

THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL

Number 165

November 1981

Founded 1967

\$1.50

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.



**KENNETH ARNOLD INTERVIEW: 1947 WITNESS
(1981 Photo by Greg Long)**

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.

The update report by John Schuessler on the Cash-Landrum radiation case shows it to be one of the most significant reports in modern UFO history. The possible explanations are only two: either it was some military test device, tested along a highway near a large urban area with reckless disregard for human safety, or it was a strange airborne phenomenon with many of the same features attributed to UFOs over the years. It seems very doubtful that any such highly radioactive device would be tested where this object was seen. Yet that would appear to be the only alternative to a luminous, maneuverable, flame-spewing, noise-making, radioactive . . . UFO.

In this issue

CASH-LANDRUM RADIATION CASE	3
By John F. Schuessler	
KENNETH ARNOLD: UFO "PIONEER"	7
By Gregory Long	
KAL KORFF AND THE "MEIER HOAX":	
A RESPONSE — Part 2	11
By Wendelle C. Stevens	
CALIFORNIA REPORT	14
By Ann Druffel	
BOOK REVIEW	
("UFOs: The Image Hypothesis")	16
By Bill Chalker	
LETTERS	17
IN OTHERS' WORDS	19
By Lucius Farish	
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE	20
By Walt Andrus	

The contents of The MUFON UFO JOURNAL are determined by the editor, and do not necessarily represent the official position of MUFON. Opinions of contributors are their own, and do not necessarily reflect those of the editor, the staff, or MUFON. Articles may be forwarded directly to MUFON. Responses to published articles may be in a Letter to the Editor (up to about 400 words) or in a short article (up to about 2,000 words). Thereafter, the "50% rule" is applied: the article author may reply but will be allowed half the wordage used in the response; the responder may answer the author but will be allowed half the wordage used in the author's reply; etc. All submissions are subject to editing for style, clarity, and conciseness. Permission is hereby granted to quote from this issue provided not more than 200 words are quoted from any one article, the author of the article is given credit, and the statement "Copyright 1981 by the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas" is included.

CASH-LANDRUM RADIATION CASE

By John F. Schuessler

(Note: This follow-up report is based on a presentation to the Sept. 1981 CUFOS UFO Conference. The case was initially reported in the Apr. 1981 issue, No. 158.)

The problem of radiation sickness caused by UFOs is defined by these brief examples:

October 24, 1887: Venezuelan family exposed to a brightly lit unidentified flying object (UFO) and suffered burns, vomiting, hair loss, and extensive swelling.

May 20, 1967: Canadian prospector Stephen Michalak encountered a landed UFO and suffered burns, nausea, vomiting, swelling and an extended illness.

October 3, 1973: Missouri truck driver exposed to an extremely bright UFO, blinded for days, and had vision impairment for a year.

These and hundreds of similar incidents indicate that UFOs are seriously affecting people. How can these people be helped? What can we learn about UFOs by studying these human effects?

A small team of engineers, scientists, and medical specialists have formed Project VISIT (Vehicle Internal Systems Investigative Team), to be a clearinghouse for all UFO incidents involving medical injury or alleged entry into a UFO. VISIT members collect and analyze data on the physical effects of UFOs on people. This scientific and medical data is then examined to discover the probable mechanisms of the UFO.

The latest entry into the VISIT data base occurred on December 29, 1980, when three Texans encountered a UFO and suffered severe medical consequences. Betty Cash (51), Vickie Landrum (57), and Vickie's grandson Colby Landrum (7), were driving home to Dayton, Texas, on the Cleveland-Huffman road just north of Lake Houston. It was 9 o'clock at



Artist's Rendition of the Sighting
(By Kathy Schuessler)

night and the road was deserted. The first indication of something unusual was the presence of a very intense light several miles ahead just above the pine trees. Betty remarked about the unusual brightness, but temporarily lost sight of it due to the many trees along the road.

Suddenly, hovering over the road only a short distance ahead was an enormous diamond shaped object. "It was like a diamond of fire," Vickie said. The glow was so intense they could barely stand to look at it. Vickie at first thought it was the fulfillment of biblical prophecy and expected Jesus to come out of the fire in the sky.

In addition to lighting the whole area like daytime, the UFO periodically belched flames downward. Fearing they would be burned alive Betty stopped the 1980 Oldsmobile Cutlass without leaving the road. They all got out of the car to get a

better look at the UFO. Colby was terrified and dove back into the car, begging his grandma to get back in, too. Vickie did and comforted Colby.

Betty stood momentarily by the driver's door and then walked forward to the front of the car. After much pleading by Vickie, Betty finally returned to the car. The door handle was so hot she used her leather coat as a hotpad to open the door. Although the winter night air had been about 40°F, the heat from the UFO caused the witnesses to sweat and feel so uncomfortable that they turned on the car's air conditioner.

Each time the object would shoot flames downward it would rise. As the flames stopped it would drop in altitude. The intense glow, however, never changed. In addition, the threesome heard an irregular beeping sound throughout the sighting.

(continued on next page)

Radiation, Continued

Finally, the flames stopped, the object rose to the south-west, and was lost from sight. Vickie and Colby commented that several helicopters could be seen above and beyond the UFO. Vickie said with relief, "we're safe and we're sound, but I'm burning and it's so hot."

Betty was directly exposed to the object 5 to 10 minutes, Vickie 3 to 5 minutes, and Colby only a minute or so. As Betty raced homeward she turned right on FM 2100. Five minutes had lapsed and just ahead was the UFO and a large number of helicopters. "The sky was full of helicopters," Betty said. Some were near, the object and others lagged behind. She feared the helicopters would collide. They were dazzled as they counted more than 20 helicopters. According to Vickie, "The helicopter roar was like a tornado."

They sped onward towards home, turning on to the Huffman-Eastgate road, then to FM 1960. By this time the object had been in sight, climbing into the night sky, for another 5 minutes. On FM 1960 the threesome were going away from the UFO, but could still observe it as a diminishing bright light for 2 or 3 more minutes.

Unusual Medical Effects

Betty dropped Vickie and Colby in Dayton and arrived home at 9:05 p.m. where her friend Wilma was waiting. Vickie said as she left the car, "My head hurts, I'm sick." Betty felt even worse. In addition to a terrible headache and nausea, her neck began to swell and red blotches appeared on her face and head.

December 29th was a turning point in the lives of Betty and Vickie. Betty, an unusually energetic woman, had plans to open a new restaurant. The sickness that followed ruined those plans. For the next four days Betty's health degraded. Her eyes swelled closed, the red blotches became blisters of clear fluid, and she was weak with diarrhea and nausea. The headaches never ceased. Because Betty was unable to function, Vickie was afraid she would die and set out to locate her doctor.



Sighting Location; l. Alan Holt; r. Vickie Landrum



Betty Cash Showing Hair Loss

After a number of telephone calls a doctor instructed Vickie to take Betty to the hospital emergency room where the staff received and treated her as a burn patient. Over the next several days Betty lost patches of skin on her face and about 50% of her hair fell out.

After 12 days in the hospital Betty went home, even though she had shown little improvement. Her condition again degraded to the point

where she returned to the hospital for 15 more days. During the weeks that followed the incident, Vickie treated herself and Colby with baby oil to stop the burning of their faces. Their stomach pains and diarrhea stopped after a couple of weeks but their eyes are apparently permanently damaged and treatment continues. Colby had nightmares for weeks and was ex-

(continued on next page)

Radiation, Continued

tremely frightened by bright lights in the night sky or by helicopters anytime.

SUMMARY OF THE MEDICAL EFFECTS

Colby Erythema (reddening of the skin)

- Eyes swollen and watery
- Stomach pains
- Diarrhea
- Anorexia (loss of appetite)
- Some weight loss
- Increase in tooth cavities

Vickie Erythema

- Photophthalmia (eyes swollen, watery, and painful)
- Vision greatly diminished
- Stomach pains
- Diarrhea
- Anorexia
- Ulceration on the arms, resulting in scarring and loss of pigmentation
- Keratin affected resulting in fingernail damage
- Hair loss
- Hair regrowth of a different texture

Betty Erythema

- Acute photophthalmia (eyes swollen closed, painful, watery)
- Vision impaired
- Stomach pains
- Vomiting, diarrhea
- Anorexia
- Loss of energy, lethargy
- Scarring and loss of skin pigmentation
- Excessive hair loss
- Hair regrowth of a different texture

The electromagnetic spectrum is divided into groups according to wavelengths. X-rays and gamma rays have very short wavelengths; ultraviolet radiation, visible light, and infrared have increasingly longer wavelengths. Since the regions overlap, an exposed person may suffer effects of more than one region — x-ray and ultraviolet for example.

Exposure to ultraviolet radiation can produce photophobia, photophthalmia (arc-eye), edema of the eyelids, and erythema of the skin. Exposure to gamma and x-radiation can provide a strong general weakness, anorexia, nausea, vomiting, apathy, severe headache, sleeplessness, and dizziness.

The symptoms provide a clue to the type of radiation exposure. The degree of illness depends upon the type and energy of the radiation, the



Vickie Landrum: Photophobia Eye Condition



Vickie Landrum: Sores Persist After 8 Months

dose, amount of exposure, and a number of other variables. However, there is no type of radiation that is not potentially dangerous to the eye. Certainly most of the listed symptoms can be found in the Cash/Landrum incident.

The Helicopters

All the witnesses were interrogated separately for information about the helicopters. They all agreed there

were at least 20. Illumination from the glowing object clearly showed details of the helicopters even though the night was dark and the moon was in the third quarter. At least two different helicopter models were present, but they referred also to the one large thing amidst the helicopters.

