

THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL

NUMBER 169

MARCH 1982

Founded 1967

\$1.50

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.



LATE 1896 ENGRAVING FROM SAN FRANCISCO CALL

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

ROSETTA HOLMES
Promotion/Publicity

GREG LONG
Staff Writer

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 1982 by the Mutual UFO Network. Second class postage paid at Seguin, Texas. POSTMASTER: Send form 3579 to advise change of address to The MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155.

FROM THE EDITOR

The "mysterious airships" of 1896-97 in the United States remain a controversial aspect of UFO history. Their performance and appearance did not resemble modern UFOs, yet no historical record is known that could explain them as human constructions. We hope that the "point-counterpoint" articles in this issue will stimulate further discussion.

Dr. Louis Winkler, astronomy professor, argues that contemporary accounts point a finger at U.S. inventors and experimental flights of prototype airships. Don Berliner, aviation writer, questions how this could be so and raises a number of pertinent objections.

We invite comment from researchers knowledgeable about the airship mystery, particularly any information or documentation bearing on the "secret inventor" hypothesis and the state of contemporary technology.

In this issue

THE NOT-SO-MYSTERIOUS AIRSHIPS OF 1896-97	3
By Louis Winkler	
"MYSTERIOUS AIRSHIPS": A COMMENT	7
By Don Berliner	
RECENT INDIAN RESERVATION SIGHTING	8
By Greg Long	
A VISIT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA	9
By Paul Dong	
STAR MAP HYPOTHESIS STILL VIABLE	10
By Louis Winkler	
CALIFORNIA REPORT	11
By Ann Druffel	
UFO SECRECY UPDATE ("Mondo Retrieve")	15
By Larry W. Bryant	
WITNESS PROTECTION: A COMMENT	16
By Peter Rank	
UFO HYPOTHESES: AUTHOR'S COMMENT	17
By Stuart Campbell	
1982 MUFON UFO SYMPOSIUM AND "SUMMIT CONFERENCE"	18
By Walt Andrus	
IN OTHERS' WORDS	19
by Lucius Farish	
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE	20
By Walt Andrus	

(Cover photo courtesy of Dr. Louis Winkler)

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

Permission is hereby granted to quote from this issue provided not more than 200 words are quoted from any one article, the author of the article is given credit, and the statement "Copyright 1982 by the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas" is included.

THE NOT-SO-MYSTERIOUS AIRSHIPS OF 1896-97

By Louis Winkler, PhD
(MUFON Consultant in Astronomy)

The mysterious airships of 1896-1897 have long fallen into the category of the unexplained or unidentified. But in the last decade or two, a new investigative tool has emerged in academe which sheds an entirely different light on the mysterious airship flap. The tool is a variety of microforms and readers that are used in connection with a nation-wide, interlibrary loan system which provides service copies of microforms. With this instrument it was possible for this writer to make a generous sampling of daily newspapers from the major cities of the U.S. from late-1896 to the spring of 1897, and draw new conclusions.

The sampling provides detailed evidence of a number of real balloon craft which were steerable or powered (airships). The areas most involved show an initial progress of activity from the west coast to the east coast, over a 5-month period. Reports of the flap start in the San Francisco area, then move to Omaha, Chicago, Nashville, and finally return to the central portion in Texas. News was quickly disseminated with the telegraph and appeared in countless newspapers. By the time the phenomena reached the Midwest, thousands of people were having sightings. And many of the reports would include landing accounts or interaction with the pilot, inventor, or passengers. The nation was a'twitter with the idea that American inventors were close to discovering the "secret" of powered navigation. These balloon aircraft would just be the first of other major developments soon to follow in the field of transportation by air.

Sightings of one or more airships in the U.S. originated in the central coastal area of California during the late fall of 1896. The San Francisco

Chronicle published a series of articles in late November regarding an airship seen in the Sacramento area with the initial weak suggestion that it was a hoax. Some reports were to the effect that it was cigar-shaped with a framework underneath for two men to sit on bicycle-like structures. Other reports were that it was oval with outstretched wings and propellers, and in one instance the operators could be heard singing. By November 22 the *Chronicle* and the *Oakland Tribune* reported that "thousands" of people saw an airship in the Sacramento area.

With this ripple, a lawyer, George D. Collins, came to the forefront and explained that his client, E. H. "Aluminum" Benjamin, was the inventor and had been working on the ship for 7 years. Collins also described some of the flights of the ship, and indicated that many parts of it were manufactured in the eastern U.S. The ship apparently was dubbed the "U.S. Collins" and supposedly belonged to the Aerial Navigation and Irrigation Co.

The sensation was so great the San Francisco *Call* carried an engraving of an elongated airship with wings, causing the San Francisco *Examiner* on December 5, 1896 to publish a stiff rejection of the whole affair:

Fake journalism has a good deal to answer for, but we do not recall a more discernable exploit in that line than the persistent attempt to make the public believe that the air in this vicinity is populated with airships. It has been manifest for weeks that the whole airship story is pure myth.

If this amount of airship coverage bothered the publisher, Mr. Hurst, then what happened in the following months must have made him furious, because by mid-April of 1897 there was a deluge of accounts of airships throughout the country.

Additions to and variations of the accounts of the first sightings in

California appeared in eastern newspapers during April. The New York *Herald* of the 12th reported that the first cigar-shaped flying machine was seen on November 16th in the Sacramento area, and Collins revealed that this airship was 150 feet long, had two wings, and was controllable. C. A. Smith, president of the Atlantic and Pacific Aerial Navigation Co., indicated the airship would fly to the east coast soon. Another story of the first California sighting appeared in the April 18th issue of the *Pittsburgh Press*. The report here was that the first sighting was in Maryville, some 75 miles northeast of San Francisco. To what extent these California sightings are related is not clear.

Concentration Areas

Reports of airships died down during the winter months, but according to the *Pittsburgh Press* an airship spent several weeks crossing the Rockies, and passed over Kansas and Iowa. Newspaper accounts were renewed when the *Chicago Tribune* reported on April 7, 1897 that hundreds saw an airship the night before in the Omaha area. The *St. Louis Post Dispatch* of April 10th, however, reported that Omaha heard of the airship 6 months earlier, suggesting news originated in October of 1896. The New York *Herald* of April 12th said that the first sighting in the Omaha area was made on March 29th. Sightings in mid-April were so numerous that the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* of April 14th and 16th indicated that hundreds had seen it in Nebraska and Oklahoma, and even thousands around St. Louis.

By mid-April the airship flap had the Midwest stirred into a frenzy and reports were coming from all directions, but the most developed data came from sightings in the Chicago area. The *Chicago Tribune* of April

(continued on next page)

The author invites comment, c/o Dept. of Astronomy, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16801.

Airships, Continued

10th reported that hundreds sighted an airship in the Chicago area, many seeing wings. On the same day, the New York *Herald* gave insight into the nature of the elongated Chicago object. Max L. Harmer, secretary of the Chicago Aeronautical Association, said he was expecting the airship since he received word several weeks prior that a party of three had already left San Francisco.

Harmer described the vessel as powered and steerable, and it was just stopping off at Chicago in its flight to Washington D.C. Harmer also explained that Octave Chanute, president of the Chicago Aeronautical Association, had full information on the ship. Chanute was reported as being one of the wealthy sponsors of this airship venture. According to the New York *Times* of June 3, Chanute was running a secret airship farm not far from Chicago, and the New York *Herald* of April 13 reported the patent papers for the airship were already on file in Washington, D.C.

The Chicago *Tribune* was able to provide most of the information regarding the inventor of the Chicago airship. On April 12th they reported that the inventor's name was A. C. Clinton who lived in Omaha. The April 26th issue, however, suggested that A. C. Clinton was an alias and the probable inventor was a violin maker Clinton A. Case, an anagram of the alias. According to Secretary Wakefield of the Omaha Exposition, Case requested 87,000 sq. ft. of landing space at the exposition. Then, the next day the Chicago *Tribune* reported that Case lived in Chicago and he was already building model airships since 1892 in Rock Rapids, Iowa. Perhaps Omaha was mistakenly reported as the home of the inventor because another inventor, Alva J. Grover, a civil engineer who resided in Omaha, is reported as having shown plans for a steerable, powered, inflated machine. But to make things even more confused the New York *Herald* of April 13th reported that Oscar B. Booth, another airship inventor from Chicago, said the Chicago airship was Charles Clinton's who lived in Dodd

City, Kansas.

In the technical vein, the most compelling evidence for the existence of an airship seen in the Chicago area was the two photographs taken by Walter McCann which was reported in several of the major newspapers across the nation. Three other witnesses — G. A. Overstocker, W. Hoodles, and E. L. Osborné — saw the airship as well as McCann who took the photographs. These photographic plates were subject to "an acid test" and pronounced genuine. The witnesses themselves could even see through a telescope a man steering the cigar-shaped airship. Unfortunately these photographs do not seem to have survived. However, among the more prominent sources which declared the photos a fake were the Chicago *Tribune* of April 12 and Donald B. Hanlon in 1970. The *Tribune* explains that it was a fake because of "too much scope of lens." (?)

Another area from which detailed reports issued was Nashville, Tennessee. On April 25th the St. Louis *Post Dispatch* provided a remarkably detailed description of an airship shaped like a shad without its head and tail that landed in the Chattanooga area for repairs. In addition to wings and propellers there was a 9-foot passenger car beneath the balloon which carried two men. One of the pilots, Prof. Charles Davidson, reportedly left Sacramento a month earlier.

Interestingly enough, the May 7th issue of the Chicago *Tribune* gives a description of another airship, also in a very convincing style. Prof. Arthur W. Barnard of Nashville demonstrated take-off and control of a balloon before hundreds at the Tennessee Centennial Exposition grounds. His balloon was elongated with propellers and had a bicycle underneath for the pilot to use, primarily for take-off. The New York *Times* of May 7th specified the airship length as 40 feet and width as 20 feet. Since we presently live in the age where humans have been landed on the moon repeatedly, it is difficult for us to imagine the sensation created in the horse and buggy days by the ap-

pearance of a controlled balloon. The *Tribune* report indicated that in the case of Barnard's demonstration "people refused to believe their eyes."

