

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

NUMBER 199

NOVEMBER 1984

Founded 1967

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.

\$1.50



RE-ENTRY RE-EXAMINED

MUFON UFO JOURNAL
 (USPS 002-970)
 (ISSN 0270-6822)
 103 Oldtowne Rd.
 Seguin, Texas 78155

DENNIS W. STACY
 Editor

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

THOMAS P. DEULEY
 Art Director

MILDRED BIESELE
 Contributing Editor

ANN DRUFFEL
 Contributing Editor

TED BLOECHER
DAVE WEBB
 Co-Chairmen,
 Humanoid Study Group

PAUL CERNY
 Promotion/Publicity

MARGE CHRISTENSEN
 Public Relations

REV. BARRY DOWNING
 Religion and UFOs

LUCIUS FARISH
 Books/Periodicals/History

ROSETTA HOLMES
 Promotion/Publicity

GREG LONG
 Staff Writer

SIMONE MENDEZ
 Staff Artist

TED PHILLIPS
 Landing Trace Cases

JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
 Medical Cases

LEONARD STRINGFIELD
 UFO Crash/Retrieval

WALTER N. WEBB
 Astronomy

NORMA E. SHORT
DWIGHT CONNELLY

DENNIS HAUCK
RICHARD H. HALL

ROBERT V. PRATT
 Editor/Publishers Emeritus

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 in U.S. funds. Copyright 1984 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

ULTRALIGHT UFOS?

Incidentally, we need to be aware and careful of putting all our delicate eggs in what may prove to be an even more fragile basket. I refer specifically to the series of UFO sightings stemming from lower New York state, about which we have all heard so much in recent months. The "accepted" explanation of said events is that they are attributable to a group of maverick ultralighters who are flying their vehicles after dark, in formation, and lighted in such a way as to emulate the popular notion of a flying saucer, or UFO.

Despite the fact that such behavior is unlawful, *what if it proves to be true?* What happens to our carefully reasoned arguments of objectivity and public concern then? In short, how often can we call "wolf" a priori to the gathering of all available information and an ultimate, perhaps embarrassing resolution of a particular set of circumstances?

As long as events warrant, we should pursue the public's education about the UFO phenomenon. On the other hand, it behooves us all to follow a course of moderation as well. Then if a particular case collapses, it will not seem as if ufology as a whole comes tumbling down with it. We were here before the sightings in southern New York state; I trust we will be here after as well.

In this issue

MASSACHUSETTS MUFON FORUM, By Walter N. Webb	3
RE-ENTRY RE-EXAMINED, By Dan Wright & Harriet Beech	5
RADAR/SONAR CONTACT, By Walter N. Webb	7
ALCALDE UFO ANALYZED, By Kenneth Ewing & John Warren	11
LETTERS	16
CARTOON, By Leonard Bruce	18
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE, By Walt Andrus, Jr.	20
COVER ART By Simone Mendez	

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

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

Permission is hereby granted to quote from this issue provided not more than 200 words are quoted from any one article, the author of the article is given credit, and the statement "Copyright 1984 by the Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas" is included.

MASSACHUSETTS MUFON FORUM

By WALTER N. WEBB

Despite a gray misty day, nearly 150 persons crowded into the Centerville Community Center in Beverly for Massachusetts MUFON's first all-day UFO Forum on Sunday, August 12, 1984. The 9 AM-4 PM event attracted MUFON State Directors from nine states including five of the six New England states (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont) as well as Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, and New York. The Forum was coordinated by Massachusetts MUFON Director Marge Christensen.

Following Marge's opening remarks, moderator Dr. Eugene Mallove, MUFON's Consultant on Interstellar Communications, introduced the first two of the day's five distinguished speakers. Barry Greenwood and Larry Fawcett labeled their topic, "UFO Secrecy '84: Big Brother Is Watching Them!" (The former delivered the same paper at the 1984 MUFON UFO Symposium.) Barry and Larry, of course, are the co-authors of *Clear Intent*, which already is in its third printing. Both investigators are active in Citizens Against UFO Secrecy (CAUS) and in MUFON as Assistant State Directors for Massachusetts and Connecticut.

BIG BROTHER & UFOS

Barry stated that government UFO documents so far released span a 40-year period, from 1942 to 1981. These have yielded a number of sighting reports from Air Force and military installations where security police and guards witnessed unknown objects maneuvering over sensitive areas at very close ranges and below treetop level.

Perhaps the most publicized of these once-secret reports embraced the October-November, 1975 wave of UFO sightings at Air Force bases and installations along the U.S.-Canadian

border from Maine to Montana. At one point, Barry commented, a security alert was declared along the full length of the northern U.S. border. (So much documentation emerged from this wave alone that *Clear Intent* devoted three chapters to the series of incidents.)

Evidence was offered that the government investigation of UFOs still continues. For example, a 1976 NORAD regulation established standard procedures for reporting unknowns to regional control centers. Barry also referred to a NORAD UFO sighting report form for witnesses to fill out. It was dated "27 October 1977," which is eight years after the supposed closing of official government UFO investigations!

The speaker concluded by saying: "All we can say for sure is that UFOs are real, unidentified, intelligent, and, at least in some cases, a potential threat to our national security."

Larry presented to the audience two former Air Force security policemen, one witnessing the 1980 Rendlesham Forest affair in England (No. 188, Oct. 1983, and No. 196, July-Aug. 1984) and the other observing a more distant UFO from the RAF Bentwaters base a week later. Each witness told his story before the attentive gathering. Of the more than 200 personnel reportedly present during the close encounter at Rendlesham, Larry announced that he has now located and spoken with nine individuals involved in the incident.

UFO ABDUCTIONS

Budd Hopkins, noted investigator of UFO abduction cases and author of *Missing Time*, spoke on "What We Can Say We Know about UFO Abductions." To give those assembled the flavor of a UFO abductee's experience, the New York artist played a tape from one of his hypnosis

sessions. The subject was "Maxine," who consciously recalled driving by "hundreds" of paralyzed rabbits on a Nebraska road in 1959 and encountering a brilliant light followed by a two-hour time lapse. In 1983 she filled in the missing time under hypnosis with an emotional, gut-wrenching account. Tearfully, she asserted that her car was stopped by three entities in the road and that she was then abducted.

Budd summarized "things we can say we know" about UFO kidnap reports:

1. Testing procedures appear to have ruled out both hoaxes and psychological explanations for a number of abduction claims.

2. Literally thousands of people may have been abducted as indicated by Hopkins' own investigations and by the great number of letters he has received from potential abductees.

3. A physical component to UFO abductions is suggested by the presence of unexplained incision-like scars and other bodily traces, the recall of physical sensations, the proven disappearance of the victim in some cases, and the logical and tactical nature of the UFO landing site.

4. A psychic component exists in the form of witness precognition, externally controlled behavior, telepathic contact with the entities, and paranormal aftereffects.

5. "Some kind of interaction with the abductee's physical body is central to the purpose of UFO abductions."

6. Occurring in only a few of Budd's cases, "dialogue with UFO occupants seems at least a marginal purpose of UFO abductions."

7. An abductee is probably unconscious during part of the experience, and some of the recalled imagery may actually be hallucinatory, perhaps the consequence of anesthetics employed by the captors.

(continued on following page)

MUFON, CONTINUED

8. "Amnesia is, at least to some extent, externally caused" and "varies radically from individual to individual, both in its scope and its tenacity."

The investigator mentioned other points common to this type of encounter: UFO abductions tend to last one to two hours; "a large number of abductees will experience more than one abduction in their lifetimes;" some subjects report the insertion of tiny nasal implants; a number of episodes describe the removal of sperm or ova samples, suggesting "genetic experimentation" as another purpose of abductions; UFO entities seem to be "objectively and scientifically inclined and generally indifferent to human emotions; the experience often leaves behind "the psychologically hurtful" aftereffects, and, Budd added, "that is one of the saddest, and yet most certain, things" resulting from such encounters.

"Something is going on, on a vast scale, that intimately affects thousands of people," concluded Hopkins, "an intelligent program for interacting with human beings, but an interaction that has yet to reveal its purpose."

TOOLS OF STUDY

The next paper was delivered by MUFON's History Consultant, Dr. David M. Jacobs, author of *The UFO Controversy in America* and Associate Professor of History at Temple University. Dr. Jacob's subject was "UFOs and the Problem of Knowledge."

