

THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL

Number 163

September 1981

Founded 1967

\$1.50

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.



Kresge Auditorium — M.I.T. Campus

SPECIAL 1981 SYMPOSIUM ISSUE

FROM THE EDITOR

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

RICHARD HALL
Editor

ANN DRUFFEL
Associate Editor

LEN STRINGFIELD
Associate Editor

MILDRED BIESELE
Contributing Editor

WALTER H. ANDRUS
Director of MUFON

TED BLOECHER
DAVE WEBB
Co-Chairmen,
Humanoid Study Group

PAUL CERNY
Promotion/Publicity

REV. BARRY DOWNING
Religion and UFOs

LUCIUS FARISH
Books/Periodicals/History

MARK HERBSTTRIT
Astronomy

ROSETTA HOLMES
Promotion/Publicity

TED PHILLIPS
Landing Trace Cases

JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
UFO Propulsion

DENNIS W. STACY
Staff Writer

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

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

Due to coverage of the 1981 MUFON UFO Symposium at M.I.T., some material had to be deleted from this issue. The regular columns and features will resume next month.

Terry Hansen's "Mind-Body" article is particularly thought-provoking, and we look forward to readers' comments on it. Also, Len Stringfield answers his critics and provides more background about the controversial "alien cadaver" photographs.

Early reports on the Center for UFO Studies conference in Chicago this month indicate that it was of exceptionally high quality. We will be reporting on it in an upcoming issue.

(Symposium photographs by Dennis Stacy)

In this issue

UFOs: THE HIDDEN EVIDENCE (1981 MUFON Symposium)	3
By Dennis Stacy	
THE MIND-BODY PROBLEM AND UFO RESEARCH	11
By Terry W. Hansen	
PUZZLING CASE OF THE CADAVER PHOTOS	15
By Leonard H. Stringfield	
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE	20
By Walt Andrus	

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

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

UFOs: THE HIDDEN EVIDENCE

12TH ANNUAL MUFON SYMPOSIUM

By Dennis Stacy
(MUFON Staff Writer)

Orthodox science has long complained that the UFO evidence is largely hidden — either in the absence of bona fide physical proof or in the uncertainty of anecdotal, eyewitness counts. The cliché, of course, has been that it is impossible to replicate the UFO phenomenon in the laboratory, therefore, the UFO does not exist as a viable phenomenon for objective, scientific study.

Nothing could be further from the truth, as this year's MUFON Symposium clearly showed. In fact, it is orthodox science that has chosen to hide from the UFO phenomenon and not the other way around, a point that was brought home in Walt Andrus, Jr.'s opening remarks. More than 15 years ago the Air Force queried several universities as to their interest in conducting a scientific study of the subject. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, was one of the first queried and also one of the first to decline the "honor" which eventually fell to the University of Colorado. The lesson, however, was clear enough: ufology has come a considerable distance in the intervening decade and a half, and traditional and contemporary science has been moved to acknowledge that progress.

Still, the ultimate burden of converting a study of the phenomenon into an acceptable scientific discipline remains on the shoulders of individual ufologists and ufological groups. Or such was the message delivered by Dr. J. Allen Hynek, the Director of the Center for UFO Studies, in his opening address, "Ufology as a Profession: A Manifesto." The dictionary defines manifesto as a "public declaration of intentions, opinions, objectives, or motives," and Hynek's speech was certainly that.



J.A. Hynek, center, chats with registrants

After recounting his initial connection with Project Sign, which began in 1948 and continued with Project Blue Book until the latter's demise in 1969, the Professor Emeritus of Astronomy at Northwestern University went on to briefly catalogue his experience with various UFO groups:

"My what a parade," Dr. Hynek said. "Each often with a pet theory... some mystical... some religious... some scientifically oriented... and many with claims to superiority, often leading to their foundering on the rocks of human nature... jealousies, competition, infighting, personality conflicts, and so on. And I have seen, as we all have, the disdain and scorn of the scientific community, in open opposition to the ideals of science. As Erwin Schrodinger, one of the pioneers of quantum mechanics, once wrote: 'A scientist should be curious and eager to find out.' Well, quite the opposite has

been true: the scientific establishment (not necessarily individual scientists) has held its nose at the mention of UFOs as though it were carrying a decaying rat to the city dump."

In a way, though, Hynek said, he could see reasons for such disdain. Most scientists probably get their information about UFOs from the tabloid press or the debunking press releases of the Air Force, neither of which is calculated to raise scientific curiosity. Is it any wonder most scientists, their time and energy already consumed by their own research projects, should refuse to take an interest in UFOs? "I was fortunate in that I was asked to (and paid to) take an interest in the subject," Hynek said, "and even at that it took me years to change my mind about UFOs."

What can we as individuals do about the contemporary scientific

(continued on next page)

Symposium, Continued

neglect of the phenomenon? "UNITE," said Dr. Hynek, "because it is up to us to present the subject of UFOs in a professional manner... not merely to bring it to the proper attention of scientists, but more importantly for our own respect. It is my profound and considered judgement that we ourselves will face another 30 years of stumbling, desultory collecting of case after case... until ufology becomes a profession.

"Professionalism is a state of mind, a serious structured approach to a subject, following the rules and standards of a given profession. The fact is, the primary sin of ufology today is that it presents to the outside world a most fantastic hodge-podge of unprofessional action, statements, maneuvers, intrigues, and balderdash... and I mean it very seriously when I say that to get anywhere in the next decade ufology must become a profession with accepted standards of action. And that simply means a housecleaning. Not only in this country, but internationally. It can be done.

"I issue a manifesto then, a call for ufologists to close ranks and unite... as individuals... in a sort of spiritual bond to set up a code of professional standards, a code of ethics for investigators, researchers and writers on the subject."

As Director of what is probably the country's most visible UFO organization, the Center for UFO Studies, Evanston, Illinois, Dr. Hynek's opening address to the 12th annual MUFON Symposium was a welcome one and one that was warmly received by the more than 400 paid registrants who attended the talks given in Kresge Auditorium on the M.I.T. campus. A summary of the other speakers' positions follows.

THE HUMAN FACTOR IN UFO SIGHTINGS

The speaker was Dr. Ron Westrum, a graduate of Harvard University and Professor of Sociology at Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti. Dr. Westrum is MUFON Consultant in Sociology and is a national

board member of the Fund for UFO Research; he is also the Associate Director of the Center for Scientific Anomaly Research (CSAR) and associate editor of the Center's highly regarded journal, "Zetetic Scholar."

"Since the majority of evidence for the reality of unexplained UFO sightings comes from human testimony, it is impossible to evaluate the UFO problem without considering the human factor," Dr. Westrum began. But we must also know something about the psychology and sociology not only of the individual witnesses who report UFOs, but of the other human elements which are involved as well, namely members of the press and media, who largely determine the extent to which UFOs are reported to the general public, and members of the scientific community, who largely determine how those reports are to be interpreted.

People who see and report UFOs, Westrum said, are much like the rest of society with one noticeable exception — those who were younger were much more likely to say they had seen a UFO than those who were older. This tendency held not only in the general opinion polls conducted by Gallup, but also in more particularized surveys like the one conducted by "Industrial Research and Development" Magazine.

As for those people who report close encounters, Westrum said, "unfortunately, the research has just not been done which would allow us to make any distinctions about them from the rest of the general public. The most that we can say at this time is that it appears that close encounters are more likely to take place in rural areas."

It is perhaps a common assumption that people who have UFO sightings will report them, but this proved not to be the case, according to Dr. Westrum. In fact, almost the exact opposite was true. In a survey of engineers and other scientists, it was found that only 22 percent of UFO witnesses told someone other than immediate members of their family about their experience. A survey conducted in the course of the University

of Colorado's scientific study of unidentified flying objects, otherwise known as the Condon Report, revealed that only one out of every eight people who thought they had seen something unusual in the sky would go to the trouble to file a formal report to the police, military, or mass media.

So, the greater majority of UFO sightings — or potential UFO sightings — are not reported in the first place. As far as the serious ufologist goes, this situation is further compounded by Westrum's observation that there is no particular correlation between the number of sightings being made during a particular time frame and newspaper coverage of those sightings. Westrum referred specifically to the so-called "dead-period" of UFO activity following the Condon Report. This period essentially lasted from late 1968 until 1973. And although newspaper coverage of UFOs decreased dramatically, the percentage of Americans who said they had seen a UFO, or a purported UFO, tripled during the same reference period.

The final human factor involved in the UFO phenomenon is, of course, the scientific community itself, which generally decides for the public what is real and what is not. Reiterating a point of Dr. Hynek's, Dr. Westrum said that individual scientists should not necessarily be blamed for the current state of affairs: most of the books and data they see about UFOs are most likely to be those least responsible. Or, as Westrum himself put it, "trash is far more likely to sell than solid investigative work."

Obviously, this is not the sort of situation in which the average scientist is likely to want to involve himself," Westrum said. "There is, though, one group of scientists for whom this neglect is inexcusable, and that is the astronomers and biologists concerned with the search for extraterrestrial life, or SETI. People who write long papers on the relative efficiency of this or that radio frequency for interstellar communication cannot

(continued on next page)

Symposium, Continued

be excused from looking into reports which could be evidence of alien visitation."