Through use of helicopter identification charts one model was clearly identified as the Boeing CH-47

(continued on next page)

Radiation, Continued

Chinook. Another was identified as being similar to the Bell Huey model, but not positively identified as such.

Each of the witnesses not only identified the shape and main characteristics of the Chinook, they also pointed out details such as the wheels, lighting pattern, and sounds.

Contact with the Houston International Airport FAA representative provided the following:

- 350-400 helicopters operate commercially in the Houston area.
- All are single rotor types (no Chinooks).
- Helicopter traffic flies Visual Flight Rules (VFR), consequently they do not contact the tower.
- Beyond 15 miles from the airport they must stay below 1,800 feet.
- The Houston radar is limited to 2,000-2,200 feet around Lake Houston due to the location of antenna.

Contact with military installations was of little help. Fort Polk, Fort Hood, Dallas Naval Air Station, and England AFB stated they did not fly into the Houston area that evening. The unit operating out of Ellington AFB in Houston had landed before the sighting time. Robert Gray Field had 100 helicopters come in from the field at one time "for effect," but claimed to have avoided the Houston area. Hence, no one claims the helicopters that filled the Huffman area sky that winter night.

Conclusion

This incident clearly points up several serious conditions. First, when a person is involved in a close encounter with a UFO they find it nearly impossible to obtain immediate assistance. The police, newspapers, and even doctors receive their plea for help with tongue in cheek. The doctors, being unprepared for a bizarre account like Betty's, spend a lot of time trying to determine what is wrong, as a standard treatment method has never been defined.

Second, military organizations could better serve the citizens of the



Distinctive Silhouette of CH-47 Helicopter

United States if they were prepared to relate the nature of objects such as the one at Huffman and others where public safety is at stake. Betty and Vickie have never said the Huffman UFO was a flying saucer with little green men. They believe it was a government-sponsored operation of some kind. Others that saw and heard the helicopters that evening have the same feeling.

Third, UFO organizations usually do not cooperate to the fullest to help the witnesses. The Huffman incident is an exception. The Mutual UFO Network of Seguin, Texas, the Center for UFO Studies of Evanston, Illinois, and the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization of Tucson, Arizona, all cooperated in a responsible manner to

assist the Houston-based Project VISIT to conduct the investigation by providing consultants, recommendations, and data pertaining to similar cases. Such cooperation is in the best interest of all parties involved.

The investigation continues. The future health state of Betty, Vickie, and Colby is yet to be determined. However, several radiation specialists have given freely of their time and talents to establish a program of rehabilitation and care. Full treatment is still lacking because the data on the source of the problem, the UFO, is still not available.

Project VISIT members are available on call for consultation. The address of VISIT is Post Office Box 877, Friendswood, Texas 77546.

(Photographs provided by John Schuessler)

MEDICAL NETWORK

Project UFOMD — a network of doctors to intensively study UFO-related injury cases — has been organized by radiologist Richard C. Niemtow. Before being called to active duty in the Air Force, Dr. Niemtow was active in MUFON and Project VISIT in the Houston, Texas, area. Doctors in the MUFON network are invited to contact Dr. Niemtow and offer their services.

Over about a 2-year period he hopes to investigate and assess a minimum of 12 cases dealing with medical injuries incurred during UFO close encounters, and possibly pro-

duce a catalogue correlating the resulting data. Investigators aware of such cases are urged to have the witness consult a physician of their own choice, and Dr. Niemtow will be available as a consultant to the primary physician. Clinical and laboratory tests should be conducted on the witness in each case.

Interested physicians, including doctors working with patients reporting UFO-related injuries, should contact Dr. Niemtow at (707) 446-5050 or write to him at 532 Merchant St., Vacaville, CA 95688.

Interview

KENNETH ARNOLD: UFO "PIONEER"

By Gregory Long

(© 1981 by Gregory Long)

Kenneth Arnold's sighting on June 24, 1947, of nine crescent-shaped objects flying in formation near Mount Rainier is practically a cliché. It was the era of the Cold War, and Arnold, a private businessman and pilot, was convinced that what he had seen were guided missiles, perhaps of Russian origin. As he wrote later in *The Coming of the Saucers* (1952), a privately published book co-authored with science fiction writer and editor Ray Palmer, "If, reasoning along patriotic lines alone, I had not reported my observations, I would have been rightfully considered disloyal to my country."

A short time later, Arnold came to regret his act of patriotic duty. On the day of his sighting, he landed in Pendleton, Oregon, and finding the local FBI office closed, visited Noland Skiff, editor of the *East Oregonian*. Arnold had no intention of seeking publicity and merely wanted an explanation of what he had seen. But shortly thereafter, a short news story of his sighting (which coined the term "flying saucers") went over the wires, and all hell broke loose.

He was deluged by reporters, visited by military intelligence, and the longer his sighting went unexplained, was persecuted and ridiculed by disbelievers. Others began reporting strange objects in the skies, and although such aerial anomalies had been reported throughout history, the modern era of UFOs was born, and Arnold was permanently stigmatized as "The Man Who Started It All."

I arrived earlier than expected at Kenneth Arnold's house in Meridian, Idaho, and while Arnold finished lunch with his wife of 40 years, Doris, I went through a stack of memorabilia that he left with me in the living room. There were newspaper clippings, magazine articles, photographs,

a 1977 commemorative issue of the *East Oregonian* celebrating the 30th anniversary of Arnold's sighting.

Each story that I skimmed rang with the same conviction and internal consistency — the man had seen nine strange objects; the sighting had occurred as originally reported; time had not eroded the reality of the event.

When I finished with the last clipping, Doris sat down on the sofa, and I talked with her about my interest in UFOs. Arnold soon joined her. His gray hair contrasted brightly with the single tone of his blue shirt, dark pants, and black boots, and the white Western string tie clipped at this neck added the kind of detail I expected to this craggy-faced, 66-year-old man who had carved out his own livelihood from this part of the West.

Arnold began by handing me a copy of the works of Charles Fort. Fort, a former newspaper reporter, published four books between 1919 and 1932 that chronicle countless unexplained phenomena, which include UFOs. These collected sightings have convinced Arnold that the U.S. Air Force had no explanation for his sighting, even though the military said that the nine objects were man-made or natural phenomena.

"I was convinced that what I saw might have been Air Force craft," Arnold said. "I was astounded when I read Fort's books. There were similarities between what I investigated and what Fort had collected."

As Arnold spoke, he revealed an unyielding, critical attitude toward science that ignores, ridicules, or attempts to rationalize away the "damned," Fort's term for anomalous data that do not fit established scientific views. This attitude is readily understandable given the treatment he has received at the hands of the press and the skeptics.

"I wasn't smart enough to dodge Noland Skiff. After the story of my sighting, reporters came out of the woodwork," he said. "They'd ask a few questions, then go away and begin writing stories. The thing was, the stories were all different!"

Arnold was particularly angry about Dr. J. Allen Hynek, former Air Force consultant on UFOs for more than 20 years, and now director of the Center for UFO Studies.

According to Arnold, Hynek told him that he (Hynek) had received from the Air Force for analysis the wrong report made by Arnold of his sighting. On the basis of this report, Hynek concluded in the official Project Blue Book files that "certain inconsistencies" existed in Arnold's estimated size of and distance from the nine objects. Therefore, according to Hynek, the UFOs "may have been some sort of known aircraft."

Arnold was flabbergasted that Hynek had not gone back to the original report. When asked why not, Hynek said, "Well, I was working for the Air Force."

"I wouldn't be surprised if Hynek were still working with the Air Force."

Someone, at least, in the "cloistered scientific society," Arnold believes, is debunking UFOs.

In addition to the skepticism that greeted Arnold after he reported his sighting, there came the harassment and, as he said, "the nameless, faceless people ridiculing me. I was considered an Orson Welles, a fraud . . . I loved my country. I was very naive about the whole thing. I was the unfortunate goat who first reported them."

Arnold took out a cigarette and lit up.

(continued on next page)

Arnold, Continued

"Governments are more afraid than anything else of Joan of Arcs, religious saints, or 'phenomena' that cause their self-destruction." This fear, Arnold believes, seems to lie at the center of the official attitude in all countries concerning UFOs.

Arnold learned this truth himself in the early days after his sighting when he was visited by Lt. Frank M. Brown and Capt. William Davidson of A-2 Military Intelligence. After discussing Arnold's sighting with him, the two officers went through his mail and selected letters from religious groups and organizations that had written Arnold for accounts of his experience. Capt. Davidson himself told Arnold that the government was aware of the effects of religious fervor, and that they did not want that to happen here.

Arnold also soon learned how the Air Force, at first personable and friendly to him and eager to hear of his sighting, soon changed its attitude, perhaps because of the threat his experience posed to the government.

The Knife and Fork Club originally invited him to speak on its lecture circuit at \$100 a day. At his own expense, Arnold printed a booklet, "The Flying Saucer As I Saw It," which he planned to use as a program guide for his audience. Air Force military intelligence learned of this offer and suggested that Arnold not publicize his experience since the Air Force was still working on its investigation of the sighting. Later, a letter arrived from the Knife and Fork Club, mysteriously withdrawing the offer. Although Arnold could not prove that the military was behind this change of heart, the implication is too strong to ignore.

In 1950, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) bedeviled Arnold with red tape, which suggested that the government was quite interested in Arnold's involvement with the subject of UFOs. When filing his taxes, Arnold presented receipts of all expenditures incurred during his private investigations. These would have been proof enough, he thought, to justify deductions for traveling ex-

pense. Not so, said the IRS. What was required was a detailed accounting of expenses entered into a record book, a standard the IRS strictly enforced. In this instance, no allowance for deductions could be made because of Arnold's faulty record keeping.