The New York *Herald* of April 14th expressed exasperation with the airship situation and said it "seems impossible to get anything reliable now about the airships." They then proceeded to describe a steam driven airship named "Pegasus" which had solved the problem of aerial navigation and had spent the last month flying about. This airship was supposedly assembled 10 miles from Lafayette, Tennessee with parts from Chicago, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis.

Numerous other accounts of inventors at work were briefly given in newspapers that spring. According to the Dallas *Morning News* of April 6th another pioneer, G. M. Padgett of Springfield, Missouri, had been making balloon ascensions in the several weeks past. And among the inventors with a reputation who were secretly working at the time was Samuel P. Langley of the Smithsonian Institute. As early as May 14, 1896 the New York *Tribune* reported that Alexander G. Bell described Langley's invention as a steam driven aerodrome which looked like a large bird. On April 13th the St. Louis *Post Dispatch* indicated that Prof. Henry S. Pritchett of Washington University claimed that Langley's invention was able to carry a man several hundred feet.

Dubious Accounts

By no means were all the newspaper accounts along the lines of pioneering efforts by inventors of airships, secretly or openly. A few of the stories seemed distinctly different in character because of features difficult or impossible to believe. The New York *Herald* of April 12th reported that John A. Hernon, electrician from San Jose, by December 1 had already been on a trip with the inventor of an airship. Over a 2-day period they were supposed to have made a trip to Honolulu and back. This was a trip of over 4,000 miles which had to be made at an average speed of 80 mph.

(continued on next page)

Airships, Continued

It is difficult to see how the westward trip against the prevailing winds could be accomplished in less than 2 days when powered flight of balloons was in its infancy. While the schedule for the trip to Honolulu stretches the imagination, the schedule for another airship reported by the *Pittsburgh Press* is an outright lie. Here the timing of a flight is given as Jacksonville, Florida 9:43; Havana, Cuba 9:47 and Duluth, Iowa 9:50.

The *Dallas Morning News* of April 19th contained a unique account involving a crash landing of an airship with retrieval of the pilot's body in the Aurora, Texas area. Part-time reporter E. E. Haydon even provided information that the pilot originated from Mars and had on his person papers with unknown hieroglyphics. No material evidence regarding the airship, pilot, or his papers was ever recovered and the report of the incident is regarded as a hoax. While a few other hoaxes were identified in the newspapers, their perpetrations were relatively simple-minded and rather weakly documented.

Among the more curious accounts of airships is the one provided by George Dunlap via the *Dallas Morning News* of May 16th. Dunlap indicated he inspected a 75-foot long steerable, powered airship near Lake Charles, Louisiana. The airship supposedly carried four passengers in its travels through Texas and Mexico and had an inventor named Wilson and engineer, Waters. Although Dunlap indicates he was invited for an ascent, he declined. Incredibly, Wilson was reported as building a total of three airships, the other two supposedly in Arizona and Mexico. Could one of these airships have been the one so widely reported by the *Dallas Morning News* on April 16th and 17th when it was reported that the pilot was seen working on his craft outside the Dallas area?

Ballooning History

In both Europe and America balloonists had been making ascensions with passengers for more than a

century. As early as 1783 Jean F. P. Rozier and Marquis d'Arlandes made a free-flight trip at LaMurette, France and 10 years later the first balloon flight in the U.S. was launched from Philadelphia. Jean P. Blanchard flew 15 miles across the Delaware River and reached more than 1 mile in altitude. But then what happened between 1793 and 1896 in America does not seem to have been documented in much detail. In Europe, however, there is considerable documentation during the period. By 1880 the first powered airship was flown in Leipzig, Germany by Wolfert and Baumgarten, but it ended in disaster. Even up to 1897 Europeans were having difficulties with their attempts to achieve successful, controlled, powered flight. In 1884 C. Renard and A. C. Krebs flew their 170-foot-long "La France." The balloon returned to its starting point after achieving a speed of 12 mph. By 1897 a European dirigible had been powered by a Daimler engine, but unfortunately their trip ended too in disaster as their engine emitted sparks which ignited the hydrogen gas in the balloon. In the same year another partially successful flight ended in disaster when a Swede, Solomon A. Andree, left Danes Island in an ambitious attempt to cross the North Pole. Because of incidents like these the *New York Herald* wrote on April 15th:

In Europe there are at least a dozen well-known scientists working on the problem (of a powered, steerable airship) and many half successful effects of flights have been made.

It is difficult to compare European and American achievements before 1897 since American reports are not as complete. Nevertheless, American flights also seemed to have their difficulties. Numerous instances of landings were cited by Hanlon, Jacques Vallee, and this writer, and of all of these, five were reported to be for repairs. However, only the *St. Louis Republic* for April 14th reported a major crash landing, in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Here G. W. Somers and W. Chadburn witnessed a blow-up of the airship which showered propeller blades, electric wire and steel

splinters.

A measure of the ballooning activity from late 1896 to the spring of 1897 is the number of sightings and landings reported. Hanlon specifies 150 sightings in 19 states, and this writer adds 1 sighting in each of 4 additional states and Cuba and Mexico from newspaper sources. Vallee and Hanlon documented 22 landings in 12 states, and this writer adds 13 additional landings in 8 states. In America there were at least a dozen inventors working on the problem, however, most were not as well known as were the European inventors. It is hardly a surprise that the state of dirigible technology in the U.S. was as advanced as it was with the long and involved history of ballooning in Europe and America.

Early Interpretations

To the detriment of UFOlogy and the history of ballooning, one of the first analyses of the mysterious airships of 1896-1897 was made by the debunker Donald Menzel. In his customary glib style the airships were:

... created from imagination — imagination inflated by the newspaper stories. As in the 1947 saucer scare, hoaxers and jokers ready to capitalize on the event, quickly entered the picture.

Naturally this same approach to the phenomena of 1896-1897 was taken by another debunker, Philip K. Klass. His version is that:

When the public has been conditioned by the news media to believe that there are strange flying objects in the skies many persons will report having seen such objects — even when the objects do not really exist.

Apparently Menzel and Klass would have us believe that half of the major newspapers in the country are not capable of differentiating between a real phenomenon and a psychological one.

In keeping with their general approach to UFOs, Menzel and Klass are not only glib, they are absurd. In spite of the activity with powered, controlled, elongated airships in the areas of San Francisco, Omaha,

(continued on next page)

Airships, Continued

Chicago, Dallas and Nashville, Klass writes:

At the time of the rash of mysterious airships sightings there were no large powered craft in the U.S. . . . Such things as airplanes or airships simply did not exist.

Menzel of course has his own explanation of how thousands of people over the U.S. had erred even though they saw details with and without optical aid:

The dark, cigar-shaped gas bag in many cases was only a lenticular cloud or mirage, which would have escaped notice except for the special significance momentarily attached to an object of this shape.

The view of the 1896-1897 phenomena taken by Vallee is different from that of Menzel and Klass, and not as glib. Vallee suggests that the airship was a figment of the imagination, and in 2 of the 21 landing cases he discusses in connection with the airship, he shows that there are similar circumstances in Medieval annals of folklore from the British Isles. Vallee also attempts to show that 4 of the remaining 19 landing events are fairy-tale-like. Most of the interpretations of the flap found in the general UFO literature, however, take the view that the airships are not an explained phenomenon. Hanlon closes his *Flying Saucer Review* article of 1970 with the statement:

It is clear that the origin of the airship is still very much an open issue. It is also clear that the mystery surrounding its appearance at that particular time in history has deepened.

What is so surprising of the analyses mentioned above by Menzel, Klass, Vallee, and Hanlon is that none considered a conventional man-made object explanation. Debunkers and UFOlogists are represented, but no one chose to treat the mountain of compelling data as just part of the history of ballooning.

At the time of the airship sightings there did not appear to be any outspoken debunkers with the reputation of Menzel and Klass. But indeed, there were a few astronomers who simply suggested without much technical defense that thousands upon thousands of people could not distin-

guish between a point of light such as Venus, Mars, Alpha Orion, or Betelgeuse, and structured aircraft. Although numerous people saw details of the construction of the ships, including passengers, and although many reliable witnesses made observations with optical aid, the astronomers failed to explain how the observers could have so erred.

Perhaps more convincing than the technical arguments of the man-made nature of the flap are the contemporary opinions of reliable sources. Some of the first supportive commentary comes from Pritchitt in the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* of April 10th and 14th.

There is too much corroborative evidence and it comes from too many quarters to treat the matter any other way (than an airship).

The newspaper also reported that the populace itself was convinced of the true nature of the phenomenon:

It is general belief that an airship is floating over the states of Missouri, Illinois, Iowa and Kansas . . . The majority ridicule the idea that anything beyond the natural has been seen.

Even the French newspaper *Figaro* commented on the believability of the American reports:

The news seems to be more than a canard, seeing the details and preciseness in which are related in the (*New York Herald*) the exploits of this airship.

Although the *Philadelphia Inquirer* carried little on the airship, in the April 17th issue they comment:

Airship stories of an apparently entirely reliable character are coming in in rapid succession and all seem to hang together.

