



**THIS DOCUMENT WAS OBTAINED FROM 'THE MUFON ARCHIVE' IN THE BLACK VAULT ENCYCLOPEDIA PROJECT.
THIS SECTION IS A JOINT EFFORT BETWEEN THE MUTUAL UFO NETWORK (MUFON) AND THE BLACK VAULT
TO OFFER AN UNPRECEDENTED FREE RESOURCE FOR UFO HISTORICAL RESEARCH.**

PART OF THE BLACK VAULT INTERNET ARCHIVE, YOU CAN CHECK IT OUT AT:

[HTTP://WWW.THEBLACKVAULT.COM/ENCYCLOPEDIA](http://www.theblackvault.com/encyclopedia)

**ALSO, VISIT MUFON FOR THE LARGEST PRIVATE ORGANIZATION DEDICATED TO THE STUDY OF UFOS
FOR THE BENEFIT OF HUMANITY:**

[HTTP://WWW.MUFON.COM](http://www.mufon.com)

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

NUMBER 214

FEBRUARY 1986


Founded 1967

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.

\$2.50



PIONEER 10 PLAQUE

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

(USPS 002-970)

(ISSN 0270-6822)

103 Oldtowne Rd.

Seguin, Texas 78155-4099 U.S.A.

DENNIS W. STACY
Editor

WALTER H. ANDRUS, JR.
International Director and
Associate Editor

THOMAS P. DEULEY
Art Director

MILDRED BIESELE
Contributing Editor

ANN DRUFFEL
Contributing Editor

PAUL CERNY
Promotion/Publicity

MARGE CHRISTENSEN
Public Relations

REV. BARRY DOWNING
Religion and UFOs

LUCIUS FARISH
Books/Periodicals/History

ROSETTA HOLMES
Promotion/Publicity

T. SCOTT CRAIN
GREG LONG
Staff Writer

JAMES LEMING
SIMONE MENDEZ
Staff Artists

TED PHILLIPS
Landing Trace Cases

JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
Medical Cases

LEONARD STRINGFIELD
UFO Crash/Retrieval

WALTER N. WEBB
Astronomy

NORMA E. SHORT
DWIGHT CONNELLY

DENNIS HAUCK
RICHARD H. HALL
ROBERT V. PRATT
Editor/Publishers Emeritus
(Formerly SKYLOOK)

The MUFON UFO JOURNAL is published by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas. Membership/Subscription rates: \$25.00 per year in the U.S.A.; \$30.00 foreign in U.S. funds. Copyright 1986 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 78155-4099.

FROM THE EDITOR

Nine times out of ten, even 99 out of 100, the Journal's graphic capabilities allow us to pass along to the viewer a reasonable facsimile of the picture we're trying to portray. This issue, however, is an exception, in that we have a remarkable color photograph, the hues and subtlety of which can hardly be translated into brute black & white. I refer, of course, to the photograph taken by George Lutz, assistant director of the Pennsylvania Association for the Study of the Unexplained (PASU), which appears on page 10 of this issue.

Aside from its inherent beauty, however, it's also an important piece of ufological evidence in a negative sort of way. Because it shows what kind of photographic evidence can be produced from a man-made phenomenon, given *advance* knowledge and time for preparation. Unfortunately, UFOs fall into neither category; in fact, they have an almost perverse proclivity for not posing for pictures. Nonetheless, some startling photographic records have been made over the years. We're proud to share one of these occasions with our readers, despite the fact that the subject source is decidedly identified.

In this issue

McDIVITT SIGHTING: PART II, by James Oberg	3
UFOS: WHAT WENT WRONG? by Ali Aabutaha	5
GLOWING CLOUDS COURTESY NASA, by Stan Gordon	10
TRIANGULAR UFO SIGHTED, by John Melesciuc	11
IN OTHERS' WORDS, by Lucius Farish	12
NEWSN'VIEWS	13
PIONEER 10 PLAQUE	14
A CHILDHOOD ABDUCTION? by Budd Hopkins	15
LETTERS	17
THE NIGHT SKY, by Walter Webb	18
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE, by Walt Andrus	20
COVER Courtesy NASA	

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

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 1986 by the Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155" is included.

McDIVITT SIGHTING: PART II

By James Oberg

The 'McDivitt UFO photo' — the "tadpole" — had a life entirely apart from the actual McDivitt UFO report. Immediately after the end of the mission, when pressed by newsmen for the photo which McDivitt had reported taken of the object, officials at the Public Affairs Office at NASA headquarters went through the just-received flight film and selected shots which they thought might have been the object. This was long before McDivitt had a chance to review the film itself.

NASA PHOTO

The original NASA caption on the photo (PAD # 65-H-1013) was as follows: "This photograph...shows the satellite McDivitt observed on the 20th revolution of his four-day space flight.... He said the Gemini-4 spacecraft was turning and the sun coming across the window when he filmed the object."

Later, after consultation with the astronaut, NASA press officials changed the caption to read: "Astronaut James McDivitt photographed this sun flare through the spacecraft window.... McDivitt explained later after the flight that the sun was coming across the window as the spacecraft rolled, the sun rays struck a metal bolt, causing the flares in the camera lens."

This is hardly a useful photo to print. It is the kind that amateur photographers prefer to throw out. But under pressure from reporters who wanted to see "McDivitt's UFO," it was the best that NASA HQ could come up with.

With just the photo and their imaginations, many UFO writers soon integrated the blob into the "astronaut UFO mythology." For example, George Fawcett reported that "Jim McDivitt reported he photographed several strange objects, including...an egg-shaped UFO with some sort of

exhaust."

Once the Condon committee had endorsed McDivitt's UFO in 1969, the reputation of the photograph grew. Often reprinted in UFO books and magazines, it became an important piece of UFO evidence. In 1975, an official of NICAP in Washington, D.C. selected it as one of the four best UFO photographs ever made. His choice was based on a penciled note on the back of their print, which reported that McDivitt had told someone that this showed his UFO. Nobody at NICAP could remember when or where. McDivitt, elsewhere, consistently claims just the opposite: the photo was selected before he could inspect the film, and it does not show his UFO.

MISSING?

There have been some controversies and insinuations over what became of the shots McDivitt really had made. Some UFO promoters have implied — even stated explicitly — that the actual films were squirreled away by NASA and that McDivitt was never allowed to see them. That's how author Tony Scaduto told the story in *Penthouse* in October, 1978: "In interviews McDivitt makes it clear that what NASA showed him and released to the public were not the photos he took; the actual photos have been squirreled away."

But McDivitt himself disagrees: "In those days we didn't number the film magazines, we couldn't go back and say which pack of film it was on. But I looked through each and every film that we had and it just didn't appear there at all. But there are a lot of photographs that are blank or overexposed or underexposed."

Elsewhere, the astronaut had worded it this way: "I reviewed the film myself a week or so later, frame by frame, and there was never anything that I saw in the pictures that looked

like what I saw in space. The cameras were not set properly or the lighting wasn't right or something."

The two most outspoken advocates of the "true UFO" status for the McDivitt UFO are James Harder, an engineering professor at the University of California at Berkeley and the director of research for APRO, and his young associate Brad Sparks. The main pillar of their argument seems to be studies of the "tadpole" films and an uncritical acceptance of the Condon report's conclusions.

At a UFO conference in Chicago in June 1977, Harder showed slides of the "tadpole" and criticized the official explanation: "One of my misguided critics (this author!) claimed that McDivitt...caught a reflection of some special bolt."

In a *Playboy* interview the following January, he was quoted as saying that "that sort of 'explanation' really shows how bankrupt the critics' arguments can get."

Harder and Sparks had difficulty getting their own arguments straight: Sparks, in a special privately-circulated report (*Refuting the Skeptics*, 1977), wrote that the bolt "would have to be flat and mirror-like"; Harder, speaking at the Chicago UFO conference, reported that "the bolt had to have a convex reflecting surface of a very special sort." And neither UFO expert addressed the fact that McDivitt himself — not the UFO skeptics and critics — had given precisely that "bolt reflection" explanation for the "tadpole" photograph.

Harder seemed to have paid little attention to McDivitt's testimony anyhow, since he said that "he reported what he saw as being a cylinder with an antenna protruding, and it was clear it was close by...and closing in." In reality, McDivitt never said "antenna," and

(continued next page)

McDIVITT, Continued

explicitly he couldn't tell how far away it was, and only ventured that he thought it "might" have been closing. Harder's justification for ignoring McDivitt's testimony is that "McDivitt's consciousness was somehow changed and his perceptions were not what he thought they were, which is not after all so uncommon with ordinary UFO witnesses." He elaborated with *Playboy*: "The UFO influenced McDivitt's perceptions," Harder suggested as one possibility.

On the other issues, Harder and Sparks also seemed to have confused their arguments. Sparks happily accepted the sunglare and eye irritation factors which reduced McDivitt's visual acuity: "These poor viewing conditions reduce the importance of McDivitt's visual observations and post-flight recognition almost to irrelevance — that leaves the film." In contrast, Harder attributed the perceptual gap to the UFO alone: "Eye irritation? Nonsense," he told *Playboy*.

Although the full chronology of the Gemini-4 "tadpole photograph" clearly shows that there has never really been any evidence to tie the tadpole image to McDivitt's actual UFO encounter — and in fact just the opposite is true — Harder and Sparks have accepted that connection as implicit and unarguable and have run with it from that point.