Frustrated, Arnold threatened to call his attorney. Thirty-one years ago, \$2,500 was quite a sum of money. In the end, up against the bureaucratic wall of government, Arnold concluded that it wasn't worth it; he paid up.

The Stymie Factor

The ridicule, the debunking, the harrassment — they all added up to the "stymie factor," a term devised by Ray Palmer, a friend of Arnold for 30 years, in a lecture that Palmer gave in Chicago in 1977, two months before his death.

Arnold played a tape of this lecture for me. "Palmer had a dangerous theory," Arnold said. "If it's absolutely true, it would have to be given to people like a piece of salami, one slice at a time over a period of 50 to 100 years." The metaphor of the salami had just the right air of absurdity to it to prepare me for the unexpected.

In a dry, fragmented voice, Palmer mused upon the past and his involvement with UFOs. Among his experiences had been the "stymie factor," or the element of ridicule that paralyzed and flustered, such as it did Arnold when newsmen made "a mess" of everything he said. In the case of Palmer, the "stymie factor" tongue-tied him in public debate with Willy Ley in 1950 and ridiculed him in a *Life* magazine article in 1952 that mocked the Shaver stories. It is these famous Shaver stories that form the root of Palmer's "dangerous theory," as Arnold put it.

In 1943, a man by the name of Richard Shaver submitted a story to Palmer's *Amazing Stories* magazine. Shaver described a secret underground world in the Earth populated by beings (the Dero) who traveled in subterranean tunnels in craft that performed like flying saucers. Supposedly, Shaver received information about this world through "voices."

Curiously, Palmer noticed that in a religious tome, *Oahspe*, which purports to be "a history of the Earth and Heavens for the past 79,000 years," Ethereans, or astral entities, travel in vehicles along "roadways" that link levels or plateaus in a spirit world that exists from six inches to 100 miles above the surface of the Earth. The craft from both worlds, Palmer noted later, made the same peculiar fluttering motions as Arnold's UFOs sighted in 1947. After further thought and investigation, Palmer concluded that Shaver was contacting *Oahspe*-like astral entities who could obsess or possess people, even though Shaver insisted that the astral, spiritualist view was "all wool" and that the Dero *did* live under the surface of the Earth.

Palmer added to these two literary sources a third element — the observation in physics that subatomic matter is real and solid, and since human beings are real and solid, then so must be their souls. And from the assumption that an invisible, spiritual, although solid, world coexists with the Earth, Palmer drew a startling conclusion: "... I think that the flying saucers are the spirits of the dead."

As the tape ended, I reflected on this "dangerous theory." It aptly drove out the extraterrestrial hypothesis as the origin of UFOs, yet it seemed hollow and incomplete, mostly because of Palmer's damnably frustrating, purposely detracting statements that immediately followed: "I don't say that; I don't say that at all ... I don't ask anyone to believe what I said."

Arnold removed the tape. Well, what did *he* believe? Palmer had said on the tape that Arnold had been adamant that what he had seen in 1947 were machines. I wondered if Kenneth Arnold was a "nuts and bolts-er."

He shrugged his somewhat bowed shoulders as he sat facing me in a wicker chair. "I don't know what they are, but I'll tell you a story."

The Anecdotes

In the early fall of 1952 or 1953, Arnold was flying to San Francisco.

(continued on next page)

Arnold, Continued

The weather had been rough all day and he landed in Fall River Mills, California, when it was just beginning to snow. He was tying up his airplane when two or three fellows at the airport approached him and said that a plane had crashed near a ranch 6 miles out of town. Because of his experience in search and rescue, Arnold decided that he would help, and he accompanied about 20 other men to the ranch, arriving approximately 20 to 30 minutes after the plane had gone down.

A farmer, his wife, and children testified that they had heard the sound of a plane before it suddenly went silent near a meadow. Outside, the family saw a globe of light the size of a basketball circling through the air near a draw. This light was followed by a second one moments before the rescuers arrived, which vanished, like the first, into the worsening snow-storm.

The storm intensified so badly that rescue was impossible until the morning when an old Army training plane and the dead bodies of two college students were discovered. One man had died from a crushed head; the second man, practically cut in half, had crawled to the base of a tree where he had died, according to a doctor who visited the site, *about 20 minutes after the crash*. This would have been the approximate time that the farm family had seen the second light.

Arnold added matter-of-factly that such lights are not unusual in his experience. People involved in search and rescue have often seen globes of light associated with dying or dead people, and the same phenomenon has occurred at crash scenes in Idaho. As a boy of seven, he himself had seen, along with others, a globe of light in a room where the body of his great-grandmother lay in state.

Spirits? Machines? Or something else?

Arnold had his eighth sighting of UFOs in 1952 near Susanville, California. What Arnold saw were two apparent "craft," one of which was totally transparent. "They looked like something alive," he told me.

"I've had the feeling with these things that they are aware of me, but they made no effort to come close."

I asked him whether these UFOs, then, are some kind of lifeform that has the ability to assume the shape of a craft. He shrugged. At best, what he saw were shaped like craft; but perhaps, he said, we are being visited in a mechanical sense.

"It's possible that intelligent life can make the journey from other galaxies. I wouldn't want to be selfish; I wouldn't deny that anything's possible."

Arnold related stories of UFO sightings experienced by other individuals in the Northwest and in Idaho. One that was particularly intriguing concerned two disks that flew over Mount Adams, Washington, and crashed in the trees, leaving behind a gelatinous substance and a sulphurous odor. The foreman of a construction crew building a road for the county at the base of the mountain scooped up a sample of the substance in a jar. The sample subsequently vanished into thin air.

The Tapes

As the afternoon lengthened, Arnold brought out tape recordings of interviews he made with witnesses in the late 1940's of strange phenomena in the skies. Three of these interviews concern flying men.

What was most striking about these interviews were the straightforward, detailed descriptions of the objects, and the insistence of the witnesses that they had seen something undeniably real. The mundane context of the experiences also seemed noteworthy. In one case, a woman had been eating an orange and had gone to the kitchen sink to wash her hands when she thought she saw seagulls in the air, but looking more closely, noticed that three men dressed in khaki suits and wearing helmets were flying in the sky at the height and speed of an airplane.

In a fourth interview, an electronics and radar expert spoke with Arnold about mysterious targets observed at the Landing Aids Experiment Station on the coastline in Arcata, California.

These targets appeared on radar for 3 years, most often in the summer, over the ocean, and travelled on 180° headings with little change of bearing at 30 miles an hour at 3,000 feet. The source of these targets was invisible to the naked eye and to aircraft sent aloft. In some cases, the targets split into two, which continued on 180° headings and then later merged together. Some targets came to a complete halt. The radar expert never found a satisfactory explanation for this phenomenon after extensive study and the painstaking elimination of all possibilities.

Arnold pointed out to me that the radar station was later closed down after military interest in reports of "mystery submarines" in the area and of objects seen leaving the ocean.

Arnold removed the last tape. What did all this add up to, I asked him, playing the student imploring the wise teacher. Arnold was prepared for that, and later I would consider my question very presumptuous. He handed me a card. One sentence on it read: "Who but the Creator could have created so great a man as the unbeliever?"

Kenneth Arnold is certainly not a believer. Even if Ray Palmer's theory of the "spirits of the dead" were true, Arnold knows that it wouldn't be accepted: "The status quo of religion is so geared from an economic basis, an hypnotic basis, that no one wants a simple explanation."

Arnold once sent President Dwight Eisenhower a telegram warning him that Americans were being visited by "other worlds." Now, as the theories of the origin and purpose of UFOs have changed, so has Arnold, and he admits, at best, that "it's a complicated sort of thing." Even though "after 30 years, if there's proof [of UFOs] the government has it," Arnold believes that the world will probably never accept the reality of their existence since "we are so engrossed in economic or selfish pursuits."

In part, Arnold sees his own involvement in the UFO controversy in terms of his responsibility to fellow

(continued on next page)

Arnold, Continued

professional pilots. From the very beginning, he saw that many pilots would have liked to have stood up and recounted their own sightings of unexplained objects, but couldn't because of the threat to their jobs. Of those who did come forward, Arnold resented the criticism they received from "mundane scientists." In turn, he felt that any criticism he received (until recently, he had flown since 1932) was a criticism of all pilots. Above all, Arnold disliked people impugning the professional integrity of pilots who place the utmost emphasis on safe travel and the security of their passengers. For these reasons, he spoke out on the subject.

However, what Arnold was left with after his public involvement with UFOs was frustration and hurt. "When it happens to you, you're completely helpless," he discovered. He spent \$30,000 of his own money in his private investigations of UFOs and related phenomena. Out of that came strong clues that UFOs really exist, yet except for the rancher and the "fellow pitching hay," no one listened to him.

What puzzled him the most was what people did with his experience — ridicule it, criticize it, exploit it. Except for *The Coming of the Saucers*, which was privately printed and distributed, and the modest profits which went to support research into UFOs or to aid charity, Arnold never tried to write about his experiences or to profit from them. His attitude has been "take it or leave it."

However, for Arnold to say that he hasn't written about his experiences isn't quite accurate although it is true that he hasn't attempted to get rich off UFOs. *Fate* magazine published a series of articles written by him in its 1948 issues. In the spring issue, Arnold recounted the Mount Rainier sighting and his involvement in the Maury Island incident in Tacoma, Washington, in which Capt. Davidson and Lt. Brown died while transporting purported "fragments" of a UFO to Hamilton Field, California.