Conclusions

More than 3,000 newspaper issues from among three dozen titles covering the period during late 1896, and between mid-March and mid-May of 1897 were searched for this article. It is very likely that considerably more data remains to be uncovered on the subject of the mysterious airships from newspapers alone. Further, Lucius Farish has informed me that he has had for some time in his possession several hundred pages of airship

material. But, although there is much work remaining to be done in constructing the story of airships in the U.S. during the 19th century, the work done to this point is sufficient for this writer to deduce the true nature of the mysterious airships of 1896-1897. It seems much more reasonable to interpret the airship sightings simply as airships which were various models in the development of the dirigible. Consequently these airships should no longer remain in the realm of UFOs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Chicago *Tribune* April 10, 12, 26 and 27 1897
Dallas *Morning News* April 6, 16 and 17, 1897
Figaro mid April 1897
Flying Saucer Review 1966, v. 12 n. 5; 1969 v. 15 n. 1; 1970 v. 16 n.4
Knoxville *Journal* May 8, 1897
New York *Herald* April 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15, 1897
New York *Times* May 7 and June 3, 1897
Oakland *Tribune* late November 1896
Philadelphia Inquirer April 17, 1897
Pittsburgh Press April 18, 1896
St. Louis Post Dispatch April 1, 13, 14, 16 and 25, 1897
St. Louis Republican April 14, 1897
San Francisco Chronicle November 19, 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 1897
San Francisco Examiner December 5, 1896

Other Sources

- Clarke, Basil. *History of Airships*. (1961, St. Martin's Press).
Farish, Lucius (Private communication dated May 30, 1979).
Fort, Charles. *Books of Charles Fort*. (1941, Holt).
Frey, Carloll. *First Air Voyage in America*. (1943, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.)
Klass, Philip. *UFOs Explained*. (1974, Random House).
Menzel, Donald. *Flying Saucers*. (1953, Harvard University Press).
"Newspapers in Microform/United States/1948-1972" (1973, Library of Congress).
Poole, Lynne. *Ballooning in the Space Age*. (1958, Whittlesey House).
Vallee, Jacques. *Passport to Magonia*. (1969, Regnery).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This writer expresses his gratitude to the extensive, courteous gratis service provided by the interlibrary loan and microform groups at the central library of the Pennsylvania State University. Appreciation is also expressed to the *Flying Saucer Review* for the extensive photocopy service in connection with this study.

"MYSTERIOUS AIRSHIPS": A COMMENT

By Don Berliner
(Aviation/Science Writer)

Dr. Winkler's discussion of "The Not-So-Mysterious Airships of 1896-97" raises as many questions as it answers. While the thoroughness of his research is commendable, his conclusions seem to this writer to be rather hard to support in light of the history of airship-related technology.

That there *could have been* powered lighter-than-air craft of unknown manufacture in the late 19th century can hardly be denied. But there could also be vicious cocker spaniels living in oxygen-filled caves on the far side of the Moon! However, in the absence of evidence, such assumptions are highly risky. And evidence of the actual existence of 19th century engine-driven airships in the U.S. simply cannot be found. Nowhere in all the vast collections of aeronautical historical material is there a single specific detail about such a device: Not a photograph, not a measurement, not an artifact, and not anything else that would suggest that even one of these things flew except in the imaginations of inventors and journalists.

And if such a machine had flown, why did it never become public knowledge? The performance described by hundreds of witnesses strongly suggests highly successful airships: fast, maneuverable, long-ranging. Yet none was ever seen except at a distance. Where were they built? Where were they based? Where did they end up? And, assuming such airships existed, why were they never capitalized upon? Why were none seen at pre-announced public displays, or in showrooms?

The first engine-driven airships known to have flown in the U.S. were those of Stevens and Boyce, who flew at Manhattan Beach, N.Y., in 1900. Prior to that, and dating back to 1863, the only powered airships in the U.S. were driven by pedals, like a bicycle, and hence capable only of quite feeble speed and very limited

range and duration of flight. Let's face it: pedalling a clumsy great gas-bag against even a gentle breeze is very hard work.

And that really points to the major argument against the "mysterious airships" having been secret U.S. craft: The state of the aeronautical arts in 1896-97 was such that airships having anything like the speed, range, and navigational capabilities of the reported craft would have required enormous advances in technology. Had such advances been made, their non-airship applications would have been so great that to have kept them secret and then let their secrets die would have cost their developers many millions of dollars in sales and royalties, and world-wide fame.

The great barrier to the development of aviation in those days was the absence of efficient engines. Gasoline engines put out a few horsepower and weighed hundreds of pounds; electric and steam powerplants were even worse. It wasn't until the Wright Brothers built a 12 hp engine that weighed around 200 lbs. (crude, by today's standards) that aviation stood a chance.

Had an efficient airship engine been available before the turn of the century, it would have found immediate application in airplanes, but that never happened. Prior to 1897, only Karl Wolfert, in Germany, had flown an airship with a gasoline engine, and his biggest that flew was less than 6 hp. The performance of known 19th century airships was pathetic, at best, with none capable of as much as 10 mph.

Even if suitable engines could have been built in total secrecy, could secret airships have flown where they were reported? Most sightings were at night, and they covered such widespread areas that either there were a large number of airships, or a few that ranged the entire country. Such flying demands some means of

navigation, especially at night: the crew must know where they are and they must be able to figure out how to get where they are headed. In 1896 and 1897, there was obviously no air navigation system in the U.S. There were no radio beacons upon which to home. There were no major roads to follow. There were no networks of well-lit cities whose unique patterns of lights would permit identification from the air.

Had there been air-to-ground radio in those days, someone on the ground might have been able to keep an airship pilot informed about his location. But useful radios were far in the future. (The first use from an airplane was in 1910.) Had our secret inventors come up with miraculous improvements in radio, they would have had to have been nuts to hold back the news.

And even if there had been such amazing radios, they would have required power for operation. The batteries of the day were huge and weak, and thus would have proven a great drain on the already over-taxed lifting ability of any pre-historic airship. This would have been true to an even greater extent for powerful searchlights said to have emanated from some of the airships. Hundreds of pounds of batteries would have been needed to run them, and their purpose is difficult to imagine.

What of the reported designs of the airships? Many were said to have had wings, oars, and even paddlewheels. Any of these appendages would have cost an airship far more than it produced, hence the total absence of anything of this sort on known airships. Wings built to the technology of the day would have provided so little lifting at the low speeds any possible engine could have produced, and they would have created so much

(continued on next page)

RECENT INDIAN RESERVATION SIGHTING

By Greg Long

W. J. (Bill) Vogel, CUFOS investigator, reports a recent sighting that he investigated.

During the first week of February 1982 at 3:30 a.m., a police officer was on routine patrol westbound on Highway 220 on the Yakima Indian Reservation in Washington State when he noticed a bright light several miles to the south. Believing a house may have been on fire, he proceeded south on Lateral C. Because the road was quite rough, he watched the road and lost sight of the light. At the intersection of Lateral C and the Marion Drain Road, the officer stopped and shut off his lights, thinking that the light may have been from

a brush fire along Toppenish Creek, about a mile south of his location.

Suddenly two cylindrical-shaped objects with half-moon shapes on their bottoms rose up from behind the trees that lined Toppenish Creek. The objects were on either side of the Lateral C road, and they were as large as a house. The objects gave off bright, white light that illuminated the ground beneath them as they rose.

After rising up to 100 to 150 feet, the objects moved south toward Toppenish Ridge (about a mile south of Toppenish Creek) and went up over the 1,500-foot-high ridge. As the objects ascended the ridge, they re-

mained generally side by side during flight and described S-shaped flight patterns.

As the soundless UFOs moved across the valley floor and up the ridge, the ground beneath was brightly illuminated. Duration of sighting from the initial appearance of the objects to their disappearance was about 4 to 5 seconds. The night was clear and windless; the moon was not out.

Vogel reports that witnesses have observed during January 1982 a number of bright NLs (nocturnal lights) compared to single "headlights" which have moved up and down Toppenish Ridge near the location of the above sighting.

Comment, Continued

weight and wind resistance, that they would have been a serious handicap to the forward movement of the airship. As for oars and paddlewheels, they would have done as much good as tying a pair of canaries to the handlebars of a modern racing bicycle.

There is no recognizable evidence that anyone flew an airship in America prior to 1900. And even if someone had, there would have been no way for it to find its way around the country at night. And many of them were equipped with gadgets that make absolutely no sense. If anyone had learned how to do these things in 1896-97, he could have put his creative brilliance to work in ways that would have ranked him with Edison. These rumored inventors may have been eccentric, but could they have been immune to the lure of fame and fortune?

Dr. Winkler has used his "new investigative tool" to come up with additional reports of airship sightings and new claims of mysterious inventors, none of which resulted in visible hardware. But has he shown why these marvellous inventors never led to anything? On the contrary, the development of airships proceeded exactly as it would have if the "mysterious airships" of 1896-97 had never been.

Dr. Winkler refers to several well-known aeronautical researchers who, he says, were somehow involved with the "mysterious airships." Perhaps he should have paid less attention to the obviously flimsy accounts in contemporary newspapers and more to what is now known about their works:

(1) Prof. Arthur Barnard definitely flew an airship at the St. Louis Exposition in the spring of 1897. But it was purely pedal-powered and hence little more than a novelty. A cross-country flight or a night flight in such a craft would have been quite a stunt, but no more than a stunt.

(2) Octave Chanute was one of the leaders in the effort to invent the airplane, not the airship. His work is well known today, and contains not a hint of serious interest in such lighter-than-air craft. As a man quite willing to share his knowledge with others, Chanute would have been very much out of character to have been part of a large secret group of aerial experimenters.

(3) Prof. Samuel Langley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, was busy in the 1890's with heavier-than-air flying machines, not airships. The "steam-driven aerodome which looked like a large bird" reported in May 1896, was his Aerodome #5, a

25-lb., unmanned model airplane which is considered by historians to have been the first engine-driven, heavier-than-air machine to have flown successfully. On May 6, 1896, it flew three-fifths of a mile. It is now on permanent display in the National Air and Space Museum, which also owns the totally unsuccessful full-size, man-carrying descendant of the #5, which flopped into the Potomac River in late 1903.

Obviously, many of the reports were either pure imagination or wild exaggeration. This is true of all categories of UFO reports, as well. It therefore seems to boil down to a couple of basic questions:

(1) Was anything at all seen, or were the airships nonexistent? Since Phil Klass says there's nothing to them, the obvious answer is that something peculiar must have been flying around the U.S.A. in 1896 and 1897.

(2) Were the legitimate sightings of unknown American airships or of UFOs? While it can be argued that unknown airships are UFOs (being unidentified, flying, and objects), the total absence of evidence of any pre-1900 airships strongly suggests that the great fuss was caused by what we now call UFOs. So what else is new?

A VISIT TO THE PEOPLES' REPUBLIC OF CHINA

by Paul Dong

(MUFON Envoy to China and Field Investigator)

In the summer of 1981, I visited China at the request of the *Journal of UFO Research* editorial board and the China UFO Research Organization (CURO). It was a very successful trip. To describe its glamour would seem like boasting, therefore I only hope that the readers will not get this impression, and instead think in terms of how China is paying attention to UFOs. This is my purpose for writing this article.