"FAITH, THEORY, AND UFOS"

From the purely social and humanistic aspects of the UFO phenomenon, we next turn to those which might be considered angelic and/or divine. The speaker was the Reverend Barry H. Downing, PhD, a board member of the Fund for UFO Research, as well as MUFON's Consultant in Theology. Mr. Downing's previous credits include *The Bible and Flying Saucers* and several articles contributed to the recent *Encyclopedia of UFOs*.

According to Downing, "UFOS have created a tension within the scientific community and much of this tension has to do with the fact that many scientists see UFOS as religion rather than science. Yet the two disciplines are not all that divorced, Downing said. In fact, science and religion share several characteristics that should be bringing them closer together rather than drawing them further apart. What passes for faith in religion is very much akin to what passes for theory in the realm of science. Both faith and theory are proposals based on intuition and feeling rather than on true, objective knowledge. And both seek to provide answers about the mystery of existence itself.

Dr. Downing also professed that he was a Presbyterian and Christian first and a scientist second. "I say this because I want you to see that one of the major problems we face today is that of deciding which scientific theories, if any, to place our faith in. Faith, science, and theory are deeply interdependent. If we place our faith in the wrong scientific attitudes and theories, we might possibly destroy the human race. Yet there is no way to avoid making the choice. Faith involves risk. We do not have any way out of our 20th Century dilemma," Downing added. "And the truth is that neither good religion nor good science can be risk free. We must not



Speakers field questions, l. to r., Bill Moore, Stanton Friedman, and Barry Downing

sacrifice ourselves on the altar of either safe science or safe religion. God wants us to take risks."

And according to Downing, UFOS are part and parcel of God's mysterious plan. "My theory, my guess, my faith, if you will, is that UFOS carry the angels of God — divine beings from another world who have helped develop the human race, and who watch over us, like shepherds watching over their sheep, as we take our risks of faith on planet earth, believing, making progress, leaving first base and trying to get to second."

Ultimately, Downing argued, we will have to assess the UFO phenomenon solely on the basis of which theory seems to make the most sense; in other words, by an act of faith. "But if I am right, the UFO mystery will remain just that — a mystery — for as long as it serves God's game plan."

CLOSE ENCOUNTERS OF THE SECOND KIND: PHYSICAL TRACES

Whether divine angels or mundane aliens (or neither) are aboard the physical objects UFOS sometimes seem to represent, one thing appears relatively certain: a curious complex of physical effects are often found on the ground where UFOS were said to

have been resting and from which they have allegedly taken off. Ted Phillips, MUFON's Specialization Coordinator, has been conducting a detailed study of landing trace cases for over 14 years. In that interval Phillips has personally investigated some 300 such cases. His files contain reports of more than 2,000 landings from 64 countries.

There has been a steady increase in the number of physical trace cases reported since the 1940s, when less than 100 were recorded. From 1951 until 1960, almost 400 UFO landings were logged. The following decade saw nearly 600 new reports, and from 1971 until 1980 there were almost a thousand. The great majority of these cases came from ten major countries: the United States ranked first, with almost 1,000 cases, followed by France, Australia, Canada, and Spain, each of which recorded in the neighborhood of some 200 cases. Argentina, Italy, Brazil, England, and New Zealand completed the list.

Most of the U.S. reports originated in California, followed by Ohio, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Iowa, and New York. The "typical" UFO landing occurs in the month of October at approximately 9 p.m. Its average

(continued on next page)

Symposium, Continued

duration is between 1 and 5 minutes and involves two witnesses. Almost half of the reported UFOs are described as disc-shaped. Thirty-eight percent are said to be of a metallic color, 21 percent red, and 17 percent orange.

Aside from the impressions associated with landing arms, or tripods, the most commonly reported physical traces involve burned or depressed vegetation and dehydrated land surfaces. Humanoids, frequently seen in or near landed UFOs, are described as being less than average human height. Various animals, particularly dogs and cats, are disturbed by the close approach of UFOs and, for some as yet unknown reason, automobile engines seem oddly affected.

"In conclusion," Phillips said, "based on the information at hand, it appears that the reports indicate an unconventional vehicle, solid and with considerable weight, which is under intelligent control — an unconventional vehicle which has no known origin or purpose."

UFO ABDUCTIONS: THE INVISIBLE EPIDEMIC

Much of the UFO evidence is hidden not only from orthodox science, but from the UFO percipient, as well. These are the cases involving alleged abduction by a UFO and its occupants which frequently contain instances of time lapses and/or amnesia. If the data are recovered at all, it is usually through the use of regressive hypnosis, although some abductees spontaneously remember experiences.

Budd Hopkins has recently been investigating UFO abductions in which the witness reports lapses in time or memory and has published his findings in a new book, *Missing Time*. His work was assisted by veteran MUFON investigator Ted Bloecher, of New York, and by psychologist Aphrodite Clamar, who contributed the afterword to the book.

Hopkins found that "classical" abductions like that of Betty and Barney Hill were the exception rather than the rule; in fact, he was soon able to



Landing trace specialist Ted Phillips

distinguish five separate abduction categories classified on the basis of the extent of the witnesses' conscious recall of their experience.

Type 1 abductions are those in which the witness consciously recalls most of his or her experience. The witness remembers first seeing the UFO and watching it approach. He or she remembers being taken aboard, the interior of the craft, and human-like creatures who usually perform a physical examination. All of this is recalled without recourse to regressive hypnosis. Type 1 abductions include cases like that of Villas-Boas, Hickson-Parker, and Carl Higdon. There may be periods when the witness was unconscious during his or her abduction and so does not recall the entire abduction scenario, as in the case of Travis Walton.

In Type 2 abductions witnesses remember the arrival of the UFO, the appearance of its humanoid occupants, and subsequent lapse in time or dislocation in space. Unlike Type 1 cases, however, they do not consciously recall what transpired while they were aboard the supposed UFO. This emerges only later with the use of hypnosis, which not all abductees are willing to undergo. The Betty and Barney Hill abduction is a classical Type 2.

Type 3 abductions are closely akin to a paranormal syndrome known as "bedroom visitations." These involve the appearance of strange people or entities, sometimes seen as if in a dream or vision and most commonly reported during normal sleeping hours. The abduction of Betty Andreasson-Luca falls into this category; she was not consciously aware of a time lapse, nor did she initially remember anything about the UFO itself, only a light emanating from it.

"It is when we begin to consider Type 4 cases," Hopkins said, "that we first understand how truly invisible the abduction phenomena might actually be. In such cases, *no UFO sighting is involved*. The abductee consciously remembers only an odd time-lapse or dislocation. No occupants are reported and there is nothing that would seemingly link the strange experience with the UFO encounter as we know it. It is only when the witness eventually agrees to undergo hypnosis that the knowledge of their abduction by a UFO first surfaces."

"Vague, ephemeral clues are all that remain in the conscious memory of a Type 5 abductee," Hopkins continued. "There are absolutely no conscious recollections of a UFO sight-

(continued on next page)

Symposium, Continued

ing, of occupants, of an on-board experience, nor, for that matter, of a time-lapse or dislocation. In other words, just about nothing at all that would suggest a UFO abduction had taken place."

Still, there is a complex of factors whereby a Type 5 abduction might be involved. These include disturbing dreams of an abduction experience, unexplained physical marks or scars on the body, an unnaturally strong fear of certain places or stretches of highway, experiences of sourceless illumination and so on. The least obvious symptom may be nothing more than a vague feeling that 'something happened to me.'"

"It has been a comforting idea over the years," Hopkins concluded, "that we had a problem with UFOs, whatever they were, but that abductions were some special and bizarre aspect of the phenomenon that occurred, if at all, only very rarely. For me, that comfortable old idea has ceased to be tenable. If one wants to be truly jarred, consider this proposition: there may be as many abductions as there are UFO sighting reports."

MISSING TIME: A PSYCHOLOGIST EXAMINES THE UFO EVIDENCE

Aphrodite Clamar is a practicing New York psychologist who helped Budd Hopkins' investigations by conducting regressive hypnosis sessions with several abductees. She also arranged for a battery of standard psychological tests to be administered to the abductees. Mrs. Clamar found that most of the UFO "victims" fit no specific psychological pattern; prior to their encounter with UFOs, society would have accepted them as psychologically and sociologically normal. Her hypnotic subjects did share one new factor in common, however. All expressed a feeling of being perplexed and troubled by their UFO experience, particularly those who had suffered time-lapse or amnesia.

"Why me?" was the question most frequently asked. "Did this really happen to me?"



Author Budd Hopkins autographs "Missing Time"

"The subjects I saw," Mrs. Clamar said, "were apt to feel marked or stigmatized in some way — ashamed, embarrassed, or perplexed about what happened to them and hesitant to discuss their experience . . . Males, especially men who had their UFO experience in adolescence, did not fare as well as women in integrating and philosophically accepting their experience."

"For the UFO witness I hypnotized there appeared to be a gap between the experience they believe they underwent and the words they were able to use to explain and describe it. The fact that we, as psychologists, do not have an adequate explanation of what happened to them, the fact that we cannot give their experience a clear-cut diagnostic label or describe it in detail, does not detract from the validity of the experience as far as the subjects are concerned," Mrs. Clamar concluded. "For them it was a genuine experience that warrants our respect and further efforts to clarify and understand it."