David pointed out that most of our knowledge concerning UFOs has been based upon human observation with a smattering of physical-trace evidence. The blame for inadequate data rests largely upon the failure of the scientific community to consider the phenomenon worthy of study.

Despite this drawback, amateur researchers are improving their own investigative techniques: MUFON's *Field Investigator's Manual* is available; individuals are conducting better quality probes into sightings; the polygraph and hypnosis are being increasingly employed as aids in UFO

investigations. But Jacobs also warned that the latter two adjuncts also have their problems and thus require great care in the interpretation of their data.

The speaker presented a capsule history of our improving UFO knowledge through the last several decades. He credited private researchers with gathering massive evidence on UFO characteristics, effects, humanoids, etc., and with publishing detailed individual cases and studies.

As for theories, David expressed his view that "ETH has stood the test of time" despite being vigorously challenged by the various ultra-terrestrial hypotheses.

Commenting upon abductions, he emphasized that these cases "require exceptional caution." The witness may be "telling the truth, lying, or thinking he is telling the truth but isn't." Abduction episodes are important, the speaker declared, because they could be "revealing information about entities and the intelligence behind UFOs."

CULTURAL CONTEXT

The final lecturer of the day was Cynthia Hind, MUFON's Continental Coordinator for Africa and author of *UFOs: African Encounters*. She repeated her '84 MUFON Symposium paper for her New England audience--"Tribal Reactions to UFOs" (No. 196, July-Aug. 1984).

The bush people of Africa, Cynthia reported, have only a limited knowledge of the Western World. They are unaware of UFOs, space flight, or sci-fi. Governed by the spirits of their ancestors, these unsophisticated observers "report exactly what they see," and what they see corresponds, in many respects, to the unexplained phenomena pestering other cultures around the globe. For years, according to Mrs. Hind, native Africans have described seeing lights, spheres, and maneuvering objects that "follow, communicate, and put them into trance."

She cited a number of cases, some of them comprising both European and native observers. In a 1972 South African episode, a farmhand spotted a bright red ball of light about 2½ feet in diameter hovering

near a farm dam. When the owner of the farm appeared, he shouted at the object which then moved laterally and vanished behind a bush. The ball soon reappeared and began changing colors. After two hours of observation, police were summoned. As the object moved away, the farmer and police fired at it, hitting it once. At this point the ball began moving up and down and stopped changing colors. It then continued into heavy cover where it disappeared.

In a more recent example, a Zimbabwe dairy farm owner and his workers watched a blue light behaving strangely on numerous occasions from late 1982 to early 1984. One time they all saw the light hovering against a distant hill. Wishing it would come closer, the farmer said the object seemed to respond, for it abruptly crossed the valley and stopped within 600 feet of the startled men. The UFO cast such a brilliant light that the farmer said it hurt his eyes and he was unable to discern a shape. The frightened black workers were convinced they were watching a ghost!

All speakers participated in a panel discussion which consisted of a spirited give-and-take between themselves and the audience. It lasted well over an hour. Following the Forum, a private dinner was held at a nearby restaurant and was attended by 50 of the registrants.

Massachusetts MUFON hopes that the one-day event can become an annual affair. In fact, several speakers have already accepted for next year's Forum.

**SUPPORT
UFO
RESEARCH
MUFON**

103 OLDTOWNE RD.
SEGUIN, TX 78155

RE-ENTRY RE-EXAMINED

By

DAN WRIGHT and HARRIET BEECH

RE-ENTRY

As a matter of record, at 9:55 PM, Sunday, May 20, 1984, debris from a Soviet launch vehicle, Soyuz T-10, re-entered Earth's atmosphere. Blazing a path across Texas to the northeast, it caused switchboards across mid-America to light up on this unusually clear night.

Most callers described a diffused cloud of sparks and vapor trails behind a huge fireball in a flat trajectory. Some witnesses in Michigan remarked on the several fragments accompanying the main body. These, they reasoned, must have been a formation of sorts, small crafts ejected from a "mother ship."

A June 17 reponse generated by the Space Surveillance Center, North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), resolved the matter. The launch vehicle had taken cosmonauts to the Salyut-7 space station, then was deorbited on April 11.

CIGAR SHAPE

Steve Crum had spent Sunday evening at his parents' residence in southern Eaton County. As he headed home, his mind was occupied with the status of his father's health. Turning west onto Bellevue Highway, the young teacher noticed an object descending at a sharp angle in the opposite direction. He assumed this to be a jetliner from Chicago headed for nearby Lansing, given the delta-wing shape.

For perhaps two minutes, he casually watched it slowly approach to his left, taking note of its seemingly oversized appearance, a greater number of headlights than expected, and a whitish mist surrounding the craft. Despite the peculiarities, he did not believe at this point that he was viewing anything extraordinary.

Half a mile away now, the object leveled off at an estimated thousand feet and "transformed into a cigar

shape." The unusual misty substance continued to envelop it with a nearly glowing quality through which numerous points of light were visible.

Steve looked in his rearview mirror and saw that three or four cars behind his own were slowing. This confirmation that others were observing the oddity was reassuring. Then the most striking aspect of the event occurred. "All of a sudden, it just shot out and it was gone." He described the accelerative effect as "infinitely faster," emphasizing that the craft, while continuing on a level course eastward, was out of sight in less than a second. He looked at his watch, which read 9:55. Quickly, he turned onto a road heading north and scanned the entire eastern horizon but saw nothing more.

GIANT TRIANGLE

Butch Fuller and Bob Fowler were out testing the Fullers' new car, driving in the countryside of southern Ingham County some ten miles away. As the two were starting for home sometime around 10 PM, they noticed two bright lights descending and approaching from the west. Assuming them to be aircraft headlights, they wondered aloud whether a plane was in trouble.

The object appeared to slow to less than traffic speed, crossing the road two hundred yards or so ahead of them at what they estimated to be a few hundred feet above the ground. As the giant vehicle glided over the roadway, Butch turned off the radio, rolled down his window and stuck his head out, but he heard nothing.

They later described the craft as likened to a triangle, with a wingspan of football field proportions and, from its nose to the rear, about four times the width of the two-lane road. The edges of the vehicle were rounded. Its finish was a "battleship grey" that reflected the lights somewhat. No mist was

identifiable.

Bob urged Butch to "step on it!" While they raced toward the scene, though, the lights seemed to fade out. This, they agreed, may have been because the lights were pointing forward and seemed to be recessed like a ship's portholes. As the object crossed their path, then, the lights would appear to have been extinguished. The men insist that the object should nevertheless have remained visible as a dark mass against the sky, but when they reached a clearing only seconds later, it was not within view. Despite their brief search of the area, they did not sight the vehicle again.

Later, on the eleven o'clock news, they heard mention of reported sightings of a high-flying object with a sparkler effect (i.e. the spacecraft debris). What they observed, the men are convinced, was not at all associated with any re-entry.

BEAUTY OR BEAST?

Shirley Sturgis and Melody Hoerl had spent their Sunday shopping and attending a movie in Kalamazoo. At a few minutes after ten, Shirley turned onto Constantine Road, a few miles from Three Rivers near the Indiana border.

Not yet up to highway speed, the trees on their left cleared away for a railroad crossing. At that moment, they witnessed what they instantly discerned to be an aerial phenomenon. Hovering just over a tangle of scrub trees was an elongated object, tapered at either end and shrouded in a silvery white mist. Behind the nearly opaque camouflage, a line of steady green and rose-colored lights shone along the base. The extreme upper portion was somewhat more clearly visible, a tapering silver outline. The cloudlike

(continued on next page)

RE-ENTRY, CONTINUED

covering encompassed the entire length of the object and beyond, some forty yards or more, and seemed to prevent the surface lights from casting onto the trees immediately below.

Shirley slammed on the brakes at first glance of the strange vehicle. She rolled down her window but heard nothing, leaving the engine running and headlights on (with no effect to either). She was elated to witness "one of the most beautiful things I've ever seen".