On the day after my arrival in Peking, I had an interview with all the editors from the *Journal of UFO Research*, President and Vice-president of Kansu People's Publishing Company, CURO chief executive Cha Leping, chief officials from the Peking Chapter (main office is in Wuhan), representatives from Peking Observatory, editors and reporters from seven magazines and newspapers in Peking, and all those "UFO fans" who heard about my visit. For the whole day my dwelling in "Friendship Hotel" was swarmed with people who asked questions of all kinds.

On the next day, I was invited by the Peking Ching Hua University Student Union to give a lecture on UFOs. The hall was fully packed. They wanted to know about the U.S. work on UFOs in the past and I told them all that I knew.

The third day was arranged for me to deliver a talk on UFOs in the Peking Planetarium. The Planetarium has 600 seats. Before 1:30 p.m. they were all occupied. Latecomers had to stand in the aisles and at the back of the hall. My friend estimated that there were 750 people present.

On the fourth day I attended a discussion session on UFOs with the editorial board of "Astronomy Lovers," "Aeronautics," and staff members of "The Third Engineering Department." More than thirty people participated in this session.



Paul Dong, center, after UFO talk at Canton Science Museum

I am a native of Canton. On the first day of my visit to Canton, the CURO Canton Chapter requested me to give a seminar on UFOs. On the next day they arranged for me to give lectures in Canton Jinan University. The morning session was attended by all the staff members, while the afternoon session was attended by all of the students. On the following day I was invited by the Canton Science Museum to give a talk on UFOs.

During my one month stay in China, I visited six cities — Peking, Canton, Shanghai, Hangchow, Guilin, and Suzhou. In every place that I visited, I was invited to talk about UFOs. Because of limited time, I told them that I would do so on my next visit and those who did not have the chance to come to my talks on UFOs could find them in the coming issues of the *Journal of UFO Research*.

In the one month tour of China, I gathered information on several hundred UFO cases within the period

1978-1981. During these 4 years, it seems that UFOs have created great disturbances in China, and thus give the people a clearer picture of UFOs. The majority believe that UFOs exist, as can be reflected by the fact that the first edition of the *Journal of UFO Research* immediately sold 300,000 copies. At present, we have subscribers from Hong Kong, Maccau, Japan, Malaysia, Indonesia, France, the Soviet Union, England, West Germany, Yugoslavia, Mexico, Spain, Italy, and the U.S.A.

Someone said that I was a bridge between U.S. and China's research on UFOs. During my stay in China, I introduced the four main UFO research organizations in the U.S.A. and their respective leaders. They are Center for UFO Studies, MUFON, APRO, NICAP and several other research institutes, including the Fund for UFO Research. I hope in the future that I

(continued on next page)

STAR MAP HYPOTHESIS STILL VIABLE

by Louis Winkler, PhD
(Department of Astronomy,
Pennsylvania State Univ.)

Many UFOlogists, including Friedman (1973) and Dickinson (1974, 1980), have considered Marjorie Fish's interpretation of Betty Hill's star map as a working hypothesis, that the stars Zeta 1 and 2 Reticuli might be a home base for extraterrestrials. But many skeptics, including Menzel (1977) and Sagan (1980) consider the reported CE-III of Barney and Betty Hill a psychological event and even reject the similarity between the Fish and the Hill map.

Statistical computations made by each side regarding the degree to which the two maps agree in appearance is dramatically different. Unfortunately this difference can not be resolved because the size of the statistical cells about the stars employed in the underlying Bernoulli mathematics can not be agreed upon. The protagonists insist on small cells making it highly improbable that random patterns can duplicate the Hill map, while antagonists insist on large cells making it easy for random patterns to duplicate the Hill map.

Recently, however, new rejections of the Fish hypothesis have appeared in *Frontiers of Science* (1981) and in statements by Dickinson (1981), Hendry (1981, 1982) and Crain (1981). These reactions are based on observations of Zeta 1 and 2 by Bonneau *et al*

China, Continued

can still be the bridge between U.S. and China, facilitating communications between the two countries.

Chinese "UFO fans" have asked me to deliver this message — they hope that the U.S. UFO experts will visit China at some future date to share their knowledge and UFO investigations.

(Paul Dong is the United States Editor of the Chinese-language newsstand magazine the *Journal of UFO Research*.)

(1981) and DaSilva and Foy (1980). Arguments here are to the effect that Zeta 1 and/or Zeta 2 are binary in nature and therefore violate Fish's criteria for selection. She only considered those single stars which have solar-like designations. Lower mass stars and double stars were rejected because it didn't seem likely that these objects could evolve life as we know it. The argument against the Fish map further proceeds that if Zeta 1 or 2 were binary, Betty Hill would have drawn it that way, and since she didn't it doesn't represent the Reticulum portion of the sky. The above grounds for rejection of the Fish hypothesis is both premature and too severe.

The double nature of Zeta 2 as determined by Bonneau is only a marginal result with the relatively new technique of speckle interferometry. Although the European Southern Observatory's 3.6 meter telescope was used the separation for the supposed companions of Zeta 2 was measured as 0."046 which is just slightly above the limiting diffraction resolution of the telescope which Bonneau indicates is 0."038. That these results are at the limit of the capabilities of the instrumentation can be seen from the fact that Bonneau experienced seeing of 1."5 to 5", which is two orders of magnitude greater than his results. There is no doubt about the validity of Bonneau's measurements in general because he duplicates results established by other means, but it just happens that Zeta 2 is a marginal, limiting case. The case for Zeta 1 being double is even weaker because Bonneau could not resolve it with speckle interferometry, and DaSilva and Foy only suspected it being double from high dispersion spectra.

The observations of Zeta 1 and 2 by Bonneau, and DaSilva and Foy are

not unique in their preliminary character. In fact this is often the case because the stars are a good number of light years away and the provisional nature of the parameters of many nearby stars is evident when a variety of star catalogs are examined. When Fish first started to match catalog stars with the Hill map she was unable to find a criterion for a satisfactory match. But when the Gliese (1969) catalog was later published more stars were included and a match was found. Another example of the provisional nature of fundamental parameters pertaining to Zeta 1 and 2 is found in their parallaxes. If three catalogs are chosen at random we see about a 30% variation in their distances as shown in the accompanying table.

A third example of uncertainties concerns the double nature of Zeta 2. Although Bonneau resolved Zeta 2 one year, he found that he could not repeat the measurement the following year. While it is remotely possible that these differences in resolution could be caused by a highly eccentric orbit, the double nature of Zeta 2 probably would have been discovered during astrometric programs because the separation of the components is at least 50% of its parallax value.

Because Betty only drew her map two years after the reported encounter, inaccuracies should be expected in relative positions and in numbers of stars where close binaries are involved. If inaccuracies are acceptable in Betty's representation of positions, then it should be acceptable in the representations of binaries too. The fact that Fish's final criterion is violated is immaterial since resemblances of the two maps are based on the positions of single and binary

(continued on next page)

"California Report"

By Ann Druffel

Unidentified Occurrence in the Greenhorn Mountains

by Howard Ford

(Note: Guest columnist Howard Ford is a psychotherapist in Thousand Oaks, Calif., who employs hypnotic techniques in his professional work.)

Tuesday, December 11, 1979 was a normal day for Melvin and Naomi, at least until about 2:00 in the afternoon. Then, the strangest thing that they had ever experienced occurred. They lost all awareness of time for over two days and had only partial awareness of a third day.

Melvin, a retired aerospace engineer who had received honors in the Apollo program, was clearing brush

on the back part of his small acreage. It was a beautiful warm sunny day with a gentle breeze and clear sky, except for an occasional small white puffy cloud. He and his wife Naomi had retired to this resort area near Lake Isabella, Calif. Their large, neat mobile home is located at the base of the Greenhorn Mountains, which is the southern end of the Sequoia National Forest, about 35 miles from Bakersfield and about 50 miles from China Lake. Their property slopes down toward the back where their garage is built. The terrain is rugged with steep mountains surrounding

them.

Melvin was a very healthy 64-year-old, who had never been hospitalized and had been to a doctor only once in his life when he was given a clean bill of health. He served as a volunteer with the Sheriff's Search and Rescue Team. He is a rather reserved person who prefers a quiet life away from the city.

Naomi was a 62-year-old housewife whose health was reasonably good except for a history of asthma. She had always been very stable emotionally with a positive attitude

(continued on next page)

Star Map, Continued

stars. So if Zeta 2 or 1 or any number of the stars of the Fish map are merely proven to be double it still is not necessarily a reason to reject the Fish hypothesis. In fact it will not be possible to make well-founded claims for or against the existence of regions of stability or habitability for any attendant planets of the binaries until some precision is achieved in determining masses, orbital parameters, spectral types, and parallaxes.

In any event, the profoundly important question as to whether we have been visited by extraterrestrials deserves more care in answering than has been exhibited with the Reticulum region of the sky. This is especially the case with Hendry's articles since they are so poorly thought out. In addition to Friedman's (1981) criticisms, Hendry also makes other fundamental errors. He seems to think he knows how long it takes for the evolution of advanced intelligence to take place and even under what chemical circumstances. To say the least, modern science is a long way from understanding the

geophysical circumstances under which this biochemical sequence proceeds.

In conclusion, either full acceptance or rejection of the Fish hypothesis is premature. While it is difficult to do, we must be patient and view the data only as a working hypothesis until much more definitive data are accumulated.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bonneau, D.; A. Blazit; R. Foy; A. LaBeyrie 1980. *Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement Series* 42, Nov.
Crain, T. S. 1981. Letter to L. Winkler dated Dec. 6
Dickinson, T. 1974. *Astronomy*, "Zeta Reticuli Incident"
_____. 1980. "Zeta Reticuli Update," published by UFOFI
_____. 1981. Letter to S.T. Friedman dated Apr. 14

	Gliese(1957)	Jenkins(1963)	Gliese(1969)
Zeta 1	0.079	0.106	0.089
Zeta 2	0.074	0.097	0.089

- Friedman, S.T. and B. A. Slate 1973. *Saga*, July, "UFO Star Base Discovered"
_____. Various Private Communications to L. Winkler
Frontiers of Science 1981, Jan.-Feb.
Fuller, J.G. 1961. *Interrupted Journey* (Dial Press, New York)
Gliese, W. 1957. "Katalog der Stern naher als 20 Parsek fur 1950.0." (Astronomisches Rechen-Institut, Heidelberg)
_____. 1969. "Catalog of Nearby Stars" (Astronomisches Rechen-Institut, Heidelberg)
Harrington, R.S. and B.J. Harrington 1978. *Mercury*, March-April
Hendry, A. 1981. *Omni*, Nov.
_____. 1982. *Fate*, Feb.
Jenkins, L.F. 1963. "General Catalog of Trigonometric Stellar Parallaxes," (Yale Univ., New Haven)
Menzel, D. 1977. *UFO Enigma* (Doubleday, Garden City)
Sagan, C. 1980. PBS-TV presentation on Dec. 14. "Cosmos"

California Report, Continued

toward life. She had never been a fearful person, except for normal anxieties about her family.

