

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

NUMBER 209

SEPTEMBER 1985


Founded 1967

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.

\$1.50



DELPHOS, KANSAS

MUFON UFO JOURNAL
(USPS 002-970)
(ISSN 0270-6822)
103 Oldtowne Rd.
Seguin, Texas 78155-4099

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

JAMES LEMING
SIMONE MENDEZ
Staff Artists

TED PHILLIPS
Landing Trace Cases

JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
Medical Cases

LEONARD STRINGFIELD
UFO Crash/Retrieval

WALTER N. WEBB
Astronomy

NORMA E. SHORT
DWIGHT CONNELLY

DENNIS HAUCK
RICHARD H. HALL
ROBERT V. PRATT

Editor/Publishers Emeritus

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 1985 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

Herein, Ted Phillips' original report on the Delphos, Kansas, physical trace landing case, prior to an update of subsequent investigations; Jim Oberg's "snipe hunt" for electrophonic signals from space; Dan Wright's trenchant criticisms of UFO field investigations, and remedy for same; an exchange of letters between England's Randles and Ridpath on Rendlesham; and my own synopsis of Bill Moore's St. Louis Symposium speech, in addition, of course, to our regular features.

In the future look forward to articles on the lifting power of UFOs, a survey and pictures of National UFO Information Week activities, and a catch-up collection of recent sightings.

In this issue

DOODLEBUGS & LITTLE GREEN MEN, by Dennis Stacy	3
INVESTIGATOR'S JIGSAW by Dan Wright	4
SNIPE HUNT IN SPACE by James Oberg	5
DELPHOS, KANSAS, CASE by Ted Phillips	8
LETTERS by Readers	15
THE NIGHT SKY by Walter Webb	18
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE by Walt Andrus	20

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 1985 by the Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas" is included.

DOODLEBUGS & LITTLE GREEN MEN

By Dennis Stacy

In 1950 the first of the post World War II UFO books, *Behind the Flying Saucers*, appeared in the nation's bookstores and was an immediate success. Surprisingly, or perhaps not so surprisingly considering some of its revelations, the author was well-known Hollywood columnist, Frank X. Scully, whose "Scully's Scrapbook" graced the pages of "Weekly Variety."

Among Scully's more startling pronouncements was the claim that at least four flying saucers had already crashed or landed on our planet, resulting in the retrieval of some 36 bodies, all between 36 and 40 inches high. The first of these was reportedly found outside Aztec, New Mexico, and contained 16 dead bodies. The saucer, 99 feet in diameter and based on a measurement system of nines as opposed to tens, supposedly sustained only a broken porthole in the crash/landing from which its occupants succumbed.

"It made a nice story, except that if you consider Scully's source, I think you'll agree it never happened," author William Moore (*The Roswell Incident*) told the MUFON symposium in St. Louis. Unfortunately, added Moore, it spawned a whole series of similar rumors and stories of crashed saucers in the American southwest that continue to pop up and plague the UFO literature. Invariably, wreckage and alien crew are surreptitiously recovered by military authorities and spirited off to Hangar 18 at Wright-Patterson Field, Dayton, Ohio. Moore should know, as his own book, co-authored with Charles Berlitz, has sometimes been accused of repeating the same tale.

DR. GEE

Scully's informant was the late Silas M. Newton, a confidence man who could apparently charm the dimples off a golf ball (he was an excellent amateur player) and his



William Moore at St. Louis

— Dennis Stacy

cohort in the charade, a mysterious "Dr. Gee," identified by Moore as one Leo Arnold Julius GeBauer. Newton, who had known Scully since 1944, would later introduce GeBauer as a prominent "magnetic scientist" who had been privileged to examine the crashed saucer. "Today we would call GeBauer an amateur inventor," said Moore. "but he had taught himself electronics at a time when there was little formal training in the field. He was a shrewd operator, too, with a considerable FBI file by the time he and Newton met, but nowhere near as intelligent as Newton." As early as 1938, GeBauer had been investigated for violation of the White Salve Traffic Act. An ardent Nazi sympathizer, he operated under at least eleven aliases.

The madness to Newton's method was designed to bolster a device developed by GeBauer known as the "Doodlebug." GeBauer claimed the

doodlebug could detect fluctuations in the earth's magnetic field which pinpointed oil, gas and other deposits. Allegedly, it could also measure a person's health the same way. By the time he and Newton met in the summer of 1949, GeBauer had become involved with a wealthy Denver industrialist and inventor in his own right, Herman Flader. GeBauer convincingly demonstrated the ability of the doodlebug to determine the depth of several new water wells on Flader's property, and the result was Colorado Geophysics, Inc., a partnership between the two, with Flader putting up the funding for three more doodlebugs and GeBauer supplying the technology. Flader managed to drag a few friends into the scheme; GeBauer managed to spend the money. Newton met GeBauer through Flader and quickly

(continued on page 16)

INVESTIGATOR'S JIGSAW

By Dan Wright

THE PUZZLE

To the community of voluntary investigators, the UFO phenomenon is akin to solving a dozen jigsaw puzzles at once, each with thousands of pieces thrown together and whose ultimate shapes and sizes are unknown. Moreover, we are given only one piece at a time to examine.

The most distressing problem, however, is that the great majority of pieces are flawed and must be discarded after examination. Some are wafer thin and fall apart as soon as we touch them, while others have only a small nodule out of place that is not easily detected. Over three decades of attempts to discover the parameters of this multi-various puzzle, an alarming number of flawed pieces that should have been scrapped were included instead, distorting the overall picture and leading us to premature — sometimes disastrous — conclusions that harmed our credibility as puzzle solvers.

It is certainly time that privately funded investigative organizations acted their age. Yet, we continue to err with such regularity that even the most sophisticated computerized cataloguing system cannot eliminate the inclusion of flawed cases — IFOs. Little wonder that scientists have not accepted the proposition in large numbers.

