?

patterned after a trade or professional group would suit our needs. The American Medical Association is probably the foremost example of an organization that promotes standards for its members, as well as speaks as one voice for the huge and diverse medical profession. In this way no organization would have to give up its basic autonomy, but would subscribe to the basic goals and standards of the coordinating organization, and allow that organization to handle public affairs on a national scale.

I realize that our task of actually organizing the proposed federation, whatever its basic structure and function, will be a difficult task. That is why I feel that it is essential that we all physically meet at a central location sometime in the not too distant future to begin the "give and take" process that will be required to complete our goals and desires. I am confident that by reasoning together, as L.B.J. was found of saying, we will not fail in our task.

Many have questioned how such a federation could be financed, and let us face facts, that will be a difficult detail to work out. However, since those of us on the steering committee are donating our time and expenses to this project, I don't see why the proposed federation couldn't operate on a similar basis. Expenses to cover telephone, stationery, postage, and printing could be met by a nominal yearly fee to be paid by participating organizations. In a sense, with all of the waste and duplication going on in the field today we can hardly afford not to have such an organization.

California Report, Continued

saying that "the imagery and events in abduction reports are nearly identical to those in revived birth trauma narratives." I have found, and other researchers agree, that "fetal-state memories" and "birth-trauma memories" are no more reliable than other information revealed through hypnosis.

How can we test an abduction account revealed under hypnosis? This is a good question and there may be a reasonable answer. In the first regression of a possible witness, get as much detailed information as possible. Then later on, days or weeks later, go back and question the witness again under hypnosis. This is a standard

MUFON

103 OLDTOWNE RD.
SEGUIN, TX 78155

MUFON STAMP PROGRAM

Contributions of cancelled foreign stamps, in any quantity, are "sold" to a collector and the proceeds used to finance international exchange of UFO information. We thank the following international colleagues for recent contributions:

Keith Basterfield, Wynn Vale, S. Australia.

Larry Fenwick, Willowdale, Ont., Canada.

Michael Sinclair (our International Director), presently residing in London, England.

Close encounters of the flipped kind

A Bavarian man who claims to have had a close encounter with alien space beings may have just been suffering from an overdose of television. After being hypnotized to aid his recall of the exact details of the extraterrestrials' appearance, the man described a creature identical in every way to ... Kermit the Frog, the flipped host of TV's "Muppet Show." Investigators have concluded the incident was "hallucinatory," but what do they know?

RIVERFRONT TIMES, St. Louis, MO
June 23-29, 1982 CR: R. Melke

UFO TEACHING MATERIALS

Marge Christensen (a MUFON Massachusetts State Section Director) and Linda Seal (field investigator) have successfully taught courses on the UFO phenomenon to adults and gifted and talented youngsters. They now offer copies of the syllabus for each course for \$7.50 each to other teachers or lecturers who may wish to make use of them.

Adult Course: "The UFO Phenomenon." Introduction, lessons for 8 meetings (2 hours each), activities and projects, and reading list.

Children's Course: "Space Invaders." Lessons for 15 sessions (1 hr and 45 min each), activities and projects, worksheets, answer sheets, and suggested reading list.

The authors are, respectively, a former and a present English teacher. The material includes information on investigation techniques, field work, analyzing data, hoaxes, and research methods.

Make checks or money orders payable to either author and address

EDITORIAL NOTES

Due to the inclusion of information on the NOVA program, space did not permit publishing the Critic's Corner column in this issue. It will resume next month.

In order to expedite editing and typesetting of articles for the Journal, authors are requested to submit typed, double-spaced manuscripts. Newsnotes and photographs on the activities of MUFON State chapters, including personal biographies of active members, would be welcome. Please share your projects and insights with other MUFON members across the country and around the world.

Short articles in the form of "Comments" or "Notes" (up to about 2,000 words) and letters to the editor (up to about 400 words) are invited from the readers. The Journal is your forum for exchange of information, ideas, and critical discussion.

them to 2 Cherry Road, Beverly, MA 01915.