Melody, by contrast, was greatly agitated. For the next few moments,

while they gawked at the spectacle only thirty yards away, she argued vehemently that they must leave: "It was coming down very, very slowly, almost like a slow-motion sideways movement....and I just felt like we had a choice. We could stay and hope that it wouldn't stall the Bronco out, or we could get out of there. And Shirley was all enthused and ready to get out and meet this thing, and I kept saying, 'I want to leave; I'm scared. I really want to go.'" Having been exposed to media accounts of E-M effects, physical abductions and consequent traumas, Melody wanted no part of what might

be in the offering.

Shirley reluctantly started to move the truck forward, then halted again almost immediately as they reached the crossing stopsign. They were a scant sixty feet from the craft as it continued to "creep" toward them, protruding now from the line of trees.


Nearly hysterical, Melody screamed at Shirley to leave. Though fascinated by the sight, for the sake of her friend Shirley crossed over the tracks and continued down the road for perhaps half a mile. While the seconds passed, she noted a more conciliatory tone in Melody's reactions and so suddenly turned the truck around, racing back to the scene. But the object was nowhere to be found.

When they arrived at Shirley's home, they were made aware of the sighting by Shirley's son and daughter-in-law, who were among the many that had mistaken the re-entry as anomalous. They maintain that what they saw was extremely close at hand and of an unconventional nature.

COINCIDENCE OR CUNNING?

Amid hundreds of reports misidentifying a re-entry vehicle, these five people, the authors are convinced, confronted something genuinely anomalous. Each learned of the re-entry afterward, yet all insist that they had witnessed an entirely different craft that exhibited flight characteristics beyond present-day technology.

In light of the obvious correlations of these accounts and the astute observations of credible witnesses, we wish to speculate: Is it reasonable that intelligent visitors would have the technological capacity to monitor decaying orbits of space vehicles and predict their moment of re-entry? If so, would these visitors have the sociological insight to realize that, in light of a known event such as a satellite re-entry, separate UFO reports are unlikely to be given credence? If this is also correct, might such simultaneous occurrences become a modus operandi of sorts as the several hundred inoperative satellites now in orbit fall back through the atmosphere with increasing frequency? ■



RADAR/ SONAR CONTACT


By WALTER N. WEBB

BACKGROUND

A longtime friend and coworker of mine at Boston's Museum of Science is Valerie Wilcox of Auburndale, Massachusetts. During a telephone conversation with me on July 27, 1984, Val commented that an English acquaintance recently mentioned a UFO experience that he had while he was in the Royal Navy. He told her he was present when an unidentified target was picked up on his ship's radar and then tracked by sonar after it entered the water! Part of the log referring to this event was alleged to have been confiscated. Val offered to have us both come to dinner some evening in late August or early September so that I could question the individual about his experience.

The following report resulted from interviews with the witness at Val's house on September 6, 1984, and at his place of business on September 12 (a follow-up interview). Since he was sworn to secrecy at the time of the incident and still is a British citizen, the observer requested that I not tape our interviews nor use his name or the name of his ship in this report. He also declined to fill out MUFON Form 9 (Radar Cases) due to the classified nature of the instrumentation. However, I was permitted to take notes.

In the 21½ years since this amazing episode occurred, I was told I was the first person to hear the complete story. Val and the observer's wife were the only others told anything about the incident (his wife learned about it only two years ago). The witness proved to be very cooperative, congenial, and quite credible in my opinion. He is 41 years old, has been married seven years to an American wife, and lives and works in Newton. His name, address,



—ILLUSTRATIONS BY BRUCE LEONARD

and occupation are on file. I have assigned the witness the pseudonym "Tom Preston."

THE SIGHTING

It was late February (possibly the 28th), 1963, and a contingent of the Royal Navy's North Atlantic Fleet had been participating in exercises off Norway for about three days. Part of this contingent of approximately ten ships included Tim Preston's frigate (a destroyer escort).

Preston, a 20-year-old lieutenant trained in navigation and radar-sonar operations (over 12 months of radar experience), was on the early morning watch (2400 to 0750 hours) in the darkened radar-sonar room. Second in command of this facility, Tom happened to be in charge of the shift at the time of the UFO incident. Besides himself, other personnel in the room comprised three radarscope operators and two sonar operators. The senior officer was not present.

The witness believes his frigate was cruising approximately northeast between Spitsbergen and Norway, some 30 to 50 miles off the northern Norwegian coast. On a map he placed his position at roughly 71° north latitude and 20° east longitude in the Norwegian Sea. Thinking back to that morning, the observer recalled that the sky was clear except for scattered clouds; the seas were probably running three to five feet; and winds were probably blowing at Beaufort Force 2 (3.5 to 6 knots, or 4 to 7 miles per hour, a slight breeze).

Each of the three radarscopes in the room displayed a different height level in the atmosphere. At approximately 0315 hours, Preston recalled, a stationary "bleep" appeared abruptly on the highest-level scope. The target's vertical height was approximately 35,000 feet, and it was located somewhat west of the zenith (overhead point) at perhaps 70° elevation. The bleep indicated a

(continued on next page)

RADAR/SONAR, CONTINUED

seemingly hard solid object giving off a strong reflection; the size of the target on the screen, according to the witness's best recollection, implied an actual diameter or length for the object of between that of a jet fighter and a 707—in other words, said Preston, roughly 100 to 120 feet across.

SUDDEN APPEARANCE

One of the strange things about this unknown target was the suddenness of its appearance: One moment the screen was empty; the next moment the target was there. If it in fact represented a genuine reflection from a real object at the indicated altitude, the object would have had to have entered the radar field at unbelievable speed, either horizontally or vertically, and then stopped instantly without any deceleration. When I asked about the possibility of anomalous propagation creating a false target, the observer said no unusual atmospheric conditions existed at the time that might have caused A.P.

Tom stated that he went out on deck a number of times during the observation and peered upward through binoculars in attempts to spot the UFO against the night sky. He was unsuccessful, however, in spotting the object visually. (A visual confirmation also eluded others in the fleet so far as Preston was able to determine later.)

After a few minutes, Tom notified his senior officer who came into the radar room, looked at the target on the scope, and then withdrew. The officer proceeded to radio the nearest ship to learn if it also "painted" the same target. It did. Thus, a radar set malfunction was ruled out. (Tom's conversations with radar operators aboard other ships following the episode determined that they had the unknown on their screens as well.)

When an attempted radio contact with the unexplained source failed to elicit any response, the fleet's flagship was contacted and an order subsequently issued to all ships to execute an evasive maneuver, basically a "Z" pattern. Preston said the UFO appeared to follow the maneuver,

remaining overhead at its original altitude and holding the same relative position on the radarscope.

JET SCRAMBLE

At this juncture, according to the witness, a call went out for fighter assistance in making an identification intercept. Within minutes, Tom heard the sound of jets through the open door, and he could see the bleeps of two aircraft on the scope racing from the southwest toward the unidentified image. (He believes the aircraft must have been English Electric Lightnings, the RAF's fastest fighters in the early 1960s.)

The observer recalled that when the jets came within about 10 to 15 miles of the unknown, the UFO suddenly performed a steep angular descent at incredible speed, crossing all three radar screens as it descended and passing completely below the radar horizon (750 to 1,000 feet height)—all within about two or three seconds! The object's path crossed the ship's bow from port to starboard.

SONAR CONTACT

As the target descended, the two sonar operators aimed their pulses in the general direction of the dropping object. Almost immediately (in a matter of seconds) following loss of radar contact, both sonar operators received audible "pings," indicating a strong echo from a fast-moving submerged target at a range of probably 20,000 yards (roughly 10 miles).

(Sonar is the underwater counterpart of radar, only the former employs sound waves rather than radio waves. The distance to the submerged object can be found from the time taken for the waves to travel to the object and back to the ship, knowing the velocity of acoustical sound waves through sea water. Tom explained that sonar's usually limited range was extended in this case by means of a classified procedure.)

The underwater target appeared to be traveling in the same general azimuth and at the same descent angle (at least initially) as the airborne object, implying that the two unknowns were

one and the same! The target's speed was considerably reduced, "down to hundreds of miles per hour" but "still moving damn fast," remarked Preston, and it was now moving along a zigzag path away from the ship. Sonar first picked up the target at its upward horizon, perhaps 50 feet below the ocean surface, and continued to register an echo from the object as it dropped rapidly into deep water (the witness claims that the depth in this area should have been "no more than 2,000 feet"). Sonar contact with the unidentified object suddenly ceased after an indeterminate period of no more than two or three minutes. The abrupt cessation of the echo might have simply indicated that the object dropped behind a rise in the uneven sea bottom.