The integrity of individual reports submitted, after all, is dependent on the conclusions of the field investigator. If the case is handled sloppily, or if the investigator is not competent to discern an IFO from a UFO, an exciting encounter is unintentionally fabricated from evidence of a satellite, an advertising plane or the myriad stimuli that routinely fool the public.

OBJECTIVITY

The bottom line in our

investigative conclusions is objectivity. Far too many of us simply have an attitude problem: To find a meteor in what at first appeared to be an anomalous event is viewed as somehow a failure, a disappointment and waste of time. And so there is a tendency to give the benefit of doubt to factors that don't fit, to ignore any impediments in the witness' account that are counter to our predispositions.

What we don't know about UFOs is obviously considerable, and understandably so. But it is inexcusable when we fail to grasp IFO events.

Some of what we must all be familiar with involves nothing more sophisticated than sitting out on our back lawns on a starry night. Monitoring the various satellites for direction, luminosity and duration affords basic insights. Similarly, the several prominent meteor showers occurring every year offer each of us the opportunity to study characteristics such as peak periods, sound and vapor trails associated with them. Observing large and small aircraft is valuable in terms of their differing configurations of anti-collision and running lights. The failure of most of us to make such observations indicates a fundamental lack of commitment.

Relatedly, it is safe to assume that few investigators are acquainted with the ad plane companies in their state. Many do not renew necessary contacts with state and local police departments, airports and military bases. They have never purchased an investigative handbook or a UFO encyclopedia. In effect, they demonstrate a disinterest in learning the basics of their purported avocation.

If we remain ignorant of radar functioning or the optical properties of cameras and binoculars, if we continue individually without a thorough grounding in past UFO events and principles conveyed by Hynek, Vallee, Fowler and others, we only serve to

muddy the waters.

Through the energy of Hopkins and the psychology professionals with whom he collaborated, we now know a great deal more about abduction sequences. And because of the unselfish commitment of Greenwood, Fawcett, Gersten and Todd, we have documented the true nature of government involvement in the subject. As important as these areas are to UFO research, they have little practical value to the great share of CUFOS and MUFON card holders. Yet, it seems that far too many of us are much more interested in discussing nasal implants or the Bentwaters incident than learning to properly use our own sighting report forms.

The crucial part of any investigation is the witness interview, which is more of an art than a science. Proper interviewing is largely a matter of experience. But an appalling lack of common sense has pervaded the process, thereby distorting thousands of cases and rendering them useless. Indeed, a primary reason for the UNICAT system presently being developed is to eliminate a significant share of cases on file wherein the investigation was conducted shoddily, to find that core of reports which stand the harsh light of scrutiny.

BIASES

Because of investigator bias and sloppiness, inadequate preparation is made before the interview; improper settings are selected; exaggerated body language by the interviewer elicits hyperbole in the retelling; ineffective listening causes important points to be missed or misconstrued; UFO-related jargon intimates the witness; and, most importantly, leading witnesses with either-or questions and references to the "craft" or the "UFO" affirms a

(continued on page 17)

SNIPE HUNT IN SPACE

BY JAMES OBERG

Practically every kid who's ever been involved with the outdoors has been involved, just once, with a "snipe hunt." On advice of older and wiser kids, you sit up all night with a sack, calling out "Here, snipe! Here, snipe!", while back at the campfire the older and wiser kids are rolling with laughter.

The analogy occurred to me very early on the morning of April 19, when, with a handful of other volunteer space program employees, I stood far out on the NASA Johnson Space Center (Houston) antenna range preparing to hold an electromagnetic sack and call hopefully into the sky.

We were there to attempt to record very low frequency radio noise from the reentry fireball plasma trail of "Discovery," as shuttle mission 51-DR came to a fiery climax with a fly-by of the Houston area en route to a Florida touchdown.

RADIO NOISES

Such radio noise, in the half to five kilohertz region (that is, with wavelengths of dozens of miles!), was still hypothetical. It had not even been suspected until, the previous November, more than a dozen Houston area eyewitnesses reported strange "hissing" noises simultaneously accompanying the spectacular pre-dawn overflight of the descending STS 51-A mission.

Such entirely unexpected perceptions brought to mind the old traditions of anomalous "electro-phonetic sound" which, on at least three hundred well documented occasions over the past several centuries, accompanied the perceptions of very bright fireball meteors. While many scientists quickly dismissed such accounts as psychologically induced, others suspected that the super-hot plasma trails might be emitting radio noise which was somehow converted into an aural perception. And in fact,



Lardas, Kenney, Oberg

artificial radio noise at those frequencies was shown to cause the perception of "hissing" among some — but not all — test subjects.

The "hissing" phenomenon associated with shuttle entries seemed to provide a serendipitous key to solving the old mystery. Here was a situation where well-instrumented researchers could lie in wait for the expected, predictable appearance of what had hitherto been an entirely random occurrence.

The research was relevant to the "UFO mystery" in many ways. First, it was a genuine atmospheric electromagnetic phenomenon for which science had no real explanation. Second, the "electro-phonetic sounds" phenomenon rested entirely on anecdotal evidence and a few attempts at laboratory controlled experiments (as mentioned, these radio frequencies DID seem to generate "hisses" in the heads of SOME test subjects). Thirdly, the instrumentation being used was very similar to radio gear long proposed as

"UFO detectors," which were supposed to notice anomalous radio noise. Success in this "shuttle sounds" search should prove helpful to researchers in ufology, least of all as mere encouragement, and possibly also as demonstration of technological feasibility and of possible new electromagnetic radiation generation and propagation mechanics within the atmosphere.