In the summer issue, Arnold pre-

sented a number of his own investigations into unconventional fireballs in the Southwest; blue-green "flashes," UFOs, and mystery fires in the Pacific Northwest; and river-dwelling purple "globes" in Canada. In the fall issue, he described "phantom lights" in Nevada. Additionally, some of Arnold's other cases have come to light (although sketchily) in the past few years, namely at the *Fate* magazine-sponsored First International UFO Congress in Chicago in 1977.

As I was preparing to leave, Arnold showed me a film can containing a 16-mm movie that he had taken of a glowing "cylinder" over Idaho Falls, Idaho, on July 9, 1966, at 2 p.m. Arnold said that the object in some ways looked like an atmospheric balloon. However, the object was traveling against winds of 45 to 80 mph blowing from the north-northwest.

Despite the evidence for UFOs that he has collected, Arnold is in no rush to present it to the world. He considers that he has lived on "hunches" his whole life and the time simply isn't right. Besides, for Arnold the businessman, UFOs are a business proposition.

Several years ago the *National Enquirer* showed interest in *The Coming of the Saucers*. Arnold sent Bob Pratt a copy of the book for him to explore the possibility of serializing it. Arnold told Pratt that he would want the book run exactly as it was. Nothing should be deleted or added since the book represented exactly what he had experienced. Arnold also asked Pratt what his feelings were about UFOs. Pratt answered in complete seriousness that UFOs were "the greatest discovery in the history of planet Earth." And although Pratt did not make a formal offer on the book, he asked Arnold if he would consider \$8,000.

To Arnold, UFOs are, at least, the greatest aeronautical mystery in the history of planet Earth and a subject truly international in scope. He considered Pratt's figure highly unreasonable compared to the \$250,000 that Arnold knew the *Enquirer* had paid one of President John F. Kennedy's mistresses to print her story.

FUND APPEAL

Members of MUFON, APRO, CUFOS, and others interested in scientific investigation of UFOs will be receiving an appeal for donations from the Fund for UFO Research by the end of the year. Formed over two years ago, the Fund now has a track record to show that it means business, but proposals already on hand would exhaust the Fund's resources very quickly if all were supported. A continuing flow of contributions is needed to sustain the momentum and accomplish many worthwhile studies now awaiting support.

In the past two years the Fund has:

- * underwritten part of the legal costs of the GSW/CAUS lawsuits against the CIA and NSA for the release of over 300 UFO documents, and assisted with related press conferences in Washington, D.C.

- * supported an initial investigation of newly-declassified documents with a possible bearing on early UFO history and U.S. government investigations.

- * established the \$1,000 Alvin H. Lawson Award for the best UFO article published during the year, to encourage high-quality research and publication.

- * expended funds for investigation of the December 29, 1980 Huffman, Texas, case in which three witnesses

(continued on next page)

There is a clear lesson here for Arnold, who — if no one else — recognizes the value of his experiences. Thus, he would demand, at minimum, a return on his original investment from anyone who wrote the full story of Kenneth Arnold.

This view isn't surprising given the personal history of Arnold. "I've always been a do-er," he said. A resourceful, independent, rugged man, Arnold made it through the Depression, the toughest years of his life, built his own business, his own house, his own planes, and because of a fateful moment near Mount Rainier and his good conscience, was caught up in a series of events that have added up to, plainly, "a pain in the neck." □

KAL KORFF AND THE "MEIER HOAX": A RESPONSE - Pt. 2

By Wendelle C. Stevens

(Part I, in the previous issue, dealt with accusations and alleged distortions in Korff's article in the December 1980 issue, No. 154. This part concentrates on the GSW analysis of the Meier photos.)

It is essential that a full response be given to Korff's lengthy section on the role of GSW and their "computer analyses" of the Meier photos. Korff's first statement concerning "first generation" copies of the photos is false. No first generation copies of the photos were let out of Meier's hands (except those which were stolen from him) until March of 1977, when the original diapositive of the cover photo of our book was released to a Munich TV station for a news item on the Swiss case. It was returned two weeks later. This is one of the photos we tested exhaustively. All of the original diapositives were taken in to have direct positive prints made. These became the master prints from which Hans Schutzbach made copy negatives by shooting the prints again on 35mm negative film with a hand-held camera. These became the file

negatives from which all subsequent prints were made. As the pictures Herr Falk sent to GSW were in positive slide format, they had to be shot from either Meier's album or from stock prints in Meier's collections, both being prints made from Schutzbach's 35mm copy negatives. These prints were already *four* lens-systems from the originals. Shooting them on-to slides again added a *fifth* lens-system. This is the best Falk could have had unless he was one of those who stole some of the original diapositives. The slides I have seen from this lot do not look any closer than fifth generation.

Someone also provided a set of the same slides to Colman von Keviczky and it may have been the same Herr Falk. I have a set of these slides and mine are certainly dim and off-color. Some are even crops of the originals.

On the other hand, I have taken Meier's remaining original diapositives to the best custom photo shop in Zurich, Photo Kino, and had custom internegatives produced in 4" x 5" and 7 x 9 centimeter sizes. This is the

second lens system from the UFO itself. We did all of our testing on four of these internegatives. This is the closest to the original that has been tested, to our knowledge. We have not allowed any of the originals (except the cover photo) out of Meier's hands for anything. The rest are protected in safes and will not be produced until no further testing is possible on the internegatives and only if a serious question remains in doubt which only the original could resolve. Then that *one* original may be taken by courier to an appropriate testing facility for examination in the presence of the courier, to be immediately returned by him to its depository upon completion of testing.

As I have explained in other responses to criticisms, the modes of computer enhancement are quite specific and are most productive when particularly applied to each separate photograph. The "buckshot" treatment of running ten different photos in the same program is not much better than no test at all.

(continued on next page)

Fund, Continued

suffered physical and emotional trauma during a UFO close encounter, which was apparently under observation by military helicopters.

* provided a grant to Ted Bloecher/Budd Hopkins/Aphrodite Clamar for intensive study of a group of witnesses who have reported being abducted by alien humanoids.

* made an award to UFO International Annual Review (UPIAR), the first scientific refereed journal devoted to the UFO phenomenon, Bologna, Italy.

* funded the writing and preparation of a carefully researched UFO slide/tape presentation for educational purposes, to be loaned to schools, libraries, and community groups.

Some of the additional proposals now under consideration, for which

adequate funds are not now available, are a computerized data bank study of UFO sightings; a study of Spanish physical trace cases; a compilation and astronomical analysis of pre-1947 sightings; and an extensive catalogue and study of the 1896-97 "airship" mystery. The Fund has also alerted MUFON investigators to the fact that financial aid can be quickly funneled to help pay for laboratory analysis or clinical tests in promising CE-II or CE-III cases involving potentially significant physical evidence. The Fund's "quick response" effort has a high priority, as long as the funds for it are available, to help assure that important evidence will not be lost due to lack of appropriate analysis or testing.

These are worthy goals to benefit all of ufology, but they require the support of everyone who wants to

obtain meaningful, scientific evidence on the nature of UFOs. Contributions are deductible on 1981 (or 1982) Federal income tax returns (IRS# 52-1164176). MUFON members who wish to earmark a contribution in the name of the organization may do so by indicating this on the check or in a covering note. We plan to report the amount of MUFON support in a future issue.

The Fund is also offering for \$30 (\$15 of which is tax deductible) a collection of 200 UFO documents released by the FBI and CIA under the Freedom of Information Act.

(Information supplied by Dr. Bruce S. Maccabee, Chairman, and Fred Whiting, Publicity Director.)

Fund for UFO Research, Box 277, Mt. Rainier, MD 20712.

Meier Photos, Continued

When I checked out the GSW methods in 1977, I found that GSW was sending batches of up to ten photos at a time to Spatial Data Systems of Goleta, California for processing in a program designed for them by Dr. Bruce Maccabee. This program was the best anywhere up to that time and Dr. Maccabee had done a good job of designing a program where none existed previously. Spatial Data charged GSW \$80.00 per computer hour for operating costs, which worked out to \$8.00 per photo in a batch of ten. For that, GSW got four steps — Edge Enhancement, Color Contouring, Pixel Distortion Test, and Digitization — for each photo in the batch.

This processing was done on the plant demonstrator equipment by the salesman, who shot a color Polaroid print of the video display for GSW, which was sent back with the print, *with no comment*. All of the "analyses" were then done *subjectively* by GSW from those Polaroid prints.

Perhaps that doesn't sound so bad until you talk to a computer programmer (and the science is so new that even they don't all agree), but they state that such tests are only meaningful if they are quite specific. In other words, there is considerable variation in these steps. For productive Edge Enhancement, you must know what you are enhancing for and this is true of the other steps also. Each case will be quite different. You can Color Contour for many different things and you have to be specific if you are to get meaningful results. This is also true in lesser degree for Pixelizing and Digitizing.

The most important step of all, however, is the first step — introducing the photograph into the computer. Everything else depends on this. Spatial Data was using an off-the-shelf popular video camera in the \$1,500 price range to introduce the data into their display set-up. They didn't even have a light table and no filters and lens attachments at all for the camera. This alone could have negated the results of their testing. We used the most expensive camera

and lens systems at the SPIES Symposium in San Diego, listing at \$52,000, to introduce our images into the storage system. We also used the top-of-the-line Hammamatsu micro-densitometer for digitizing at both 5 micron and 1/2 micron sizes for analysis. We also used their thermoluminescence burst-test equipment to study possible radiation effects on the emulsion crystals in the images. This was only the beginning of our analysis and we failed to find any evidence of fraud or hoax.