Director's Message, from p. 20

Mother Lode Country (Sonora) seeking historical lore, the *National Geographic* crew interviewed Marvin Taylor and photographed his UFO exhibit for an upcoming issue of their prestigious magazine. Mr. Taylor's exhibit has already been featured in articles and photographs in the Sacramento *Union* newspaper and the Sonora *Union Democrat*. If any of our readers think that the UFO issue is dead, they should try following the footprints of Tom Gates, Marvin Taylor, and Paul Cerny. These three gentlemen are to be heartily commended for their fantastic work in helping to educate the public to the UFO phenomenon, which simply will not go away in spite of government-backed attempts to eradicate this so-called "fad."

Mr. Walter Mensching, State Section Director for Fond du Lac County in Wisconsin and a veteran in UFOlogy, has been the first member to respond to your Director's invitation to

perpetuate their personal UFO files by bequeathing it to MUFON in their will. Mr. Mensching has instructed his attorney to revise his will to donate his entire collection of books and articles to MUFON upon his death. His file now includes 39 hardcover books, 47 paperback books, and 145 file folders classified by subject. Please advise MUFON if you have made this provision in your will, so that we may be prepared to pack the file and assume the shipping charges. We are grateful to Mr. Mensching for his generous gift.

The Steering Committee for the proposed North American UFO Federation promised to communicate their progress to all interested people. The MUFON UFO Journal is one of the media devices selected for this purpose. In this issue of the Journal, I have taken the liberty of publishing the proposals and recommendations submitted by Rick Hilberg, representing the Northern Ohio UFO Groups on the Steering Committee in an article titled "The Proposed Federation of UFO Groups." Rick said

"he hoped that some of the other groups and individuals who were not present in Toronto (for the Summit Meeting) will take notice and offer their support." Your Director definitely feels that Mr. Hilberg's message should be shared with all interested parties.

When we are speaking of cooperation in UFOlogy in the United States, the name of Robert J. Gribble automatically comes to your Director's mind. Bob's dedicated service to the operation and communicating his UFO Hotline telephone number 1-(206)-722-3000 of the National UFO Reporting Center, P.O. Box 1807, Seattle, WA 98111 to airports and police agencies is growing in giant strides. This is now our most vital source of UFO reports from the public, since the Center for UFO Studies has discontinued their 24-hour hotline service.

A recent example of the expediency of this service was demonstrated when a potential abduction case witness from Woodridge, Ill., called the National
(continued on next page)



Lucius Farish

In Others' Words

A black, saucer-shaped UFO was seen over Brindisi, Italy, by an airliner crew and two passengers, according to the August 17 issue of NATIONAL ENQUIRER. The object was visible for about one minute before shooting off at a very high rate of speed. The August 31 ENQUIRER reports the case of an Arizona couple who claim to be aliens from another world, reincarnated on Earth.

THE STAR for August 31 features a report on a 4-year period of UFO activity in the Hudson Highlands area of upstate New York. The incidents include sightings of various types of objects, as well as car chases and one apparent landing, with large footprints found in the area.

The "Anti-Matter/UFO Update" section in September OMNI has a good summary of December 1981 sightings in the vicinity of Reserve, New Mexico. This issue also has an interesting article on what the late Ivan T. Sanderson called "OOPARTS" (Out Of Place ARTfacts.) There is little here which has not already been covered in the many writings on the "ancient astronauts" subject, but it is refreshing to see OMNI devote space to such topics.

An article by Hilary Evans and Michel Piccin in the October issue of FATE examines the UFO abduction claim of Frank Fontaine, which allegedly took place in France on November 26, 1979. Evans and Piccin conclude that the episode began as a practical joke on the part of Jean-Pierre Prevost, a friend of Fontaine's, but got out of hand following extensive publicity.