TEST RUN

So here we were on a crisp spring morning, just after sunrise, with the mission's landing already put off one rev by bad weather, tuning in a receiver, tape unit, and directional loop antenna. If such static existed, it might just show up, although the expected range — about a hundred miles — was so great that discouraged NASA scientists had decided not to even try on this mission. We weren't that smart, so we were out

(continued on page 7)



Loop Antennas

SNIPE, continued

on the range when the NASA scientists — foolish boys! — were snug in their beds. But since I had been instrumental in instigating and encouraging this whole observation plan, I felt a duty to be there to see what was caught. Half a world away, simultaneously but late in the evening of the same day in Australia, physicist Colin Keay (who

had written several papers on the electrophonic phenomenon and who excitedly joined the “brain trust” when I had sent him a letter describing the November experiences) sat by his telephone, waiting for news.

With a radio tuned to the Mission Control Center feed, we kept track of the orbiter’s descent. It crossed California, New Mexico, then was in radio contact with a radio site on the Johnson Space Center itself. I scanned the sky with binoculars, seeking for any visual hint of its passing, but saw nothing. Pat Kenney, another space engineer, listened to an earplug hooked to the antenna; our colleague Mark Lardas kept a visual lookout; another engineer watched an oscilloscope for any “signal” above background noise.

At the time of closest approach, with the orbiter doing Mach 6 at 200,000 feet, about a hundred miles due south of us, the background static of sporadic cracklings became a continuous roar. The line on the oscilloscope humped dramatically from the normal quivering flat line. For five seconds this abnormal phenomenon continued, and then the signals fell back to normal.

Were we capturing the electromagnetic snipe? The widetrack tape sucked it all in and stored it safely away. But weeks of analysis with a frequency analyzer, on a space/time-available no-budget basis, still lay ahead. The indications were suggestive, but not overwhelming. Still, we were excited enough to miss hearing the spaceship’s sonic boom — which everybody else outside at JSC seems to have heard, eight minutes after the passage.

POSITIVE RESULTS

Later we learned that the analysis had indeed been positive. SOMETHING different from background noise had blared briefly through the electromagnetic spectrum. It was too weak and elusive to analyze more precisely, but it was there, and future expeditions will seek to chase it down more aggressively. Keay may even fly up from down under to be on hand.

This particular space shuttle mission had been only the fourth to fly past Houston: 41-B in February 1984 revealed its predawn fire trail to only a lucky few observers far enough south to escape the Houston cloud cover; 51-A in November was close enough and advertised enough to pull out enough pre-dawn witnesses so that many of them sensed the “hiss”; 51-C in January was a DOD mission so its midday flyover followed a classified ground track (many of us still heard the sonic boom).

Future flyovers look less frequent than initially hoped: some missions will be landing at Edwards AFB in California, while others will come in from 57 degree high inclination orbits, with their plasma trails across the Great Lakes. And even normal Florida landing approaches can fly past Houston up to hundreds of miles north or south. Hence it may take up to a year to “capture” more nearby — descent plasma trail radio noise, if — and it is still an if — such a phenomenon is real.

We’ll be out there, hunting for electromagnetic snipe. Open the sack, careful, now! Anything inside? Hissss.....

MUFON RADIO NET

DISTRICTS

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

DELPHOS, KANSAS, CASE

By Ted Phillips

INTRODUCTION

In order to set the stage for a series of previously unpublished articles to follow on "Delphos Revisited" by Walt Andrus, the Editors feel that it is imperative that current readers be familiar with Mr. Phillip's original investigations taken from the MUFON file.

A brightly glowing object was observed very close to the ground (CEII) at a farm near Delphos, Kansas on November 2, 1971 at 1900 C.S.T. Delphos is located 11 miles northeast of Minneapolis, in Ottawa County, Kansas. The site of the observation was on the Durel Johnson farm, half a mile north and half a mile east of Delphos. The Johnson farm is located in a flat section of the state composed primarily of cultivated fields and scattered tree lines.


The witnesses were Durel Johnson, aged 52, Erma Johnson, 49, and Ronald "Ronnie" Johnson, 16. Possible confirming witnesses were Elton Smith, School Principal, Delphos, and Lester Ernsberger of Minneapolis. An investigation was conducted at the site on November 3, 1971, by Sheriff Ralph Enlow, Undersheriff Harlan Enlow, and Kansas Highway Patrol Trooper Kenneth Yager. Further investigations were made on December 4, 1971 and January 11, 1972 by Mr. Phillips.

(Color photographs of the scene were made by Frank E. Shrimplin, MUFON State Section Director from Valley Fields, Kansas on November 4, 1971. He was accompanied by William E. Hurtig, a Methodist Minister, now living in Silver Lake, Kansas. Reverend Hurtig lived for 20 years on the farm presently owned by the Johnsons.)

-Walt Andrus

THE OBSERVATION

At approximately 7:00 p.m.



Ted Phillips

- Dennis Stacy

C.S.T., November 2, 1971, Ronald Johnson was tending the sheep, accompanied by his dog. Mrs. Johnson called from the back door of the Johnson house asking Ronald to come to supper; he replied that he would be through in a short time. After Mr. and Mrs. Johnson had finished their meal, Mrs. Johnson called the boy again, this time he didn't reply. Mrs. Johnson stated that she didn't see anything of an unusual nature, such as a glow and did not hear any sound.

Ronald stated that as he worked in the sheep pen and just after his mother called to him the first time, he heard a rumbling sound and the object was suddenly illuminated. Ronald and the dog did not notice the object prior to the sound. The object was illuminated from top to bottom by multicolored light. The illumination did not come from individual lights but rather it was a mass of varied colors over the entire

surface. An actual metallic surface could not be seen, however, the boy could make out a definite shape. The object appeared to be slightly domed at the top and base with a slight bulge at the center. There was a bright glow between the base and the ground. The object was hovering about 2 feet above the ground, and at no time did the witness see the object touch the ground.