Regarding the GSW analysis; their first statement that most of the ten analyzed photos are extremely light above the UFO image (the image itself was washed-out too) should have told them that they had many-generation copies before them. That this would tend to mask any supporting structure is true.

Their second statement — that the UFO images are out-of-focus when compared to other features of comparable distance from the camera — is completely misleading. Unless they had walked over the photo sites and measured the distances, as well as marking the apparent position of the UFO based on the witness' best estimate, they could not possibly know what other features *were* at a comparable distance. In most of the ten photos they had, there were *no* other features at a comparable distance. And it does *not* indicate that the UFO is close to the camera. Those opinions are entirely subjective and have *no basis whatsoever* in fact.

The third statement, that considering the focal length of the camera, all calculations place the UFO at four to six feet, is also completely false. When I shot photos of a model, in focus, filling about 20% of the width of the image frame, as some of those in question do, at the mean distance of five feet (GSW said four to six feet), I got a model UFO measuring 6 inches in diameter and *all other objects beyond 10 feet from the camera were badly out of focus*. The titles of books in the background were indistinguishable. Something is wrong with Korff's reasoning.

The fourth statement, that atmos-

phere effects on distant features in the photos are not noticeable on *any* of the UFO images, is also wrong. A glance at the facing photos, in sequence, on pages 29 and 30 of our book, will demonstrate this misinterpretation. In Volume II, we will present a series of photographs in sequence, showing a dark point in the distant atmospheric haze as it approaches and grows larger, frame by frame, until it is recognizable as one of the craft in the photos tested by GSW.

The fifth statement concerning shadows is a strange one, considering the fact that the Swiss sky in this vicinity is usually *white*. In a white sky such as this, *even the trees aren't casting any shadows*.

In the sixth statement, we find that this handicapped man is supposed to have successfully employed three types of hoax photography. Let's look at these:

a. Suspended Model — This is perhaps the most likely method that could be used; however, no one has ever found the model or the suspension rig, nor has anyone ever found "the string" in any of the photographs. And here I specifically refer, also, to the very photographs which Korff used to illustrate his article. Despite the fact that the first photo is printed *upside down*, there is no evidence of a suspension line, top or bottom, in the photo. This is the same object depicted in the second photo, which *does* show "artifacts" (unusual lines), but the "string" doesn't start at the top of the UFO and it *stops halfway up*. The other "artifact" that crosses the middle of the image is conveniently ignored by Korff, as are *three* more such "artifacts" exactly like these which have been cropped out on this photo. They are completely outside the image area of the UFO. We did not find any of these on our examination of the second generation internegatives and we had sharp, clear, dense images to work with. We advised our colleagues in this research of GSW's discovery and they were also unable to find such anomalies.

(continued on next page)

Meier Photos, Continued

b. Double Exposure — Now this would be difficult indeed. Nearly all of Meier's photographs were shot on 36-frame rolls of positive transparency film and on more than one occasion, he shot more than three rolls of film during the UFO event. In some of the series of photos, he photographed the ship above the horizon and then descending below the horizon, with the frames in numbered sequence. Sometimes there were other obstructions in the photographs. To successfully shoot 108 frames, in sequence, of the UFO image against a dark background, then go out and shoot a ten or twelve-frame run in sequence, with the UFO in proper position relative to the new background scene, every time, several times in succession, without having the image get lighter by the second exposure and without having it in a position where it overlaps something else or crosses another line or is malpositioned in flight trajectory in sequence as it gets smaller in size going away from the photographer — this is stretching the point a little! We must also remember that while he is successfully doing this, more than once, he is using a camera that he can't look through or change the focus, plus being one-armed and having to do everything with that handicap!

c. Double Print Method — This admittedly could be done in a laboratory, even a home photo lab, but the nearest lab to Meier is 80 kilometers away. For him to do it himself is out of the question, so he would require collaborators. He would need equipment and facilities. He has no equipment and no easy access to any. He had no running water in his house, no temperature control, bare-bulb electrical power and no darkroom potential, no available space, no privacy and no storage place for equipment to keep it unseen. None of the witnesses there ever saw any photo processing equipment around and no one ever saw him using any or any evidence that he had used any. There were eight people living in the house, all potential observers. No photo pro-

cessing chemicals were available near him and he would have difficulty going and coming with chemicals, models, equipment or anything else on his open moped transportation — and he still had a one-arm limitation.

Of the spacecraft near a tree on facing pages 35 and 36 of our book, I measured that distance to be 52 yards (156 feet) from the camera. By "computer analysis" mentioned by Korff, I must assume that this was the one made by GSW through Spatial Data Systems, which included a color contour treatment on Dr. Maccabee's program. This was only a simple color-coding program for basic separation, in primary colors, of basic data, with no definite purpose. This photo, not shown by Korff, was published in Japan's *UFOs and Space Magazine*. It showed the entire object in the same shade of red as the entire tree and trees in the picture. Now even an untrained eye can see that the top of the object is not anywhere near the color of the tree, nor is the bottom. To get the same color for both means that the red was assigned for all values in the tree and the UFO. This is no analysis. On the other hand, contrasting colors could have been assigned, one to the shades of brown in the tree and the other to the shades of blue and gray in the UFO. We would then have a different picture entirely. When we tried this, we found the branches to be in front of the UFO. The photographer actually estimated the craft in the photo to be about 50 yards beyond the tree, out over the valley, even beyond the top of another big tree down the hill that looks like a bush at the base of the primary tree in this photo.

I don't know how GSW "interpreted" the branches of the primary tree to be behind the UFO, since they all came out in exactly the same red color on the color contouring used by GSW.

That the density (gray value) of the shadow bottom of the UFO varies appreciably from features in the tree should be expected. They are at different angles to the sun and of completely different textures. If they did not vary, something would be amiss.

The "double print" explanation for such a photo is ridiculous.

Korff states that "the computer digitizing scan of the edges of the UFO and foreground features . . . reveals that the UFO is in the same plane." First of all, this is fallacious at the 5 micron digitizing done by Spatial Data Systems. The pixel count would probably not vary at all across any of the edges in the picture at this broad a range. The second implication, that they are in the same plane because of this, is difficult to analyze because they don't mention which picture they are talking about. However, except for the shots with the movie camera, or the tripod, or the moped in the scene (which are not in the ten photos sent to GSW), there are no close foreground objects for comparison — except trees, and they characteristically have a different edge from a finished surface. The smooth edge of uniform density on the UFO is to be expected since it was hovering when the photo was made.

A model of eight inches diameter, as suggested, taking up 20% of the width of the picture frame as observed, would be seven feet from the lens; anything beyond fifteen feet would be out of focus at most settings. We do not find this in the Meier photographs.

Korff then goes on to state that all these frames can be duplicated with a basic camera and darkroom equipment. Von Keviczky stated the same thing, yet neither of them have come up with even one such photograph. In our case, we have a wonderful society here where we can obtain everything we need in the way of equipment, chemicals and facilities. We have running water, controlled temperatures, print dryers, darkrooms, special lights, etc., and we have both arms and as many confederates as we care to work with. Why haven't they duplicated just one of the photos in question?

The statement that the bottom portions of the UFOs are always dark is certainly unfounded as may be seen

(continued on next page)

"California Report"

By Ann Druffel

Interpreting the Bailey Case

Following the publication of Part I of "Controversial Entity Photos from California" in this column (Jan. 1981, No. 155) a Pandora's box seemed suddenly unlatched. An account of Harrison E. Bailey's CE III in a wooded area outside Orland Park, Ill., on September 24, 1951 was received favorably by many researchers.¹ The case did not seem to differ substantially from dozens of other CE IIIs and CE IVs² which have found their way into print in respected journals and magazines.

However, in January 1980 the same percipient, now a licensed Baptist minister in Pasadena, California, brought forward a dozen Polaroid pictures which were purportedly a

Meier Photos, Continued

by the photographs shown on pages 15, 17/18, 19, 37/38, 53, 55 and 58 in the book. I suppose that by Korff's line of reasoning, these are the 20-30 foot diameter craft.

There is no ground shadow visible in the picture frame on the cover photo of the book because the shot was made at 5:30 in the afternoon and the sun's low angle would cast it completely out of the picture to the left, if it were distinguishable at all in this white sky.

The photo sequence of a disc-shaped craft circling a tree is actually reported to have taken place over a time estimated to be 3 to 4 minutes. The clouds do, in fact, move faster in the higher valleys here. The nearest weather station is 80 kilometers away, in Zurich, in a large valley with a big lake, and their weather is completely different. Clever superimposition of the objects that are both *below and above the horizon and cross the skyline*, as suggested by Korff, with no evidence of the skyline showing, would be a clever trick indeed!□

film record of an alien visitation into his home.' As a consequence, the Bailey case became unacceptable to some researchers, even though his unusual "visitors" seemed to be the same creatures whom he had encountered in 1951 and which had seemed to visit him occasionally during the intervening years by means of experiences he thought were vivid dreams.

These researchers seemed unable to accept implications of paranormality inherent within the visitation as described by Bailey, and also permanently imprinted on the pictures themselves.

Several serious questions have been raised regarding the manner in which the case was investigated, toward certain hypnotic techniques used, in 1977, to elicit details of Bailey's apparent abduction experience within the landed craft in 1951, and toward Rev. Bailey's character and emotional stability. These questions took the form of editorial comments by my good friend and colleague, Editor Richard Hall, in the January 1981 issue and also in a "Letter to the Editor" by Alvin Lawson, Ph.D., whose comments in the April 1981 issue reflected the feelings of W.C. McCall, M.D. as well.