"Nevertheless, the question persists: is the UFO experience, as relived under hypnosis, genuine or a

delusion? After spending more than 60 hours with some 20 subjects under hypnosis, I still cannot answer the question."

WHAT THE GOVERNMENT WOULD KNOW ABOUT UFOS IF THEY READ THEIR OWN DOCUMENTS

Peter Gersten joined MUFON in 1977 as a legal advisor and field investigator. He was the legal counsel to William Spaulding's Ground Saucer Watch in *GSW vs. CIA*, September 1977, which resulted in the release of over 900 pages of official government documents pertinent to UFOs. He also represented CAUS (Citizens Against UFO Secrecy), in their Freedom of Information suits against the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Federal Aviation Administration.

"In the 3,000 pages of previously classified documents on UFOs released during the past 4 years by the Department of State, Army, Navy, Air Force, by the Federal Bureau of

(continued on next page)

Symposium, Continued

Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Defense Intelligence Agency, we find the expert testimony of scientists, military personnel, intelligence personnel, law enforcement officers, and other reliable and responsible people on the subject of UFOs."

And what those expert witnesses tell us is almost exactly opposite the official government "line" on UFOs, namely that UFOs show no evidence of being intelligently controlled vehicles, nor is there any reason to think they may pose a threat to national security.



Peter Gersten

Gersten, however, is hardly convinced by the government's arguments. "I am a defense attorney in criminal cases," he explained. "I know what evidence is. If the evidence contained in these documents were to be presented in court it would provide overwhelming proof that UFOs do exist and that some UFOs are unconventional aerial objects... I do not hesitate to say that what we are dealing with here is an advanced form of technology and I will use the government's documents to prove my case."

Gersten then proceeded to show a series of slides of previously classified documents which did indeed indicate that most of the government agencies listed above took an active interest in the UFO phenomenon, at least to the

extent of accepting and responding to the various UFO reports which came to their attention.

Here are only a few of the many examples Gersten showed:

- Department of Defense document dated September 8, 1973, and classified as a "Serious Incident Report." Two military policemen reported a UFO over Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia, which hovered, rapidly changed altitude, and travelled at a high rate of speed. The object was described as between 35 and 75 feet in diameter, oval-shaped and showing brilliant blue, white and amber flashing lights.

- Algeria, 1975, a Department of State message revealing a report by the local Defense Ministry of UFOs maneuvering over Algerian air space during the month of March. The object seen on the night of March 6, was said to have a "very bright light... which obscures its shape. Object maneuvers and has been seen to land and take off. Sighting last night, at about 1930 hours, was first by radar and secondly visually."

- January 21, 1976, a National Military Command Center memorandum for the record reported two security police officers seeing UFOs near the flight line at Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico. The UFOs were reported as "25 yards in diameter, gold or silver in color with blue light on top, hole in the middle and red light on bottom."

"Does a flying doughnut 75 feet in diameter represent known present-day technology?" Gersten asked.

Despite frequent claims to the contrary, Gersten noted, the government has also shown an abiding interest in UFOs in terms of the nation's security. An Air Force document dated May 1950, referred to "the continued occurrence of unexplained phenomena of this nature in the vicinity of sensitive installations."

In December of 1952, the Assistant Director of Scientific Intelligence for the CIA sent the following message to the then-acting Director of the CIA, Walter B. Smith:

"Sightings of unexplained objects at

great altitudes and travelling at high speed in the vicinity of major U.S. defense installations are of such nature that they are not attributable to natural phenomena or known types of aerial vehicles."

What we might logically expect from the government, then, if only it bothered to read its own documents, could be an objective reappraisal of official attitudes towards the UFO phenomenon.

"But what we know for certain," Gersten concluded, "is that the government, after more than 30 years of secrecy and deception, still manages to keep UFO related information from the public. I object to this policy of UFO secrecy. I feel that the public has a right to know."

AFRICAN ENCOUNTERS: CASE INVESTIGATIONS

There is also another way in which the UFO information can be hidden, as was demonstrated by the symposium's next-to-last speaker, Cynthia Hind, of Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe.



Cynthia Hind

And that is by virtue of living in a society which is not basically as well acquainted with the phenomenon as are most of the European and Asian countries. Despite the difficulties of educating the public and finding qualified people who are willing to contribute to investigations, Mrs. Hind was able to take comfort in the fact that the reports that did surface

(continued on next page)

Symposium, Continued

exhibited characteristics similar to those reported in other areas of the world.

She recounted several cases which would have been the envy of any European, Asian, or American investigator. The most dramatic of these involved a probable physical trace landing which occurred near Despatch, South Africa, on October 2, 1978. It was reported by four teenage youths who were waiting for the mother of one of them to pick them up after school.

The day was fine, but overcast. One of the boys suddenly noticed a silver object protruding out of the brush on the side of a hill across the valley. At almost the same time, another boy noticed two silver-suited men about 300 yards to the west of the silver object. The two distant figures were moving toward the center of the hill when they were joined by a third man, who appeared to be carrying a small suitcase.

But the most unusual thing of all was the way they were moving.

"They moved only from the knees downward," said Peter Simpson, oldest of the four boys, "and used their legs like a fin."

Report of the sighting was delayed some 10 days because of the objection of Peter's father, a local doctor, who did not want to become associated with something as bizarre as flying saucers. Each of the boys was questioned separately and asked to submit sketches of what they had seen. Although there were some differences, the sketches agreed on most points, as did the oral accounts.

Eventually, Mrs. Hind was able to enlist some of the local citizens in an effort to survey the potential landing site. To the volunteers' surprise, the vegetation and brush turned out to be some 6 to 8 feet high and necessitated the use of machetes to chop their way through. When they did reach the site indicated by one of the boys, however, they found an area measuring some 6 by 18 meters (21 by 60 feet) which had been crushed down to ground level. On the outside of this oval depression were nine marks,

each containing 3 or 4 tiny imprints. It was extremely difficult to ascertain the exact nature of these marks, because it was now some 16 days after the original sighting and there had been at least one heavy rain in the meantime. All of those present, however, were convinced that as a hoax, the physical evidence on the site was simply too much for the young boys to have arranged, even if they had all worked together.

THE ROSWELL INCIDENT: BEGINNING OF THE COSMIC WATERGATE

Finally, a Symposium devoted to the subject of the hidden evidence behind the UFO phenomenon would hardly be complete without a discussion of what may well prove to be the greatest cover-up of all times: the fact that the United States government could have in its possession a crashed saucer along with the deep-frozen bodies of its occupants.

Such theories have been current for a number of years, in fact, ever since the late 1940s, when UFOs made their most recent and persistent appearance in the skies overhead. But it was not until the appearance this year of *The Roswell Incident*, co-authored by noted author and linguist, Charles Berlitz, and William Moore, that the theories of UFO crash retrievals gained widespread public attention.

William Moore was present along with the man hired as research consultant for the book, nuclear physicist Stanton T. Friedman.

Briefly, the Roswell Incident concerns the apparent high probability that a UFO crashed on American soil in the state of New Mexico, in July of 1947. Stanton T. Friedman uncovered the original lead in January of 1978, while lecturing in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and appearing on local media. Someone introduced him to the manager of the TV station, who said that Friedman ought to get in touch with Retired Colonel Jesse Marcel who had handled one of these "flying saucers way back when."

Friedman did get in touch with the now elderly Marcel, but was skeptical until Bill Moore, researching the story

in the files of the University of Minnesota, came across the original news release which said that the Air Force had recovered a crashed "flying disc." Just as immediately, however, press releases were issued which denied the original report: the odd scraps of shiny material picked up in the desert near Roswell were actually the remains of a weather balloon.

Air Force brass supposedly had the material flown to Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas, where General Ramey displayed it to members of the press. A local weather forecaster was on hand to explain that the material being shown had indeed come from a weather balloon.

There is no doubt about that, Moore and Friedman admitted. The problem is that the Air Force kept the real recovered material aboard plane and later flew it on to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio. The Fort Worth press conference was nothing more than a stage show and a cover-up, the beginning of Cosmic Watergate and a policy that still exists today. At least this is the scenario arrived at by the two men after interviewing Jesse Marcel and others who were in the area around Roswell, New Mexico, at the time of the crash. Marcel was a highly placed intelligence officer who would later be promoted to Colonel and work with America's hydrogen bomb program.

Present day Air Force officials, of course, continue to deny the existence of any crashed saucers in their possession.

There was, of course, much more to the MUFON M.I.T. Symposium than can be included in an overview of this sort, including Friday night's beer and wine reception; Saturday night's Speaker Panel when all Symposium Speakers assembled on stage and replied to questions from the audience; numerous workshops on subjects such as animal mutilations, close encounters, and investigators' ethics; the showing of several UFO documentary and related films; and the detailed presentation of the Betty Andreasson abduction shown in slides

(continued on next page)



I. to r., Bruce Maccabee, Tom Deuley, and Dick Hall representing the Fund for UFO Research

by Raymond Fowler. Betty Andreasson, now Luca, was available for questions from the audience after the presentation.