A series of booklets compiled by members of the Australian Centre for UFO Studies has now been reprinted by Robert Girard of Arcturus Book Service. The six volumes are: A REFERENCE CATALOG OF INTERESTING CASES REPORTED TO THE CENTRE IN 1978 compiled by

Keith Basterfield, \$2.00. A REPORT ON OBSERVATIONS OF UFOs FROM AIRCRAFT CREW MEMBERS IN AUSTRALIA compiled by Keith Basterfield, \$3.00. AN IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF AUSTRALIAN UFO-RELATED ENTITY REPORTS by Keith Basterfield, \$12.50. A REFERENCE CATALOGUE OF INTERESTING CASES REPORTED TO THE CENTRE IN 1979 & AN ANALYSIS OF AUSTRALIAN-WIDE REPORTS 1979 by Keith Basterfield & David Seargent, \$3.50. THE UFO-ANTHROPOID CATALOGUE by Mark Moravec, \$4.50. ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS PRESENTED AT ACUFOS UFO CONFERENCE 5 compiled by Keith Basterfield & Harry Griesberg, \$2.50. Additional postage and handling fees are 85¢ for the first item and 35¢ for each additional item. Nine additional ACUFOS publications will be reprinted by Arcturus in the near future. The address for Arcturus Book Service is: 263 North Ballston Avenue, Scotia, NY 12302.

Those who have followed Leonard Stringfield's pioneering efforts in gathering evidence of UFO crashes and retrievals by government agencies will be pleased to know that this latest work is now available. UFO CRASH/RETRIEVALS: AMASSING THE EVIDENCE (Status Report III) is a 53-page softcover booklet (8½" x 11" format), presenting 12 new first-person reports and 15 new "intermediary" reports, as well as several of what Stringfield calls "interminable" cases (i.e. "friend of a friend of a friend"). Also included are updates on two previously-discussed cases and commentaries on various aspects of the Crash/Retrieval subject.

This is a fascinating and important document by a researcher who has, in some instances, been maligned and ridiculed by those who should know better. Stringfield deserves the full support of anyone who dares to consider himself open-minded and objective. I highly recommend this

booklet, as well as the other writings by Stringfield, some of which are still available from him. The price for Status Report III is \$10.00 plus \$1.00 postage & handling. For overseas orders, the charge for airmail postage is \$5.50; surface mail, \$1.50. All foreign orders should be in U.S. funds, checks drawn on U.S. banks or International Money Orders. Leonard Stringfield's address is 4412 Grove Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45227.

Director's Message, from p. 18

UFO Reporting Center to report his experience. Bob Gribble immediately called MUFON in Seguin, Texas. A long-distance call to our MUFON State Section Director in Woodridge (who lived only seven blocks from the witness) resulted in an interview in less than 30 minutes from the time of the initial report. Needless to say, the witness was impressed with our promptness. After a thorough investigation, we hope that this case may be published in the Journal.

"The Catalogue of UFO Periodicals" by Tom Lind, a SAID OF SAUCERS Research Publication, is now available directly from the author for \$12.50 plus 75¢ postage and handling. For orders outside of the U.S.A. and Canada please add \$2.00. Tom calls the 280-page book the first extensive English language bibliography of UFO periodicals. The book may be ordered from: Tom Lind, P.O. Box 711, Hobe Sound, FL 33455 U.S.A.

Plans are now being formulated to hold a UFO meeting in Corpus Christi, Texas, for MUFON members and friends during the Thanksgiving weekend. Friday November 26, 1982 is a tentative date, however, the location will be announced later after the arrangements have been formalized. Everyone who contacted MUFON after last years public appeal will receive letters of invitation.

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE


by
Walt Andrus

Michael Sinclair, International Coordinator now residing in London, England, has jointly announced the appointment of Dr. Roberto Pinotti as MUFON Representative for Italy. Dr. Pinotti is the President of Centro Ufologico Nazionale and one of the foremost UFO researchers in Italy. His mailing address is Via Odorico Da Pordenone 36, 50127 Firenze (Florence), ITALY and telephone 367718. This appointment culminates negotiations initiated during the CUFOS UFO Conference in Chicago in September 1981 when your Director met with Roberto.