I feel obliged to answer all the specific questions raised on this case. The main problem is lack of space, since the questions can only be answered by explaining complex situations in Rev. Bailey's life. Short replies cannot adequately clarify the misunderstandings. A good place to start, however, is with the comment by Editor Dick Hall that, during a May 18, 1977 hypnotic session, Bailey was repeatedly "prompted and was obligingly suggestible" as he

described an abduction aboard an oval craft, examined by two short-statured aliens with distorted features, and given a message which he was to carry back to the U.S. Government and to the American people.

Editor Hall picked out one paragraph in the 42-page transcript in which Dr. McCall, as hypnotist, asks Bailey to "use your imagination. I want you to imagine you were taken aboard." Studying the entire transcript, it becomes clear that this particular technique was employed by Bill McCall to try to break through a stubborn block, seemingly caused by fear of ridicule in Bailey's hypnotically regressed mind. Several techniques had been tried prior to this approach during the same session, but had produced no results. Seeking to clarify the situation, I asked R. Leo Sprinkle, Ph.D., a pioneer in hypnotic regression of UFO close encounter witnesses, to give his opinion on the session's transcript and received the following reply:

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been asked by Ann Druffel, 257 Sycamore Glen, Pasadena, CA 91105, to offer my opinion regarding the typescript of an interview with Reverend Harrison Bailey, with hypnotic suggestions by Dr. Wm. McCall and UFO investigators Dr. Alvin Lawson and Mrs. Ann Druffel.

I am happy to provide my opinion and I am willing to respond to specific questions or comments about this statement.

I have no way of verifying, or even evaluating, the information which came out of the hypnotic session; however, I believe that Dr. McCall has done an excellent job in providing suggestions which were acceptable to Reverend Bailey, so that Reverend Bailey might explore his memories, or impressions, of the experiences which had occurred to him in 1951. In

(continued on next page)

Calif. Report, Continued

my opinion, the suggestions for imaginary activities are acceptable methods to elicit information which seems to be repressed, or which is being suppressed, by a participant because of traumatic or emotional reactions to the release of unconscious information.

Of course, skeptical investigators can question whether the use of techniques to elicit imaginary information might also encourage the participant to fabricate, or elaborate, or lie, about information which is hazy or difficult to explore. In forensic psychology, safeguards are being utilized to minimize personal contact between the hypnotist, investigator, and hypnotic subject in cases of criminal activity where the witness might be mistaken about the identity and actions of alleged criminals. In my opinion, however, the difficulties in UFO investigation, and the possible consequences, are neither to be viewed as the same difficulties as those in forensic hypnosis, nor as the same difficulties in clinical hypnotherapy. In my opinion, hypnotic procedures for UFO investigation can be used both to help the participant to explore his or her memories, as well as to help the participant to become aware, to accept, to acknowledge those memories.

At this state in UFO investigation, I believe that it is difficult for investigators to know whether the UFO experiences are physical face-to-face encounters; out-of-the-body experiences; mental programming; or, a combination of these experiences. Thus, exploration can be viewed as an important goal in the use of hypnotic techniques, but evaluation of the information may require additional background information rather than total reliance upon the information which comes out of the hypnotic session. In my opinion, Reverend Bailey's reactions are similar to those of other persons with whom I have worked, and whose fears may have caused repression and/or suppression of their UFO experiences; the gradual release of information may be either a normal response to a sense of courage and confidence on the part of the participant, or there may be some kind of "timing" process of which UFO investigators are unaware.

In reading the typescript, I find that the questions and approach of the investigator, and the stated reactions of the participant, are similar to those of a number of persons with whom I have worked; in my opinion, the information shows a similar pattern to that of other UFO witnesses who have experienced encounters which, to them, indicate a real physical and psychic experience with what seems to be intelligent beings from another planet or another dimension, etc.

The hypotheses of fraud, fantasy, self-delusion, or imagination, etc., seem to be more complex than the hypothesis that Reverend Bailey is experiencing recall of events which happened to him; however, the specific understanding of

the origin, purpose, and powers of the hypothesized UFO beings remains in doubt. Thus, further investigation seems to be appropriate to see if the Reverend follows the same kind of pattern of behavior which is typical of other UFO contactees and abductees; (e.g., psychic experiences which lead him to an obsessive-compulsive pattern of behavior so that he can complete some "task," or "mission," or "duty.")

I commend the investigators and Reverend Bailey for their willingness to pursue this investigation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Leo Sprinkle, Ph.D., Director
Division of Counseling and Testing
Professor of Counseling Services
University of Wyoming

Dr. Sprinkle's suggestion that further investigation would determine whether Bailey followed the patterns of behavior typical of other abductees had already been fulfilled. When I first became acquainted with Bailey in 1975, he had since 1965, been trying to alert the American public to the existence of UFOs and attempting to deliver to government officials the specific message which he was convinced had been given him by the UFO beings in 1951. His persistent efforts might well be considered compulsive, and even obsessive, though he managed concurrently to maintain an equable nature and to accomplish socially valuable work as a Baptist minister.

It is hoped that Dr. Sprinkle's statement will aid in clarifying the controversy regarding Bailey's May 18, 1977 hypnotic session. Al Lawson and Bill McCall, on the other hand, contend the the hypnotic techniques used during Bailey's session were valid for use with a "real" CE IV witness experiencing a psychological block, but that the information derived regarding Bailey's abduction was neither valid nor real. This seeming paradox is understandable when one realizes that both Lawson, and to a lesser degree McCall, feel that all abduction scenarios are caused by some mechanism totally within the mind of the percipient.

Various experts in hypnosis hold differing views as to the validity of the information obtained through hypnosis and also hold differing

views on the techniques which are professionally acceptable in obtaining information from a hypnotized subject. But when two hypnotherapists, who seem to hold widely divergent views regarding the nature of UFOs agree that certain soothing and reassuring techniques are valid in obtaining information from hypnotized witnesses — information which the percipient *feels in his own mind to be true* — then researchers should pay heed. It is very probable that Rev. Bailey was being encouraged to lose his fears, increase his trust in the hypnotist, and speak out what he felt was the truth; i.e., that he had, in fact, true memories of being aboard a UFO.

No one — even the disagreeing hypnosis experts — knows anything definite about what occurs during very close encounter/abduction scenarios, except that real psychological and physiological damage apparently results from some such encounters. We can only speculate, at this point, about the meaning of it all.

It is my own opinion, however, that some sort of unknown (therefore "alien") intelligence is reacting at some level with human beings during these experiences. Most likely the human percipients are in some altered state at the time. It also seems that the manifestations *do* take at least *temporary* physical form during some phase(s) of the interactions.

I hope the above helps clarify the controversy about the Bailey hypnotic session. In a future column I will clarify other criticisms directed toward this case.

NOTES

1. In *Fate* Magazine, two-part article, April and May 1978 issues.

2. The term CE IV is used here to signify an alleged UFO abduction experience.

3. Regarding Editor Hall's statement in his "Editorial Comments" at the end of Part I of "Controversial Entity Photos from California" describing Bailey as a self-styled minister, Xerox copies of Bailey's ministerial licenses have settled this question to Hall's satisfaction.

4. See Jan. and Feb. 1981 issues of *MUFON UFO Journal* for two-part article on the Bailey photos.

BOOK REVIEW

UFOs: The Image Hypothesis. Close Encounters of an Australian Kind, by Keith Basterfield. (Reed Books, Australia, May 1981), 111 pp., \$5.95.

(See also "Imagery and Close Encounters," by Keith Basterfield, in MUFON UFO Journal No. 162, August 1981.)

One of Australia's leading UFO researchers has presented in this short book the kernel of an idea that deserves wide attention and may provide insights into that mystery we call the UFO phenomenon. The author offers his theory as a possible explanation for much of the hitherto unexplained residue of UFO events that survives the gauntlet of critical investigators.

The author recounts his odyssey which led him to this position, in simple and straightforward terms. The account is free of the sensationalism that has been a feature of much of the available UFO literature. His approach is in step with the critical winds of change that are now sweeping through UFO research at large.

Against a background of personal investigation and experiences, he draws a picture of a subject fraught with observations of "UFOs." These are definitely explainable in conventional terms once common sense investigations have been conducted by intelligent and critical investigators. Basterfield gives short shrift to a number of areas of UFO experience, including claims of "angel hair," photographs, and radar evidence. According to the author, there is very little in "UFO 'nests' and all that."

However, in his estimation there is a residue of ostensibly unexplainable cases. The bizarre experiences of the Rye housewife on Mooraduc Road in Victoria and a mechanic's roadside encounter with a strange object resting on the ground near Murray Bridge in South Australia, are among the Australian cases described. It is to these cases — the unexplained residue — that Basterfield addresses his "image hypothesis."

The Ivy Tanks case of September 6, 1973 (p. 28-30) proved to be the initial stimulus for the author to consider this hypothesis. Its fascinating correspondences with the well-defined characteristics of hypnopompic and hypnagogic imagery caused him to consider whether other cases shared these similarities. Perhaps surprisingly, a great many close encounter cases had features which suggested to the author that they were perhaps the result of imagery. A remarkable number of close encounter cases worldwide occur in the nocturnal interface of waking and sleep, and therefore the theory may be of great utility in attempting to determine the objective reality of these experiences.

The author even offers a possible mechanism for UFO events that occur to people in an ostensibly awake state. Here he refers to "neural discharges" that occur generally during "paradoxical sleep." Deprivation effects, in certain studies, have led to "neural discharges" and intense visual imagery or hallucinations during waking hours of certain subjects.