Then there was the behind-the-scene work conducted by Joseph Santangelo and the local MUFON members, all of whom must be congratulated for one of the most progressively organized and realized of all MUFON's annual Symposia. Accommodations were on campus and a complete schedule of meals available for those who so desired.

MUFON held its annual corporate meeting on Sunday, July 26th, hearing reports from the Treasurer and individual State Directors. Cynthia R. Hind, a Symposium speaker, was named Continental Coordinator for Africa.

ADDENDA

We failed to properly credit Dennis Stacy for the photographs with his articles on the Klass-Friedman debate (No. 160) and the London UFO conference (No. 162). We apologize for this oversight. Dennis kindly provides high quality photographs with his articles, and deserves full credit for them.



Betty Andreasson-Luca

The Mind-Body Problem and Its Importance to UFO Research

By Terry W. Hansen

In recent years, some scientists have become increasingly preoccupied with the possibility that we may be able to locate and establish communication with extraterrestrial intelligence, despite the fact that most scientists believe that no hard evidence is available to indicate its existence. This interesting development has been accompanied by a flood of papers, books, proposals, television programs, etc. intended for both specialist and popular audiences. Almost simultaneously, we have seen the appearance of a large body of literature on the UFO phenomenon, although in this case, the scientific community has tended to shun any association with the subject.

Certainly one of the main reasons, if not *the* main reason for the widespread popular interest in the UFO phenomenon, is the intriguing possibility that it represents the activities of intelligent extraterrestrial beings. Because this possibility seems to contradict many widely-held scientific dogmas, and because of certain manipulative policies introduced by the U.S. intelligence community, this idea has been generally regarded as highly disreputable by the bulk of the U.S. scientific establishment. More "socially acceptable" routes have been proposed to search for extraterrestrial intelligent life.

In this article, I shall focus on the possibility that *some* UFOs represent advanced intelligent activity and discuss the problems involved in recognizing intelligent life forms considerably more sophisticated than ourselves.

As students of the subject know all too well, the UFO phenomenon offers a wealth of puzzling and often bizarre manifestations for which no single, universally-convincing explanation has been offered. Indeed, it is not at all surprising that scientists

unfamiliar with the extent of the phenomenon are compelled to doubt its very existence. On the one hand, we have reports of objects in the sky and on the ground which, although surprising, do not challenge existing scientific paradigms too severely. They might be explained by suggesting that they are technological devices of some kind, constructed by some advanced race or races which have discovered the secret to interstellar travel. It is not surprising that this idea, or some modification of it has, from the beginning, been the most widely-held explanation for the UFO phenomenon, since it fits in rather well with popular conceptions of the Universe.

But of course, things are not so simple as this. We must also account for the so-called high strangeness aspects of the phenomenon which seem to pose such a severe challenge to the physical scientist that one is tempted to dismiss them as "merely" psychological delusions of some sort. Here the extraerrestrial hypothesis seems to break down. Physical scientists seem to be reluctant to deal with this aspect of the phenomenon for fear of being drawn into some dark abyss of "psychic nonsense" where scientific principles seem to have been abandoned altogether. Or, if they do summon the courage to confront these cases, it is generally in the old familiar framework, that is to say, as an extension of current physical science (advanced technology as magic) requiring no fundamentally new ideas or concepts.

On the opposite side of this "nothing is new under the sun" approach are those who feel convinced that many aspects of the UFO phenomenon represent a need for an entirely new model — a radical and revolutionary explanation of some sort, perhaps not even involving ex-

traterrestrial entities at all, but requiring perhaps, only the collective unconscious of the human race. This view is almost diametrically opposed to that of the "hard-core" physical scientists described.

Thus, the UFO research community seems split into two camps with a range of opinions linking the two extreme positions I have briefly outlined. I will now suggest how these two views can be reconciled by a more sophisticated appreciation of the nature of intelligence which is not too foreign to experience, scientific or otherwise.

Before we embark on a program to locate and understand extraterrestrial intelligence, it would be wise to ask if we understand the nature of human intelligence. We should try to identify as many possible misconceptions as we can here, because if we don't understand what human intelligence consists of, how can we ever hope to recognize non-human intelligence when we run into it?

A rather close and interesting parallel exists between those attempting to understand the UFO phenomenon and those interested in the so-called "mind-body problem" in the philosophy of science. Briefly stated, the mind-body problem asks whether there is a clear distinction between the physical brain and the mind, or, if they are one and the same. Once again, we find two opposing points of view. On one extreme are those who claim that all aspects of conscious experience can be explained in terms of physical and biological phenomena (e.g., neural activity). We may call this school of thought "materialism" and it is analogous to the school of thought which claims that the UFO phenomenon can be explained in the context of physical theories.

(continued on next page)

Mind-Body, Continued

At the other philosophical pole are those who maintain that there is a clear distinction between the physical brain and the mind. These investigators argue that the diverse range of experiences and the truly remarkable capabilities attributed to our brains cannot possibly be explained in terms of neural activity alone and that some overriding entity called the mind is necessary to monitor and control the various activities going on in our brains. In other words, they say that the human brain is merely an organ or, to use a computer term, an interface between the mind and the world of physical matter/energy. Perhaps many of the functions that we have assumed are carried out by the brain are not performed there at all, such as the storage of information. This view obviously requires the introduction of some strange metaphysical concepts which are at odds with, and even rather shocking to, the materialists.

The philosopher Karl Popper² has introduced a useful model in an attempt to resolve the mind-body problem. This model divides all aspects of the universe into three categories or "worlds," and is hence known as "the three world model." World One is the world of physical matter/energy or the world that the physical scientist has traditionally been concerned with. World Two is the world of subjective conscious experience which cannot be measured or quantified, but is directly experienced. (Pain, for example.) Finally, World Three consists of written language or artifacts like paintings and other works of art. World Three objects are encoded interpretations of World One objects or World Two experiences. Scientific theories such as those that physicists have developed and written down are examples of World Three objects although they are distributed on World One paper and ink. World Three objects can only be approximations of Worlds One and Two.

Traditionally, it has been believed that there was no need for the introduction of World Two, since it was thought to be explainable in terms of World One phenomena alone. It was,

and for the most part still is, believed that science would ultimately obtain a complete understanding of the human mind/brain through the work of neurophysiologists at one end and psychologists at the other. Thus, complete understanding of the brain would be achieved as if these two groups of scientists were boring a tunnel through a mountain and would someday meet in the middle, resolving the problem once and for all. This is the classical materialist view of how the mind-body problem will be resolved. Notice that a similar view can be seen among the "hard-core" physical UFO researchers who suggest that even the most bizarre aspects of the UFO phenomenon can ultimately be explained in terms of properties of matter and energy (known or unknown).

As so often happens in science, increasingly detailed observations have led to breakdown of existing paradigms. Increasing numbers of brain researchers have come to believe that conscious experience, memory, and many other accomplishments attributed to the brain, simply cannot be explained purely in terms of neural activity alone, no matter how complex. More and more frequently, accounts are appearing in the scientific literature of research which indicates that most traditional ideas of how the brain works and what it is for, are fundamentally incorrect.³ Neurophysiologist John Eccles, in a book co-authored with Karl Popper (*The Self and its Brain*) argues that the most probable explanation for observed properties of the brain is that the mind is a separate and distinct entity from the physical brain. It is necessary to supervise the various activities going on in the brain. The mind exerts an influence on the physical world by selecting an area of the brain which can carry out the mind's wishes, and the brain then amplifies the command through long chains of events which are only poorly understood. Thus, the mind, a non-physical entity, exerts an influence in the physical world.

It is impossible to summarize this complex and scholarly work here, but

the main point is that a rigorous scientific case has now been made for the idea that the essence of intelligence is non-physical. While this idea is not, at this time, the prevailing opinion in the scientific world, the evidence to support it is compelling and I believe that it will ultimately become the majority view. Although, since it is such a radical departure from existing scientific dogma, we shouldn't hold our breaths!

At this point, I should point out that the position advocated by Eccles occupies a similar status to that advocated by some UFO researchers who propose metaphysical explanations for that phenomenon. Both positions are minority views, and both seem to be gaining ground as the evidence accumulates. The general trend in both cases is toward the introduction of fundamentally new concepts of what intelligence is and how it manifests itself.

If I understand Eccles' position correctly, he believes that the self-conscious mind evolved out of necessity as our ancestor's brains became increasingly more complex. In other words, the mind is a relatively new phenomenon which exists only in the higher animals and not among very primitive species. I infer from this that no non-physical entity like the mind is proposed to have existed in lower animals like insects. (Although I may be inferring too much. I cannot speak for him.)

A somewhat different view is proposed by E. Lester Smith and his associates in their book *Intelligence Came First*.⁴ They propose that consciousness is the primary reality, capable of functioning in its own realm, and that biological forms are secondary manifestations. In other words, the physical world does not guide the course of biological evolution and therefore intelligence — intelligence or the mind — guides the course of evolution in the physical world. Although, of course, the physical world has its own set of rules. Once again, considerable scientific evidence is cited in support of this radical view.