Tom's frigate had begun steaming toward the target's entry point a flank speed and probably arrived at the spot in about 20 minutes. A visual and sonar search over the entry point, however, yielded nothing. No further contact of

(continued on next page)



RADAR/SONAR, CONTINUED

any kind was made with the submerged object.

When asked to estimate the total duration of the entire radar-sonar observation, the witness said he was uncertain owing to the length of time that had elapsed since the event. But he came up with "five or six minutes although it could have been a lot longer." In fact, if one considers all the elements of time involved throughout the episode--the initial radar observation prior to notification of the senior officer, the subsequent ship-to-ship communications, the attempted radio contact with the target, the evasive maneuver of the fleet, the arrival of the jets, and the sonar contact--it would appear that a duration on the order of at least 15 to 20 minutes would have been more reasonable.

SUBSEQUENT EVENTS

After Tom witnessed the senior officer enter the UFO observations in the radar log book, their shift ended. Radar room personnel on the early morning watch ate breakfast and then turned in. Probably sometime between 1200 and 1300, Tom said he was awakened and ordered to report to the ward room, along with the five radar and sonar operators on his shift that morning. There was a little grumbling at having their "sack time" interrupted. Awaiting the men in the ward room were their senior officer and the commander of the ship. All sat down around a table over coffee.

The senior officer proceeded to go over the events of that morning, asking questions about the radar-sonar observations. He told the six men that their conversations were being taped and explained that until more was known about the unknown target, they were to remain silent about what they had seen. "Gentlemen," the officer said, "we will remember that we have all signed the Official Secrets Act (or words to that effect)." Although there were no threats, the implication was clear that to divulge anything to anyone concerning the tracking of the UFO would be considered a breach of security.

I asked Tom if the meeting might have been part of a general order carried out on other ships in the fleet as well in connection with the UFO incident. He responded that he didn't know if it was or not.

The witness recollected that he was in the ward room about 10 minutes. He said he never heard anything further about the unknown target.

When Preston came on duty once again at 2400 hours, he said he was surprised to discover that a "spanking new book" had replaced the radar log used the previous morning.

20 YEAR SECRET

Tom obeyed his senior officer's instructions to the letter and never revealed to anyone what happened on the British frigate that morning in 1963 until just two years ago. Preston and his wife happened to be watching Nova's infamous "The Case of the UFO" in October, 1982. Immediately after the PBS program had ended, Tom turned to his wife and told her he had participated in a UFO sighting while in the Royal Navy. He remembered that he didn't go into much detail and never referred to the experience again until the observation with Val in July, 1984.

What did he think the object was? "I have no idea," Tom replied simply. He added that whatever it was, "it was guided." The witness emphasized that both the radar and sonar targets consisted of crisp, hard reflections, not "ghost" echoes. The radar target, he stressed, was "absolutely not" an aircraft, balloon, bird, or false weather target. Nor could it have been a radar set malfunction since operators on other ships had the same target on their screens.

EVALUATION

As far as I am personally aware, this case is totally unique in the history of UFO reports. It is the first known combined radar-sonar contact of a UFO. With perhaps a single exception, it is also the first known sonar-tracking of a USO (Unidentified Submarine Object), UFOs reportedly seen entering, passing through, or exiting bodies of water. The most significant

UFO accounts involve objects observed entering and/or leaving water. Sightings of many unidentified objects remaining underwater throughout the entire observation may in fact be due to the activity of foreign submarines as well as to bioluminescent phenomena (the mysterious "wheels of light").

The only other publicized USO sonar contact that this investigator could uncover turns out to be not much more than an unsubstantiated rumor related in the late Ivan T. Sanderson's *Invisible Residents* (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1970; Avon Books, 1973). Citing Martin Caidin's *Hydrospace* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1964) and Ed Hyde's article "U.F.O.'s--At 4500 Fathoms!," *Man's Illustrated* (Mar. 1966) as two of his sources, Sanderson pooled the various versions of the story and came up with a composite account which can be summarized as follows:

Sometime in 1963 (the same year as the Preston episode) the U.S. Navy was conducting antisubmarine exercises off Puerto Rico. The craft included five smaller naval vessels, submarines, aircraft (at least one towing a dunking or dipping sonar below the ocean surface), and possibly the carrier *Wasp* serving as the command ship.

HIGH-SPEED USO

A sonar operator aboard a destroyer reported that one of the subs suddenly commenced pursuit of an unknown submerged object that was moving at "over 150 knots" (170-plus miles per hour!). According to most accounts, similar sonar reports of a high-speed object began coming in from all of the other ships and from the sonar-trailing aircraft. One of Sanderson's sources stated that no less than 13 craft recorded in their logs that their sonars had tracked this object. Allegedly, the unknown target continued to be tracked for *four days* as it maneuvered down to depths of 27,000 feet! (This must have been in the vicinity of the Atlantic's deepest point--28,374 feet below sea level--in the

(continued on next page)

RADAR/SONAR, CONTINUED

Puerto Rico Trench.)

If the above story is true, nothing of known earthly origin can travel underwater at such speeds or maneuver at such depths. The fastest nuclear subs can attain 45 knots (52 miles per hour) and dive to around 3,000 feet. The bathyscape Trieste, with a specially constructed pressure-resistant hull, descended to a record 35,820 feet in 1960. However, it was incapable of maneuvering about.

It is unfortunate that more than 21 years elapsed before the Preston case reached the attention of a UFO investigator. We have here yet another example of government UFO secrecy at work--this time a foreign nation, Great Britain. Largely due to his apprehension over potential repercussions if he revealed his experience, Tom felt compelled to keep his knowledge of the event to himself. Since it hadn't occurred to him at the time that the radar log notes would be removed, he had only his memory to rely upon during our interviews. He expressed uncertainty about some of the details and about his exact location off the coast of Norway. Nevertheless, the gist of what took place seems quite clear.

If we assume that the observer's recollections are approximately correct regarding the UFO's 35,000-foot vertical height, 70° elevation angle, three-second descent, and approximate 10-mile-distant entry point, then we can infer that the object's 30° descent path covered 14 miles at a speed of about 17,000 miles per hour--in the neighborhood of a slow meteor's veLOCITY!

ANOMALOUS PROPAGATION

The radar target apparently was not confirmed visually. This situation would ordinarily lead one to believe anomalous propagation might be responsible. AP arises when abnormal atmospheric conditions interfere with the normal propagation of radar waves, causing a display of false targets in places and at altitudes where no physical object should appear. For example, superrefractive layers in the

atmosphere may bend radar beams at such an angle that they pick up distant surface or airborne targets below the horizon and make them appear at elevated locations on the radarscope. Nothing would be evident to the naked eye in the sky.

Nevertheless, according to the witness, none of the conditions that might lead to AP were in fact present at the time.

But there are other arguments against anomalous propagation and natural phenomena in general being the cause of the radar-sonar targets. Was it just a coincidence that the target suddenly darted away at the moment the jets approached after having remained stationary for quite possibly some 10 or 15 minutes? Was it a coincidence that an unidentified, high-speed sonar target appeared in the same direction of the airborne target's point of disappearance below the radar horizon and within seconds of loss of radar contact? What sort of airborne natural phenomenon can suddenly submerge and maneuver almost equally well through a water environment?

EVASIVE ACTION

The image on radar gave all the outward appearances of reacting to the jets' approach and then successfully eluding further detection by submerging in the ocean and eventually retreating from view. Another example of apparent intelligent behavior: The target appeared to follow the fleet's evasive "Z" maneuver.

Owing to (1) the lengthy passage of more than two decades since the experience occurred and the resultant diminished accuracy of remembered details, (2) the unavailability of written data or records concerning the instrumented readings, (3) the availability of only a single witness, and (4) the lack of visual confirmation, I might ordinarily have listed this reported experience as "simply" an "unknown."

But because of the credibility of the witness and the report's unique and potentially important nature as a combined radar-sonar UFO contact, I have elected to upgrade the status of

this report to that of "significant unknown."



"ALL THE NEWS"

As most of you are probably aware, journalistic standards in this country are set by *The New York Times*. Indeed, the paper's front-page logo reads "All the News That's Fit to Print," as if the *Times* were the sole arbiter in the land of what constitutes "news" and what does not. Too often that judgment has weighed against the reporting of UFO sightings and related anomalous phenomena.