Sparks described the UFO as "a bright white ellipse with a curved bluish streamer doing a wavelike motion in space," which was "in sharp focus on the film." Hence, wrote Sparks, "the Gemini-4 space UFO remains unexplained."

Harder was even more confused — and confusing: "The object (sic) itself shows...to be an orangish oval, about three by five degrees in apparent size; the Titan booster stage would have had to be within 100 yards...to have appeared that big." But McDivitt refuted Harder: the tadpole never appeared to be that size because the astronaut never watched it — it had no connection with the real object McDivitt watched.

Harder was undaunted and described motion in the image: "That bluish flare...actually has a turbulence

to it," he told the Chicago convention, "as you could expect of a turbulent or plasma jet... This is one of the great unexplained pictures of the space program."

DISTANCE & SIZE

Harder rejected the booster explanation: "To have mistaken his own booster at a hundred yards is something I just can't believe," he told the convention; to the *Playboy* interviewer, he asserted that such a suggestion was "an insult to McDivitt's intelligence and professional competence." But in order to conclude this, he fallaciously required the booster to be at the same range it would have had to have been at in order to match the angular size of the tadpole, and McDivitt never said the UFO had even come near to that angular size. In fact, McDivitt's testimony suggests that the angular size of his UFO was at least ten times smaller, on the order of a tenth of a degree or less — which could have been the booster about ten miles away, far enough so as to be easily unrecognizable.

So Harder's confusion led to a glaring fallacy in estimating the UFO's range and the consequent ability of McDivitt to recognize it. But that's not the way Sparks described the controversy of my own published accounts of astronaut UFO sightings: "Oberg...has intentionally perpetrated an anti-UFO fraud on the unsuspecting public," he complained in 1977.

But who is really perpetuating a fraud? Harder made this kind of statement in *Playboy*: "Movies of a UFO were taken by astronaut James McDivitt. Yet his evidence, as far as we know, was never taken seriously by any government agency and is dismissed by professional skeptics."

This claim is manifestly false: the McDivitt movies do not show a UFO, and McDivitt himself is the first to say he doesn't think his "beercan" was likely to be any alien spaceship or similarly extraordinary phenomenon.

To be fair, Harder and Sparks are far from worst offenders (they did, however, pass up the offer to review and comment on this chapter). Sensational UFO literature is full of

tales loosely based on the McDivitt case, portraying both astronauts watching in fascination as a rocket ship circles them and then fades away into thin air. In one account, the UFO had just kidnapped an Air Force cargo plane over the Bermuda Triangle. Another distorted version of the story has been immortalized in widely distributed comic strip form.

Meanwhile, the Condon Committee investigator, Dr. Franklin Roach, has explained — in correspondence with me in 1977 — what he really meant by the provocative phrase "a challenge to the analyst." He wrote, "I meant that someone with more knowledge or patience than I had should analyze what the report meant. My feeling was that the 'analyst' would probably come up with a very natural explanation... Congratulations to you for following up and making the obvious identification as the Gemini-4 booster rocket."

So Roach had never intended to endorse the unsolvable nature of the Gemini-4 UFO encounter in any case, and his letter clearly stated that he felt the McDivitt case was closed with the publication of my preliminary conclusions in 1976 (even though the conclusions had been a little hard on Roach himself for not following up leads that in hindsight were 'obvious').

BEERCAN

Is any conclusion possible after so many years, when much supporting documentation has been lost and the eyewitness testimony has become fossilized by countless repetitions? The principal leg of the Roach/Condon endorsement — that there weren't any candidate objects within a thousand miles — has been demolished by the recognized presence of the beercan-shaped Titan-II stage.

McDivitt, more than a decade after the fact, refused to believe he could have misidentified that object — but both his degraded eyesight and different viewing angle at the time of the sighting eliminate any reliability from that opinion — and years of UFO research have taught us the surprising

(continued on page 17)

UFOS: WHAT WENT WRONG?

By Ali Abutaha

Ali Abutaha is a senior consultant in telecommunications and computers who resides in Virginia.

Editor's note: UFOs, we sometimes forget, are still a controversial subject, and nowhere is this more evident than in the area of their possible origins. It is one thing to say they are extraterrestrial, for example, quite another to pinpoint their exact source, whether it be a remote planet light-years removed, or somewhere much closer to home. In the following article Mr. Abutaha presents his own approach to the problem and arrives at a surprising solution. His conclusion is his own and is not to be taken as that of the Mutual UFO Network or the editor of the Journal. If his paper inspires others to propose alternative theories or to disprove his own, however, constructive criticism in the field, we believe, will have been served. We welcome both articles and letters of comments in response.

The Unidentified Flying Object (UFO) phenomenon actually refers to several phenomena, one of which is the possible "intelligent" origin of the objects. The latter is the most significant aspect of the phenomenon, if true. Despite numerous and serious attempts to decipher the UFO enigma in the last four decades, a genuine scientific solution has not been achieved. This leads to the logical conclusion that either (a) the intelligent content of the phenomenon does not exist, or (b) the serious scientific attempts, so far, have been unsuccessful. It is the author's opinion that the latter was the case. The problem seems to lie in the scientific techniques used by the serious researchers to solve the UFO enigma, and not in the scientific method.

In this article, the specifics of what went wrong are presented and discussed. It will be shown how the application of systematic and established scientific techniques can lead to a genuine scientific solution.

SCIENTIFIC METHOD

Almost every serious work on the UFO phenomenon deals with the so-called modern scientific method. There is no universally accepted definition for the method. However, there is agreement concerning its basic elements, eloquently stated by Immanuel Kant as, "Concepts without percepts are empty, percepts without concepts are blind," or simply: hypotheses and theories must be supported by observations and tests. Which comes first is not important, but the two ingredients must be present to account for a genuine scientific discovery.

The UFO phenomenon produced thousands of reports by people who perceived and reported sightings of seemingly unnatural phenomena. The "descriptions" of the objects as given by the witnesses, and only those descriptions, represent the input, the true scientific input, to the problem which cries out for a solution. The reports of the witnesses represent a set of observations, or percepts, to which the human mind must find equal and valid theories, or concepts. Beyond this short treatise, there is no need for further discussion of the modern scientific method. The problem becomes one of "technique" to satisfy the "method," and not the method itself.

CONDON REPORT

Perhaps, the most prominent scientific study of the subject was that conducted at the University of Colorado in the 1960's, "The Scientific

Study of the Unidentified Flying Objects," and which was sponsored by the U.S. Air Force as part of Project Blue Book. The Colorado group, led by a prominent twentieth-century scientist, set out as their straw man hypothesis the simple equation:

UFOs = ETIs

where ETIs are the popular extraterrestrial intelligences. The intelligent content of some of the UFOs is obvious to the casual and serious reviewer of the reports. Whether the objective of the Colorado Study was to refute or to prove the straw man hypothesis was not as important as the clear recognition that "UFOs=ETIs" was consistent with the scientific method. "UFOs" were the percepts, and "ETIs" the concepts which were to be developed by the human mind.

The Colorado group refuted the simple equation, and both their conclusion and methodology were sanctioned by the National Academy of Sciences. This, among other things, led to the termination of Project Blue Book in 1969. There were other serious scientific efforts, by individuals and groups from public and private organizations but these did not achieve acceptable and satisfactory explanation of the possible intelligent content of some of the UFOs.

If some of the reported objects were the product of nonterrestrial intelligences, then two possibilities arise:

1. The state-of-knowledge is not sufficiently advanced for the human mind to develop satisfactory concepts, equivalent to the reported percepts, or observations, or
2. Something went wrong with the scientific efforts so far.

(continued next page)

UFOS WRONG, Continued

In despair, some scientists concluded that 1 above was the case. The next sections will show that the fault was in the scientific techniques which were used to solve the problem; admittedly, a complex problem.

THE PITFALL

Almost from the outset of the modern UFO era, the scientific community was divided into three groups: two minorities, the proponents and the opponents, and a majority, the indifferent. After sifting through many reports, the proponents arrived at the conclusion that intelligent content in the UFO phenomenon is a possibility. If not, they insisted that, at the least, there is a phenomenon which must be dealt with seriously and scientifically. The opponents, on the other hand, asserted that the mysterious objects are not spacecraft from anywhere, and that such possibility existed only in the minds of some of the witnesses and the proponents, who were dubbed the believers. Judging by the prevailing attitude of the majority, the indifferent group, it appears that the opponents' viewpoint prevailed. The burden of proof, and rightfully so, should have always been on the proponents, and not on the opponents. Yet both groups tried to solve the problem.

Somehow and somewhere, the identification of that one genuine case, the clincher, was made a scientific requirement. In a scientific debate on the subject in 1969, and in the writings of some serious scientists and individuals throughout the modern history of the phenomenon, the proponents were invited to select the one case which they agreed to contain the proof of extraterrestrial vehicles. Even prizes were offered to anyone who could produce the case. That was the pitfall.

SINGLE CASE

By imposing the single case requirement, scientists and science were no longer needed. One case does not establish a trend, and studying trends in observed phenomena is the

essence of the business of science. When an alien spacecraft lands on Main Street, USA, the layman will not need the scientists to tell him so; anymore than he, or she, would need the scientists to explain to them that the Earth is spherical by using photographs of the planet taken from orbit and clearly showing its spherical shape. Rather than conduct systematic scientific study of the phenomenon, the race for that one case was on. A race that required no genuine scientific credentials.