(continued on next page)

Mind-Body, Continued

Further destruction of the materialist philosophy has been carried out by physicists themselves. Investigation into the nature of matter has led to the inescapable conclusion that no such thing as hard particles of matter exist. Each time a new "fundamental particle" is discovered, it is found that it can be further subdivided into more and more "particles." Because of this, what appear to us to be solid physical objects such as buildings, animals, etc., have been shown to be comprised of energy fields bound together by forces described in complex and abstract mathematical laws. Thus the universe appears to be more like a great thought rather than a great machine.⁵

These discoveries expand our concepts of the nature of intelligence in some very profound ways and compel us to consider more sophisticated ways in which advanced intelligence may manifest itself. In light of this, we should also re-examine our old ideas of where we fit into the scheme of things. The traditional view of science is that the Human race occupies the pinnacle of the pyramid of life on Earth. We certainly appear to be the most intelligent and adaptable of all other forms of life. We seem to be unique in our ability to use advanced technology to help us survive in almost any environment in which we seek to. In addition, we see no other forms of life which appear more advanced than us. Indeed, some scientists have actually suggested that we may be unique in the entire universe! But perhaps this is only a case of not being able to see the forest for the trees.

Lovelock⁶ has developed the concept of the planet Earth as a sort of colonial organism whose constituent sub-organisms act together unwittingly to maintain the larger ecosphere in a stable condition over long periods of geological time. Indeed, while observing the interconnected cities of the United States at night from high overhead in a commercial airplane, it is difficult to escape the impression that the Human race is, in fact, a colonial organism, with each of us acting

the part of individual cells in the overall body. Humans are born, grow, and die, but the overall organism of human society lives on and evolves. Perhaps it would be more accurate to describe the Human race as a specialized organ in the larger GAIA organism. This concept can be extended to the solar system, the galaxy, and so on.

The point of this discussion is to emphasize our very limited perspective on our place in the hierarchy of the universe. It is much simpler to recognize and comprehend biological organisms which are less complex than ourselves, but much, much more difficult to comprehend levels of organization vastly greater in extent and far more complex than ourselves. This is because we are caught up in the minute details of life at our level of organization, and the subtle influences imposed on us from our surroundings tend to escape recognition. Although it seems apparent that such higher levels of organization do exist, we can only vaguely perceive their true nature and purpose, just as a cell in my liver only vaguely perceives the role it plays in my body. (Although it may be intimately in touch with all biochemical processes it must take part in at its level of organization, with which I never consciously concern myself.)

Thus, an argument can be made, based on accumulated scientific observations, that intelligent life, much more complex and advanced than Human beings, is already known to exist, although because of the great difference in complexity between ourselves and higher levels, "communication" as we conceive of it, is quite a hopeless endeavor. Just as I would not think of discussing physics or music with my liver cells, the higher levels of organization in the universe cannot have an English-language discussion with us. Communication, (if you can call it that) between vastly different levels of organization is much more subtle and sophisticated than this, *but it does occur*. What we really mean when we talk about communication then, is transferring information between

organisms at the same or very similar levels in the hierarchy of the universe.

It is clear that the whole problem of communication between different organisms is one whose complexity is almost never appreciated, even by otherwise intelligent scientists. Some hint of the difficulties involved in communication with intelligent animals similar in complexity to ourselves can be gained from the work of John Lilly with dolphin communication.⁷ The problems of translating our own World Two perceptions into a World Three symbolic language which can be detected by organisms with entirely different World One physical senses and then understood once again in World Two are enormous. Most subtle concepts would almost certainly be lost in the translation. Even communication between Human beings of the same culture is often abysmally bad. For these reasons, pronouncements by CETI researchers about radio communication with intelligent non-humans on other planets should not be taken too seriously. The gap between us is unlikely to be as narrow as they seem to believe.

The most efficient way to communicate between organisms which are significantly different would be to do so directly, by-passing World Three symbolic language (at best a pale imitation of either World One or World Two) and the awkward restrictions of World One, the physical world of matter/energy. If it is true that the nature of intelligence is non-physical, as I believe the evidence suggests, then it is reasonable to expect that organisms or beings only slightly more advanced than us might be able to do this.

Communication carried out in this manner might be dismissed as a "purely subjective" experience by a physical scientist who thinks that events are only meaningful if there is quantifiable physical evidence left behind. Nevertheless, such communication would certainly be a meaningful experience to the person who engaged

(continued on next page)

Mind-Body, Continued

in it, although he or she might be at a loss to convey the experience to another Human being except by using limited analogies or symbols. Much of the communicated message may not even be available to the person's conscious mind because it might be suppressed by the shock value of the experience, or perhaps because the communication was intended for the subconscious mind in the first place. From the point of view of the person receiving the communication, it might well be considered a "religious experience."

The recognition that the true nature of intelligence is non-physical should help in understanding the baffling set of occurrences known as the UFO phenomenon. While we should recognize that the UFO phenomenon almost certainly consists of a variety of more or less unrelated phenomena, not all of which can be attributed to what is traditionally defined as advanced intelligence, many UFO cases bear the hallmark of intelligence capable of manipulating the physical world in ways which are clearly beyond the means of all (?) humans. In addition, they can apparently communicate or at least transmit experiences which are subjectively real, but leave little or no physical evidence.

Second, it is important to recognize that our own technological efforts are tending to follow an interesting trend. Technologies such as radio and television, sound recording, computer graphic simulations, movies, etc., provide us with "simulated real experiences" of greater and greater fidelity, while the technology required continues to decline in physical size. *We should not lose sight of what this is all about.* It is an effort to communicate experience from one conscious mind to another by minimizing the barriers presented by Worlds One and Three. But the technology or hardware required is of secondary importance. It is the conscious experience that we derive from this effort which is important. A complete understanding of what the physical brain is for and how it operates might

provide the ultimate reduction in hardware needed for communication.

Finally, we need to recognize that intelligence manifests itself at a variety of levels of sophistication and complexity from the sub-atomic particle, on up to the galactic level and beyond. An individual Human occupies only one rung in the ladder, not the top of the pyramid. Just as we can look down the ladder to contemplate lower levels of complexity, we should try to look up the ladder to higher levels of complexity appreciating that these higher levels can only be dimly recognized and understood by us because of their immense size, sophistication, and subtlety. The UFO phenomenon is an interaction that is not so simple that we can recognize it as originating from an organism or organisms more simple than ourselves, and yet, it is not so subtle and pervasive that it escapes our attention as communication altogether. Therefore, it is most likely due to an intelligence or intelligences which is vastly more sophisticated than ourselves.

Thus, I submit that the best explanation for many aspects of the UFO phenomenon remains the extra-terrestrial (or at least non-human) intelligence hypothesis, although the true nature of the exchange between us and them will likely remain poorly understood by scientists for a very long time because of our current limited perspective and general inability to comprehend interaction on a scale that apparently involves the entire human colonial organism. In addition, the split in the UFO research community between the "nuts and bolts" school of thought and the metaphysical school can be seen to be due primarily to a fundamental misconception of the nature of intelligent life on the part of physical scientists (a conception not supported by the latest biological research) and is resolved by the model introduced here. I assert that this hypothesis is the best that can be offered at the present time and can stand up against the greatest number of objections.

NOTES

1. Mallove, Eugene F. and Forward, Robert L., Bibliography of Interstellar Travel and Communication, *Journal of the British Interplanetary Society*, Vol. 27 (12) pages 921-943; Vol. 28 (3) pages 191-219; and Vol 28 (6) pages 405-434.
2. Popper, Karl R., *The Self and its Brain*, Springer International, 1977.
3. For a couple of interesting recent reports which indicate that all is not well with current theories of what the brain does, see: Lewin, Roger, "Is Your Brain Really Necessary?," *Science*, Vol. 210, 1232-1234; and "Right Brain, Left Brain," *New Scientist*, Vol. 87, 790-792.
4. Smith, Lester E., *Intelligence Came First*, The Theosophical Publishing House, 1975.
5. Capra, Fritjof, *The Tao of Physics*, Shambhala Publications, Inc., 1975.
6. Lovelock, J.E., *GAI: A New Look at Life on Earth*, Oxford University Press, 1979.
7. Lilly, John C., *The Mind of the Dolphin*, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1967.



HYPNOTIC RECALL

A warning on the "remarkable ability of the human mind to confabulate" and the impossibility of avoiding such suggestions to a hypnotized subject was sounded by Bernard L. Diamond, a professor of both law and psychiatry at the University of California and a frequent expert witness in the courts.

In words that would seem to apply to use of hypnosis in UFO investigations as well, he stated:

"Hypnotized persons, being extremely suggestible, graft onto their memories fantasies or suggestions deliberately or unwittingly communicated by the hypnotist... Use of hypnosis by police on a potential witness is tantamount to the destruction or fabrication of evidence."

He termed hypnotically recalled memory "a mosaic of appropriate actual events, entirely irrelevant actual events, pure fantasy, and fantasized details supplied to make a logical whole."

The article is available for \$2 from California Law Review, 14 Boalt Hall, University of California, Berkeley CA 94720.

THE PUZZLING CASE OF THE CADAVER PHOTOS

By Leonard H. Stringfield

This article breaks my long silence on the theme of UFO crash/retrievals. My last article, "Status Report on Alleged Cadaver Photos," appeared in the *MUFON UFO Journal*, December 1980. I now feel urged because of the constant noise of criticism, insults, and baseless rumors to re-state my position as it relates to my continuing research into this sensitive and controversial issue.