Subtle signs are afloat, however, that the rigid editorial policy of the *Times* may be undergoing a change. In late August, for example, the paragon of the eastern press yielded to what must have been the pressure of local events and reported on the hundreds of sightings of a huge, triangle-shaped UFO which had been plaguing lower New York state and western Connecticut for several months. In September of this year the subject even made the editorial pages in an article by Sydney Schanberg, "Must We Identify UFOs?" The author concluded, if I read correctly, that UFOs are a sort of healthy mystery and need not be brushed aside surreptitiously nor necessarily explained away altogether.

Other recent developments have also been encouraging, including the continuing *Times* coverage of reports of "Chessie," an elusive, perhaps previously unknown sea creature seen swimming Chesapeake Bay, and an article which appeared in the prestigious Tuesday "Science Times" section about the "wildmen" of China.

We've known all along UFOs and other anomalies were worth reporting. Thanks to the *Times*, the rest of the country may soon realize it, too.

-EDITOR

ALCALDE UFO ANALYZED

By **KENNETH EWING** and **JOHN WARREN**

SUMMARY

Mel Medina of Alcalde, NM, reported to the state police and the *Rio Grande Sun* newspaper having seen bright lights and a strange-shaped object from approximately 7:05 to 7:30 PM MST, April 24, 1984. The object was nearly stationary from 7:10 to about 7:25 in the direction northeast by east. At that time it started to move from left to right in front of him and then turned east toward Truchas Peak. Eventually it disappeared from view. Upon further investigation we uncovered 16 other groups of witnesses, whose stories more or less confirmed Medina's story. We were able to obtain radar data from the FAA through the Freedom of Information Act, which contained the tracks of 22 identifiable commercial or private flights near the area the object was seen during the time from 7:00 to 8:00 PM MST. In addition, a military craft entered the area from the east at 7:25, turned south, then back east and was out of the area by 7:30. It was later determined to be a KC-135 aerial tanker on a refueling mission, whose rendezvous point was northwest of Las Vegas, NM. The KC-135 is the size of a Boeing 707 and according to an FAA military liaison officer is usually "lit up like a Christmas tree" when making a rendezvous. The radar data indicated that it remained at its assigned altitude between 22,000 and 24,000 feet, but that it slowed down from 360 MPH to 185 MPH as it turned back east.

We believe that this military craft can account for many of the eyewitness accounts, but not all. It is difficult to understand how Medina could have observed the craft for 15 minutes before it crossed the Sangre de Cristo mountains and entered the Espanola Valley. Almost all observers estimated the object's size as substantially larger than a commercial airliner. Medina observed the object through

binoculars, but could not see any wings.

As with so many cases of this type (lights in the sky) we will never know for sure if there was a large unidentified object there that evening, which was invisible to radar, or if the large number of witnesses who saw the object were simply unable to recognize the KC-135 in the dim twilight or judge accurately the size of the object.

We learned many interesting things during the course of the investigation, which will be recorded here for future use of our local organization. Some of these items may also be of use to investigators elsewhere. The next two sections will discuss the eyewitness reports and the radar data. Following this will be a discussion of what the object was NOT. We then make our analysis of the sightings in terms of the KC-135 explanation. We learned a few things about investigating techniques which we have recorded in a separate section. The final section acknowledges help we received from many sources.

EYEWITNESS REPORTS

The firsthand observers discussed in this report represent a cross-section of the Hispanic population in northern New Mexico. Their educational level varied from high school or less to Masters level college degrees. Their English language proficiency varied from excellent to minimal, in the situation where Spanish was their dominant language. Some observers were long term businessmen in their communities or they simply work there, while others commuted from their respective towns to various jobs in Los Alamos County (location of the Los Alamos National Laboratory).

There were 17 independent groups ranging from 1 to 4 persons for a total of 34 people (27 male and 7 female). Many were interested in talking to us, but many others did not want to be


associated in any way with UFOs. We are not using names because many people want no publicity. We have not asked permission of the others. The names themselves have no public recognition value outside their own towns. We believe the statistics of the observations are most important. We interviewed a member of each of the 17 groups either in person or by telephone.

The eyewitness data are summarized in Table I. Of our 17 groups, 7 people could give angular size; 11 people gave elevation. Almost everyone could give direction or compass bearing. Five people gave both angular size and elevation. Many or most people do not think in terms of angular measurements. They said it was "big as a house," etc. We tried to get them to think of a finger at arm's length or something similar. Within the accuracy of our data, a finger at arm's length is about 1.5 degrees or 3 full moons. A fist at arm's length is about 7.5 degrees. Angular measurement is the only meaningful number. One cannot estimate size unless one knows distance. We planned to get these distances by triangulation. Distance estimates by witnesses can be very deceptive.

Compass bearing was obtained by asking the individual to face in the direction of the phenomenon and point. We all carried magnetic compasses.

Elevation is a bit more difficult. Pointing can be off by a factor of 2 or 3. We had a protractor with a plumb line and by sighting one can obtain an angle. We would ask people to think in terms of draftman's triangles which easily give 30, 45, and 60 degrees. Most people understand that. The object was seen from Medanales and Truchas and Chimayo at least 15 miles and possibly 20 miles apart. Figure 1 shows a map of the area with an estimated trajectory

(continued on next page)



ALCALDE, CONTINUED

based on eyewitness observations. Based on these distance and angular size estimates, we calculated the size of the object in feet, shown in Table II. We calculated a minimum size of about 1000 feet. The maximum number seems too large to be worth considering — about a mile in size.

Another difficulty we had was in establishing clock time estimates needed to establish a space-time trajectory. Rural communities, in general, are not as tied to a clock as those of us in more urban areas. We know that something very large passed over part of northern New Mexico on the night of April 24 (Tuesday), between 7 and 8 PM MST with most of the observations at about 7:30. We cannot be more accurate.

RADAR DATA

Figure 1. Map of the 17 separate eyewitness sightings of the April 24, 1984, UFO in the Espanola valley. Also shown are paths of the KC-135 aircraft and 5 other unidentified radar trajectories occurring during the time interval from 7:00 to 7:30 PM.

Through experience with search and rescue operations, we were aware that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) radar covers our area. Computerized data output are kept on magnetic tape for 15 days and may be obtained by private citizens under the Freedom of Information Act for the cost of producing computer listings. It takes about three weeks to get the data.

We have one hour's worth of radar traces encompassing the event. During that period 22 flights of aircraft containing transponders passed over the area of interest. These are probably mostly commercial flights. They were at an altitude of about 30,000 feet or 4 or 5 miles above the surface. One of the

tracks was a military plane and as we later found out by telephone from the FAA in Albuquerque, it was a KC-135 on a refueling mission from an airport at Amarillo, Texas. The KC-135 was at an altitude of about 22,000 feet above sea level. The plane slowed down while turning around Truchas from 375 mph to 185 mph. The plane was lit up for rendezvous purposes. The radar trace showed the plane came in from the east, turned around the town of Truchas to the west and was at a slant distance of about three miles from the witnesses at Truchas and then left at a bearing of about 100 degrees. We were told that it was to rendezvous with another plane near Las Vegas, NM. The circuit took less than five minutes on our radar trace. The time of this occurrence was about 7:25 to 7:30 PM EST. The path was at the height of our

(continued on next page)




Figure 3. The KC-135 could not have been seen over the mountains 15 minutes before it entered the valley if it was traveling at 360 mph.

ALCALDE, CONTINUED

visible by scattering from the atmosphere, but is so large that it could not possibly look like headlights or landing lights.

KC135 PROBLEMS

There are at least five problems with the KC-135 aircraft as an explanation of all the witness sightings and the radar data. These are enumerated below.

The KC-135 crossed the Sangre de Cristo mountains and entered the Espanola valley about 7:25. By 7:30 it had turned back east and crossed the mountains again. Many of the witnesses claimed to have watched the lights for a long time. Because it was difficult to get good time estimates from witnesses, we are not sure whether a long time means 5 minutes or 20 minutes. The main witness, Mel Medina, did note the time the UFO appeared and disappeared (7:10 and 7:30). If we deduct the 5 minutes that the KC-135 was in the Espanola Valley, then for 15 minutes Medina was seeing something else through his binoculars. At 7:10 the KC-135 should have been about 90 miles away to the east of Alcalde and 8000 ft. above the valley floor. Figure 3 shows the geometry with the vertical scale exaggerated. The earliest that the KC-135 could have been seen is about 7:20.