About 2:00 o'clock that afternoon, Melvin joined Naomi for lunch. They sat down on a naughahyde couch in the den with their backs to the outside wall, looking across the room at the television. They snacked on crackers and cheese with a glass of wine — their customary lunch. Instantaneously and simultaneously they lost all consciousness. Neither has any recall of seeing anything irregular occurring to each other or in the house. On Thursday, December 13th sometime after sunset both begin to remember slightly. Naomi remembers it was getting dark, then also a memory of early morning, Friday the 14th.

Several events which they have been able to remember occurred from Thursday night to Friday night. They fall into three categories: 1. events they both experienced which were similar to each other but not yet substantiated as reality; 2. events which they both remember; 3. Naomi recalls numerous feelings, visions and happenings that seem to be her own experiences, which she refers to as hallucinations, dreams, or "pictures."

First, a discussion of the things they both experienced but have not yet substantiated as reality. There seems to be a uniqueness about these, because they do not place them in the time period after consciousness started returning, but during the unconscious period. Naomi recalls being in an unfamiliar room, the memory of which she refers to as a "mental picture." The room was white, "almost like an operating room." She was lying unclothed on a table for a long time with legs and arms spread apart. The room was absolutely empty except for the gurney-like table, and measured about 5 by 8 feet with white panelled walls. She felt she was being tilted in different directions and was fighting hard to move but was unable to do so. On one end of the room the top half of the wall panel was open. Her husband came to the open area and started to climb over.

The wall panel moved upward, and she screamed and cried, "Don't come in ... stay away!" According to Naomi he responded "No, I want to be with you," to which she replied, "Oh, don't ... you'll die, too!" She sensed she was being elevated or levitated upward and feared being "squashed." The panel closed him out. Melvin has no recollection of this encounter.

He remembers clearly, however, being in a "cubicle" with four walls, which he estimated to be 5 feet to 8 feet square. Everything was black or white or varying tones in between. He states, "There was a girl in there with me." He indicated she had "no features" and "everything was gray. She had no color so as to tell if she was black or white or Indian." He estimated the "girl" to be his height or above, about 5'10" or 6'. Melvin repeatedly stated she was featureless and everything was gray. He was uncertain about what she was wearing, except that the top and bottom were the same color or tone. He could not understand all of her speech and referred to it as a foreign language; however, when she communicated with him he could understand her clearly.

She also spoke with "her brother and mother who were down below them." Melvin kept demanding that the girl let him out of the room and she told him to rap on the floor or wall a certain way so a panel would open and he could go free. He says her attitude was "very determined." He states he crawled around on the floor knocking on the floor and walls trying to get out. His memories of the room are vivid. He stated "It is just as vivid today as it was when it happened," when the writer interviewed him many months after the event and added, "I don't know how I got out."

Both Melvin and Naomi were very impressed with the fact they heard a continuous sound. They never identified the time of the sound but did not place it in the time period after consciousness started returning. He refers to the sound as a helicopter. She said she thought it was a large truck or tractor idling. However, after

they had been rescued and were at the hospital, a helicopter landed to bring a patient to the hospital, and she immediately said it was the same noise.

Naomi felt that Melvin's feet might have been injured because during the ordeal she had seen him walking on "ice or glass." After hospitalization she tried to find justification for the experiences and therefore decided the plastic runner down the hall may have caused her to think he was walking on ice. She had never heard that others have reported that people are levitated in connection with light in some UFO reports.

In summarizing the whole occurrence Naomi adds, "I had a feeling we were out of the house at one time." She also felt she was trying to get out of something. She repeatedly used the word "they."

At the hospital, after rescue, Melvin was understood to say he felt his home had been invaded by a "lady" who had a powerful influence over him, which had caused him to go out of his house and had left a curse or spell on both of them. He felt that a powerful "force" had controlled him. He also said "a man and a woman entered his house." Later, he did not recall making either statement.

Next we consider the things they both remember consciously even though some of the behavior seems very irregular and confused. They both remember being in the bedroom when they started regaining consciousness and being unable to move with full strength. They remember being cold and unable to get enough clothing to keep warm because they could not walk. Melvin remembers having on only one work boot and looking for the other one. Naomi recalls her leg muscles paining terribly, which she attributed to her struggling in the white room. She remembers getting a pistol and throwing it to Melvin and also being in the bathroom with the door locked and Melvin trying to get in and planning to chop down the door if necessary.

(continued on next page)

California Report, Continued

They both remember her aunt coming to their home twice and the sheriff coming once.

In the third category of events there are fragments of confused thinking which Naomi experienced. She thought a whip came in the window in the bedroom and, with a crack, knocked things off the dresser, including her jewelry case whose contents scattered across the floor. This event added to her fear that "they" were going to kill her. She saw a hand with a saw cutting the floor out around the night stand. She removed a gun from the night stand and threw it to her husband. He concurs that she threw the gun but does not know anything about the floor being sawed. He recalls her saying when she threw the gun, "We are going to get some of them before they kill us." She was surprised to return to her home about two months later and find the floor and carpet undamaged.

During the ordeal Naomi saw objects as black, such as items on the shelves in the hall, the TV, and even her medicine. She recalls telling a neighbor man who came by their house not to give the dog food because "they" had "put holes in it and it was black." Thinking "they" were using the radio near the bed as a communication device, she grabbed it and threw it to Melvin.

She experienced all mirrors like windows or two-way glass and thought people were looking at her. She thought her brother was peeking in the window at her. She was convinced her husband's friend was sitting in the bath tub with all his clothes. She locked the bathroom door to keep "them" out and Melvin thought she was hollering to get out. He envisioned the door knob as having been moved over about 4 inches, so close to the door facing that he could not open it. His neighbor had come by to play with their dog so Melvin sent him to the garage to get the ax so he could chop the door down. When she heard what he said, she unlocked the door and stayed in the den.

She saw faces everywhere of

people they knew. Even the afghan had a face on every little square about one-half inch in size. She saw a "person" in their home and objects flying around her. Most of the hallucinations Naomi experienced occurred Thursday night, during the day on Friday, and Friday evening.

Some time on Friday, Naomi's aunt came to their house. She found them dressed inappropriately in thin night clothes, the bedroom in disarray with a chair on its side, a table lying over with a leg broken off, and a broken glass container with contents spilled. She tried to assist them but could not make sense of their behavior, because Naomi told her everything was "fine." Naomi finally told her aunt to leave; she did, her feelings hurt. A friend of this aunt advised her to go back because something was evidently very wrong. She returned and tried again but with little success. She then reported the condition to the sheriff who came to the house. Since they were friends, he "hollered" to Melvin, who told him that "everything was OK." The sheriff called to Naomi who also responded that everything was fine. The sheriff left. Finally, on Friday evening, the aunt called the victim's son, who is a businessman in Thousand Oaks, approximately 170 miles away.

The son immediately responded, bringing a friend with him. Upon arriving, he found his father dressed in pajama bottoms, his mother in a thin night gown. The outside temperature was 28 degrees and there was no heat in the house. Neither parent would talk to him. He checked the furnace and discovered the outside furnace door was open, the heater cover off, and the thermocouple pulled out. This last item would take considerable strength. He also discovered both parents had injuries. According to the son, his mother was so cold that when he touched her, it felt like his hand would stick to her. She also had what has been called a "burn" on her left hip and thigh area. Melvin was seriously injured with a bad "burn" on his left hip which indented the bone about the length and diameter of a pencil. There was a hole and a "burn"

about 1½ inches from the top of his head toward the back of his head, approximately the size of a half dollar. There was also a "burn" on the outside of both heels at least the size of a half dollar. The most severe injury was on his lower back. It started below the waist line and reached down about 4 inches, covering a width of about 10 inches across his back.

Naomi told the investigator later that "his back looked like a huge grizzly bear took a bite out of it... you could see the white muscles." It is not clear if this view was with full consciousness or was part of her hallucinatory state. Their son said the injury was black, swollen, and raw when he arrived. Pictures were taken of the lower back by a physician about one month after the injury and by the investigator about 11 months after.

The son took Melvin to the local hospital. Since he was in need of more sophisticated treatment, they left the small local hospital and went by to pick up Naomi. She was most resistive to going. Her son rolled her in a blanket and put her in the car, and drove both parents to the Westlake Community Hospital in Westlake Village adjoining Thousand Oaks. The couple were hospitalized several days with extensive tests and treatment.

Naomi was admitted as depressive reaction and dehydration. Melvin was admitted as psychotic reaction, dehydration, and renal failure. By Sunday, December 16th, they were both fully rational and have remained so ever since. They mentioned that they were told by a doctor that they had approximately 8 hours of life left when they arrived at the hospital.

As of November 1980, when interviewed 11 months after the incident, Melvin had a massive scar on his back about 3 inches by 7 inches, with one area not completely healed. There is an indentation and scar on his skull and a scar as well as a dent in the hip bone. The burns on the heels are no longer visible. According to Melvin,

(continued on next page)

California Report, Continued

he was told at the hospital he had "third degree high radiation burns." There were different opinions given by the various doctors as to the cause of injuries. This investigator (Ford) is in possession of the couple's medical records, and they verify substantially the couple's statements as to the extent of their injuries and mental states when admitted.