As incredible as my subject may seem to science, religion or the media — and even to me — I believe there is some credence for it. I further believe that at some point in my research, since the circulation of my paper, "The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome," that I may have hit a sensitive nerve in the Intelligence community or, perhaps in some other covert group. I base this on coincidental events, and other evidence, that suggest a powerful force is afoot to influence or even manipulate my work.

First of all, I should make it known that I have taken early retirement from corporative work, effective January 1981 after 30 years of service. However, to dispel a rumor that the C.I.A. was behind my removal, I hasten to add that I have been retained as a consultant by the same company, for two more years. Needless to say, I have had to concern myself with other priorities apart from pursuit of the UFO, plus allowing for readjustment.

Next, I must stress that I have not been banished from research or forced into silence, threatened or harassed by any of the usually suspect Intelligence agencies. So far, I remain "high and dry" in my work, but I do wonder about the fates of so many of my erstwhile informants, 20 who are first person, and the others — 29 — who are known to me through an in-

termediary. Most of these people, strangely, have become inaccessible, others have become evasive and a few have clearly stated their fear of reprisal. Two key informants openly have admitted that they can say no more on the subject.

Strange, too, was the time sequence, September-October, 1980 when most of my sources fell into silence. Looking back, the abrupt change came hard-on-the-heels of the MUFON Symposium in Houston, June 1980, at which time I announced that I had in my custody photographs allegedly showing alien bodies. Then, another coincidence. In August 1980, a second independent set of photos, alleging to show a small burnt alien body from a UFO crash, vintage 1948, in Mexico, hit the national scene. No sooner had they got publicity, came word from Bill Spaulding, who had analysed the photos, declaring that the alien body was no more than a monkey used in a 1948 rocket test.

To the best of my knowledge, the Mexican photos were obtained by Williard McIntyre of Maryland from an unidentified Navy source. These were released through cohorts, Charles Wilhelm and Dennis Pilichis of Ohio, who at that time were all pals in a group called The Coalition of Concerned Ufologists. Notably, it was Wilhelm, in Cincinnati, who got the biggest splurge of publicity, August 21, 1980, when WLW-TV featured his photos. Having no previous knowledge of the photos, it came as a shocker to me.

Perhaps even more significant than the timing of Wilhelm's publicity, was the coincidence that he and I, both researchers in the Cincinnati area, had each come up with individual sets of photographs, alleging to show alien

bodies. Think of the odds against this coincidence.

Then, by coincidence, again, in September, the stage was set for the beginning of a broadside of blatant attacks against my photos, my work, my credibility. The reason for these attacks, according to The Coalitionists, was a supposed remark that I had made to a mutual researcher, calling their photos a hoax and blaming McIntyre for it. Actually, I do not recall ever using the word "hoax" to disqualify the Mexican photos. Getting many embarrassing calls from researchers who asked for my opinion about the photos and Wilhelm, I openly questioned, of course, the coincidence of timing and the role of McIntyre, but, usually I referred to the Spaulding analysis, the only analysis available.

Really now, is a hearsay remark the real reason for such a *selective* vendetta against me? And, even if I had said, "hoax," so what? Is my word in the "ears" of research so colossally important, so profound or so sacred to cause three people to go "ape"? Yet, others in the field who have been far more critical of the McIntyre photos, have gotten off relatively unscathed.

In review of all the negative coincidences affecting my work, I will be the first to concede, however, that each event, seemingly linked together in conspiracy, may be just an isolated circumstantial event. Certainly, I would not characterize Wilhelm or Pilichis, or even McIntyre as secret agents, but if there is a conspiratorial meaning in the pattern of coincidental events, is it possible that all three were unwitting stooges for somebody else pulling their strings?

(continued on next page)

Photos, Continued

It seems we should know more about the source of McIntyre's photos, and much more about McIntyre himself, for whom Wilhelm has expressed his implicit trust. Personally, I do not know Williard McIntyre; however, other researchers in his bailiwick who know him from early NICAP days, question his research credibility.

It was in McIntyre's *MARCEN Journal*, Vol. II, No. III, 1979, that I first became suspicious of his research and his alleged sources. In this issue, under the heading, "Marcen Looks at UFO Retrievals," McIntyre lists 24 cases, 17 of which had appeared in my first paper, "Retrievals of the Third Kind." Allegedly from his own research, he adds precise dates and number of bodies for each incident from alleged "witnesses whose military background could be verified."

In essence, by making a few well placed phone calls, McIntyre had uncovered extraordinary statistical data unavailable to me or any other researcher. Dick Hall informs me that material from *INFO* and *MUFON Journals* also has been presented in *MARCEN Journal*, slightly doctored up and claimed as original research. McIntyre, Hall says, is also known to experiment with fake photographs.

Whatever the role of the Coalitionists, the trigger had been pulled to discredit my photos and my credibility. One example of their tactics, using false assumptions as a guideline, was in their published paper, "Alien Body Photos: An Update Report," dated November 21, 1980. In this, among other misleading claims against me, is an alleged transcript of a tape of my talk made before the Cleveland Ufology Project group in September 1980. Significant are omissions, statements out of context, misquotes in transcription, etc. No need to elaborate, as I know what I said as do others of a more responsible type who were present.

I preferred, during the heat of the attacks, to remain silent, not wanting to fall into a long, useless battle of sniping from the gutters.

Now, let's go back to my scenario

of supposition. Perhaps, I, too, was set up to be shot down. Given a set of photos by my source to proclaim in Houston as the big breakthrough, only time — a short time — would elapse before the inevitable discovery by researchers of photos of a similar kind that had already appeared in *Ancient Astronaut*, 1977, *Official UFO*, 1978, and again in *UFO Sightings*, 1980, all three published by the Fass Brothers, of questionable reputation. In fact, a photo, appearing in the latter magazine, coincidentally, new on the market, was dated July, but released as early as May. Fortunately, one of my colleagues (who had seen my set of photos) brought a copy to my office. I knew then that something was wrong. Had I been gullible, I might have proclaimed the photos in Houston, but I did not!

Instead, even more suspicious of a plot, I decided to play the game as agreed upon with my source. When I prepared the text of my message to deliver the next morning, I repeatedly emphasized the word "alleged" to describe the photos, which is a matter of record. (See *MUFON UFO Journal*, July 1980.) As added insurance, I alluded to another photo I had received from an anonymous source in Washington, D.C. in the Spring of 1980, alleging to show an alien craft aboard a rig near a hangar. This one, with the help of qualified analysts, was declared to be a hoax. Promised was the same treatment for the new photos before I would endorse them for release to the media.

For the moment, I felt safe. I would continue my quiet probes and, at the same time, press my source for additional evidence, but I knew that time was against me.

For the record, on the way to Houston, I discussed my photos and the fake story in *UFO Sightings* with Dick Hall, editor of *MUFON UFO Journal* and a trusted researcher since my CRIFO days in the early 50's. I also showed him a copy of a government Memorandum from my source which he offered as back-up evidence. This one document, if legitimate, could alone blow the lid off secrecy. Not only did it cite sensitive

UFO matters, but implicated the federal judicial process by playing games with a covert agency. Hall agreed that for me to release the memo was premature. It needed more thought, more probing. Even the photos had their risks, we agreed, but I felt that I should proceed with the announcement of my acquisition, as planned, on the assumption that soon more back-up material would come. He had lots of it, according to my intermediary — photos of a UFO landing at an airbase, more alien body photos in color and other memoranda from "inside" Intelligence contacts.

Even if the photos were a tool of disinformation, I reasoned, perhaps I could ferret out some clue, or a loose end, to prove that my time and investigations were not in vain.

But the tables suddenly turned against me as though somebody had pressed a button. No sooner had I returned to Cincinnati, calls came in about the Fass magazines with their fictitious stories featuring the suspect photos. Word was out that I had been hoaxed. Even Stan Friedman and Bill Moore, who had seen the photos privately in Houston, thought they had uncovered a hot scoop and declared that I was a victim of a cruel joke. Others, shallow in the investigations, were quick to condemn and downgrade my work. Some critics, already rankled over my failure to disclose my confidential sources in "The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome," joined the rumor mills. *Ignored completely was my statement made in Houston.*

While rumors spread and got more malicious, I tried to contact my source to relate the scope of negative criticism. Critically needed, at this point, was more substantive back-up photos, such as the ones showing "alien bodies" in color. But, through my intermediary, I learned that my source was in hiding. His claim, I was told, was that he had been under heavy surveillance since my Houston message and feared physical harassment.

(continued on next page)

Photos, Continued

If true, then he had good reason to hide. When he and our contact met in Erie, Pennsylvania, in March 1980, to discuss a plan to reveal some of the massive evidence, he stressed his cruel treatment at the hands of conspiring Intelligence agents. If, on the other hand, my source is, himself, an agent, and his story of mistreatment was a sham to win me to his cause, then I must admit that I was the victim of a frame-up. Whoever was behind my source was, indeed, powerful and resourceful.

At this point there is the obvious question: Who is my source and his intermediary? For many reasons it would be imprudent for me to release their names at this time. However, one or both are known by at least two former NICAP members of high station, both of whom are suspicious of the source's motives. One believes that the source, and even the intermediary are agents; the other, knowing only the intermediary, wonders about his undercover status.