A second problem with the KC-135 explanation is that many witnesses claimed to have seen two distinct bright lights when they were anywhere between 8 and 18 miles from the path of

the KC-135. At this distance the two landing lights should have appeared as one, except to someone with very unusual eyesight.

One of the stars in Ursa Major is really a double star system (Alcor and Mizar). The two stars are about 11 minutes of arc apart. This was used by the ancient Arab armies as an "eye test." Let us assume that the landing lights on the KC-135 (wing span of 135 ft.) are about 50 ft. apart. At 18 miles (roughly the distance of closest approach to Medanales) the angular separation calculates to be 1.8 minutes of arc. The witness at Medanales definitely stated that the lights looked like the headlights of a car (See Appendix A). Even the witness at Alcalde (about 8 miles from the distance of closest approach) should have had difficulty because the angular separation is only 4.25 minutes.

Many of the observers saw a red light above and between the two bright lights. It is difficult to understand how a navigational tail light could have been visible at such large distances. Our major witness in Alcalde saw the object through his binoculars and could easily see seven lights along the side of the object. Furthermore, he reported that the red light separated from the object and flew out of the binocular view and later returned to its original position.

If the reader has any doubt about angular resolution, there is a simple experiment that can be done. Take two flashlights; separate them by 6 inches on center; and then back off until you can't resolve them as separate lights. The angular separation is 12' of arc at

143 ft., 8' at 215 Ft. and 4' at 430 Ft.

The third problem with the aircraft explanation is the size of the object reported by so many witnesses. The angular size of the whole KC-135 at a distance of 8 miles is approximately 12'. A thumb held at arm's length is about 2 degrees. Many witnesses thought that it was much larger than that.

The fourth problem is the fact that the radar trajectory does not correspond very well with the trajectory as determined by the witnesses in Penasco and La Bolsa near Dixon. One of the witnesses in Penasco said that the object passed directly overhead (See Fig. 1).

Finally, the fifth problem is that, in addition to the radar track for the KC-135, the radar data contain several tracks of unidentified nature before the KC-135 showed up and almost no unidentified tracks after it left the area. These tracks are also shown on Fig. 1. While the tracks corresponding to commercial aircraft and the track of the KC-135 can be seen entering and leaving the region of the radar plot, the unidentified tracks appear to originate and end in the middle of the region. We are not familiar enough with the quirks of radar to be able to discriminate between ground clutter and the signature of UFOs. All that we can say is that there are an above average number of unidentified radar returns in the time interval before the KC-135 and in the region where Medina claims to have been seeing the UFO. The source of these returns is unexplained.

We have come up with several possible hypotheses to explain the available data. These will be listed in order of increasing strangeness:

1. The object was only the KC-135; many of the witness recollections were inaccurate or influenced by the subsequent article published in the *Rio Grande Sun*.

2. There were two aircraft; a small private plane with landing lights on, which wandered around the valley from 7:05 to 7:25 (to account for Medina's observations and some of the extra radar returns) and the KC-135 reported (again, with much accuracy) by the witnesses. The small plane left as the

(continued on next page)

Table I
Summary of Sighting Information

Location	Number		Size Angle	Noise	Time	Elevation Angle	Speed	Location		Lights	
	M	F						1st	Last	White	Red
La Bolsa	4		7.5	none	7:30-8	10	—	E	S	7	
Truchas	1		—	none	8:00	45	slow	E	SE	4	1
Truchas	1		—	hum	7:8	15	slow			12	1
Truchas	2		7.5	none	7:10	30	—			2	
Medanales	3		1.5	none	—	15	stopped	E	SE	2	
Alcalde	1		6.0	—	7:35	—	—	E	SE	many	
Alcalde	1		—	—	7:15-30	15	stopped		East	2	
Alcalde	2	1	1.5	hum	7:02-30	5	slow		East	many	
Chimayo	4		—	—	aft 7:00	—	—		—	—	
Chimayo Rd	1		—	—	—	—	stopped		East	2	8
Chimayo Rd	1	1	3.0	—	7:30	5	—		East	some	
Mora	1	1	—	none	7:15	—	—		From E	2	1
Mora	1	2	—	—	7:30	overhd	—		SE NW	—	—
Chacon		1	—	none	9:00	—	—		SE NW	2	
??	3		4.0	—	7:30	—	slow		Twd Truchas	2	1
Penasco		1	—	motor	7:15	10	—		Fm SE	2	
Penasco	1		—	—	7:00	ovrhd	—		To W	—	—

ALCALDE, CONTINUED

KC-135 came in and Medina mistakenly thought that there was only one object.

3. There was a large UFO in the area that did not register well on the radar but was seen by many witnesses. It flew out of the valley when the KC-135 arrived. Some of the witnesses saw the true UFO but most saw the KC-135.

No doubt there are many other possible hypotheses and much more that could be done to discriminate among these hypotheses, but we must ask ourselves what is to be gained. There are no physical traces or unnatural accelerations associated with the event. With the military aircraft visible on the radar, skeptics would never admit that this is a solid UFO sighting no matter what supporting evidence is brought forth. About all that we can do is chalk it up to experience and wait for another UFO to appear.

LESSONS LEARNED

We have learned the following lessons for future reference:

1. Let the newspapers and radio know you are investigating an incident. It is a quick way to get more leads.
2. FAA radar is available almost everywhere. It is well worth the cost of \$100 to \$200 for a 90 mile square area

and a half hour of time. The FAA was very cooperative and helpful.

3. Be aware of LIDAR installations in your area (See APPENDIX C). The LIDAR beam can occasionally be seen. There are approximately 15 such installations across the country, according to our local expert. In addition there are mobile units in airplanes and even the space shuttle.

4. An investigation of this sort can bring out stories about other sightings. During this investigation many UFO stories came to the surface, only three of which might bear on the investigation. These are your "standard" UFO stories with basic details like dates and times forgotten, but they represent what a surprising number of people have experienced.

This spring some people were coming home from a ski trip in Colorado and were driving the road between Pagosa Springs and Tierra Amarilla in the evening, and lo and behold, southwest of the road was a hovering, large, football-shaped object with two bright lights. They kept driving.

About a year or two ago a coworker was going home to Velarde on the road from Espanola, and east of the road, above the rolling hills was a large, glowing, football-shaped object. Many cars were stopped along the road and many people were watching. When

the object left suddenly, everyone got into their cars and drove off.

Another coworker, who lives in Dixon, was sitting on his patio with his wife about 10 PM, when a rectangular object passed overhead. He estimates that it was about 3/4 degree in long dimension and the perimeter was lit up with various colored lights. It seemed to make a low electrical hum as it passed over. The informant thinks this occurred on May 16, 1984.

Another interesting lead was called in by a resident of Espanola who claims to have a film he took of a "half-dollar-sized" UFO New Year's Eve several years ago. We are still waiting for him to find the film among his collection.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge help in this investigation from David Platts, Bob Lanter, Louy and Bernice Burkhardt, Sid Stone, Gil Miranda, Robin Hoard, Ross Graves and the fine people at the Albuquerque Center of the FAA.

APPENDIX

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF RADAR BACKGROUND DATA

(continued on next page)

ALCALDE, CONTINUED

Arbitrarily the area on the radar plots was broken into four areas defined in figure B-1. The visual sightings were basically inside the triangle and these statistics relate to those visual sightings and not something else. Different areas will give different numbers but the basic significance will not change. By inspection this data is not random. We are expecting a track similar to that for an airplane but we got an area effect only noticeable after superimposing all the data on one sheet of paper with the aid of a light table and a box of colored pencils.




Figure B-1. Division of the area into subareas for statistical purposes.

There is a large group of unknowns in the NE-area in the mountains north east of Penasco. There is also a group of unknowns in the S-area in the region of Otowi bridge. The FAA does not have an explanation for this. These basically remain constant in time.

We counted all dots (.) as one unit and all colons (:) as two units. We will use the Chi Square statistic and assume the null hypothesis—that there is a constant time — invariant number of unknowns in each area. The data are summarized in Table B-1 below. The data are also plotted in Figure B-2 below.