How legitimate are such psychological explanations? The author has only presented the theory in a tentative and initial form, and therefore it is difficult to judge how comprehensive the theory is intended to be. He appears to be suggesting that almost all residue cases may eventually be explained in these or more mundane terms. I have no doubts that some cases are amenable to such mechanisms, particularly when we enter the murky realm of "abduction," "time loss," and "interrupted journey" experiences. However, some aspects of the UFO phenomenon, as we presently understand it, are more difficult to dispose of.

Physical traces related to UFO events are a case in point. Basterfield considers only the famous Tully case (see my article in Ron Story's *Encyclopedia of UFOs*) as about the only physical trace event of any merit.

While I share some common ground with the author's hypothesis, I must consider his position on physical traces in particular as an over-

simplification. There are quite a number of impressive physical trace events (e.g., Socorro, NM., 1964; see Ray Stanford's book, *Socorro Saucer in a Pentagon Pantry* and the article in *Encyclopedia of UFOs*).

The Boyup Brook case (p. 41) is used by the author to support his psychological mechanism for "car stop"/"car control" cases, however, it should be appreciated that the driver's watch also stopped for 5 minutes — a period of time consistent with the witness' impression of the duration of the "car control" incident. Therefore the "time-gap" experience — a psychologically understood mechanism — seems out of place. Also "EM" cases (or "car effect" cases) with more than one witness seem to rule out the "psychological" cause. The BUFORA Vehicle Interference Project compiled by Geoffrey Falla and edited by C. F. Lockwood and A. R. Pace (1979) lists many two-witness EM events among the some 420 total cases.

The lack of cases, particularly overseas events, illustrating each part in the development of the theory, is a weakness, but one I understand due to the publisher's reduction of the overall length of the original manuscript. The author has not pursued the idea that the image hypothesis is ultimately testable and therefore it may well be a "scientific" hypothesis, if we view it from a classical falsification stance. The hypnagogic state can be studied in the laboratory with some success, so much so that Charles T. Tart in his pioneer work *Altered States of Consciousness* (1969, 1972) was able to say, "It is a straightforward step from the Bertini, et. al. research attempt to control the hypnagogic state itself and explore the possible use of such control." (See "Some Preliminary Observations With an Experimental Procedure for the Study of Hypnagogic and Related Phenomena" by M. Bertini, Helen B. Lewis, and Herman A. Witkin; condensed from *Archivio di Psicologia Neurologia e Psichiatria*, 1964, v. 6, 493-534; pp. 95-114 in, *Altered States of Consciousness*, 1972.)

(continued on next page)

Letters

Abduction Response

Editor,

I would like to assure William Leet (August, No. 162) that I am neither metaphysical nor, on this occasion anyway, a puller of legs. That "something" occurs, physically as well as psychologically, in many alleged abduction cases, I regard as highly probable: Rutledge's recently published findings are quite sufficient to establish a physical basis for the UFO, and I am quite ready to accept that they could be extended to account for the physical effects shown in many "abduction" cases. But because we accept the physical effects as real, it does not follow we have to accept the entire scenario at face value. The evidence for any form of contact with UFO persons must be considered unproven so long as alternative explanations are available; and I believe they are.

Book Review, Continued

Perhaps UFO based imagery can be produced under controlled conditions, along the lines of Alvin H. Lawson's "imaginary abductees" experiments.

Basterfield's exposition of his imagery theory potentially has wide utility in explaining some UFO close encounters. It requires more detailed qualification and development beyond its current narrow horizon. However, as an idea expressed as a non-rigid working hypothesis, the concept deserves the thorough and thoughtful consideration of a wide researcher-oriented audience.

The author's conclusion that "... the truth (about UFOs) may lie in understanding more about ourselves and (our) beliefs, than in the stars" could be right. An answer will require much more research and open-minded debate along these and other lines. The author and indeed this reviewer would find such tasks a most worthy endeavor.

— Bill Chalker

Luis Schonherr's article rightly emphasizes that a *discriminating* use of psychology should not be seen as a "soft" approach, but as potentially as "hard" as any other. By pointing out that it enables us to extract valuable information even from cases hitherto dismissed, on purely physical grounds, as fraudulent, he may entitle us to retrieve much currently devalued material from the waste bin. Whether this will ever amount to a "Come back, George Adamski, all is forgiven!" remains, perhaps, doubtful.

I was glad to see Keith Basterfield's condensed version of the viewpoint expressed in his useful book *Close Encounters of an Australian Kind*. His thinking, too, has led him to propose mechanisms which bridge the conventional distinction between physiological and psychological processes, and show that just because a response is subjective, it is not necessarily "all in the mind." He, too, never questions that a "real" incident occurs; but he, too, requires us to extend our notions of what constitutes "real."

Hilary Evans
London, England

Retrievals and Theories

Editor,

In his article in the September 1981 issue (No. 163), Len Stringfield describes me as a "critic of the ETH (extraterrestrial hypothesis)" and implies that is why I am skeptical of crashed-saucer stories.

It is true that at one time I was hostile to the ETH, but in the past several years, as I have made clear in my various writings (see, for example, my position statement in *Encyclopedia of UFOs*, p. 74), my views have changed considerably. I now define myself as an "agnostic" about all UFO theories. I also feel that, given the varieties of physical evidence, subjectivist/psychological/parapsychological interpretations of the kind I once advocated are unsatisfactory. I consider the ETH a reasonable approach and I even subscribe to it every other Thursday.

My quarrel with Len (whom I have long liked and admired) has to do with our differing assessments of the evidence for the reality of crashed saucers. I find the evidence weak and unconvincing; and that, not an *a priori* rejection of the possibility of physical spaceships, is why I reject retrieval claims.

Jerome Clark
Lake Bluff, Ill.

Farish Statement . . .

Editor,

In the August 1981 issue (No. 162), Mr. Lucius Farish stated that "... there are relatively few books (probably less than 30) which make substantial and needed contributions to our knowledge of the UFO subject." I think it would be of value for him to tell us what they are.

William E. Jones
Columbus, Ohio

. . . and Farish Reply

Editor,

Needless to say (mine is) a purely personal viewpoint . . . no two people are likely to agree on the 30 (or whatever number) "best" books on the UFO subject. Therefore, I'm reluctant to give such a list, as it might imply that any books I excluded were not worth reading. I am a firm believer that anyone interested in UFOs should attempt to read *anything and everything* (including) all the nonsense and the re-hash in order to get to the "good stuff" . . . In my capacity as a book reviewer, I enjoy the opportunity to tell readers of particularly good books when they come along, but I don't feel that I have the right to tell them what *not* to read. That is an individual decision — as it should be.

Lucius Farish
Plumerville, Ark.

MUFON

103 OLDTOWNE RD.
SEGUIN, TX 78155

Director's Message, Continued

MUFON Consultant in Radiology, has become deeply involved in this case.

By working with people such as Bob Girard, owner of Arcturus Book Service, 263 N. Ballstone Avenue, Scotia, NY 12302 and Lucius Farish, Route One-Box 220, Plumerville, AR 72127, MUFON is attempting to accumulate a comprehensive UFO library of both hardbacks and paperbacks as a reference source and to preserve the existing UFO literature for the future. Members who own duplicate copies of UFO hardbacks are encouraged to either donate them to the MUFON library or advise the selling price, title, and author so they may be purchased by writing to MUFON at 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155. Many of our members presently have substantial personal libraries, which they should seriously consider bequeathing to MUFON in their wills in order to perpetuate this important literature. There may be others who have become overburdened with UFO books and periodicals throughout the years, or may have lost interest in the subject, who would derive a great deal of satisfaction in seeing their library preserved by MUFON as a reference in their memory. Please contact your International Director at the above address if you would like to contribute in any way to the MUFON library.

Each month, I will utilize a portion of my message to suggest ideas to improve UFO investigations and research, training Field Investigators, duties of State and State Section Directors, etc. J. Allen Hynek, Ph.D. set the stage for this month's proposals with the challenge he offered in his paper at M.I.T. "Ufology as a Profession." We will simply pose the question and try to answer it by asking "how to be a professional in ufology?"

(1) In order to have competent investigators interviewing and performing on-site investigations, formal Field Investigator training classes must be conducted by qualified personnel utilizing the MUFON Field Investi-

gator's Manual as a reference. (2) We must seek and recruit people educated and trained in their profession to apply their expertise to resolving the UFO phenomenon. (3) Trained field investigators should team up with trainees or apprentices when conducting UFO investigations to impart their techniques. (4) All of us must be cognizant that the majority of the people in the academic and scientific community are not familiar with the UFO literature as it regards the major cases investigated, the data accumulated, and the statistical analysis available to the public, since they have never taken the time to peruse this material. We must become involved in public education to disseminate these vital facts.

(5) Be prepared with the facts on investigated UFO cases before discussing them with the press, or appearing on radio and television programs, so as to breed confidence as a professional to the public. (6) In public appearances, dress and conduct yourself in such a manner that you will command the respect of everyone that you contact. (7) Since we are dealing with a subject that some people consider controversial or even "hogwash," the challenge to operate in a professional manner is even a more difficult role.