While the serious scientific efforts to solve the UFO enigma should have been directed at establishing trends in the phenomenon, the trend has been "a case by case" study, as witnessed by the few serious studies of the subject. And while the specific trend to be established should have been that of the nature, or the essence, of the objects as found in the descriptions of the witnesses, the trend has been to study and classify the witnesses, their background, occupation, and other personal data; or the location, time and frequency of the sightings, and so on. This is not to minimize the importance of such encyclopedic tabulations in the overall scheme of things. But, the solution does not lie herein. These tabulations can only serve to establish the credibility, or lack of it, of the sightings. Once the credibility of a sighting is established, multiple witnesses and other criteria, then the "descriptions" which were given for that one case can be considered to be a data point. All such data points can then be combined to form a data set. The data set can then be processed using established and systematic techniques in the hope of finding a genuine scientific solution.

I must add here that there is no hope in finding a genuine scientific solution in the pursuit of a government cover-up. For if one hopes to find that one case, the clincher, in the classified files, then, as I said before, the scientist is not needed. If, on the other hand, the intent were to add more cases to the existing ones in the hope of conducting better statistical analysis, then, based on past experience, the effort will not be productive. There are more than 50,000 cases in the public domain. Some say

more than 100,000 cases. How many more cases are needed to conduct the analysis?

STONES & FISH

The most often repeated historic incident in UFO literature is that of the stones that fell from the sky. Would it have made any difference whether 100 or 10,000 stones fell from the sky? Was the answer to be found in the characteristics of the witnesses, or the continent on which the stones fell? One can fill an encyclopedia with the varied details of the witnesses, and the size, color, number, composition, angle of fall, and other details about the stones. The statement of the scientific problem to be solved was simple: Stones falling from the sky is a perception (observed phenomena) to which the human mind had to find explanations (hypotheses or theories), i.e., the disintegration of comets. Of course, there were reports of fish falling from the sky, a different phenomenon, and a clear distinction had to be made between the nature of the "stones" and that of the "fish."

The proponents use the "stones" incident, and rightfully so, to caution the opponents and, more importantly, the indifferent majority, to take heed from past experience. They should also take heed, for it seems that the problem with the UFO phenomenon lies in the abundance, and not scarcity, of cases. I do not mean to belittle the effort to collect and classify information, or to seek more cases. Nor do I mean to minimize the importance of the other possible natural causes of the phenomenon and their study. But, in the event that there is a solution to the intelligent aspect of the UFO phenomenon, then there are enough cases, or data points, to work with *already*.

ANALYSIS

Modern scientific techniques and instruments have made the achievement of a high degree of accuracy possible. This is particularly true when dealing with quantitative

(continued next page)

UFOS WRONG, Continued

data. The UFO problem is highly empirical. The input consists mainly of descriptions given by human witnesses, of varied background and ability to articulate their experience.

The descriptions represent the true scientific input to the problem, and only qualitative analysis can be conducted. Such analysis should lead us to a normal trend, a first approximation solution. In this manner, the effects of bad data points can be minimized, or hopefully eliminated. This is the best scientific approach as further analyses, iterations, can only lead us closer to the correct answer. Until such analysis is performed and a region of gravitation, or a normal trend, for the data points is found, any attempt to deal with a single data point (sighting) would not preclude the possibility that a bad data point, a wild point, is selected.

The objective of our analysis, then, will be to find if a correlation exists between the data points (the sightings) and some other variable, which may assist us in establishing a reasonable hypothesis concerning the mysterious objects. Let us attempt a systematic scientific analysis of the phenomenon.

HUMAN EYE

Each sighting will be considered a data point. All the sightings combine to form a data set which shall be the subject of this analysis. To avoid cluttering of the data, and in order to facilitate a solution, one, and only one, common characteristic of the objects shall be selected for the analysis. Which characteristic, of the many, shall be select? We should like to select a variable which is collected with a reasonable accuracy. The validity of scientific and technical data depends on the accuracy and calibration of measuring instruments and the visual acuity of the observer. The major source of information about the UFOs has been the human eye. There were other characteristics perceived by the other senses, but these senses are not as accurately calibrated as the vision sense.

The reported characteristics of the objects are many, including shape and

size, phenomenal speeds and maneuverability, instantaneous appearance and disappearance, and many others. Before we study the manner in which they perform the reported superior technological feats, we should like to know something about their nature, which may lead us to identifying them and their home. The nature of the objects can be found in their appearance to the human eye which is, scientifically speaking, reasonably calibrated as discussed next.

The human eye sees only a narrow band in the electromagnetic spectrum, the visible spectrum. The longer wavelengths of the infrared spectrum are invisible to us, though these are perceived by our skin as heat. Also, the shorter wavelengths of ultraviolet radiation are not seen by the human eye.

Vision requires the eye, a conscious observer, and a source of light. The reflection of light from surrounding objects makes them perceptible to the human eye. The snake, on the other hand, sees a rabbit in total darkness. What the snake sees is the "heat" of the rabbit's body. The body heat of the rabbit makes it appear to the snake to be bright and self-luminous. This is possible because the snake's thermal eyes see in the infrared spectrum. The snake, knowing that it is perceiving in the infrared region and distinguishing the appearance of the rabbit from surrounding cooler objects, can then make the judgement that the rabbit is a warm-blooded animal. The bee, on the other hand, knowing that its eyes perceive ultraviolet radiation and seeing this radiation in certain parts of a plant, make a quick judgement and flies directly to the source of nectar. The appearance of an object depends not only on its nature, but also on the method of observation.

Since we are interested in the nature of the UFOs, we know our method of observation, and we have numerous visual descriptions of the objects, then the variable we shall select for the analysis will be the "appearance" of the objects to the human eye.

LIGHT SOURCE

In the visible spectrum, the appearance of an object depends on its temperature. The metallic appearance of metals and alloys, for example, is easily recognized in the light, but unseen in total darkness. When the temperature of a metal sample is increased, a point is reached when a source of light, the reflection of light, is not needed for the human eye to see the sample as it becomes visible in total darkness. Here, the sample appears to us to glow, and can be described as self-luminous, and fire-like; as seen in heater or kitchen stove elements. Eventually, the glow itself becomes a source of light making other objects around it perceptible to the human eye. The glowing color of the sample will undergo changes as temperature is increased, glowing red, then yellow, and then blue. The color of glow has even been calibrated to tell us the approximate temperature of a hot object by merely looking at it.

So far, we said that a sighting is considered a data point and we selected the visual appearance of the objects as the variable for our analysis. But, how many sightings shall we select for the analysis, and which ones shall we use? With the exception of the most obvious misperceptions and hoaxes, a true scientific analysis must include all of the sightings reported over a period of time. Ancient and historic cases must be avoided as the time element would have rendered these obsolete. The modern sightings, say, those made in the last forty years, can be included, as the level of confidence in these should be higher. To discard any sighting will be interpreted as tampering with, or fudging, data — scientifically unacceptable. It then seems that any scientist who may be interested in trying out his or her luck with the UFO enigma must cope with tens of thousands of cases. But, that need not be the case.

The serious investigators of the UFO phenomenon, pros and cons, have culled through the tens of thousands of sightings which have been reported in the last four decades. They eliminated obvious misperceptions and misidentifications of natural or

(continued next page)

UFOS WRONG, Continued

man-made objects, single-witness cases, hoaxes, and others. In the process, they must have eliminated good data points; but this was done randomly. Whether the good sightings, or the unsolved cases, are 20%, 10%, 5%, or even one percent of the total sightings, this is sufficient to conduct reasonable statistical and scientific analysis.

DATA INPUT

When the descriptions of the objects are entered into a computer program as input to the problem, the resulting data set is the most unscientific looking data set that a scientist has ever seen. The data set does not lend itself to standard analytical, empirical, or finite-element techniques. Even graphical presentation appears impossible. Yet, as the appearance of the enigmatic objects may betray their nature, let us review some of the words selected by the witnesses to describe the objects. The descriptions are in the actual words of the witnesses and should represent the true scientific input to the problem. I must emphasize that there were cases in which the objects appeared to the witnesses to be of metallic or other identifiable character, but these were fewer indeed. The most common description of the objects, as seen by the human eye, is given in Table-1, The UFOs Data Set.

This is but a small fraction of what I have in my computer. Many of the words seen in the Table were repeated over and over by different witnesses, or different background, in different locations, and at different times in the last forty years. Again, there were many cases where the objects were described as metallic in appearance. These represent but a small fraction of the total number of sightings.