Chi Square is a statistical test used to determine the probability of data deviating from an average expected value. Experimental data do scatter and too good a fit is just as peculiar as too bad a fit. There are 13 degrees of freedom in the table because there are 14 time groups — always one less.

Any statistical textbook contains the same table of Chi Square. For example at 13 degrees of freedom the table reads as follows:

Table B1

Time	Inside	NE	W	S
07:02.5	00	18	0	05
07:05	00	15	0	10
07:07.5	01	17	0	06
07:10	00	14	0	06
07:15	05	18	0	14
07:20	10	25	2	18
07:25	03	24	6	11
07:30	05	23	3	12
07:35	03	20	3	12
07:40	01	27	0	16
07:45	00	22	2	09
07:50	02	16	0	05
07:55	06	21	5	09
08:00	03	17	1	13
Sum	39	277	22	146
Average	2.8	19.8	1.6	10.4
Chi Sq	39.4	10.5	33.3	20.7
D. F.	13	13	13	13
Chi Sq.	3.57	4.11	5.01	5.89
Prob. (%)	0.50	1.00	2.50	5.00
	7.04	19.81	22.36	24.74
	27.69	29.82	90.00	95.00
	97.50	99.00	99.00	99.50

A Chi Square of 10.5 is within the 10 to 20 percentage level of probability, meaning that it is not significant. A Chi Square of 20.7 is approaching significance at the 91% level. Chi Square's of 33.3 and 39.4 are very highly significant. There is only a .5% probability of a Chi Square+29.82 occurring by chance. There is a 99.5% probability of some nonrandom explanation. Our values of Chi Square are more significant than this.

The statistics show that something increased the unknown returns in a non-random way during the time interval 7:00 to 8:00 PM. We do not understand this.

UFOs are not simple phenomena.

(ALCALDE TABLES & GRAPHS
CONTINUED ON
FOLLOWING PAGE)

LETTERS

UFO-MERCURY LINK?

In the July/August, 1984, issue of the MUFON *Journal*, Ann Druffel commenced a two-part article entitled "Mercury A Possible Clue to UFO Propulsion?" Having read both parts, I find myself unable to resist making a few comments.

Ann would seemingly have us believe that there is a growing body of evidence linking UFOs to the metal mercury. As I have followed the UFO literature rather closely for many years this came somewhat as a surprise. Nevertheless, I was certainly prepared to examine the anecdotal evidence I assumed Ann would muster linking the two. My contention is that no real evidence to that effect was presented.

The first evidence adduced, for example, was a sighting at Rio Vista, California, in May of 1964. The primary source of information appears to have been two newspaper accounts. Subsequent information turned up that a Northern California investigator, not referenced, claimed that mercury was discovered missing from an oilfield over which the craft hovered. That's it? That's the evidence? Weak as it is, it is perhaps the strongest presented in the entire article.

The second sighting offered as evidence was made by a 16-year old in 1973. The sighting itself did not involve mercury, but the percipient theorized that the UFO was powered by "an incomplete MIT concept" involving two mercury pools, rotating in opposite directions, as part of a nuclear fusion device. Ann admits not knowing if the case proved genuine, but that point is strangely irrelevant. Clearly, the percipient's theorizing that the UFO may have used mercury does not mean that it did!

Much of the "evidence" culled up in support of a possible link between UFOs and mercury is in a similar vein. Because sulphurous odors are sometimes reported with sightings, the synthesis, by McMasters University

(continued on next page)




Figure B-2. Plot of the number of unknowns per 5 minute interval versus time in each of the four areas.

Table II SIZE ESTIMATES(a)

Witness Location	Closest Approach in miles	Angular Size in degrees	Diameter Estimate in feet	Estimated Elevation in degrees	Estimated Elevation in feet(b)
Alcade	8	1.5	1100	5.0	10,000
Medanales	15	1.5	2060	15.0	25,500
Chimayo	17	3.0	4600	5.0	13,000
LaBolsa	10	7.5	6900	10.0	15,000
Truchas	4.5	7.5	3100	30	20,000

a) Size + distance X angle in radians; 1 radian=57.3(o)

b) above sea level.

chemists, of a mercury compound using sulphur dioxide, becomes significant. This is somewhat tantamount to saying salt smells of chlorine. It certainly does not indicate an association of mercury with UFOs. Nor does the rather common use of mercury in electrical switching devices, discussed in Part II.

In Part II, Ann showcases an alleged abduction case where the percipient purports to have been given an interstate ride. But the case is far from convincing, being filled with rather standard pseudo-scientific fare. Even the percipient's description of the "mercury" is erroneous. Having chased many a globule of mercury across laboratory tables and floors, I can assure the reader that it is anything but "jelly-like."

Ann discusses briefly ancient Sanskrit writings alleged to describe wars between two antediluvian civilizations fought with nuclear-like weapons and flying vehicles called "vimanas." Mercury was supposed to be an essential element in their propulsion systems. As I vaguely recalled hearing such tales before, I checked the reference given - Ivan T. Sanderson's *Invisible Residents*. And indeed, Appendix B of the book contains translated passages describing airships powered with iron engines that contained mercury. But where did Sanderson get his material? By kind permission of Desmond Leslie and his publishers.

The name Desmond Leslie immediately raised a red flag of caution. Checking Sanderson's only reference on this matter, I found, as reference 261, "Leslie, Desmond and Adamski, George, *Flying Saucers Have Landed*, etc.- This is not an acceptable reference in legitimate ufology, and I think I know Ann well enough to say that she would not have used this material had she realized its source.

In Part I, Ann points out that her background was in sociology, and muses as to whether a non-technical person should theorize about possible modes of UFO propulsion. I personally

(continued on next page)

LETTERS, CONTINUED

have no objection as long as two provisos are met.

The first is simply that the investigator seek out professional expertise and opinion. In the southern California study group of which Ann is a part, there are three physicists and two engineers, three of whose training and experience includes plasma physics. They certainly would have been helpful in assessing the teenager's claim of "an incomplete MIT concept," and perhaps prevented a number of technical misconceptions that appeared in the article. Beyond the study group, there was the UCLA Fusion Laboratories, and the physics and engineering departments of many junior and 4 year colleges in the southern California area. Similar resources exist throughout the country for other ufologists.

The second proviso is that some attempt be made to assure oneself a basic science education. Not all lay ufologists have a problem with basic science, but for those who do, I have

for several years recommended taking high school or college freshman level courses in physics, chemistry, and math. With the plethora of adult schools and junior colleges in most parts of the country, it really isn't a very tall order, and is a reasonable prerequisite for the rigors of ufology. Perhaps for the contributing subscriber, who is concerned primarily with keeping abreast of developments of ufology, such training is unnecessary. But I firmly believe that those who have the time to write articles in ufology have the time to provide themselves with a reasonable science education, and are obligated to do so.

-JOE KIRK THOMAS

OLYMPIC UFO REACTION

Tonight I watched the concluding ceremonies for the 1984 Olympics. I assume you did, too. (If you didn't, you could probably get a tape of them from ABC.)

Anyway, what happened during the concluding ceremonies: A "UFO" (a prop, of course) showed up complete with flashing lights.

There had to be at least 100,000 people at the Los Angeles Coliseum and probably a billion more watching on TV.


No one in the audience knew that a UFO (and it was a well-done UFO at that) was going to show up.

What did the audience do when this light-flashing UFO appeared over the stadium? (Interestingly, the ABC announcer referred to it as a spaceship and did not use the term UFO or flying saucer.) Did they panic, freak out, run for the gates? Did people watching on TV head for the hills or the nearest high bridge or skyscraper?

No way.

Those in attendance at the L.A. Coliseum (and they represented people from every race, walk of life, nation, etc.) cheered, clapped, applauded, oohed and aahed. (Granted, if it had

(continued on next page)



DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE
(continued from back page)

After receiving very constructive feedback from our State Directors and some members of the Board, Dan Wright has prepared the fourth draft of his "Field Investigator's Examination" composed of one hundred multiple choice, true-false, and fill-the-blank questions. It is broken down into segments that cover the following subjects: (1) Light and Optics, (2) Sound, (3) Measurements, (4) Electrical/Magnetic, (5) Human and Animal Reactions, (6) Physical Traces, (7) Photography, (8) Radio and Radar, (9) Celestial Objects, (10) Atmosphere and Weather, (11) Conventional Vehicles, and (12) The UFO Experience.