This Unidentified Occurrence has been speculated on by the medical staff, the victims, and various others as lightning, drug reaction, foul play, fumes, poison, microwaves, radio frequency waves from an airplane, eddy current (air to ground and ground to ground), spontaneous human combustion, or a CE-III (or IV). Lightning seems ruled out as it was a clear day and no burned spots were found on or in their mobile home. The drug and poison theories were resolved by blood tests at the hospital. Analysis of all food and drink in the home revealed nothing irregular. The foul play and robbery theories were negated by the fact that nothing was missing. The injuries were not the kind an intruder might inflict.

There were no marks found on or inside the mobile home, therefore it may or may not rule out the eddy current, microwave, and radio wave theories. However, there was soot in some areas of the house, which suggests a combustion or electrical arc of some kind. The spontaneous human combustion theory has a similar parallel in various literature and more recently on the "That's Incredible" TV program. This series reported a spontaneous combustion which occurred to a man who lived through it. Two of the similarities are that both events occurred in an enclosed area surrounded by metal, one location being a mobile home, the other a motor home (camper) and that both victims had similar injuries and both lived.¹ Is it possible that spontaneous human combustion is less intense when it occurs in a metal enclosure?

The Close Encounter of the Third Kind theory has a limited amount of evidence pointing to it in this particular case. Both Melvin and Naomi

heard a "noise," experienced being in a "room," were aware of the presences of strange persons and had other perceptions similar to those reported by CE-III (and CE-IV) witnesses. Naomi's hallucinations, however, were not of a type commonly reported in CE-III's and CE-IV's.²

The son's friend who accompanied him to their rescue reported he had never seen anything like the "spell" they were under. He served as a pilot in the Vietnam war and now his flights are sometimes routed over the Lake Isabella area. He said he was not going to fly over that area again. Their son continually stated, "It is the weirdest thing I have ever seen." He encouraged them to have the mobile home moved and never go back there. Melvin and Naomi did return, however, after two months. Upon being released from the hospital, they stayed in the area near the hospital for required treatment of the "burn" on his back. When they returned home, Naomi was surprised to find everything had color instead of being black. However, the windows and TV screen did have a black, sooty film on them. A macrame owl in the kitchen/hall area was almost black from soot. Nothing else in the den was damaged except some of the drapes. On these were found patches of soot 3 or 4 inches from the ceiling.

Their dog was kept at another home for two months. After returning and for a year afterward, the dog has shown extreme fear when she sees a kite or a vapor trail left by a jet. She panics and comes to Melvin trembling and hides. The dog has always been an outside dog and has never acted in this manner before.

There have been changes in Naomi's personal life. She returned home physically healthy and shortly afterward shoveled 12 tons of gravel over the driveway and parking area because Melvin was unable to do it. She experienced some apprehension at first but has now reconciled herself with only a limited amount of fear. She feels she has aged a lot in the way she looks, she tires more easily and her neck, back, and shoulder muscles

ache. However, she still feels she is a relaxed person. After returning home she had no asthma for 5 months, but after that time the asthma returned.

Melvin feels most of his changes are physical. All of the injuries have healed and are basically trouble-free except his back, which showed one small area that still has not healed when photographed in November 1980. He is limited in the amount of pressure he can tolerate on his back; even lying down is painful. He has extensive nerve damage in one leg which still limits his mobility.

On the afternoon of December 10, 1979, the day before the ordeal started, their dog dug into a hill about two feet and came out with a meerschau pipe, which had been apparently washed up by recent rains. The pipe has some burned material in the bowl which smelled like old tobacco. After the inexplicable happening of December 11, Melvin and Naomi began to think that there was perhaps something from the pipe that caused the problem. They have no logical basis for their assumption, however. The pipe is intricately carved. Their son referred to it as looking "evil."

At the present time this case is truly an Unidentified Occurrence. Any information that could relate to this case would be greatly appreciated. Please send the information to Howard Ford, MUFON Investigator, 4087 W. Elkwood St., Newbury Park, CA 91320, (805) 498-8489.

NOTES

1. Most spontaneous combustion cases occur in persons of advanced age who live alone. Both the "That's Incredible" case and Melvin and Naomi were in their 60s, comparatively young. (Editorial comment, AD)
2. Could these hallucinations have been due to Naomi's dehydration, rather than a direct result of the incident itself? (Editorial comment, AD)

MUFON

103 OLDTOWNE RD.
SEGUIN, TX 78155

Time was when I used to offer this rejoinder to a superskeptic of UFO reality: "All you need to have is for just one of the reported 'unknowns' to be confirmed as an alien spacecraft; the rest, no matter how strange or how mundane by comparison, merely provide some icing on the cake."

Now, in these days of escalated claims of "close encounters," the game has improved and the players have acquired new roles. Oh, it's still the old game of hide-and-seek, the object being certain artifacts of UFO visitation in years past. Only now the *seeker* no longer is the Government but the citizenry of the Government; the *concealer* being not the force behind the visitations but the UFO policymakers in the Executive Branch. Against that turn of events, I now should confront the superskeptic with: "If just one of these accounts of alien spacecraft/creatures being kept in custody of U.S. military authorities happens to be true, then it certainly makes sense for the Air Force to have terminated its obsolete Project Blue Book."

The pursuit of crashed UFOs/retrieved UFO-nauts, now institutionalized by publication of Leonard H. Stringfield's findings and speculations, has injected new life into the status quo of modern UFOlogy. Until this matter is put to rest, all other present and future efforts at objective UFO research will, in the public's mind at least, amount to so much window dressing. Fed by rumor upon rumor, this Secret of Secrets may be the most fertile ground for organized UFOlogy since the day Edward U. Condon declared the UFO subject unworthy of attention by orthodox science. After all, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration ostensibly is holding its UFOlogical breath in down-played hopes that someone, somewhere, someday will present its scientists a bonafide piece of UFO hardware for analysis. What irony if that piece, along with dozens more akin to it, has been gathering cobwebs for three decades in this or that

Air Force storage hangar! Irony, of course, knows no bounds in the steady march of UFOlogy toward immortal folklore.

What's paramount now is *perspective*. And that's just what Stringfield's evolving "retrievals" research is providing us. His is the perspective of the careful, methodical, persevering, seasoned analyst who knows both his own limitations and the limitations of his subject matter. The result — a model for future investigative reporters in the field of UFOlogy — recently was brought up-to-date and published by MUFON as a 38-page monograph entitled *The UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome — Status Report II: New Sources, New Data*.

Documentation Update

For readers acquainted with the earlier version of this in-depth chronology of "retrievals" case histories and personalities, the current offering will help fill in blanks, correct errors of omission/commission, and promote wider review/debate/acceptance of the findings to date. Indeed, it's not hard to project the success of this body of documentation to be on a par with the classic NICAP study *The UFO Evidence*. Even as this column goes to press, the "Stringfield Report" (as it's bound to become known) probably is finding its way into numerous in-baskets on Capitol Hill.

If Congress is on its post-Watergate toes, the Stringfield Report might serve as a catalyst for long-overdue public hearings on the Federal Government's UFO news-management program. Until then, perhaps the document will serve as the conscience of the Executive Branch, fostering and/or supporting internal dissension over the secrecy policy. Whatever its immediate impact in official circles, the Stringfield Report certainly will open the door to a new era of UFOlogy, one that will continue to challenge Stringfield's investigative prowess and personal

stamina.

As a not-too-detached observer of this coming of age of "retrievals" research, I have a few suggestions on how Stringfield and his associates might add further substance to their pursuit:

- Press on with the gathering of affidavits of first-hand testimony; persuade all such witnesses to go on public record with their accounts so as to encourage other to do likewise. In this aspect of the politics of UFOlogy, there is safety in numbers.

- In instances where there is limited concern about official reprisal for public revelations, enlist the aid of the U.S. Freedom of Information Act to compel government sources to release the documentation pertinent to the witnesses' accounts.

- Consult with individual members and appropriate committee staffs of the Congress so as to establish a climate of immunity for those witnesses (declared and undeclared) who might wish to come forward in a secure forum to air their accounts.

- Institute negotiations with high officials of the Executive Branch to have the government issue a blanket "declaration of immunity from prosecution" for all participants in the "retrievals" program and subsequent coverup, with emphasis on the total freedom of each participant to engage in public discussion of his/her involvement.

Once these steps are taken, the progress made to date might be doubled in a few year's time; and — who knows — maybe by then there'll be no longer a need for this column in the pages of this or any other UFO-research periodical.

Citizens Against UFO Secrecy (P.O. Box 4743, Arlington, VA 22204) has begun publication of *UFOmant*, "... a bulletin of news and views on the freedom of UFO information." Single copy price: \$3.00, with checks made payable to CAUS.

WITNESS PROTECTION: A COMMENT

By Peter Rank, M.D.

(MUFON Consultant in Radiology)

I would like to comment on the reliability of information and method of presentation surrounding the UFO Crash/Retrieval Syndrome made public by Leonard Stringfield several years ago. There has been some controversy about the reliability of Stringfield's data with special reference to his reluctance to go public with the names of his witnesses and informants. His failure to identify the sources of information has been used to cast some doubt upon the reliability of his data. This seems to be unfair. Perhaps the following explanation will help.

For a generation now UFOlogists have been unconsciously assuming that the Journalistic Model of reporting is the one which demands the most credence. Information published in the media demand that such stories reveal the who, what, where, when, and why of the incident reported. It is assumed that such complete disclosure lends authenticity to the story involved and indeed is a requirement for believability. Most UFOlogists have adhered to this principle whenever possible. Such full disclosure according to the Journalistic Model has been counter-productive. In many cases, foreknowledge that their names would be published in the popular media has driven away UFO witnesses and certainly has driven away any informants who cared to comment anonymously about the Crash/Retrieval Syndrome.

It should now be clear to all dedicated UFOlogists more than a generation after Kenneth Arnold's sighting, that a different manner of reporting UFO information than the Journalistic Model is required. Perhaps another alternative should be adopted, specifically the Medical Model of reporting scientific information, and do so in accordance with case history technique. Medical literature frequently has need of

personal information about patients. The literature is replete with such case histories. In all cases the patients' anonymity is respected and the patient identified only by initials. These case histories are never challenged on the grounds that the patients full name is not disclosed, and the underlying integrity of reporting is assumed as a matter of fact.