Today, great emphasis is placed on quantitative analyses and their accuracy. But, how do we handle the UFOs data set quantitatively? What can we calculate from it? There are no values to deal with and no acceptable scales to use. We cannot use the least-squares method nor can we develop

TABLE 1. THE UFOs DATA SET

Shiny
Blinding
Red flame
Very bright
General glow
Self-luminous
As a welder's torch
Terrific bright light
As a hot electric stove
Brilliant blue
Glowing orange
A light so powerful
Bright orange object
Bright flash
Intense blinking lights
Amber-colored
Rising on flames
Ball of fire
Bright blue-white light
Blinding bluish light
Very luminous
Luminous ball
Very brilliant circle
Dazzling sphere
Disk of fantastic brilliance
A ball of intensely white light
Halo around the edges
A sort of luminous tomato
Very bright shining disk
Illuminating the whole town
Extraordinary source of light
A luminous plate
Color of a red-hot iron
Glowing with iridescent glow

Huge fiery-orange sphere
Reddish yellow light
Great amber-rust light
Diffused and whitish in color
Brilliant gold device
A phosphorescent golden sphere
Odd tongues of flame
Silhouetted by a bluish glow
Glare of an oxy-acetylene torch
Real hot looking
Red glowing ball
With color of fire
Blazing with light
It light up the pasture
Huge light
Light of varying intensity
Brilliantly glowing
Big bright light
The source was extremely intense
Very, very bright
Fiery round device
A saucer-shaped glow
A diffuse luminous object
Glowing in silence
Abnormal blinding flash
Very luminous cylindrical object
Very brilliant circle
Fantastic brilliance
Supernatural brilliance
Brightly shining disk
Fiery spheres
Self-luminous sphere
Self-luminous object
A red sun-like light

general polynomials from the raw data. We cannot calculate a standard deviation, a variance, a probable error, a confidence limit, or any other meaningful statistical value.

The prevailing scientific view today is that genuine scientific analysis must be supported by exact calculations; else, the analysis is considered nonscientific. This is akin to saying that the separation of water into hydrogen and oxygen was not science, but that the quantitative analysis of the ratio of the two elements was; or that the Copernican heliocentric hypothesis was not science, but that the Keplerian orbital equations were; and so on. Almost all genuine scientific discoveries begin with a qualitative solution which can then be refined to the highest accuracy desirable, or attainable with

existing instruments. Any solution that we can obtain from the UFOs Data Set, and irrespective of the level of accuracy, is better than no solution at all. No computer, short of a well developed Artificial Intelligence (AI) computer, can deduce the desired solution from the data set. Even when AI is fully developed, it may not be capable of deciphering the enigma. The mind which is already an advanced AI system, can be, and could have been, applied to the problem on hand.

A NORMAL TREND

Can we make a prediction concerning a normal trend, or a region of gravitation, for the appearance of the

(continued next page)

UFOS WRONG, Continued

UFOS? It seems that the answer is yes.

We set out to see if a correlation can be established between the sightings and the appearance of the objects to the human eye. A careful study of modern cases shows a clear normal distribution in the description of the objects. The partial UFOs data set listed in Table 1 is given to show where the area of intense population of the data exists. Titanium-, aluminum-, and stainless steel-like unidentified flying objects constitute a sparsely populated area of the data set.

The normal trend of the data is that the objects appear to the human eye, and within the visible spectrum, to be "glowing, self-luminous, and fire-like." It should be noted that in most cases the whole object appeared to glow and to be on fire, and not only some appendage associated with thrust or power. The whole object appeared brilliant and fire-like, not unlike the appearance of the rabbit to the snake's eyes. This is the essence of the nature of the mysterious UFOs.

If we add to this the claim of many witnesses that the object appeared to be under superior intelligent control, then we have a well defined scientific, or technical, problem to solve. How can we mentally explain the intelligently controlled "glowing, self-luminous, and fire-like" objects? The glow of the objects and our method of observation should immediately tell us that the objects could not come from Earth-like planets, that they are not extraterrestrials, and that they are, very likely, nonterrestrials. If any of our own spacecraft appear "glowing, self-luminous, and fire-like" to nonterrestrial beings, we can immediately deduce that they do not see in the visible spectrum like we do.

So, before we begin speculations about parallel worlds and universes, faster-than-the-speed-of-light travel, and other possibilities in search of Earth-like planets in our and other galaxies; and before we search for anti-matter existences, psychological stimuli, and others, let us first reflect on the normal trend of the UFOs data set and see if it tells us something about the objects.

LIFE SUPPORT

The most important element in space travel is the life support system. In our case, the spacecraft and the space suit. The life support system must contain and maintain the environment and provisions which are necessary for the preservation and maintenance of life and equipment. If the reported "glowing, self-luminous, and fire-like" objects were the product of some nonterrestrial intelligence, which is conducting space travel, then a life support system is as necessary for them as ours is for us. Their designers must contain and maintain the environment and provisions which are necessary for the preservation and maintenance of "their" life and "their" equipment.

If they normally exist in sub-zero temperature, then that temperature must be maintained throughout their trip. And if they normally exist at a temperature of 3,000°, or even 6,000°, then that temperature must be contained and maintained in their life support systems to preserve their bodies and their equipment. In the case of unmanned spacecraft, the temperature constraints may be relaxed; but there is a limit to allowable temperature variations.

HIGH TEMPERATURES

We should not be so inflexible as not to allow nonterrestrial intelligences the ability to contain and maintain such temperatures for long durations. We, perhaps infants in the vast universe, have been able to contain temperatures in the order of millions of degrees, though for short durations; but we hope to maintain and control fusion-generated temperatures in the foreseeable future. The same field that we use to isolate ourselves and our surroundings from the fusion inferno may, at some point in the future, be used in reverse; namely, to isolate us and our equipment on the inside of a toroidal structure from externally imposed harsh conditions. Such a reversed tokamak may even be used to travel into the Sun and back safely. If the protective shield of such a device were to fail while in the vicinity of the

Sun, then everything inside our enclosure would melt, boil, evaporate, and disintegrate in a split second leaving no "nuts and bolts" to tell of the mission.

Just as the snake can reason, from the glowing appearance of the rabbit and the infrared method of observation, the nature of its prey, so shall we be able to reason from the "glowing, self-luminous, and fire-like" appearance of the UFOs and our visible spectrum method of observation the nature of the objects.

It is reasonable and logical to conclude from the appearance of the objects, as described in the data set above, that their temperature is 2,000°, 5,000°, or an even higher value, and that living organisms and equipment in these enclosures must also be at said temperature. Whether developed in accordance with the theory of evolution, or created, these living beings would have evolved in the higher temperatures. The minimum temperatures measured for the Sun are in the range of 4,000°K to 6,000°K, and this should not go unnoticed.

Such statements run contrary to the prevailing common sense of our time. Here, we must be cautious, for the built-in bias in our collective common sense can have more influence on our judgement than our knowledge. This is the very same common sense remember, which refused for centuries to accept that the Sun is at the center of the solar system, that the Earth is spherical in shape, and so on with many other phenomena.

But, how? How can living beings exist at such high temperatures? Can we use the laws of science to show if such a fantastic possibility is possible? Is it possible that the designers, builders, and operators of the mysterious objects come from the Sun?

The Sun reached a thermodynamic state of equilibrium much sooner than did Earth. If we can conceive a mental picture of a "Darwinian Pond" on the Sun, where simple living organisms could have formed and evolved to the complex level seen here on Earth, then the same processes which we use to explain how

(continued on page 18)

GLOWING CLOUDS COURTESY NASA

By Stan Gordon

Stan Gordon is MUFON's State Director for Pennsylvania. He lives in Greensburg and is co-director of PASU, the Pennsylvania Association for the Study of the Unexplained.

It was about 5:30 a.m., on the morning of November 20, 1985 when the PASU, Pa. Hotline began to ring. The first calls from observers gave descriptions of an object that initially sounded like a brilliant meteor. But as reports began to come in from many sections of the state, it was soon apparent that something besides meteors was involved. Truckers, police officers and other early morning travelers described seeing towards the Southeast part of the sky a pinpoint of light that gradually grew in size until it was about 5 times the diameter of the full moon. This bright circle of light expanded and was described by some viewers as like a silent explosion of light in the sky. This light dissipated and left a somewhat fan-shaped, greenish cloud.

SECOND CLOUD

In a short time, a second appearance of a similar light explosion occurred in the same part of the sky, and produced a similar cloud below the first one. These brilliant, green cloud formations remained visible in many areas for over half an hour.

The bizarre appearance of these lights created fear in some of the early risers. Reports of newspaper delivery boys asking to come into local homes, some thinking we were under nuclear attack, were not uncommon from information we received. Police radio communications systems buzzed with reports. PASU, recognized as a statewide clearinghouse for UFO reports, was deluged with inquiries from the public as well as law enforcement agencies and news-reporters.



NASA'S CHEMICAL CLOUDS

— Photograph by George Lutz

ROCKET LAUNCH

After interviewing a number of the observers, we felt what had occurred was explainable and was likely connected with the space program. PASU first contacted the FAA, which had no information on the phenomenon. A call was then placed to NORAD in Cheyenne Mountain, Colorado. They asked me to call back after the information was cleared.

I then dialed up the NASA facility at Wallops Island, VA., a good source for IFO reports. It was here we found the source of said UFO reports. At 5:19 a.m., NASA launched from this facility a three-stage, sub-orbital sounding rocket known as a Taurus Nike Tomahawk.

At an altitude of 230 miles the rocket released a compound of titanium, boron, and barium. And at an altitude of 325 miles, a compound of titanium, boron and lithium was released. The various chemicals

created the strange, colored clouds.

To complicate matters, during the time of the rocket launch it seems quite likely that some people in various locations were also observing bright meteors, some of which fit the description of a Bolide, which is much brighter than the normally observed meteor. The Leonid annual meteor shower had just recently peaked, and PASU had been receiving other bright fireball sightings during the preceding couple of weeks.

A careful investigation of UFO incidents normally results in a natural or scientifically explainable occurrence. There is no doubt, though, that there are strange UFO encounters that are not easily identifiable, and that is what makes UFOlogy so interesting.