The witness was about 75 feet from the object and had a fairly clear view of it. Upon seeing the object he stood quite still, and noted that the dog was very quiet. Ronald stated that the colors were blue, red and orange and that the colors did not change at any time. The object had an estimated diameter of 9 feet and appeared to be about 10 feet high. He could not see any surface details because of the glow, which was

(continued next page)

DELPHOS, continued

quite bright as the trees in the area were illuminated, as was the ground. The boy said that it hurt his eyes when he looked directly at the object, and for several days following the incident his eyes were sore, and he suffered from headaches.

The sheep were obviously disturbed by the presence of the object, or by the sound as they were bellowing. Mr. Johnson stated that the sheep would jump from the pen each evening for a week after the incident.

The boy was sure that he would have seen the object before the rumbling sound began had it been illuminated. Ronald likened the sound to that of an old washing machine which vibrates. After several minutes the object brightened at the base. The glow at the base enlarged somewhat and the object began to ascend with considerable speed at an angle, passing over a nearby shed by about 4 feet. As it cleared the shed the sound changed to a high-pitched sound, like that of a jet aircraft. As the sound changed the boy was suddenly unable to see — he claimed to have lost his vision completely. I asked him if he could see spots in his vision, as one would following a photographic flash; he said he could not. (We may assume — and this would be an assumption only — that it was at this time that Mrs. Johnson called the boy the second time. As the object had ascended and was to the south of the house at a point not visible from the back door, Mrs. Johnson would not have heard or seen anything unusual.) Ronald stated that, while unable to see, he could hear the sound fading into the distance.

REGAINS SIGHT

After what seemed to be several minutes, the boy began to regain his sight. He saw the object in the sky and ran to the house. He told his parents that a flying saucer or something had landed and was still visible in the sky. Mr. and Mrs. Johnson both stated that the boy was frightened and excited when he entered the house. They didn't believe the boy at first and he became very aggravated.

Mr. Johnson then went outside and saw a bright light in the southern sky. He called out and all three observed the light at a point 180° due south. They described the light as being very bright and at least half the apparent diameter of the full moon. I asked if it would have been as bright and large as an automobile light 100 feet away and they said it was larger and brighter. As they observed the light, which was the color of an arcwelder, it was decreasing in size, moving into the distance. They watched the light for a brief time and then proceeded to the landing site. They did not see the object again.

As Mr. and Mrs. Johnson and Ronald walked around the shed adjacent to the site, they saw, in the darkness, a glowing circle. The soil surface was glowing a bright grey-white. Portions of nearby trees reportedly glowed also. Mr. and Mrs. Johnson touched the ring surface, but it was not warm. The texture of the soil surface felt strange, like a slick crust, as if the soil was crystalized. Mrs. Johnson noted an immediate numbing at her finger tips. She rubbed her hand against her leg in an attempt to remove the dirt and that portion of her leg also became numb. She likened the numbness to that of a local anesthetic. Mr. Johnson noted the numbness in his fingers also. For about two weeks this condition prevented Mrs. Johnson from taking pulse readings on patients at the rest home where she works. She stated that she simply could not feel anything with her finger tips. Mr. Johnson said that the numbness left his fingers in a much shorter time. They did not consult a doctor. Mrs. Johnson ran to the house and picked up their polaroid camera, returned to the site, and photographed it. Upon returning to the house, Mr. Johnson called Mr. Willard Critchfield, Editor of the Delphos Republican; according to Mr. Critchfield the time was about 8:00 p.m. No action was taken at that time.

The following day — November 3, 1971 — Mr. Johnson and Ronald drove into Delphos and talked with Mrs. Thaddia Smith. I quote from Mrs. Smith's report given to Sheriff Enlow on the afternoon of November 3, 1971: "While visiting with Mr. Johnson and

Ronnie during the noon hour, Wednesday, November 3, I learned some of the details of the previous night. This is the way it was told to me.

"Ronnie, aged 16, accompanied by his dog was taking care of his flock of sheep at approximately 7:00 p.m. when suddenly he saw a blinding, brilliant light, and heard a loud rumbling sound that turned into a sound similar to a jet engine, and then the light ascended into the heavens in a southerly direction from an area in a shelter belt of trees behind a hog house near the sheep pen.

"He was nearly paralyzed with fear, but finally managed to run to the house and called his parents out of the house to look at the light which was still visible high in the heavens to the south of their house.

"The boy and his dog were still afraid. The dog wandered around the yard with his head up in the air as though still looking for the object.

"The family went to the area where the object was seen ascending from (sic). There they found a large circle on the ground that had a fluorescent glow in the dark. Mrs. Johnson took a picture of the area.

"I, after listening to their experience, a little skeptical, having my curiosity aroused and being a newspaper reporter, decided to go to the Johnson farm home to take a picture of the area where the object had been.

"I was accompanied by my husband, Lester Smith, and son-in-law, Kenneth McCullick, who were also curious.

"Upon arriving at the scene I knew instantly that something had left evidence that it had been there.

"The circle was still very distinct and plain to see. The soil was dried and crusted. The circle or ring was approximately 8 feet across, the center of the ring and outside area were still muddy from recent rains. The area of the ring that was dried was about a foot across and was very light in color.

"The object had crushed a dead tree to the ground either when it landed or took off, and from appearance had broken a limb of a live tree when it landed. The broken limb was most

(continued on page 12)



DELPHOS, KANSAS WITNESS: RONALD JOHNSON AGE 16 AND HIS DOG SNOWBALL SAW A BRIGHTLY GLOWING OBJECT APPROXIMATELY 9 FT. IN DIAMETER AND 10 FT. HIGH, HOVERING ABOUT TWO FEET ABOVE THE GROUND WITHIN 75 FT. OF THE WITNESS.



RONALD JOHNSON AND HIS FATHER DUREL JOHNSON AGE 52 HOLDING GEIGER COUNTER USED BY UNDERSHERIFF HARLEN ENLOW TO MEASURE FOR RADIATION DURING HIS INVESTIGATION.