New books that have recently

been published include the following: *Investigation Ovari* (UFO Investigation) by Vincente-Juan Ballester Olmos (MUFON Representative for Spain) with the forward by Dr. J. Allen Hynek. Published in Spanish, copies may be obtained for \$8.50 in U.S. dollars or the equivalent in other currency by sending your order to Plaza y Janes, S.A. Export Department, Virgen de Guadalupe 21-33, Esplugas De Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain.

One of the most exciting UFO cases recently brought to the attention of the news media and known as the Rendlesham Forest UFO is the subject for the book titled *Skycrash - A Cosmic Cover Up*, authored by the prime investigators, Brenda Butler and Dot

Street in collaboration with Jenny Randles. Published by Neville Spearman, Ltd, in England. The price was not available at the time of this writing. Some of us had the privilege of meeting Dot Street and Jenny Randles when they attended the UFO Conference at the University of Nebraska in November 1983.

MUFON still has an adequate supply of the best seller *Clear Intent* (paperback) for \$8.95, plus \$1.50 for postage and handling. We will maintain this outstanding book on our publications list.

News'n'Notes

George Fawcett, MUFON Assistant State Director, North Carolina, reports on some of his recent activities on behalf of ufology. Aside from several speeches to various civic groups and appearances on three local TV stations, George says:

"From September 8-15th, I had a two-window display in downtown Lincolnton, N.C., for their 13th Annual Apple Festival. The exhibit consisted of photographs, slides, maps, illustrations, books, scrapbooks, models and posters of UFO matters worldwide, which has drawn a great deal of interest and comments. 'How to Join MUFON' was one of the many posters in the windows which included at least 100 framed photographs and almost 95 UFO books and publications, including the *MUFON Journal*, *MUFON UFO Investigator's Manual*, and a copy of each of the annual *MUFON Proceedings*."

LETTERS, Continued

been a real UFO, there would have been a few freakouts, but again, people freak out everyday.)

An "alien" stepped up on a pedestal and made a short speech. A very authentic-looking alien, too. Anyway, once again no one freaked out or ran for the exits. They (the audience) applauded when he finished.

If this was some sort of test for human reaction to a landing, then my hat is off to the powers-that-be. If it was simple coincidence, then such an example should be proof enough that people are ready and can handle it.

-FRANK TOBEY

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION

1. Title of publication: MUFON UFO JOURNAL (USP 002970) (ISSN 0270-6822)
 2. Date of filing: Sept. 25, 1984
 3. Frequency of issue: monthly
 4. Location of known office of publication: 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Guadalupe, Texas 78155
 5. Address of the headquarters: 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155
 6. Names and complete addresses of publisher, editor, and managing editor:
 Publisher: Walter H. Andrus, Jr., 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155
 Editor: Dennis W. Stacy
 P.O. Box 12434, San Antonio, TX 78212
 7. Owner: MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC. (MUFON), 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155

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

The Mutual UFO Network, Inc. is exempt from Federal Income Tax under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. MUFON is a publicly supported organization of the type described in Section 509(a)(2).

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

9. For completion by nonprofit organizations authorized to mail at special rates: Publication is issued by an organization eligible for these rates in accordance with Section 423.1 and 422.2.

10. Extent and nature of circulation:

Average No. copies each issue during preceding 12 months	Actual No. copies of single issue published nearest to filing date
A. Total No. copies printed	1460
B. Paid circulation	
1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales	0
2. Mail subscriptions	1287
C. Total paid circulation	1287
D. Free distributions by mail, carrier or other means: samples, complimentary, and other free copies	63
E. Total distribution	1277
F. Copies not distributed	
1. Office use, left over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing	112
2. Returns from news agents	0
G. Total	1400

(signed) Walter H. Andrus, Jr.
Publisher

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

by
Walt Andrus

The second printing of *Clear Intent* was sold out immediately after its release on August 21st. Prentice-Hall publicist, Renae Biale, has advised that the third printing will be available in late September or early October. Ms. Biale has suggested that MUFON's nationwide publicity campaign be delayed until the book stores have adequate supplies. The local emphasis must be coordinated with the managers of your respective bookstores throughout the nation, since we cannot predict a specific date. Each local UFO group should use their own ingenuity in promoting the book from personal handouts on MUFON, UFO displays or videotapes of UFO documentaries.

It is a pleasure to announce that Barry J. Greenwood, co-author of *Clear Intent* and Assistant State Director for Massachusetts has additionally accepted the Staff Position of Historian for the Mutual UFO Network. He has one of the finest personal collections of UFO literature, videotapes, books, publications, documents and photographs in the world today. David M. Jacobs, Ph.D., author of *The UFO Controversy in America* and a MUFON Consultant in History, can attest to this fact after his recent tour of Barry's UFO library.

On October 18, 1984, *PM Magazine*, a syndicated national TV program, featured a segment on the work of the Mutual UFO Network, providing favorable exposure to 14 or 15 million viewers. Considering that the crew of *PM Magazine* in San Antonio filmed for four hours in the MUFON office, only a small portion appeared on the network program.

According to the MUFON Bylaws, Regional Directors on the Board of Directors will be elected each year to four year terms. In 1985, the Central Regional Director will be elected by a

postal ballot prior to the annual corporate meeting in St. Louis on June 30, 1985. This will be followed in 1986 for the Canadian Director, 1987 for the Eastern Region, and in 1988 the Western Regional Director will be elected. The Central Region is composed of twenty states in the middle of the United States starting on the west with North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas and extending to the eastern boundary composed of Michigan, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee and Alabama. Charles L. Tucker, Indiana State Director, is the present Central Regional Director. Only current MUFON members residing in the Central Region are eligible to vote or to be candidates for this distinguished responsibility. To nominate a person, permission must be obtained from the prospective candidate so as to be assured that they will accept if elected. The names of all candidates for the Central Region must be submitted in writing to MUFON in Seguin, Texas, before April 15, 1985 so a mail ballot may be executed in adequate time. A Regional Director may succeed himself/herself if duly elected to a second four year term, but may not hold his or her office for more than two successive full terms. The name of Dan R. Wright, State Director for Michigan, has been submitted for nomination.

Vance George Reed, State Director for Colorado, has selected Mrs. Judy Brigham of Wheat Ridge to be the Assistant State Director. Ed Planz has appointed Edward O. Brown to the post of State Section Director for the Alabama Counties of Tuscaloosa, Fayette, Lamar, Pickens, and Greene. Mr. Brown recently retired as the Director of Public Relations for the University of Alabama and is active as an amateur radio operator in the MUFON Net with the call letters N4JUB. Ed has been a member of MUFON for ten years.

The UFO Study Group of Greater St. Louis is hosting the MUFON 1985 UFO Symposium at the Chase Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri on June 28, 29 and 30. The theme for the 1985 symposium is "UFOs: The Burden of Proof." Mark your calendar now so that you may plan your vacation to "Meet Me in St. Louis."

Marge Christensen has announced that the National UFO Information Week has been scheduled for mid-August of 1985. Every state organization may now start making their plans, displays, public events, etc. so they will be prepared. As MUFON Public Relations Director, Marge has initiated a newsletter uniquely titled "P.I.P.E. Line" (Public Information and Public Education). It has been established as a means of providing members of our National Committee on Public Information with an up-to-date account each month of their progress in the areas of public information and public education. It will also provide the members of this committee with a "pipeline" for sharing their ideas and suggestions. The area coordinators are Paul Cerny, West Coast; Tom Deuley, Southwest States; Dan Wright, Central States; and Marge Christensen, East Coast. Committee Assignments consist of the following: Walt Webb and Dennis Stacy, Press Releases; Barry Greenwood, Tom Gates, and Dan Wright, compile slide presentation available to members for P.R.; John Schuessler and Walt Andrus, contact electronic media and wire services; Tom Deuley, Art Director, to design posters for National UFO Information Week; and Marge Christensen, coordinate all State P.R. Directors, publish "P.I.P.E. Line," work with area coordinators, furnish copies of syllabi for UFO courses, edit MUFON Newsletter, and coordinate 1985 UFO Information Week.

(continued on page 19)