MUFON

103 OLDTOWNE RD.
SEGUIN, TX 78155

TRIANGULAR UFO SIGHTED

By John Melesciuc


One of the interesting aspects of this case is the credibility of Ana and Per Hoel. Due to their professions, both are trained to observe and memorize detail. Ana is a professional artist and Per an industrial designer. At 1815 hours on 26 November 1984 while dinner was being cooked, Ana and Per were out for a refreshing walk accompanied by Patrick, their Irish Setter. It was a routine they enjoyed for five years. The night was clear, 57°, and the water of Magnolia Bay was calm.

YELLOW WEDGE

On entering Shore Road, Ana and Per noticed a wedge of yellow light being aimed at the surface of the ocean. Ana thought it must be a reflection of moonlight which proved negative for the moon was more southerly. They also thought it might have been a Coast Guard rescue operation but there were no helicopter sounds. This investigator verified through the Cloucester Coast Guard that there was no rescue operation in progress. Also the elevation of the light was too high for a ship's marking light.

Patrick is a very impatient dog. If Ana and Per decide to interrupt the walk to converse or to observe a snowy owl, the dog will bark continually until the walk is resumed. It must be made clear that there was no animal reaction to the UFO on Patrick's part. So while the Hoels were observing the light, Patrick started one of his barking fits and it was quite annoying.

After six minutes of continuous barking, Ana jokingly said to Patrick, "If you don't stop barking I'm going to have this light beam you up." Upon making this statement, two red lights, one on the left and one on the right began blinking alternately. It was now obvious to the Hoels that the object was moving towards the shore very slowly and that the initial light was at the front point of the object.



TRIANGULAR UFO SEEN BY
ANA AND PER HOEL

As it neared the shore the red lights stopped blinking and they now noticed four white lights lined up between the two red lights at the rear of the triangle. They now estimated the object to be 125 feet in altitude and they both could see a canopy-type structure underneath. It was the same type of bright yellow light shining through this framed transparent structure as the front light. The triangle itself seemed to be of non-reflective material with the outer edge darker.

At this point, a low droning sound which was very consistent could be heard. She said the sound was as muffled as her dryer. It passed over trees and there was no air displacement.

TURNS

The object now made a 90-degree turn toward the center of Magnolia. It was heading toward the highest point in

town, a five-story condominium. The Hoels now were running after the object which was about a quarter mile away. As it approached the roof of the condominium, they could judge the scale of the object — 150 ft. across the rear section and 130 ft. from front point to rear.

VANISHES

When the object was about 100 feet from the rooftop, it vanished. This halted Ana and Per in their tracks. Ana asked Per if they were both "flipping out." It must be made clear that the whole object, not just the lights, vanished for approximately one minute. Upon reaching the condominium, they spotted the formation of lights through trees. This formation of lights, four white lights between two red, was heading back out

(continued on page 16)

In Others' Words

By Lucius Farish

The **NATIONAL ENQUIRER's** December 3 issue reports on the 1948 Directorate of Intelligence report on 1947-48 UFO sightings which has been declassified and released through the Freedom of Information Act. This report has been reprinted in the **JOURNAL**.

The "Anti-Matter/UFO Update" column in the January issue of **OMNI** deals with the CNES/GEPAN UFO investigative agencies in France. Some 1600 UFO reports have been logged with GEPAN during the past eleven years, 38% of which remain unexplained.

A little-known UFO (or "mystery aeroplane") wave during the months of January-February 1916 is detailed by Michael T. Shoemaker in the December issue of **FATE**. The events were reported from the states of Pennsylvania, Delaware and New Jersey, with additional reports coming from Canada. The January issue of **FATE** has an article by Dr. Bruce Maccabee on three large and brilliant UFOs seen in Connecticut on December 4, 1981.

CORRECTION

A correction and apology to those who may have ordered any of Zecharia Sitchin's three books from the Avon Books address given in a previous column. This was the editorial address and, although orders to this address should have been forwarded to the mail order division, this does slow up the process. For those who may want copies of **THE 12TH PLANET** (\$4.50), **THE STAIRWAY TO HEAVEN** (\$3.95) or **THE WARS OF GODS AND MEN** (\$3.95), the correct address is: Avon Books - Dept. BP - Box 767, Route 2 - Dresden, TN 38225. Please include \$1.00 per book for postage & handling; allow 6-8 weeks for delivery.

MEIER CASE

Okay, here we go again! For those who are still with us after all the furor about the Eduard ("Billy") Meier case from Switzerland, we can report that two excellent videotapes are now available which detail the original investigators' findings. The material was gathered by a Japanese film crew headed by Jun-Ichi Yaoi, which filmed a documentary for Nippon TV in Japan. Lee Elders has edited the original tapes into three videocassettes. The first two, **BEAMSHIP: THE MOVIE FOOTAGE** and **BEAMSHIP: THE METAL**, are priced at \$59.95 each. As the titles suggest, these tapes deal with, respectively, all the 8mm motion picture footage shot by Meier, plus an analysis of the footage by the Japanese film crew who shot the documentary, and the metal samples allegedly given to Meier by extraterrestrials.

The films are extremely interesting and the analysis certainly suggests that something out of the ordinary was taking place when the films were shot — something not easily explained by models, superimposition of images or any of the other "answers" provided by the critics. The metal samples are examined by Dr. Marcel Vogel, a chemist for IBM. It would be helpful to have a background in chemistry and/or metallurgy while viewing this tape, but the end result is that, once again, there are some decided anomalies which suggest that the metal samples were produced by a very advanced technology.

The third tape in the series, **BEAMSHIP: THE MEIER CHRONICLES**, will be available later in the year. As I say, if you haven't already made up your mind on this case, I can highly recommend the videotapes. They are available in either VHS or Beta format (please be sure to specify which when ordering) from: Genesis II Publishing, Inc. - P.O. Drawer JJ - Munds Park, AZ 86017.

SOURCE BOOK

The latest volume in the Catalog of Anomalies series from William R. Corliss' Sourcebook Project is **THE MOON AND THE PLANETS**, detailing astronomical anomalies within our solar system. Anything and everything of an unusual nature which has been reported on or near the Moon and the nine planets is examined in this volume. Two later volumes, **THE SUN AND SOLAR SYSTEM DEBRIS** and **STARS, GALAXIES, AND COSMOLOGY**, will cover other astronomical subjects. As with all other publications of the Sourcebook Project, this latest one is replete with all manner of data evaluation scales, indexes, extensive lists of references, illustrations, etc. Pyramids on Mars, kinked rings of Saturn, transient lights on the Moon — all these subjects and many more are covered.

I have only one "gripe" concerning the evaluations (tentative though they may be) of anomalies; at no time is it seriously considered that some of these phenomena might be due to the actions of "other intelligences." Considering some of the events which have been reported, I fail to see how this very definite possibility can be ignored. Still, **THE MOON AND THE PLANETS** is an outstanding contribution to the literature of anomalies and I can only give it my unqualified recommendation. Copies are available at \$18.95 from: The Sourcebook Project - P.O. Box 107 - Glen Arm, Maryland 21057.

MUFON

103 OLDTOWNE RD.
SEGUIN, TX 78155

NEWS'N'VIEWS

This report is a reconstruction from events reported by TV station KVOA in Tucson, during their news program on October 7, 1985, and from articles which appeared in the *Arizona Daily Star* and the *Phoenix Gazette*, on Wednesday, October 9, 1985.

A local air-traffic controller and a police helicopter pilot tracked about 60 unidentified aircraft over Tucson Monday morning October 7th at 12:15 a.m. Tucson International Airport radar picked up the aircraft southwest of the city, near Ryan Field and lost them as they flew northeasterly through Redington Pass, said Patrick O'Sullivan, Air Traffic Manager for the Federal Aviation Administration.

The air traffic controller on duty that night reported to O'Sullivan that they monitored the objects for about 90 minutes as 15 groups of four or six objects each were tracked on radar traveling at about 250 knots or 288 mph.

RADAR TARGETS

The controller asked a police helicopter pilot to try to identify the objects, but he was unable to do so. Sgt. Doug Russell of the Tucson Police Department said the pilot told him what happened. "The tower called and said they had some targets but no transponders." Transponders are radar receivers that automatically identify individual aircraft for air traffic controllers. "If you don't turn your transponder on, all it shows on radar is a blip," Russell said.

The helicopter pilot tried to follow the objects and did see some lights, but was unable to catch up with them, Russell said. The pilot was at about 4,000 feet altitude and estimated that the lights were at about 7,000 feet.

David-Monthan Air Force Base, only four miles away from Tucson International Airport, stops flying jets by 10:30 p.m. said Lt. Julie Fortenberry,

base spokesman. No military flights were known to be in the area, she said.

Authorities are not investigating the occurrence because "if they were airplanes, they didn't break any laws," O'Sullivan said. It's not unusual seeing airplanes going across the scope who don't talk to us," he added. (Associate Editor's note: The speed of 250 knots or 288 m.p.h. is within the range of some private planes, however it is unlikely that sixty such aircraft would be flying in groups over Tucson after midnight with none of their transponders turned on.)

EDITORIAL

The Arizona Daily Star (Tucson) in an article on Sunday, October 13, 1985, asked some provocative questions. "Somebody knows why those 60 flying machines washed over Tucson in waves in the wee hours on Monday.