PHOTO MADE BY TED PHILLIPS, MUFON SPECIALIST IN LANDING TRACE CASES ON DECEMBER 4, 1971. NOTE WATER ON GROUND, BUT SNOW DID NOT MELT IN RING AREA. THE SOIL WOULD NOT ABSORB WATER. DEHYDRATION OF SOIL EXTENDED TO A DEPTH OF 14 INCHES IN RING.



THIS LIMB WAS APPARENTLY TWISTED AND BROKEN DUE TO FORCES ASSOCIATED WITH THE HOVERING OBJECT. NOTE STANDING WATER AT THE BASE OF THIS TREE, SINCE SNOW WAS MELTING.

DELPHOS, continued

unusual, it would snap and break as though it had been dead for quite some time, yet it was green under the bark, and the upper area still had green leaves clinging to its branches. However the lower area was free of all leaves and some of the bark on the lower areas looked as though it had been blistered and had a whitish cast.

"I took a picture of the area and went back to the newspaper office to write my story. Thinking about the almost unbelievable things I had seen I decided to call the Concordia Weather Bureau to find out if they had seen any unidentifiable objects on radar, and was told their radar had not been turned on and they advised me to notify the Ottawa County Sheriff's Office. I called radio station KSAL in Salina to report the incident. They also advised me to report to the sheriff's office, which I did."

The above report was written by Mrs. Thaddia Smith and given to Ottawa County Sheriff Enlow.

SECOND REPORT

I now quote from a written report by Undersheriff Harlan Enlow given to me on January 11, 1972:

"Report of Harlan Enlow, Undersheriff, dated November 3, 1971.

"At approx. 1:30 p.m. 11-03-71 this Officer received a call from Thaddia Smith, a reporter for the *Delphos Republican*, advising that a UFO had been reported at 7:00 p.m. 11-02-71 at the Durel Johnson farm 1 mile north and ½ mile east of Delphos. Mrs. Smith advised that she had reported the incident to the Weather Bureau at Concordia, Kansas and to KSAL Radio in Salina, Kansas, and that both had advised her to report it to this office.

"At approx. 2:00 p.m. 11-03-71 Sheriff Ralph Enlow, Kansas Highway Patrol Trooper Kenneth Yager, and Undersheriff Harlan Enlow went to the Johnson farm and talked to Mr. and Mrs. Johnson and their son Ronnie who had observed the UFO the previous night.

"We were advised by Ronnie that at approx. 7:00 p.m. 11-02-71 while out in the sheep pen with the sheep he had

heard a loud noise and saw a bright light coming from a shelter belt behind the hog house. As he watched, the light rose into the sky and left in a southerly direction. Ronnie ran into the house and got his parents who came out and saw the object in the sky still headed South.

"Mr. Johnson took us out behind the hog house where we observed a ring shaped somewhat like a donut with a hole in the middle. The ring was completely dry with the hole in the middle and outside of the ring mud. There were limbs broken from a tree and a dead tree broken off, there. There was a slight discoloration on the trees. We were given a picture taken the previous evening by Mrs. Johnson which showed that the ring glowed in the dark. Undersheriff Enlow took a soil sample from the dried ring and photographed it.

"The soil sample taken was almost white in color and very dry. We used a Civil Defense Radiological Monitor to determine that the soil was not radioactive. The soil sample and photographs are stored in the vault in the Sheriff's Office pending further investigation by the proper authorities.

"On 11-03-71 Mr. Lester Ernsbarger of 416 Argyle St. in Minneapolis advised Deputy Sheriff Leonard Simpson that at approx. 7:30 p.m. 11-02-71 he had observed a bright light descending in the sky in the Delphos area.

Signed Harlan Enlow, Undersheriff"

FIELD INVESTIGATION

On the evening of December 2, 1971, I received a telephone call from Dr. J. Allen Hynek. During that conversation Dr. Hynek gave me the basic details of the Delphos sighting. I immediately placed call to Sheriff Enlow and advised him that I would be in the area on Saturday morning, December 4, 1971. Sheriff Enlow offered to contact Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, which he did.

When I arrived at the small Kansas town of Minneapolis I found Sheriff Enlow in his office awaiting my arrival. We discussed the details of the case briefly and I was given a soil sample taken by Sheriff Enlow on November 3, 1971, the day following the alleged

landing. Sheriff Enlow and I then went to the Johnson farm which is located 11 miles north of Minneapolis.

When we arrived at the farm the temperature was 37° and the snow was melting. At the farm the condition of the lot was that of a bog. Mr. Johnson and Ronnie met us at the car and I was impressed with their sincere interest in the incident which had taken place there 32 days before. I began by talking with young Ronald. I would describe them simply as typical residents of the mid-west, having a rural background. The boy and his father are very pleasant and calm, not really excited by their unusual experience, but quite curious as to what the UFO may have been and what could have produced a ground marking such as the one found at the alleged landing site.

THE WITNESSES

I discussed the observation with Ronald as long as the limited time would permit. He seemed sincere, and not too interested in UFOs or space flight. Ronald stated that he had read a few books on UFOs in the past. He said that it had been at least a year since he had heard or read anything on the subject. He stated that he had hoped to see a UFO someday but didn't believe that he would. To my knowledge there have been no UFO sightings in the central Kansas area during the last year. He did not at any time attempt to embellish his story with wild comments or theories. I believe that he tried very hard to answer each question correctly and to the best of his ability. Durel Johnson stated that he and Mrs. Johnson had indeed rushed outside to see the brilliant object in the southern sky. Unfortunately, neither Mr. Johnson or the boy were able to make any really sound estimates of the time periods during the observations. As they are not trained observers there were numerous details which they could not give with any certainty.

GROUND TRACES

Following the discussion of the sighting we went to the landing site. In

(continued next page)

DELPHOS, continued

order to reach the site one must cross the farm lot which by then was extremely muddy. The melting snow had left a great deal of standing water along with the mud. As we approached the site we walked around a small shed and through scattered trees. To my amazement there was the ring, with snow melting from the ground in all the surrounding area, still to be seen after 32 days. The ring was perfectly outlined by the unmelted snow. Although the surrounding soil was extremely moist, we found that if the snow was removed from any portion of the ring the soil directly beneath the snow was dry and light brown in color, in contrast with the black, moist soil in the ring center and around the ring.