Might it not be useful for us to adopt a similar approach? Both witnesses and informants would thereby be protected. Witnesses could then report all their data to serious researchers with the clear knowledge that they and their families would never be identified in any publication which might provoke the popular media to descend upon them like locusts at a feast. Informants, many of whom are discussing information that is highly classified, perhaps several levels above the well known Top Secret category, may then feel free to "go public" with their information without fear of retribution. This would encourage others to come out of the closet, and allow considerably more information to develop about the Crash/Retrieval Syndrome.

There is obvious journalistic precedent for this practice. Journalists are, and always have been, very protective of their sources and have insisted in courts of law that their sources remain anonymous. Legal attempts to force journalists to reveal sources of their information have failed. This guaranteed anonymity has served as a mighty bulwark of a free journalism. It could also serve as a mighty bulwark for a more liberated investigative UFOlogy.

I do not think that the criticisms of Stanton Friedman and William Moore have merit. Their criticisms of Stringfield's desire to protect the anonymity and safety of his sources stands outside the bounds of all reasonableness

for a variety of reasons. Let me be clear that I respect their work. Still, I have personally talked to a UFO witness, a CE-III subject, and several military types, and most seek to guard their privacy. It is quite clear that our first responsibility is to consider these people as "patients" who first of all need our assistance and support, and who need our guarantee that their privacy and good faith will not be abused.

(Note: Dr. Rank is Director, Dept. of Radiology, Methodist Hospital, Madison, Wisc.)

Letter

Response to Stevens

Editor,

Your MUFON UFO Journal (Oct. 1981, No. 164, pp. 3-5) published an article "Kal Korff and the Meier Hoax: A Response - Pt. 1" written by Wendell C. Stevens. This article on p. 5, col. 2, 1st par. stated about my investigation on the "Billy" Eduard Meier hoax the following:

Korff's facetious references to Meier having met Jesus Christ stem from a misstatement by Colman VonKeviczky, whose distorted views were acquired during his very limited (one day) "investigation" of the Meier case . . .

To eliminate any kind of misunderstanding about my and ICUFON's analytic research, which has always been based on factual and hard-core evidence, we ask you to publish the following corrections:

1. ICUFON Inc. started to investigate and analyze "Billy" Eduard Meier's alleged close encounter with "Pleiadean" spacecrafts, 2 females of cosmic origin, his 40 first generation color photographs, movie film periodicals, media and periodical issues, in September 1976. We filed a thorough analysis with the German military authorities in Dec. 1976. In

(continued on next page)

UFO HYPOTHESES: AUTHOR'S RESPONSE

by Stuart Campbell

(Note: Mr. Campbell's article, which has stimulated a number of letters to the editor and a longer critique by Virgil Staff, appeared in No. 156, Feb. 1981.)

Virgil Staff (No. 161, July 1981) has no way of knowing my motive for writing, although that has not prevented him from condemning it. He thinks that I intended to remind UFOlogists that they do not understand the source or meaning of the UFO phenomenon. This is quite wrong. My purpose was to remind UFOlogists of the number of assumptions involved in the many popular hypotheses, and in particular to show that the extraterrestrial hypothesis (ETH) involves so many assumptions that it stands apart from other mundane hypotheses. The ETH involves not only a leap of imagination, it involves a leap in the number of assumptions.

Staff thinks that I do not believe in the existence of ILE (Intelligent Life Elsewhere). On the contrary, I do not say that aliens do not exist, or that they cannot reach Earth. Indeed, I do not say that no alien craft are cruising our skies. I merely pointed out that belief in all these things involves assumptions and that the likelihood of

the belief being correct is inversely proportional to the number of assumptions. It is hardly arrogant to point out the obvious fact that we have not yet determined that ILE exists.

If, as Staff claims, my chart is inadequate, then he is free to produce his own. What "possible phenomena" does he think my chart excludes? What "other factors" may require inclusion? I make no "attempt to locate present day sighting within the chart's Level 3." Staff attributes to me an unreasonable motive and then attacks that motive. All I say is that the placement of unknowns in Level 4 should not be undertaken *until* it has been established that the unknown does not fall into Level 3. It is hardly my fault if there are many more mundane explanations for UFOs than are known to UFOlogists.

Staff thinks that there is no reason to believe that aliens think like us. On the contrary, beings in control of an advanced technology are bound to think scientifically, as we do. They must use mathematics, as we do. Just as the laws of nature are the same from one end of the universe to the other, so the thinking process of intelligent beings is bound to follow a

similar pattern. To have begun space exploration they would be, as we are, an energetic, expansionist race, determined to survive and be survived. In short, they would be more like us than we would care to admit. Aliens who did not think like us are unlikely ever to have developed a technological civilization, or have left their home planet.

Staff's understanding of Ockham's Razor is rather odd. Certainly the Razor does not claim that hypotheses based on many assumptions are *always* less likely to be correct than hypotheses based on few assumptions. But it does issue a warning that the assumptions should not be multiplied beyond necessity. Skill is required in judging when it is necessary to add further assumptions. However, the Razor has nothing to do with "facts that are not available" (if they are not available, how could they be facts?). Indeed, the Razor deals not with facts, but with hypotheses and assumptions.

My article also dealt with the scientificity of UFO hypotheses, a matter which Staff has ignored. □

Letter, Continued

this time Mr. W. C. Stevens had not the slightest idea about the existence of Mr. Meier upon the earthplane. Here in the U.S.A. I duly presented my first analyzed photographic evidences of the hoax to my research colleagues, to Stanton T. Friedman and Jim Lorenzen in 1977/78. Regarding these proven facts my investigation of the Meier hoax extends over 5 years, and not "one day."

2. It is true that in my analysis I called Mr. Meier the "4th disciple of Jesus Christ" because according to the enclosed excerpts of his pamphlet (and more circulars) he declares unmistakably his missionary assignment

from the Embassy of the Talmud Immanuel alias Jesus Christ to declare to humanity the original teachings of Jesus Christ. (Receipt of Swiss documents relating to Meier acknowledged. — Editor)

3. It is also a matter of fact that on March 18, 1980, near Wetzikon, Switzerland, I investigated with Mr. Hans Jacob the famous location of that pine tree, which was circled by Semjase's spacecraft and photographed by Meier in various positions among the twigs (the photos were widely publicized). But when I verified that no-neighbors of the location ever remembered that any pine

tree was planted or standing on that field, and Mr. Jacob imitated for me how Billy pointed out to him a spot and shouted out "Here — here the tree was annihilated by Semjase." I said, "That is enough for today. Let us go Hans, and rather locate your wienerschnitzel than feeding me with further Pleiadean jugglery."

Colman S. VonKeviczky (Maj., Ret.)
Director, Intercontinental UFO-Galactic Spacecraft Research and Analytic Network, Inc.



1982 MUFON UFO SYMPOSIUM AND "SUMMIT CONFERENCE"

by Walt Andrus

The United Friends of Ontario is extending an invitation to everyone to attend the Thirteenth Annual MUFON UFO Symposium to be held July 2, 3, and 4, 1982 at Loew's Westbury Hotel, 457 Yonge St., Toronto, Ontario M4Y 1X7, Canada. Sponsored by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc./MUFON, Mr. Henry H. McKay, Canadian Regional Director, is Chairman of the host organization. The theme for this year's international symposium is "UFOs — CANADA: A Global Perspective."

The featured speakers scheduled and their topics are Dr. J. Allen Hynek, Scientific Director of the Center for UFO Studies (speech title not available); Dr. George and Iris Owen, "Parapsychology as It Relates to UFOs"; David A. Haisell, "International Committee for UFO Research"; Arthur Bray, "Professionalism in UFOlogy"; Stanton T. Friedman, "Present Policy, Stated or Otherwise of Canadian Government Agencies on UFOs"; Michael A. Persinger, PhD, "Predicting UFO Events and Experiences"; and William L. Moore, tentative title "New Roswell Crash Disclosures."

Significant specialized workshops will be interspersed between featured speakers along with videotaped films such as "Strange Harvest" on cattle mutilations and "UFOs are Real," a documentary, on Saturday and Sunday. Friday evening, July 2, will be devoted to registration and a get-acquainted session. Admission prices for each session have not been established, but will be announced in the near future.

Sixty rooms have been reserved at Loew's Westbury Hotel at the special group rates of \$58.00 per room, per day, single occupancy and \$68.00 per room, per day, for double occupancy. Each participant must make his own reservation directly with the hotel. Please advise the hotel that you are attending the 1982 International UFO Symposium, so that you obtain the

group rate and are assigned to one of the 60 rooms blocked for this purpose. More information will be provided in the April issue of the Journal. Start planning your vacation now to attend this exciting and inspiring symposium.


The Annual MUFON Corporate Meeting is planned for Sunday, July 4, from 9 a.m. to 12 noon.

For further information please write to United Friends of Ontario at P.O. Box 54, Agincourt, Ontario M1S 3B4 Canada or MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Texas 78155, U.S.A.

1982 UFO SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Interest in attending the 1982 UFO Summit Conference being held in Toronto, Ontario, Canada in conjunction with the 1982 International MUFON UFO Symposium has been overwhelming, necessitating a revision in our planning. Many regionalized UFO study groups and organizations have expressed a serious interest in sending representatives, accepting the invitation extended in the December 1981 issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal*. It is gratifying to know that so many people are anxious to discuss subjects that will lead to greater cooperation in UFOlogy and the application of their individual talent to help resolve the phenomenon.

It is the consensus of the key people, representing the cooperating UFO agencies, that a Sunday afternoon session of 4 hours would be inadequate to properly address the important issues and allow each representative to share his or her ideas and suggestions. It had also produced some conflicts in the Sunday afternoon speaking program at the Symposium. Based upon the above conditions and the sincere desire to take some major steps for North America in UFOlogy, the entire day of Monday, July 5th (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.) will be devoted to this meeting.



Loew's Westbury Hotel,
Toronto, Ont., Canada

In the United States, July 5th is being observed as Independence Day and is thus a holiday. July 1st is Canada Day for our Canadian friends and hosts. Representatives desiring to attend the 1982 UFO Summit Conference should arrange their transportation and housing plans to include this additional day. In order that each representative will have a copy of the proposed agenda prior to the UFO Summit, please write to Walt Andrus signifying your intentions of attending. We are also soliciting subjects which the different UFO agencies feel should be part of the agenda so as to maximize our efforts. From all indications, this could be the most significant UFO Conference ever conducted in North America.