From my view, I have no hard clues or knowledge based on my past experiences in NICAP to guide me into suspicion. I do know that my intermediary has been helpful in other UFO probes, is always friendly, always available by phone, works for a living and is well informed and of above-average intelligence. His contact, the source of the photos, is also of above-average intelligence, neat in appearance and seemed sincere as he described his past experiences with undercover agents, his frame up, his interest in radionics and his health factor. Neither of my contacts are of the type found in the lunatic fringe.

I last heard from my photo source via carbon copy of a letter sent to my intermediary, dated March 3, 1981. In this, my source reiterates a revival of fears from federal and law enforcement agencies, citing some examples of threats and harassment. In one part of his letter he said, "I can clearly ascribe it to Len's pronouncement and article of late (see *MUFON UFO Journal*, December 1980) that they definitely know where the information is coming from and the heat is

on... the trail is the right trail he's following and he knows it but what can he and I do with the odds against us? In time we will win. But it's going to hurt awfully bad to be a winner...

"So I sit on a hot seat and I don't know, presently, anything except I am being attacked from all sides. What it is coming down to is one of three choices or a combination of all three on some of them: (1) Go back on the road with the slide show, revised, to reveal the facts with charges that can be damaging, (2) release more information that will cause an explosive rebuttal, (3) find a lawyer who knows the UFO situation and would be willing to fight a UFO case in open federal court that would open a bee's nest by bringing charges of conspiracy and harassment... I think it would be to their benefit to let a sleeping dog lie..."

Although my last letter to my photo source, dated June 29, 1981, has not been answered, I did hear from my intermediary by letter dated July 13, 1981. He states in part, "... It is my feeling that you do not need to respond to anybody. You have gathered a great deal of information and presented it honestly and accurately. If people do not want to believe it, that is up to them, and it should not be of concern to you. You still have the facts and those who are receptive will believe you.

"Those who don't want to believe you won't no matter how much material you give to them. Then there is the group that wants to discredit you, and is trying to get you to react so you will divulge more information which it can systematically refute..."

Now, let's go further into a scenario of supposition. Suppose my source was playing his hand above the table with me and his photos were obtained from a C.I.A. contact. If, on this premise, his photos are genuine, and were secured illegally, then understandably, they would have to be discredited.

According to my source, he had possession of the photos since 1977 or early 1978; during which time, he stated, a secret agent, posing as a friend, tricked him into surrendering

copies. If this be the case, it might explain the sudden appearance of the photos, or reasonable facsimiles, in disreputable magazines, thus, the real ones would be defused and easily be labelled as fakes.

At this point, I may ask the same question as the reader: Who is the real Dr. L. K. Barnes who allegedly took the photos (or facsimiles) and sold them to the Fass publishers? When I tried to call Myron Fass at his New York office for his explanation, he was not reachable. Attempts were also made in the Fall of 1980 to locate Dr. Barnes without success.

Jim Moseley, editor of a monthly saucerzine, who publishes all sorts of hot flashes on UFO matters from all sorts of people, has been helpful in gathering some useful information relative to the photo in my custody dubbed "fish tank man." In a postal card, dated March 21, 1981, he wrote, "I obtained from Jeff Goodman (former editor of *Official UFO* and *Ancient Astronauts*) one color transparency of the fish tank man photo — whether the actual one they published or a similar one, he does not know. He could not find more than one among his transparencies..." Moseley added in the April 30, 1981 issue of his newsletter that "Stringfield's pictures are very similar to the one in *Official UFO* but by no means identical. (They) are taken from a different angle; they have a more blurry focus; and the creature shown is more decomposed. There are other differences."

Still to be explained are two photos (never published to my knowledge) showing what seems to be a maimed or dismembered body, notably, inside the same type of glass tank with the same accoutrements such as down-drafts and two beakers emitting vapors. These two photos I had seen only in the presence of my source and intermediary during our rendezvous March 1980, in Erie, Pennsylvania. As I recall these photos did not indicate professional work; too much shadow and nebulous areas where parts of the body appeared to be

(continued on next page)

Photos, Continued

covered by cloth. Also of note, the face, turned to one side, was almost featureless; and one leg seemingly detached from the body, was bent at the knee. Even more inexplicable is the one photo showing the skeletal rib cage and arm with claw-like appendage. To the best of my knowledge, this photograph never appeared in a Fass publication or any other magazine. My source's only comment was that the skeletal specimen was delivered from a Florida Air Force base to Wright-Patterson and sent on to a university in Pennsylvania for secret study.

I knew that if I could endure the noise of criticism I would, in the meantime, try to put the photos to test or at least seek advice from the professional community. Response was disappointing. While in Houston, a physicist (known to research) working in a high level and secret capacity at a complex in New Mexico, took close-up photographs of the photos in my custody, to show to a person he claimed to be in a "position to know." In a short time he called me from his office to state that the body in the glass case was *genuine*.

Like out of a James Bond movie, a Houston doctor who seemed impressed by the one photo showing the skeletal rib cage, arm and what appeared to be a "rotatory" wrist and claw-like hand, took me aside to relate that he was advised by a person of "highest authority" to get copies of the photos and the name of my source. Curiously, he said that his authority who had access to the President, if need be, knew I was coming to Houston. Of course, I did not identify my source, as a matter of practice, and the photos I did deliver did not get his authoritative response.

Hoping for better luck, I went to my key medical source, the doctor who claimed to have performed an autopsy on an alien body in the early 50's (see "UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome"). Through a colleague, he stated that he could not vouch for the photographs, however, the body depicted bore a likeness to a type he had

seen. He would not elaborate on details or comment on the glass tank or its accoutrements such as the apparent downdrafts circumventing the body.

Dr. Stan Tytko, biochemist and member of the Cleveland Ufology Project, aware of my plight, offered in September 1980, to experiment with the photos using infra-red film. Special film was procured but the test never got off the ground. Instead, by reversing the negatives to show the effects of opposite muscular highlights, we found to our mutual surprise that certain highly vascular organs appeared in their proper anatomical places. Interesting, of course, but we agreed that it was inconclusive. Further tests were never made.

One last probe made through the efforts of Dr. Harry Marks, head of the Analytical Chemistry Department of the University of Cincinnati, brought me to the office, on campus, of anthropologist, Dr. Anthony J. Perzigian. I showed him only one photo for study, the one with the skeletal rib cage and appendages. This one, free of all the ballyhoo and free of the Fass publications, puzzled me the most. Perzigian's useful comment appeared in this Journal, December 1980.

Still another facet of exploratory endeavor regarding the skeleton photo, was an attempt to explain the operation of a hypothetical rotatory wrist as suggested by the appearance of a protuberant section joining the four-digit claw and the forearm. Al Reed, an able and knowledgeable illustration artist of Sunnysvale, California, made extensive drawings and overlays for medical review, however, it was during this period that communications with my key medical consultant had turned to silence. The project is shelved for a better day.

During the Summer of 1981, while probing into leads from new sources, I received in the mail (printed appropriately on yellow paper) a veritable ultimatum, dated June 1, 1981, from Charles Wilhelm, as head of a newly formed Hoax & Fraud Committee. Copies were sent, far and

wide, to research groups and the media. In this release, concerning the photos, Wilhelm demanded answers to a list of questions within a 60 day deadline or face exposure as a fraud.

My response: Nonsense! I believe I have adequately presented my case in this article, save for names of people who prefer privacy or who are in an obviously uncompromising position because of the squeeze of secrecy. Someday, when I consider the time right, I may release through this Journal all of my photos, which are not secret by any means, and, perhaps the sensitive "United States Government Memorandum" received from my photo source.

For the record, I share no animosity for Wilhelm as he exhibits for me. And, for the record, in spite of the Spaulding analysis, I cannot prove that "his" photos show a dead monkey, any more that I can support his claim that it is a dead alien. I say: lay the photos to rest; there are more important matters on hand. Just imagine what could be accomplished if bitterness could be put asunder!

Also, in a field so undisciplined, I will overlook other remarks coming from my equally frustrated contemporaries. In FATE, Jerry Clark, long a critic of the ETH, suggests that my venture into crash/retrievals has degraded my credibility. May I ask, to whom should we look, with that sainted credibility, for the answers we seek. Is this person in the psychic world?

George Earley, also in FATE, spurns my research on the theory that a recovered craft during the 1950's could not have been transported over inferior highways or by any other means from a distant crash site, to Wright-Patterson. Perhaps so, but I never claimed that all the alleged crash-landed craft had been conveyed to Wright-Patterson. Perhaps, again, the one or two that may have been conveyed got there because of *urgent priority* and on the strength of this I believe anything can happen — even if the craft had to be fragmented for shipment. After all, the 1950's were not in the Dark Ages.

(continued on next page)

Director's Message, Continued

at M.I.T., whereby we recognized and honored the loss of our leaders and officers who had passed away during the previous year — Paul Kelley, State Section Director for Sacramento in California on March 28, 1981 and Mrs. Barbara Mathey, Continental Coordinator for Africa on June 10, 1981 in Los Angeles.