We removed snow from one section of the ring and introduced water into the exposed ring area; the soil would not permit the water to pass through the surface. This was most remarkable, as there had been several inches of rain and snow between November 2 and December 4. Mr. Johnson and I next removed a sample from the ring. The sample contained a high concentration of a white substance, and this white material was evident in all of the ring soil that we exposed. The particles were not to be found in the soil in the center of the ring, or in the surrounding soil. The ring soil was quite dry to a depth of at least twelve inches. The soil outside the ring was also sampled and was simply black and wet to a depth of at least 8 inches. I cannot imagine soil exposed to the elements remaining so dry for such a long period of time.

THE SITE

The site is located approximately 250 feet to the north of the farmhouse. The ground at the site is devoid of all plant life. A shed is located 23 feet from the center of the ring. The shed is 27 feet long and 4 feet high at the side towards the ring, and 5 feet high on the south side. A wooden fence 51 feet long runs west from the shed to the sheep shed where the witness stood. Ronnie stood at a point 10 feet south of the fence.

Between the ring and the shed is a dead tree, located 145° S. at a distance of 16 feet from the ring center. This tree was dead before the incident, but was standing. The stump is 7 inches high and 7 inches in diameter, and the break indicates that the tree may have been broken as the object made its descent along the assumed entry path. It appears that the tree was pushed towards the ring but fell, possibly due to suction on the eastern side of the trunk, at a right angle to the flight path. The fallen tree is 11 feet long and careful examination failed to reveal any marks at any point along its length. This tree could have been pulled over with a tractor and chain, however, one would expect to find chain marks. Sheriff Enlow and I discussed this possibility and feel that this was not the case.

Also adjacent to the flight path, one finds two 6-inch diameter trees, 125° South at 20 feet and 180° S. at 13 feet. The flight path would have been between these two trees. Their limbs extend towards the flight path and are 11 feet apart at a height of 12.5 feet above the ground. Two trees are located at 325° North at 5 feet from the ring center (1 ft. from the ring edge) and at 35° N. at 5 feet from ring center. These trees reportedly glowed and do show a slight discoloration on the ring side. A large broken limb was found still hanging at 260° W. a distance of 11 feet from ring center. The limb is broken at a point 8.5 feet above ground. The limb was broken downward, and the diameter at the break is 3 inches. When extended to its original position the limb would have been quite near the ring's edge. Close examination of this limb showed several possible impact marks. One mark in particular is of interest on a section of the limb which would have been very near the circle. About a 1-inch length of the bark was peeled back exposing a green surface. This area was definitely not a natural fault in the bark. This limb was alive at the time of the alleged landing, and it would have taken considerable pressure to have broken it.

Entry into the site would not have been possible to the north or east as those areas contain numerous undisturbed trees. A vertical descent or ascent would be out of the question as

the tree branches directly above the ring were not damaged. The broken limb did show what appeared to be heat blisters, while branches were green at the center but would snap at the slightest pressure. The flight path would appear to have been as Ronald described it: between two trees, over the fallen tree, over the low shed and to the south. An object with the dimensions described by the witness could have made its way into, and out of, the landing site. A landing by any conventional aircraft is completely out of the question.

After taking the appropriate measurements and photographs we returned to the house and discussed the observation briefly once again.

I then drove back to Delphos and talked with a representative of the Concordia Weather Bureau by telephone. He stated that the meteorologist had visited the site and made a check for radiation and that the results were negative. The meteorologist could offer no explanation for the ring and felt that it was indeed unusual.

I was given photographs of the site taken by the *Delphos Republican* November 3, 1971 and a small branch taken on the same day.

SECOND TRIP

I decided that a second trip to the alleged landing site was necessary to obtain the needed information and to get the most accurate measurements of the site possible. I felt that the trip would be worthwhile if only to observe any changes in the ring.

I talked with Sheriff Enlow about the possibility of a hoax. We discussed this at length and both are of the opinion that a hoax would be most unlikely. I obtained a signed statement from Sheriff Enlow regarding the reliability of the witnesses. I quote his statement:

"TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

"In reference to the UFO sighting at the Durel Johnson residence near Delphos, Kansas on November 2, 1971. The Johnsons are life-time residents of Ottawa County and the Delphos

(continued next page)

DELPHOS, continued

Community. They are well known and well respected by Officers from this Department. It is the opinion of this Officer that the information given by them would be accurate to the best of their knowledge.

"In reference to the UFO sighting on November 2, 1971 by Mr. Lester Ernsbarger of Minneapolis, Kansas. Mr. Ernsbarger is an Employee of the Minneapolis Street Department and a reserve Police Officer with the Minneapolis Police Department. I feel that his information would be accurate to the best of his knowledge.

"Signed: Ralph Enlow, Sheriff, Ottawa County, Kansas."

After talking with Sheriff Enlow, I proceeded to Delphos where I stopped at the office of the *Delphos Republican*. I talked again with the Editor, Willard Critchfield and reporter, Thaddia Smith. I obtained a signed statement from Mrs. Smith as she had gone to the site on November 3, 1971, and obtained branch samples and photographs. I quote from her statement:

"After receiving information late in the afternoon of November 3, 1971, that personnel from the Ottawa County Sheriff's Office, Highway Patrol and the Cloud County Weather Bureau had visited the site and taken samples of the soil and trees, I, with my husband, returned to the Johnson farm that evening to secure further information they might have for my newspaper article concerning the mysterious UFO.

"The Johnson family, my husband and I, without lights, walked in the darkness to the site.

"We we came into view of the area we could see very distinctly the glowing ring. In the area around and inside the circle there was nothing but darkness giving a person an eerie feeling.