Each representative should come prepared to forget past personality and group differences, or pet hypotheses, and devote their attention to fresh approaches that breed cooperation in UFOlogy. The success of this important conference hinges upon these conditions and how our vast talent can be harnessed in a positive effort.



Lucius Farish

In Others' Words

The *National Inquirer* for January 26 told of a 1980 incident in Senegal in which a UFO allegedly destroyed numerous buildings in the tiny village of Baridiame. A report on November 1981 sightings in Vermont is the subject of an article in the February 2 issue. Australian air traffic controllers' sightings of square, silvery UFOs are featured in the February 9 issue. The February 16 issue details the case of two Brazilian truck drivers who claim to have spent 5 hours aboard a UFO. Researchers Dave Webb and Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle are quoted regarding their investigations of UFO abduction cases in the February 23 issue. A

report in the March 2 issue tells of recent UFO sightings in the area of Galveston, Texas.

The *UFO Annual 1982* from the publishers of *UFO Report* has several reprinted articles, plus new contributions by various writers.

The "UFO Update" segment in the March issue of *OMNI* is a good example of the anti-UFO material which this publication seems to prefer. Jeff Wells, apparently a former reporter for *National Inquirer*, gives his version of that paper's involvement with the Travis Walton case.

Robert Girard of Arcturus Book Service has brought out his 1982

UFO Literature Reference Guide & Catalog. This is an excellent publication for UFO bibliographers, as well as being a good source for in-print (and some out-of-print) UFO literature. The 45-page catalog is \$2.50 per copy from A.B.S. at 263 North Ballston Avenue, Scotia, NY 12302. The price outside the U.S., Canada, and Mexico is \$3.50, sent by airmail.

Two previously-announced books, James Oberg's *UFOs and Space Mysteries* (The Donning Co.) and Otto Billig's *Flying Saucers: Magic in the Skies* (Schenkman), apparently will be published in March or April, 1982.

Director's Message, Continued

his work in the *MUFON UFO Journal* or in one of our future annual *MUFON UFO Proceedings*.

After being published as a section in a series of newsstand magazines — *Probe*, *Second Look* (now *Frontiers of Science*) — the *International UFO Reporter* of the Center for UFO Studies (CUFOS) has now returned as an independent publication under its original format in the January 1982 Vol. 7, No. 1 issue. *I.U.R.* will be published bimonthly alternating with the *CUFOS Associate Newsletter*, both emanating from P.O. Box 1621, Lima, OH 45802. The Editor-In-Chief is J. Allen Hynek; Production Manager, John P. Timmerman; and graphics by Martin R. Timmerman.

R. Leo Sprinkle, PhD, has announced that the 1982 Rocky Mountain Conference on UFO Investigation (3rd Annual Contactee Conference) co-sponsored by PRO UFOS (Paranormal Research Organization for UFO Studies) will be held Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, June 17, 18, 19, 1982 at the University of Wyoming in Laramie. For further information please contact Mrs. Sally Noble, School of Extended Studies, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY. 82071, telephone (307) 766-

2149. More detailed information will be provided in the April issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal*.

The Fund for UFO Research, Inc. quarterly report, October-December 1981, not only updated their financial status, but included the successful accomplishments during the period. The UFO Research Poll attached is an excellent method of determining which categories of research programs should be stressed and where available funds should be used to maximize their efforts. The Mutual UFO Network as an organization has been unable to provide financial support to the fund, however, many of our individual members have done so. MUFON will continue to lend support through publicity in the *Journal*, as our contribution for the present.

It would be appropriate at this time to restate MUFON's policy on advertising in the *MUFON UFO Journal* and the use of the *Journal's* mailing list by others. We do not accept paid advertisements, since many would have to be declined, creating embarrassment for both the *Journal* staff and the advertiser. To some readers, publishing of advertisements implies an endorsement of the product. Even though a source of monetary income

could be realized with purchased advertising, the poor relations created overshadow the benefits. The *Journal* staff and the Mutual UFO Network prefer to treat items that might have been advertising as current news articles, thus we may be selective in editing published material.

Both APRO and NICAP have suffered embarrassment, requiring written apologies, when their subscribers mailing lists were sold to unscrupulous people for advertising purposes. MUFON has never allowed our mailing list to be used by anyone for any purpose. As an example, when the Fund for UFO Research asked to use it, we declined on the basis of policy consistency. However, we offered to publish submitted material that would promote their fine work, which has been done through *Journal* Editor Richard H. Hall.

Your director would like to thank all of the people who have contributed foreign postage stamps at the request of Richard Hall. The sale of these stamps to a collector is being used to pay for Air Mail postage of the *Journal* to some of our active leaders in the far corners of the world, which in turn stimulates information exchange internationally.

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE ^{by} Walt Andrus

Many UFOlogists will be delighted to hear that Tom Benson will continue as MUFON's State Director for New Jersey and remain active in the future. Tom may be contacted at P.O. Box 1174, Trenton, NJ 08606 and telephone (609) 890-8591. He will also continue to publish *The Sixth Quark Journal* on an issue-by-issue basis.

In order to maintain a strong MUFON organization in Massachusetts, Joe Santangelo, State Director, has announced new appointments to fill vacancies or resignations. Barry J. Greenwood, 6 West Hancock St., Stoneham, MA 02180 is the new State Section Director for Middlesex County replacing Fred Youngren. Barry has specialized his interest to government document research and the history of the UFO phenomenon. He is not only the historian for MUFON of Massachusetts, but also was recently appointed to the board of directors of Citizens Against UFO Secrecy. After serving MUFON admirably as the State Section Director for Norfolk County since June 1975, Mrs. Merlyn Sheehan has asked to take a less active role. Paul A. Smythe, P.O. Box 529, Boston, MA 02117, telephone (617) 267-5559 has been selected to replace Mrs. Sheehan as State Section Director. Joe Santangelo must be commended for the professional manner in which he has directed MUFON of Massachusetts, Inc. and as the Director of the MUFON Amateur Radio Net.

Leland Bechtel, Associate Professor of Psychology and Education at Bates College in Lewiston, Maine, has agreed to become the State Director for Maine. He resides at 173 Wood St., Lewiston, ME 04240, telephone (207) 782-3860. Mr. Bechtel attended the 1981 MUFON UFO Symposium at M.I.T. and was impressed with the scientific credibility of MUFON as an organization.

When an unusual number of UFO sightings recently occurred in Maine, Brent Raynes, former State Director

recommended two active investigators who could assist. Both have since joined MUFON and have been appointed State Section Directors. Mrs. Shirley C. Pickett, Infant Street RFD4, Box 417-A, Ellsworth, ME 04605, telephone (207) 667-4596 is covering Hancock County. Miss Mary C. Kimball, 60 East Main St., Apt. 2, Dover-Foxcroft, ME 04426, telephone (207) 564-3021 has the responsibility for Piscataquis County. Both women have been active in UFOlogy for many years, therefore we welcome their experience.

Mr. John E. Zeller, 9475 S.E. Maloney Place, Portland, OR 97266, telephone (503) 771-4813 has been promoted to the position of State Section Director for Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties in Oregon. He and his wife have vigorously investigated several UFO sighting reports assigned to them in the Portland, Oregon, area. The former State Director for Oregon, Terry A. Hartman, is now living in New Zealand and is operating IUFORA from P.O. Box 2240, Wellington, New Zealand. Many of our members met Terry at the 1979 MUFON UFO Symposium in San Francisco where he was a speaker.

As a result of your director's TV appearances and a newspaper story in Corpus Christi, Texas, seeking teams of investigators for each county, Robert W. Lake, P.O. Box 310, Three Rivers, TX 78071, telephone (512) 786-3034 volunteered to serve as State Section Director for Live Oak County. Bob has a B.S.E.E. from U.C.L.A. and was a USAF photo reconnaissance pilot during the Korean Conflict. Mr. Robert L. Mahlbacher, Route 1, Box 39EE, Amisville, VA. 22002, telephone (703) 937-4501, has been invited to be the State Section Director for Rapahannock, Culpeper, Madison, and Warren counties in Virginia, adjoining the counties headed by Frederick Whiting in Alexandria, Va. Retired from the Central Intelligence Agency

as a Communications Security Officer, Mr. Mahlbacher is a former Marine Corps Master Sergeant.

MUFON is extremely proud to announce that the following individuals have volunteered their expertise as Consultants on MUFON's Board of Advisors: David M. Jacobs, PhD, 110 Rex Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19118, telephone (215) 247-7725 is a Consultant in History. A professor of history at Temple University, David attended our first UFO symposium at Bradley University in Peoria, Ill. In 1970, when your director first met him and his wife. He was a featured speaker at the 1975 MUFON UFO Symposium in Des Moines, Iowa. David is best known in the UFO field as the author of the book *The UFO Controversy in America*, published in 1975 by Indiana University Press.

Maria E. Pietrzyk, M.D., 401 South 43rd St., #204, Renton, WA 98055, telephone (206) 255-0920 becomes a Consultant in Psychiatry. Dr. Pietrzyk is part of the network organized by R. Leo Sprinkle, PhD, of people utilizing hypnotic time regression procedures in order to assist UFO witnesses to recall more about their UFO encounters. Richard L. Clark, PhD, 4482 1/2 Bond Street, San Diego, CA 92109, telephone (714) 274-0196, was appointed a Consultant in Mathematical Engineering and Field Investigator. He also holds an M.S. in Psychology and is professionally employed as a Consultant-Systems Engineer.

New Research Specialists joining MUFON this month are Paul A. Stowe, 63 Van Cedar St., Brentwood, NY in Nuclear Technology; Garner M. Petrie, Jr., 7595 New Burlington Road, Waynesville, OH 45068 in Public Education; and James R. Leming, 9474 Tramwood Court, Cincinnati, OH 45242 in Artistic Renderings. Jim has volunteered to do artistic renderings of UFO sighting reports, therefore we hope that our readers will have an opportunity of viewing

(continued on page 19)