Photos, Continued

Also, I believe that Stan Friedman, for whom I have respect as a lecturer with rhetorical prowess (espousing the ETH) was perhaps too rhetorical in his remarks during the MUFON Symposium in Boston when he put me down as a "collector of stories" and not a qualified investigator. Well, for his new book, co-authored with Bill Moore, I hope that his investigative talents can uncover documented proof that alien craft had, indeed, been retrieved. While he makes light of my medical testimony, it should be obvious that my source, who serves on the staff of a major hospital, cannot stand up and be counted.

Now, having broken my silence, may I note that there can be no quick or final judgement, from my point of view, concerning the status of my photos. To weigh the evidence so far, it seems preponderantly against their authenticity. Conversely, and perhaps never to be resolved, the whole story of the Photograph Escapade is stuck with too many inconsistencies and missing links that still pique the imagination.

Perhaps the real story is *not* whether the photographs are genuine, but *who* was the manipulator of events that neutralized my sources, my research status, and rightly reasoned that my next monograph, planned for 1981, would never get off the ground.

(Editor's Note: Neither during the trip to Houston, which I shared with Len Stringfield, nor at any other time has he claimed, publicly or privately, that the "alien cadaver" photographs were genuine. His attitude has been consistently inquiring, skeptical, and cautious.)

At the MUFON Annual Corporate Meeting on July 26, 1981 at M.I.T. in Cambridge, Mass., Mrs. Cynthia R. Hind accepted the position of Continental Coordinator for Africa. Her selection for this important post was based upon her ability to travel extensively on the continent, to not only investigate important UFO sighting reports, but to recruit qualified investigators and leadership in both the well established and emerging nations of Africa. Cynthia is eminently qualified to fill this post. Michael Sinclair, International Coordinator, has also made extensive contacts in his business trips to Africa.

Other items of business at the Annual Corporate meeting included annual reports from the State Directors present in alphabetical order — Robert Bletchman, Connecticut; Forrest Lundberg, Iowa; Joe Santangelo, Massachusetts; Bruce Maccabee, Maryland; Tom Benson, New Jersey; Gary Levine, New York; Neal Hern, Texas; and Mrs. Mildred Biesele, Utah. Canadian Provincial reports were made by William "Bill" Allan, British Columbia; Henry H. McKay, Ontario; and Stanton Friedman, Atlantic Provinces. International reports were made orally by Mrs. Cynthia Hind, Zimbabwe, Africa; Paul Norman, Victoria, Australia; and in writing by Keith Basterfield, Continental Coordinator for Australia and New Zealand. Dan Wright, State Director for Michigan, attended the symposium, but was unable to be present for the annual meeting.

Walt Andrus presented the Treasurer's report which showed that for the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1981, MUFON had a balance of \$3,740.91 after expenditures of \$24,150. The majority of the expenses were represented by secretarial salaries, symposium and Journal printing costs, postage, and office supplies. Copies of the Treasurer's Report were given to the members of the Board who were present. Michael Sinclair, International Coordinator, was unable to attend, but sent copies of his correspondence to the continental coordinators with Henry McKay to either be delivered in per-

son or mailed in the U.S.A., due to the postal workers mail strike in Canada. All of the MUFON officers and Board of Directors listed in the 1981 MUFON UFO Symposium Proceedings were reelected to another term (1981-82) by the members attending the annual corporate meeting. Dennis Stacy, Director of Publications, served as recording secretary for the meeting.

By the time most of the readers received their copies of this issue of the Journal, the Center for UFO Studies Conference held on September 25, 26, and 27, 1981 at the Midland Hotel in downtown Chicago will be only a memorable event. John Schuessler, MUFON Deputy Director for Administration, was one of the featured speakers. He gave a factual account of a December 29, 1980 case titled "Medical Injuries Resulting from a UFO Encounter (Cash/Landrum Case)."

Starting with the September 1981 issue of the MUFON UFO Journal, we are initiating a new method of reminding member/subscribers when their membership and Journal subscription expire so that they may renew promptly and not miss an issue. To the right of the stenciled address on the cover of your magazine, there is an expiration month and year. If the number is 9/81 your membership would expire after receiving the September 1981 issue. Due to the slow delivery of a second class mailing to the far corners of the Earth, we will place renewal forms in your Journal two months before the expiration date so that you may renew promptly. A red "x" will appear at the bottom of the renewal form with the last issue of your subscription as the third reminder. If your membership renewal is not received after the third notice, your address stencil and membership card will be removed from the current membership file. Please help us by helping yourself maintain continuity in your monthly MUFON UFO Journals and supporting what we believe to be the finest UFO organization in the World today.

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE by Walt Andrus

With congratulations for a job well done still resounding in their ears, the Massachusetts MUFON group has passed along their symposium file to the Chairman, Henry McKay, in preparation for the 1982 MUFON International UFO Symposium to be held July 2, 3, and 4 at the beautiful Loews Westbury Hotel in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. MUFON Board Members Henry McKay and Michael Sinclair will spearhead this symposium with the able assistance of UFO people in Ontario on their committees. They kicked off their promotion at M.I.T. with Ontario travel literature and a red heart sticker carrying the inscription "Metropolitan Toronto . . . affectionately yours."

The host chairperson for the 1983 MUFON UFO Symposium in Los Angeles will be William F. "Bill" Hassel, Jr., supported by the Southern California MUFON organization, and assisted by Paul C. Cerny, Regional Director for the Western States. The host organization for the 1984 symposium has not been made final, however, the Reverend G. Neal Hern, State Director for Texas has invited MUFON to the Dallas/Ft. Worth metroplex area for our 1985 UFO Symposium. Pittsburgh, Pa., has made a tentative bid for the 1986 symposium, but this has not been confirmed. MUFON of North Carolina has expressed an interest in hosting the 1984 affair in Winston-Salem, N.C., due to their fine experience with their annual MUFON training conferences that have expanded in scope each year.

Robert Bletchman, State Director for Connecticut, has selected Lawrence A. "Larry" Fawcett, 471 Gooselane, Coventry, CT 06238 as his Assistant State Director and Field Investigator. A police officer with many years of experience in UFO investigations, speaking engagements and media publicity, Larry will be an asset to MUFON.

Mrs. Mildred Biesele, State Director for Utah, is proud to announce the appointment of Daryl L. Letham, Ph.D., 4318 Lynne Lane, Salt Lake City, UT 84117 as the State Section Director for the Utah counties of Salt Lake, Davis, Morgan, and Summit. Dr. Letham is an Associate Professor of Physics at Weber State College.

Shirley C. Fox, P.O. Box 164, Ft. Myers, FL 33902 has volunteered to serve as the State Section Director for Lee and Charlotte counties in Florida. Her telephone number is (813) 334-8318. A new consultant to MUFON, also residing in Ft. Myers, is Everett R. Walter, Ph.D., 3350-3 Alouette Circle, Ft. Myers, FL 33907. Dr. Walter has been teaching a yearly course in Ufology at the local community college since 1973. He was the first to receive a doctorate in education for a dissertation pertaining to the UFO phenomenon. As a team, we hope that Dr. Walter and Shirley Fox can develop a strong group of field investigators and UFO researchers in western Florida. Both of them attended the 1981 symposium at M.I.T. Shirley and Robert Morgan from San Antonio, Texas were a great aid in manning the MUFON literature table at M.I.T.

G. Neal Hern, has recommended Stephen Clark, Ph.D., 1560 N.W. Highway, Suite 106, Garland, TX 75041 as a Consultant in Clinical Hypnosis. Dr. Clark, a practicing clinical hypnotherapist, is a Roman Catholic Priest, has a Doctor of Divinity degree and a Ph.D. (ABD). He is presently involved in an important abduction case under investigation in Texas that will be published in the Journal upon completion of the investigation and documentation of the facts.

Mrs. Idabel E. Epperson, State Director for Southern California since February 2, 1973 and Chairman of the NICAP Subcommittee prior to that time, has asked to take a less ac-

tive role in MUFON due to personal health reasons. Due to her vast experience in the field of Ufology and her many personal contacts throughout the world, she will continue to serve MUFON in an advisory capacity for southern California, which encompasses all of the counties starting with San Luis Obispo, Kern, and San Bernadino on the north to the border with Mexico on the south. Idabel's interest in UFOs started in 1952, by reading current literature, however, her active field investigation work began in 1956. She worked with the late Dr. James E. McDonald on several interesting reports during this era. Her daughter, Marilyn, has faithfully worked with her mother as an administrative assistant the majority of this time and will continue to share her enthusiasm and efforts in the future.

Based upon the fine recommendation by Mrs. Epperson and the mutual respect of his colleagues in southern California, William F. Hassel, Jr., Ph.D. has agreed to accept the position of State Director, replacing Idabel. Bill Hassel has served MUFON as the State Section Director for Los Angeles County and as a consultant for Propulsion systems since November 1974. He and his family presently reside at 4217 Minnetonka Drive, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360. In the near future, Dr. Hassel will be announcing the appointment of an Assistant State Director and also his replacement for Los Angeles County. His first step will be to revitalize the southern California membership, followed by the expansion of the UFO group presently meeting at the University of California in Los Angeles, who will become the nucleus for hosting the 1983 MUFON UFO Symposium.

A new tradition was instituted at the 1981 MUFON UFO Symposium

(continued on page 19)