"The Johnson family having lived in the Delphos Community their entire life are respected, truthful, conscientious, trustworthy and a well-thought-of typical hardworking Kansas farm family.

Signed: Thaddia Smith, Reporter, *Delphos Republican*."

I then returned to the Johnson farm to find Mr. Johnson and Ronnie

working in the lot. The three of us went through the observation once again. The details were basically the same as given before. Mr. Johnson did mention that the dog avoided the ring on the evening following the sighting, and he would return to the area only after a number of people had visited the site the following day. Mr. Johnson stated that he had lived on the farm for the past 14 years, and the site has never had any structure on it.

The three of us went to the site and the ground which had been muddy on my previous visit was now dry. The ring was faintly visible as it was a slightly lighter color than the surrounding soil. We proceeded to "water down" the area with several buckets of water, and as we placed the water on the soil the ring became quite prominent. As the surrounding soil immediately absorbed the water it turned a dark black, but the ring soil would not admit the water and simply turned a lighter color. The water stood on the ring soil briefly and suddenly ran off the surface into a lower section of ground at the center, as it did so the surface appeared dry. It was as if the water had been poured on a glass surface.

We must remember that all this was taking place 71 days after the ring appeared. Mr. Johnson and I opened the ring in several areas, all were dry and contained the white substance. We were able to expose the soil to a depth of 14 inches, and it was still dry at that point. I opened the soil at the ring edge in order to see the normal soil meeting the ring soil from the surface to a depth of 6 inches (I did not go deeper at this point). The ring soil was dry with the white substance, the normal soil joining the ring was black, damp and did not contain the white material. On the western edge of the ring one finds an area which was not dried, and it contains none of the white material. The ring has an irregular diameter of 8 feet, and the ring width ranges from about 12 inches to over 20 inches. The greatest width is at the eastern side. This is interesting as it would have been down wind from the ring center, and it may be possible that the wind acted as a spreading agent.

After spending several hours at the Johnson farm I drove back to

Delphos and talked with Mrs. Johnson at a rest home where she works. Mrs. Johnson is a very pleasant, soft-spoken individual, sincere and intelligent. As they related the events of the evening of 11-02-71, she simply confirmed the information given us by Mr. Johnson and Ronnie. She did state that the object seen in the sky was quite large and bright and that it was moving away from them, growing smaller. She said that as she touched the ring soil minutes after the alleged ascent it felt cool, not at all warm. It felt strange; having a slick, crusty feel. She felt the numbing in her fingers and tried to remove the soil by rubbing her hand against her leg. That portion of the leg became numb also, this condition persisted for more than two weeks.

During my first trip, and during this visit as well, I attempted to meet Lester Ernsbarger who is a possible confirming witness. I have not been able to contact him as of January 16, 1972.

Another possible confirming witness is Elton Smith, Box 326, of Delphos, Kansas. Smith is employed at the Delphos Attendance Center as Principal-Educator.

Smith stated the following about the observation which took place at about 6:20 p.m. on November 2, 1971: "I saw *only* a streak of light coming downward, to the North of me (in the approximate Delphos area) as I was walking to the north from the school building to the football field in Bennington, Kansas. I did not see an object, but just thought it was a falling star."

As Smith observed the streak descending in the general direction of the alleged landing site just 40 minutes prior to the observation of the landed object, we might assume — and it would be pure conjecture — that Smith may have indeed seen the object on its landing path. If the streak was a meteor, it would have been quite bright as the sky was not in total darkness. As no object was seen, however, we certainly cannot consider this to be a confirmation of the Delphos UFO.

Lester Ernsbarger, a Minneapolis Street Department employee and reserve police officer, observed a bright

(continued on page 17)

LETTERS

— Ridpath, Randles

Dear Editor,

I write to correct some of the mis-statements in Jenny Randles' article on the Rendlesham Forest case in the April issue of your Journal.

Firstly, I was not asked by the BBC ("Britain's state-owned TV Network," as she describes it) to produce an expose of the case. In making my own investigation, I learned that there were significant facts that the UFOlogists had not made public, and I took my story to the BBC's Breakfast Time programme, for whom I was at that time a science consultant.

Secondly, she charges that I invited myself into the audience at a subsequent Independent Broadcasting Authority debate on the case and "hogged a lot of air-time." In fact, the producers contacted me and invited me on to the programme to answer questions put to me by the presenter, which I did. In each case Randles' version is an inversion of the truth, and I have told her this in a personal letter.

Thirdly, her implication that media interest in Britain has been suppressed by pressure from above is fatuous. *The News of the World*, which ran the Rendlesham story, is owned by the same proprietor as *The Times*, which criticized it. The proprietor of *The Times* is not a Lord. He is Rupert Murdoch, a name not unknown in American newspaper circles. I would suggest the reason that *The Times* criticized the story is that their standards are higher than those of the *Enquirer*-like *News of the World*. Has Randles considered the possibility that the rest of the media refused to show any interest because they find the case no more convincing than I do?

Since I published my findings on the Rendlesham case, reprinted in your March issue, the tape recording made by Col. Halt in the forest has been made public. It confirms the conclusions in my article. Yes, the case has been solved for the past 18 months. That is

the one sentence in Randles' article that I agree with.

Fraternally,
Ian Ridpath
England

Dear Editor,

I must take the opportunity to reply to the letter sent by Ian Ridpath, commenting on my MUFON Journal article about the Rendlesham Forest, England, sightings.

On the question of his October 1983 BBC-TV feature. Mr. Ridpath called me *after* this was screened and I asked him why he had not contacted me about the case before making the item. He had known *for at least two years* of my involvement; through articles in the UFO media and lectures and discussions.