"But why does no one seem especially curious to find out? The uniform shrug of shoulders from the Air Force, the Federal Aviation Administration — even from Jim and Coral Lorenzen at Aerial Phenomena Research Organization — reads like the opening scene of a Steven Spielberg script.

"Officialdom agrees that there were no reports of U.S. military activity in the area at that hour. The idea that it could have been foreign aircraft is dismissed out of hand. Foreign aircraft would have been detected somewhere else in the nation before being spotted over Tucson. Surely they would have been picked up by scanners at the North American Air Defense Command in Colorado Springs, as they headed northeast from Tucson. But not a peep of explanation from NORAD was forthcoming, either.

"The F.F.A. says that aircraft going over a city at 7,000 feet or so don't have to check in with that city's air-

traffic controllers. Davis-Monthan Air Force Base says that military planes that pass more than five miles from a military field don't have to check in either.

"But 60 of them? Flying in "waves"? Somebody knows."

MUFON is indebted to several members in the Tucson area who submitted newspaper clippings and telephoned, including Allen Benz in Tucson and Thomas R. Taylor in Tempe.

Coral Lorenzen, when being interviewed on television, requested that all witnesses should call APRO. She said that she fielded about 20 calls from people who claimed to have sighted the aircraft Monday, but she said she unplugged her telephone about 2 a.m. to get some sleep. (Considering the present status of APRO, these individual reports to Coral may never see the "light of day." Associate Editor's comment.)

-Walt Andrus

17TH ANNUAL UFO SYMPOSIUM

JUNE 27-29, 1986

PRESENTED BY



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK

KELLOGG CENTER
FOR CONTINUING
EDUCATION
MICHIGAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

PERSPECTIVES

By Marge Christensen

As we begin a new year, it is a good occasion to take some time to put the last year into perspective and to take measures to ensure progress in the year ahead. It may be said that 1985 will be remembered as the year that the first National UFO Information Week was observed, and the year that MUFON began to really function as a mutual network with a greater degree of organization than in prior years.

We will also remember 1985 as the year that the Field Investigators' Exam was instituted and standards for our field investigators began to become tightened, and to reflect greater professionalism and competency on our parts. In 1985 we also saw a significant document release from Air Force Intelligence; we witnessed a 5-part documentary on an important UFO case on Cable News Network, as well as a fairly good UFO documentary on HBO.

Also, during National UFO Information Week, we saw several

media articles and programs portraying the UFO subject seriously and objectively and we witnessed some genuine dedication to the UFO subject by many of our State Directors and members who gave generously of themselves both in effort and funds as well as time in order to promote public education.

DECLINE

As 1985 came to a conclusion, however, we witnessed some less than credible media articles and a general decline in high caliber public information on the UFO subject throughout the country. Why this occurred after such a successful media blitz as we achieved last August, is difficult to comprehend.

The only sensible, constructive avenue open to serious UFOlogists at this time is to turn this situation around entirely.

Let 1986 be the year UFOlogists come of age! Let it be the year that a genuine concentrated effort be made by everyone who calls himself/herself a serious UFOlogists to work selflessly

toward a solution to this vital enigma, and to cooperate with other serious, UFOlogists toward the end. Let it be the year that we are all able to rise above petty egotistical needs, and both individual and organization rivalries and battles. Let it be the year that we give the skeptics a real run for their money and stop assisting them by giving them things to attack us for.

Let 1986 be the year of PROFESSIONALISM IN UFOLOGY.

It is time we stopped being our own worst enemies and started to become our own best supporters. Doesn't that make a great deal more sense? Only we can make it happen.

Let our slogan for the year be: **BECOME A PART OF THE SOLUTION, NOT A PART OF THE PROBLEM.**

Marge Christensen is a high school English teacher and MUFON's Director of Public Relations. She was the driving force behind the first National UFO Information Week and has frequently contributed articles to the Journal.

NASA

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

25

25th Anniversary
1958-1983


Pioneer 10 Plaque

The Pioneer 10 spacecraft, destined to be the first man-made object to escape our solar system, carries this plaque. It is designed to show scientifically educated inhabitants of some other star system—who might intercept it, millions of years from now—when Pioneer was launched, from where, and by what kind of beings. The design is engraved into a gold-anodized aluminum plate, 152 by 229 millimeters (6 by 9 inches); attached to the spacecraft's antenna support struts in a position to help shield it from erosion by interstellar dust.

At the far right, the bracketing bars (1) show the height of the woman compared to the spacecraft. The figure indicated by (2) represents a reverse in the direction of spin of the electron in a hydrogen atom. This transition puts out a characteristic radio wave 21 cm long, so we are indicating that 21 cm is our base length. The horizontal and vertical ticks (3) are a representation of the number 8 in binary form. Therefore, the woman is $8 \times 21 \text{ cm} = 168 \text{ cm}$, or about 5'5" tall. The human figures represent the type of creature that created Pioneer. The man's hand is raised in a gesture of good will.

The radial pattern (4) will help other scientists locate our solar system in the galaxy. The solid bars indicate distance, with the horizontal bar (5), denoting the distance from the Sun to the galactic center. The shorter solid bars represent directions and distances to various pulsars from our Sun, and the ticks following them are the periods of the pulsars in binary form. Pulsars are known to be slowing down and if the rate of slowing is constant, an other-world scientist should be able

to roughly deduce the time Pioneer was launched. Thus, we have placed ourselves approximately in both space and time. The drawing at the bottom (6) indicates our solar system. The ticks accompanying each planet are the relative distance in binary form of that planet to the Sun. Pioneer's trajectory is shown as starting from the third planet, Earth.



A CHILDHOOD ABDUCTION?

By Budd Hopkins

Budd Hopkins is a New York-based artist who joined MUFON in 1975. He specializes in abduction cases and is the author of "Missing Time."

In March of 1984 I received, in response to my book *Missing Time*, a letter from a woman I shall call Margaret Bruning. Margaret, or "Meg" as she prefers, is a registered nurse living in central Ohio, and her letter detailed several "childhood dreams" — her phrase — which paralleled UFO abduction accounts she had read about in my book. She hopes that by relating these "nightmares and dreams" she might "finally lay the ghosts of (her) childhood to rest." She would like to end her "embarrassing habit of becoming hysterical whenever an inanimate object vibrates or hums."

Meg's letter was precise, neatly-written but rather sadly desperate, a not unexpected emotion considering what she has gone through. The first experience she related was a "dream" that occurred in 1952 or '53 when she was about five or six years old.

DREAM

"Everyone — my parents and sister — are asleep. I can't sleep because of the humming. It seems to come from the back yard. I get out of bed, walk into the kitchen and look out the back screen door. There were three men on the back porch. As with most dreams the rest of it doesn't make much sense. Somehow the three men were suddenly in the kitchen. They were standing around me, pinning me down on the kitchen table — literally. They pushed a huge needle into my stomach. The pain was terrible. The overhead kitchen light (which was off when I walked into the kitchen) seemed bigger — brighter — blinding. I tried screaming — couldn't move. When I awoke in the morning, my shorty

pajamas had dried blood all over them. I'd had a pip of a nosebleed in my sleep — it had clotted in my braids and a bit had pooled in my ears."

SCARS

There were other, similar "dreams" and memories included in Meg's letter. She also mentioned that she has two odd scars — "Right temple 1-2" long, right forearm 4-5" long, for which neither my parents nor I have any

explanation. I've never been cut there that we can recall. We've always called it stigmata."

Meg stated rather firmly that she did not want an investigator to contact her; she merely wanted to put her recollections down on paper in hopes that they would somehow be neutralized by the telling. I was aware, of course, of the implications of Meg's descriptions, but I was also aware that

(continued next page)



BUDD HOPKINS AT ST. LOUIS SYMPOSIUM

— Dennis Stacy

ABDUCTION, Continued

despite her disclaimers she seemed to be asking for some kind of help. I wrote to her, inquiring further about her childhood "dream."

I wanted to know if, the next morning, she had told her mother about her nightmare. She could not remember, but she recalled that her mother "was awakened by the sound of my vomiting. Not only had the blood pooled and clotted in my ears, hair, face, and on my pajamas, but I had swallowed a great amount in my sleep."

She went on: "The night following the nightmare I woke mother and our neighbors across the street screaming for help in my sleep. All I could recall was a man in black and pain."

MEN IN BLACK

I had inquired about the three men in the first "dream." "I do remember the appearance of the men in black. They were dressed in similar black uniforms that creaked like leather or plastic with their body movements. I never understood why their clothing made sounds but their footsteps didn't."

"One of them wore a scarf. He was the one that told me to be still — you are fine — be still. He had a crease where his mouth should have been — the crease didn't move when he talked to me. He had dark slanted eyes that reminded me of a shark. I had a book on sea creatures. His eyes were like the shark's in the book. All of them had grayish white skin — odd shaped heads (egg-like). They had hands but the fingers didn't seem right. They were the size of grown-ups — big. I'm not sure if the humming sound came from them or the air. It made my skin crawl and feel numb."

Meg and I exchanged letters and I phoned her on several occasions. She steadfastly maintained that these recollections — and other, equally disturbing memories which have yet to be explored — were nothing more than "the unpleasant phantasms of a very ill child" or perhaps the result of "mass hallucination," however that concept might apply.

The one indisputable fact was that something deeply traumatic had

occurred, and more than once. Meg always worked the night shift, she explained, because of her terror of falling to sleep after dark. Even during daylight hours she said she sometimes "awakened screaming, gasping for air or unable to move a muscle — yet unable to remember what terrified me."