James E. Miller has accepted the position of State Section Director for the southwestern Ohio counties of Butler, Hamilton, Warren, and Clermon, replacing Charles J. Wilhelm. Jim and his wife live at 6916 Millikin Road, Middletown, OH 45042, telephone (513) 777-3555. Mr. Miller has worked with Leonard Stringfield for many years and ranks CEIII cases high on his interest priorities.

Mrs. Dorothy I. Lewis has been appointed Provincial Section Director for Lambton County in Ontario by Henry H. McKay. Mrs. Lewis, a former section head for UFO Investigations Canada, may be contacted at 1064 Brenchley St., Apt. 210, Sarnia, Ontario N7S 1R5, Canada; telephone (519) 344-8248. Dorothy comes highly recommended to MUFON by Dan Wright, State Director for Michigan, and Joseph C. Stewart, State Section Director. Mr. McKay, Provincial Director for Ontario, plans to appoint other Provincial Section Directors utilizing the talent in present UFO groups throughout Ontario that responded so enthusiastically at the recent 1982 MUFON UFO Symposium in Toronto.

"UFOs: A Scientific Challenge" is the theme selected for the 1983 MUFON UFO Symposium at the Huntington-Sheraton Hotel in



Walt Andrus with Dr. Roberto Pinotti, MUFON representative for Italy

Pasadena, California on July 1, 2, and 3, hosted by MUFON of Southern California. Tom Gates will handle the speaker introductions as Master of Ceremonies. Bill Hassel, Chairman for the symposium, and his program committee are preparing a list of potential featured speakers and will be extending invitations in the near future.

Based upon the success of the program on Sunday in Toronto, where most of the speakers had volunteered their expertise, Mr. Hassel and his program committee are hereby extending invitations to interested people in the UFO field who would like to share their specialized research with the symposium attendees. Please submit an abstract of your proposed paper and contents to William F. Hassel, Jr., 4217 Minnetota Drive, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360 with a copy to MUFON at 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin TX 78155 if you are seriously interested in speaking or desire to have your paper published in the proceedings. Your abstract or paper must be received by December 1, 1982 so that it may be evaluated within our publication time frame and program planning schedule.

The outstanding ongoing public

education program by members of MUFON of Northern California may spark ideas for other groups around the United States if they are shared with our members. Key people in this valuable public relations program are Paul C. Cerny, Western Regional Director; Tom Gates, Astronomy Consultant; and Marvin E. Taylor, Assistant State Director for Northern California. The following chronological events are typical of their continued activities: August 21 — Tom Gates, 1-hour program on KGO-FM San Francisco; August 23 through August 29 — Tom Gates, Paul Cerny, and Marvin Taylor were speakers and installed UFO exhibit at Redding's Space Fair 1982 with the theme "Fact, Fantasy and Future"; September 10, 8:00 p.m. — KPDX-TV Channel 5 in San Francisco aired their TV Documentary on UFOs featuring MUFON representatives and including the Cash/Landrum Case near Huffman, Texas. September 7 — Tom Gates, Marvin Taylor, and Paul Cerny were guests on a 1-hour TV program from Channel 13 in Stockton-Sacramento titled "Good Morning California."

Paul Cerny has been asked to negotiate the inclusion of a MUFON UFO Exhibit and display with a large NASA and Confederate Air Force traveling exhibit to be part of four upcoming County Fairs in Idaho, Washington, and California by a private production firm. Tom Gates and Dr. Richard Haines were recently interviewed by a Los Angeles TV crew that are producing a TV documentary to be titled "ETI-The Search" to be shown in the Los Angeles area.

Marvin Taylor's recently acquired and MUFON expanded UFO Exhibit/Display, now installed on the second floor of his real estate office for the public, got a real boost when the *National Geographic* magazine team heard about it. Touring the California

(continued on page 18)