(8) In closing, Barbara Schutte would like to offer her personal challenge to all of us. "We are no

(continued on p. 19)

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION

1. Title of publication: The MUFON UFO JOURNAL (USPS 002970)
2. Date of filing: October 15, 1981
3. Frequency of issue: monthly
4. Location of known office of publication: 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Guadalupe, Texas 78155
5. Address of the headquarters: 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Guadalupe, TX 78155
6. Names and complete addresses of publisher, editor, and managing editor:
 Publisher: Walter H. Andrus, Jr., 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155
 Editor: Richard H. Hall, 4418 39th St., Brentwood, MD 20722
7. Owner: MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC. (MUFON), 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155

A not-for-profit corporation incorporated under the State Laws of Texas

Trustees: Walter H. Andrus, Jr. (International Director), 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155; Sam Cross (Corporate Secretary) R.F.D. 2, Seguin, TX 78155; John Donegan (Treasurer), 1901 Mount Vernon, Seguin, TX 78155

8. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities: NONE

9. For completion by nonprofit organizations authorized to mail at special rates: NO CHANGE

10. Extent and nation of circulation:

	Average No. copies each issue during preceding 12 months	Actual No. copies of single issue published nearest to filing date
A. Total No. copies printed.....	1183	1100
B. Paid circulation		
1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales.....	0	0
2. Mail subscriptions.....	974	959
C. Total paid circulation	974	959
D. Free distributions by mail, carrier or other means: samples, complimentary, and other free copies	104	71
E. Total distribution	1078	1030
F. Copies not distributed		
1. Office use, left over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing	105	70
2. Returns from news agents.....	0	0
G. Total.....	1183	1100

(signed) Walter H. Andrus, Jr.
 Publisher



Lucius Farish

In Others' Words

The October 6 issue of *National Enquirer* has a feature on Betty Hill and the various UFO-related events which she says have happened to her since she and her late husband were taken aboard a UFO in 1961. A report in the October 13 issue tells of a Franklin, Ohio, woman who claims to have been abducted twice by UFO occupants.

The *Star* for October 6 reports on a region in Lake Ontario where ships and planes have allegedly disappeared mysteriously. Various UFO sightings have been reported in the same area.

Sociologist David W. Swift contributes an interesting article to the "Forum" column in the October issue of *Astronomy*. Swift discusses the differences of attitudes and viewpoints between UFO researchers and scientists who have been engaged in the SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence) program. A useful and enlightening article.

Although there is no UFO column

in the October issue of *OMNI*, the "Anti-Matter" section of the magazine contains some UFO items. Particularly fascinating is a brief report by Harry Lebelson on a mysterious cylindrical object photographed hovering slightly above the surface of Lake Ontario in 1967. Numerous details of the object are visible in the photo. (The object has since been identified by Ray Stanford, Project Starlight International, as a specific craft used for a floating orchestra, distorted by light refraction. —Ed.)

The November issue of *Science Digest* has an article by Patrick Huyghe on UFO sightings by scientists and trained observers. Huyghe also comments on the current state of UFO research and scientists' attitudes toward the subject.

A brief look at some of the books slated for publication during the final quarter of 1981: October will see the release of Daniel Cohen's *The Great Airship Mystery*, dealing with reports

from the years of 1896-97. This will be published by Dodd, Mead. Also in October, James Oberg's *UFOs and Space Mysteries* is due out from The Donning Company. Two postponed books, re-scheduled for publication before the end of the year, are *Mannerism on Space Communication* by Anthony L. Coundakis (Exposition Press) and *Flying Saucers: Magic in the Skies* by Otto Billig (Schenkman). Researcher Wendelle C. Stevens will be offering a privately-published edition of *UFO... Contact from Reticulum*, a detailed study of the William Herrmann abduction case. This should be available in October. Stevens plans additional books during 1982. Rumor has it that researchers Stanton T. Friedman and William L. Moore will combine their talents for a book to be published in the fall of 1982 by the San Francisco office of Harper & Row. Other than this, it looks like a "long, dry spell" for commercially-published UFO books.

Director's Message, from p. 18

longer a group of hobbyists. We know too much at this point to take such an apathetic attitude. We are a group with many Ph.D.'s, M.A.'s, B.A.'s, M.D.'s — Professionals! Now let's start performing like professionals! Certainly you would not be so unconcerned in your own practices!"

An article in *Astronomy Magazine* October 1981 issue, titled "Parallel Universes: A Tale of Two SETIs" is an observation that depicts the problem that Ufologists face in seeking scientific recognition. It is a direct comparison of MUFON's Tenth Annual UFO Symposium at the Airport Marina Hotel in San Francisco in 1979 and a NASA sponsored meeting nearby at the Ames Research Center, at Moffett Field, as they related to SETI.

The author — David W. Swift, Ph.D., Department of Sociology, University of Hawaii, Honolulu — was one of the speakers for the MUFON symposium and also participated in the NASA Conference. He is thus qualified to make not only an observation, but also an evaluation of the two approaches to SETI.

MUFON-C.E.S. MEETING

The Central European Section of MUFON (MUFON-C.E.S.) held its 8th annual meeting September 4-6, 1981 at the Airport Hotel, Freiburg, West Germany.

Speakers included Dipl. Phys. I. Brand, Dr. L. Ferrara, Dipl. Ing. A. Schneider, B. Biffiger, and Dr. W. A. Frank. Among the topics discussed

were photoanalysis, UFO sightings by pilots in Europe, a European CE-III case, evaluation methods, management of UFO data and catalogues.

The scientific and technically oriented German-speaking members are an important element of MUFON's world-wide cooperative investigation of UFOs. Volunteer German-language translators are invited to assist in making MUFON-C.E.S. reports and data available in English. Contact MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155.



DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE by Walt Andrus

In conjunction with the recent Center for UFO Studies Conference in Chicago, an important meeting was conducted between MUFON Board of Director members James McCampbell, John F. Schuessler, Walter Andrus, and three members of Project URD, Bertil Kuhlemann, Sten Lingren, and Bjarne Hakansson from Sweden to discuss and later evaluate the adoption of their proposal as an international standardized system for reporting and computerizing UFO reports. In order that the MUFON Board of Directors may evaluate the proposal by the International URD Foundation of Sweden, five different manuals were presented to James McCampbell, Director of Research, and Walt Andrus, International Director, for their perusal. The Project URD manuals are each lettered with their titles. A) "A Scientifically Orientated Approach to Support Solving the UFO Enigma — A Contextual Discussion"; B) "Description of a system aimed at collection, registration and evaluation of observational data regarding events possibly belonging to the UFO Category"; C) "Field Investigator's Manual"; D) "Codifier's Manual"; and "Report No. 1, Characteristics of a UFO Report File."

Since this was an introductory meeting, obviously no final decisions were made on Project URD. It was the consensus of the MUFON board members present that the adoption of this plan on an international scale was premature, since preliminary meetings are still being conducted to invite other nations to participate in the Provisional International Committee on UFO Research (PICUR). Michael Sinclair, International Coordinator, is MUFON's permanent delegate to PICUR. MUFON emphatically affirmed our support of PICUR as a step in organizing an international UFO research organization. This point was dramatically emphasized when your International Director asked Bertil Kuhlemann to read a confirming

statement from the August 1981 issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal* to the assembled group.

Mr. Kuhlemann was given a copy of the second edition of the MUFON Field Investigator's Manual for their study. This was tempered with the advice that a new updated third edition was being prepared and would be available early in 1982. Since MUFON is recognized as one of the leading UFO organizations in the world today, our Swedish friends were delighted by our support for international cooperation. Mr. McCampbell requested that a letter be drafted to Bertil Kuhlemann confirming MUFON's support of the work of PICUR, as evidence to solicit greater international participation.

This is to advise present members and new members joining that the present Field Investigator's Manual (second edition) is now out of print and not available. Anyone ordering from our publication list will be advised of this fact and that they have a choice of credit toward other publications, an extension of their membership period, or a refund.

The following new State Section Directors have been appointed during the past month: Barbara J. Schutte, R.R. 1, Box 138A, Wever, IA 52658, telephone (319) 372-7340 volunteered to cover Des Moines and Lee counties in southeast Iowa. As a Field Investigator for CUFOS, Barbara participated as a panelist in the Field Investigator's Workshop at the recent CUFOS Conference in Chicago where her enthusiasm contributed to the success of the session. Barbara has organized a UFO study group around the Burlington, Iowa, area and is conducting Field Investigator's training utilizing the MUFON Field Investigator's Manual. Douglas J. Labat, 4801 Lurline St., New Orleans, LA 70127, telephone (504) 241-6776 has accepted the responsibility for metropolitan New Orleans, which includes the parishes of Orleans, Jeffer-

son, and St. Tammany. A former research specialist, Doug is an electronics engineer with the telephone company and has developed a very extensive library of UFO material. Michael L. Marks has been appointed State Section Director for Clark County by the State Director for Washington, Robert J. Gribble. Mike resides at 12611 N.E. 31st Street, Vancouver, WA 98662, and his telephone contact is (206) 256-7685. As a Field Investigator, he is particularly interested in landing trace cases.

After joining MUFON on June 29, 1973 as a Field Investigator, Donald A. Johnson, now a Ph.D. candidate, has volunteered his expertise as a Research Specialist in Statistical Analysis. Don's present address is 728 3rd St. South, Kirkland, WA 98033, telephone (206) 822-6609. Originally recommended by Dr. David R. Saunders for membership in MUFON, Don has continued his UFO research in the prime areas of statistical analysis of CE IIs and perceptual/cognitive/personality aspects of UFO witnesses. Utilizing his statistical education, Don conducted a very fine workshop on the subject "Size, Distance, and Duration Parameters of the Ignition Interference Effect" at the CUFOS Conference on September 27th.

One of the outstanding papers presented at the CUFOS Conference was delivered by John F. Schuessler titled "Medical Injuries Resulting from a UFO Encounter (Cash/Landrum Case)." We expect to publish a follow-up on this very significant case, originally reported in the April 1981 edition of the Journal, since it ranks as one of the most important medical cases in our records. As the prime investigator, Mr. Schuessler is in the best position to release the pertinent facts, since he has access to the medical records. Dr. Peter Rank,

(continued on page 18)