MEETING

In the fall of 1985 I was invited to Denison University in Granville, Ohio, as a visiting artist. I wrote to Meg, who lived not far away, and proposed a meeting. In late October she came to Denison with a woman friend and we spent the morning chatting about her recollections, and about the idea of using hypnosis to re-experience her "dreams." She agreed, finally, that it would be better to explore the past than never to know what had, and what had not, actually happened to her. I told her my belief that knowing for certain might lessen the power of her fear. The edgeless unknown always seems to be far more terrifying than the finite known.

The hypnotic session took place the following morning in my room at the University guest house. It was remarkable not only for its content but also for the vivid way Meg reenacted her experience. Everything she said and did was exactly appropriate for the five- or six-year-old child she had been at the time. She had no idea, for example, of UFOs. Her descriptions were limited by the knowledge and vocabulary possessed by an intelligent five-year-old girl living in central Ohio in 1952.

For the hypnosis I used the device of an imaginary movie theater, a place where Meg and I and a friend of hers could sit in comfort and safety to view a film made years before of a strange experience she had had as a child. It is a method that helps to keep traumatic experiences at some distance, and offers the subject control over the images: the "film," I explained, can employ closeups, long shots, it can be dimmed, shut off altogether, and so on.

I set the scene and Meg described her house, her bedroom, and the image of her sister and herself asleep. She mentioned the fact that her little sister

was snoring as usual.

Meg: There's a noise. It's like a humming. (Pause) Somebody's talking. Doesn't sound like Daddy. So how do you know my name? I'll make sure the door's locked. (Pause) If I get up Mom'll be mad. Uh oh. (Pause) How'd they do that? A lock doesn't do that. Not without somebody touching it. (Pause, and then, nervously) Can you turn it off?

(To be continued)

TRIANGULAR, Continued

to Magnolia Bay.

Again Ana and Per raced towards the triangle trying desperately to catch up. On reaching Shore Road they now noticed the object drifting slowly and at a lower altitude toward Kettle Island about one mile out. At this time the triangle seemed to come to rest above the water with the lights becoming dim then bright. Ana and Per observed this action for 40 minutes and believed the object was still there when they left to check on their now burnt dinner.

As reported earlier, there were no Coast Guard operations at this time. This was verified by calls made to both Boston and Gloucester Coast Guard Stations. This investigator also contacted Hanscom Air Force Base, Otis Air Force Base and Camp Curtis Guild which verified no unusual military maneuvers. Subsequent checks were made at Beverly, Lawrence and Newburyport Airports for advertising and ultra light aircraft. This also proved negative.

Due to media and press coverage on this sighting, three more witnesses were contacted but were reluctant to be interviewed for fear of ridicule. This investigator feels it should be noted that Per Hoel went through a period of ridicule from his co-workers. A newspaper headline was later dated stating, "Drunk couple see UFO," and found in his office. Also, a model of a saucer dangling from a hat was pinned to a bulletin board. Despite these two disturbing instances, Ana and Per still felt this experience should be made known to the public.

LETTERS

Dear Editor,

When I recently told a respected judge, who is a personal friend, of my interest in the UFO phenomenon, he surprised me with his encouragement and support. In this violent, unstable world threatened with nuclear holocaust, he regarded the pursuit of a higher order of intelligence suggested by the UFO phenomenon as more than worth the effort.

When individuals approach the UFO phenomenon with an almost religious devotion and fervor, we should be reminded of how vital their efforts are for overcoming the resistance and suppression from elements in society that consider as false any phenomenon that cannot be explained by presently accepted principles and points of view. The vanguard of any successful movement toward change requires such bold and forceful individuals for its success.

We have here a phenomenon supported by substantial empirical evidence. Even the integration of such knowledge with current scientific views can be exceedingly painful. There is ample evidence of this phenomenon in the context of ancient religious experience that often has been treated lightly in the modern world. We need enlightened integration. Old concepts, worn threadbare over the ages, will be instilled with new life and realism. Such integration with science and religion could result in new, uplifting, and constructive understanding with great heuristic value in social, scientific, and religious endeavors.

Much of society's present outlook will need penetrating reconstruction. Established and institutionalized ideas cannot be expected to yield politely to the advance of new and revolutionary knowledge. Individuals and institutions can, in fact, be expected to erect roadblocks and throw more than a few obstacles in the way. But the time will come. The foundations are being laid. A

virtual renaissance in the understanding of our world and universe is possible. Our present anthropocentric thinking will be shattered as it is immeasurably broadened to include understandings that can change human relationships and result in an unprecedented harmony and reverence for life.

With every new discovery, new vistas of exploration are revealed. We in the UFO movement have a foot in each of two worlds — the world of the present and the world yet to come. Our efforts are relevant, and there is room for everybody. Science, religion, philosophy, politics, education, social service, business, industry, all modes of productivity, and every honest observer are included.

Open-minded honesty, becoming like a little child to learn at the feet of Nature, and courage are required. Insight and discovery then come like a gift. We must work hard, think clearly, and build upon the efforts and contributions of those who already have given so much dedication, skill, time, and penetrating thought to this perplexing and promising phenomenon. New discoveries will come. Some will amaze us at their simplicity and power. Thinking in new and untried ways is a virtue. We must pursue it with diligence, pride, and circumspection. We will not be disappointed.

L. Bechtel
Maine

McDIVITT, Continued

lesson that pilots are, in truth, among the poorest observers of UFOs because of their instinctive (and entirely proper!) pattern of perceiving visual stimuli primarily in terms of threats to their own vehicles.

Lastly, this coincidence must be considered: that Gemini-4 was the only one of ten manned flights of that series in which a rendezvous was attempted (and nearly accomplished) with a beer-can-shaped target; and that Gemini-4 was the only flight on which a crewman reported seeing any unidentified beer-can-shaped object.

If the case cannot be closed for

certain, it at least cannot any longer stand as a particularly valuable piece of UFO evidence. It shows how the tapestry of modern spaceflight legendry can grow to cosmic proportions even when woven only of individual prosaic strands.

All it has really proved is how readily some UFO researchers can adopt — and adapt — useful material to "prove" whatever they originally intended to prove, evidence notwithstanding, and how certain a UFO witness (of impeccable technical credentials and personal integrity) can be of a distant, drifting memory.

The Gemini-4 case may be evidence for many things, but UFOs are not one of them.

UFO NEWSCLIPPING SERVICE

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

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

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

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



UFOS WRONG, Continued

Homo sapiens evolved from the simplest organisms on our planet can be used to show how intelligent and technologically advanced Solo sapiens are also possible.

Considering the estimated ages of the Sun and the Earth, Solo sapiens would have started on the ladder of evolution sooner than did Homo sapiens. If Solo sapiens embarked on space explorations, then, solar aerospace engineers must have designed life support systems capable of containing and maintaining their environment: high temperatures, high pressures, strong magnetic fields and other variable which are necessary to keep the molecules of their astronauts and their equipment intact.

The temperature of the objects, and even themselves, makes them appear to our eyes, within the visible spectrum, to be "glowing, self-luminous, and fire-like," just as our analysis has shown to be the case with the mysterious objects.

It is possible that we are dealing with intelligence that is vastly superior

with intelligence that is vastly superior to our own and only some eight-light-minutes away from Earth? Such possibility explains many dilemmas and paradoxes associated with the UFO phenomenon.

(To be continued)

— MUFON —
AMATEUR
RADIO
NET

EVERY SATURDAY
MORNING
AT 0800 EST (OR DST)
ON 7237 KHz S.S.B.

THE NIGHT SKY

By Walter N. Webb

MUFON Astronomy Consultant

FEBRUARY 1986

Bright Planets (Evening Sky):

Venus emerges in the evening twilight late in the month, setting in the west three-quarters of an hour after the sun.

Jupiter, in Capricornus, is very low in the WSW early in the month and sets only an hour after the sun. Thereafter, it vanishes into the solar glare. The giant planet moves into the morning sky on the 18th, although it will not be visible until around mid-March.

Bright Planets (Morning Sky):

Mars and Saturn appear near each other this month, rising in the ESE about 1:45 AM on the 15th. Mars passes just below the 3rd-magnitude star Beta Scorpii on the 7th, 5° above the 1st-magnitude star Antares on the 17th, and about 2° below Saturn on the 18th. Antares means "rival of Mars," a reference to the reddish color of each object. This month affords a good opportunity to compare the color and brightness of both planet and star. Mars and Saturn are almost due south at dawn in midmonth.

Halley's Comet:

Halley will not be visible from the earth's surface during most of February as it swings around behind the sun. Perihelion, or closest approach to the sun, occurs on the 9th (separation 55 million miles). During the last week it might be possible to glimpse the comet rising tail-first south of east as morning twilight begins (about 5 AM). But full moonlight will interfere, and observers have a better chance of seeing both the comet's head and tail next month.

Moon Phases:

Last quarter--Feb. 1
New moon--Feb. 8
First quarter--Feb. 16
Full moon--Feb. 24



The Stars:

By February evenings, Orion the Hunter--since November a prominent part of the evening sky--has moved into its highest position in the south. Reddish Betelgeuse marks the right shoulder of the warrior, bluish-white Rigel marks the left leg, and stars of lesser brilliance indicate the head, left shoulder, belt, sword, and right leg. Orion justifiably can be called the perfect constellation because it so precisely outlines its namesake.

To the SW of Orion lies that brightest of (nocturnal) stars Sirius. At midmonth it is low in the SE at dusk, transits south at 9 PM, and sets WSW about 2 AM. UFO investigators should be thoroughly aware of this infamous IFO!

MESSAGE, Continued

Journal.

Even though the Field Investigator's Examination has a few questions that are not covered in MUFON's Field Investigator's Manual, the third edition published in 1983 (161 pages) is still the recognized authority and tool for all people conducting UFO sighting investigations. The price to current members is \$6.00 and to all others \$10.00 plus \$1.50 for postage and handling in U.S. funds.

* * *

MUFON still has an adequate supply of the MUFON 1985 UFO Symposium Proceedings that was held in St. Louis, Missouri with the theme "UFO: The Burden of Proof" (180 pages) for \$10.00 plus \$1.50 for postage and handling if ordered separately from other books. Symposium Proceedings are still available from 1975 through 1984 at various prices from \$4.00 in 1975 to \$10.00 starting with 1980 and thereafter. The postage for combined orders is only \$1.50 at the fourth class book rate.

As we enter 1986, marking MUFON's seventeenth anniversary and the 19th year for SKYLOOK and the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, you are encouraged to read the article in this issue titled "Perspectives" by Marge Christensen, Director of Public Relations.

* * *

Over the past five years, the MUFON UFO JOURNAL has published articles about the Billy Meier Case both pro and con as to its validity. The article titled "The Meier Case" by

James W. Deardorff in the November 1985 issue number 211 has already resulted in 14 readers asking for additional sources and material. Background information on the author was inadvertently not included. The author has a Ph.D. degree, is a professor at Oregon State University and a Consultant to MUFON in Atmospheric Physics. Even though most of us have declared that this case is basically a hoax after studying it since 1978, your International Director invited Mr. Deardorff to write an article explaining what he learned first-hand from Eduard "Billy" Meier during his visit to Schmidruti, Switzerland in June, 1985. Dr. Deardorff's contribution is appreciated, since only a few people have been able to meet Eduard Meier personally. However, his meeting with Mr. Meier was inadequate to obtain the information that he sought.

John Brent Musgrave, the current director of the North American UFO Federation (NAUFOF), advised that a ballot was circulated in the Fall of 1985 among the Board to determine whether it would be best to formally disband NAUFOF. Four of the six members on the Board responded to the ballot (Druffel, Manak, Musgrave, Wilhelm). Two (Haines, Mazzola) abstained. All who replied expressed their wish that the organization had flown, but all felt that at the present time there is no viable alternative, but to close shop and formally disband. In his letter of 26 December 1985 and received on 22 January 1986, John stated "Given the results of the poll, I believe I have no alternative but to declare that NAUFOF has in fact

disbanded."

* * *

Dale Goudie has taken over the management of the computer operation known as UFO Information Service from Michael Hart. Their address is UFO Information Service, P.O. Box 219, Mercer Island, Washington 98040-0219. It is still functioning as a UFO Bulletin Board using voice line (206) 721-5035 and computer line (206) 722-5738 with an IBM-XT as the main computer. Bob Gribble of the National UFO Reporting Center has been submitting UFO sighting reports to the bulletin board.

We are happy to report that Bob Gribble is again referring UFO sightings to MUFON in Seguin, Texas for assignment to appropriate investigators for interviews and investigation. State Directors are receiving a copy of the half-page report so they may follow-up with their investigators. To be effective, prompt responses are essential.

Donald A. Curtis, State Director for Iowa, recently mailed 146 letters and sighting referral notices to the Department of Public Safety, Iowa Highway Patrol, 99 County Sheriffs and 25 of the larger municipalities (Police Chiefs) in the state of Iowa as phase one in his program to advise them where to refer UFO sighting reports. This mailing included printed sighting reference cards for easy referral. Mr. Curtis is to be congratulated for this important and positive step. Last year, Mrs. Jean Waller, State Director for Oklahoma, conducted a similar mailing.

MUFON RADIO NET

DISTRICTS

FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	SIX & SEVEN	EIGHTH	NINE & ZERO
N1JS	WB20GS	WA3QLW	K4HXC	W5UAA	W6LTP/7	KNQN	WAOOBN
W1LHV	WA2IUI	K3HWH	WA4NKZ	WA5CTJ		W8ZDX	NOCIS
N1BDC	WA2VBT	W31KG	WA4RPU	K5WLT		KA80GF	WB9QQH
K1AJL	N2EQL	WB3AMR	N4JUB	KA5RRL		KA8RWM	KAOLYY
	N2EPG	N3BBI	W4SKE			WD8PLP	WOAJA
			N4FSZ			K8ZDZ	KAODIG

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

by
Walt Andrus

Effective February 1, 1986, the MUFON Board of Directors has increased the annual membership/subscription dues to \$25.00 in the U.S.A. and a single copy to \$2.50. Second Class mailing to all foreign countries is now \$30.00 in U.S. funds, payable by International Postal Money Order or a check written against a U.S. Bank. Cash in U.S. dollars is acceptable. Since the study of the UFO phenomenon is frequently a family affair, additional members in the same family, that is, identical home addresses may become members for \$10.00 each when one member in the family subscribes at the regular rate, provided they so designate when submitting their dues. Air Mail postage to foreign countries is an additional fee.

★ ★ ★

We are confident that members will feel that 12 monthly issues of the MUFON UFO JOURNAL (20 pages) for \$25.00 is an exceptional value compared to the *International UFO Reporter*, which publishes only 6 issues per year for the same price. Both CUFOS and MUFON recognized the necessity for evaluating their financial positions in order to remain viable UFO organizations.

★ ★ ★

Tom Benson, recently elevated **Ward C. Campbell** from a State Section Director to the Assistant State Director for New Jersey. Mr. Benson has selected **Fred Schaefer** to replace Mr. Campbell as the new State Section Director for Gloucester, Camden, and Salem Counties. Ward Campbell has been a member of MUFON since 1974.

★ ★ ★

Leonard W. Sturm, State Director for Illinois, has appointed **William A. Leone** to the position of State Section Director for Cook and DuPage Counties. Mr. Leone resides in Westmont, Illinois.

Robert Todd of Ardmore, Pennsylvania has volunteered his expertise as a Research Specialist in the

area of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). By specializing in the F.O.I.A., Mr. Todd has probably been the most successful researcher in obtaining government and military documents related to UFOs. It is a privilege to have Robert represent MUFON in this significant field. **Richard M. Neal, Jr.**, M.D., a speaker at the MUFON 1983 UFO Symposium and a Consultant in Physiological and Psychological effects, is concentrating his research on medical cases. Dr. Neal plans to submit future articles on his work to the MUFON UFO JOURNAL.

★ ★ ★

The theme for the MUFON 1986 UFO Symposium at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan on June 27, 28 and 29, 1986 is "UFOs: Beyond the Mainstream of Science." The following speakers have selected these titles for their presentations: **John F. Schuessler, M.S.**, "Cash-Landrum UFO Case File: The Issue of Government Involvement;" **Dr. Richard F. Haines**, "Detailed Report on the Vancouver Island Photograph;" and **Marge Christensen**, "Scientists and Anti-Scientific Thinking in Regard to the UFO Subject." Other speakers are **Bruce Maccabee, Ph.D.**, **Harley D. Rutledge, Ph.D.**, **Michael D. Swords, Ph.D.**, **David M. Jacobs, Ph.D.**, **Robert H. Bletchman, J.D.**, and **Alan C. Holt, M.S.**

An award for the individual who has done the most for the UFO subject in each calendar year will be awarded. The individuals who have been nominated for the 1986 award are as follows: **Barry Greenwood**, **Budd Hopkins**, **Marge Christensen**, **Dan Wright** and **Bruce Maccabee**. A ballot will be included in the March 1986 issue of the MUFON UFO JOURNAL so that members may cast their votes and submit them to Walt Andrus for tabulation. The award will be presented at the MUFON 1986 UFO Symposium at Michigan State University.

★ ★ ★

The survey of the MUFON Board of Directors taken in October for ideas and suggestions to improve the professional caliber of the MUFON UFO JOURNAL emphatically noted that more of our Consultants, Research Specialists, State and National Directors, Staff Specialists, and Journal Staff members should be submitting articles for publication based upon the accomplishments in their specialized fields, speculative proposals to resolving the UFO enigma, book reviews and reports of the activities in their State or Nation.

All members are invited to submit narrative reports for publication of UFO sightings that have been thoroughly investigated and definitely found to be UFOs — not IFOs. If the MUFON UFO JOURNAL is going to continue to be the leading monthly UFO magazine in the world, it is imperative that the finest material be made available for publishing. Until we can keep the Editor and Associate Editor inundated with credible material, none of us has the prerogative of complaining about the caliber of material being published.

★ ★ ★

Dan Wright and **Shirley Coyne** have indicated in a preliminary report that the new Field Investigator's Examination response has been very good and of those responding thus far, the great majority have scored well. Before they can assess the overall achievement, they must factor in the nonresponses. For those of you who have not returned your answer sheet to Mrs. Shirley Coyne, please comply so that we may progress to step number two. A few of the respondents have offered substantive suggestions to reword or otherwise improve perhaps half a dozen questions prior to finalization of the exam as an ongoing document. Dan and Shirley will prepare a findings report for publication in the

(continued on page 19)