Ian Ridpath explained then that, as science consultant to that particular BBC morning programme, *they* had asked *him* to film a "different angle" on the story (these words are as close to accurate as I can recall them). Now, perhaps Ridpath lied at that time, to save face as to why he never checked with primary investigative sources. Or, as I interpret it, he may well have mooted the basic thought of an "expose" to them and they replied in the tone above. This allowed him to liberally avoid contact with anybody who knew anything at all about the case.

I fail to see how any investigative journalist can be satisfied with filming one forestry worker, who admits he had seen nothing and knew nothing about the case, but had found some rabbit holes in the forest a month or so later! Unless, of course, said investigative journalist has no interest in finding out what really happened, but rather wants to show the BBC he can demolish any UFO case he chooses (so long as things like the facts don't get in the way).

As to his appearance on the March

1985 IBA programme. I was told by the chief researcher the day before it went out that Ian Ridpath had "suggested himself to us" (her words). I have checked since, and been told that somebody else at the station may have contacted him before then, as they approached several dozen people as possible candidates. But they had selected myself and astronomer, Dr. John Mason, to appear on stage. Then Ian Ridpath had "pointed out his virtues" (which is, of course, his privilege, but shows how much he wanted to appear).

I can only tell you what I was told. If Mr. Ridpath disagrees with this then he presumably must be right and the person who told me the above at the TV station is not telling the truth, for reasons I cannot imagine.

In any event I certainly saw Ian Ridpath waylay the programme presenter the second she walked into the room to prepare for the show with Dr. Mason and I. He then spent many minutes clearly suggesting to her what the show should do. Again, his privilege. I am not disputing that at all.

Thirdly, Ridpath really is being silly if he attempts to make us believe that Rupert Murdoch runs the *News of the World* and the *Times*. He may be the financial power behind them, but each paper has distinctive editorial styles and very often disagree with one another 100 per cent! As for the story's suppression, I prefer to listen to the journalists who *told* me of their problems (such as TV producer Doug Salmon), rather than make assumptions (as Ian Ridpath does) based on his conclusion that the case is unimportant. He seems to have reached that view remarkably quickly and deductively, as he has never once interviewed a single witness of any description.

Would you dismiss a case on

(continued on next page)

DOODLEBUG, continued

recognized the dollar potential of the doodlebug. Being by far the sharper of the two, he stepped into the lead role and the two soon serenaded Flader and associates to the melodious tune of a quarter of a million dollars.

Meanwhile, Newton mingled in Hollywood (he claimed to have known Bob Hope and Jack Benny, among others) with friends supplied by the trusting Scully. In 1947, while drilling an oil well in Wyoming, he had seen what he took to be a flying saucer and became deeply engrossed in the subject. With public interest in UFOs peaking, Newton's genius took the short step of connecting the doodlebug to flying saucers. He began to let on to Scully that he was privy to space-age technology derived from study of a crashed saucer, namely the doodlebug. When Scully wanted to know more, specifically to speak with one of the scientists who had examined the flying disc, Newton trotted out GeBauer, disguised as Dr. Gee.

SCULLY REPORTS

Scully fell for the story, hook, line and doodlebug. Based on the information he received from Newton and GeBauer, he reported in his weekly column for October 12, 1949, that he had learned "all there is to know about flying saucers." In a second column, dated November 23, of the same year, Scully related the Newton story entire and said the saucers were known to have come from Venus. At some point he started work on *Behind the Flying Saucers*, later boasting in his autobiography that he completed the work in 72 days. "As you might imagine," said Moore, "that left him little time for any original research."

While Scully was at his typewriter, Newton continued working the links. A week after the appearance of Scully's second column, he wormed his way into a party at the Lakeside Country Club that included Bruce Cabot of King Kong fame. After the game and a couple of rounds of drinks, out came the saucer story along with the doodlebug, now a "magnetic radio," said by Newton to have been retrieved

from the crashed saucer. He also claimed to have pieces of the aliens' clothing and bits of the disc's metal gears. Cabot was suspicious enough to call in the FBI, which turned the tale over to the air force's Office of Special Investigations.

Thanks to OSI interest, an official memorandum to J. Edgar Hoover, the director of the FBI, was eventually generated, dated March 22, 1950, which has since been cited by some UFO researchers as evidence that the government does indeed have in its possession several crashed flying discs. "Had they bothered to check into the matter before jumping to conclusions," said Moore, "they would have realized that the original source of the story was Silas M. Newton, and that the document is essentially worthless."

DOODLEBUG

So was Newton-GeBauer's doodlebug, which contained little more than a few lights and flashlight batteries, but certainly no advanced extraterrestrial technology. Following a couple of expose articles by J.P. Cahn in *True Magazine*, Newton and GeBauer were indicted and convicted of operating a confidence game. They were ordered to pay restitution and given suspended jail sentences, neither man serving time. At the time of his death, December, 1972, in Los Angeles, Newton's estate had more than 140 claims against it for a total of almost a million and a half dollars. GeBauer died similarly impoverished in Colorado, in late 1982.

Scully passed away in 1964 in California, maintaining to the end that Newton was a victim of circumstances, and that a flying saucer with Venusians on board really had crashed in the desert.

Apparently Newton took pains not to involve Scully directly in any of his financial shenanigans. "I'm convinced Scully was innocent in the affair and simply used by Newton," said Moore. "He was too valuable as a source of Hollywood contacts to risk alienating."



LETTERS, continued

criteria like that?

Of course, what speaks volumes is that all Ian Ridpath can continually do is comment on minor points of no real importance. I could (if necessary) concede that he is right on every single one of the things he raises in his letter — and it would make not one jot of difference to the case. What he never does is answer my criticisms of his lighthouse/rabbits explanation. I wonder why?

Sincerely,

Jenny Randles
England

Dear Editor,

I have recently started research on UFO cases describing any alleged alien writing; symbols, words, communications, etc.. This includes automatic writing in an unknown language by persons involved in UFO cases. Since MUFON, CUFOS, and APRO are apparently not aware of anyone else who has done research in this area, I know little about how many such cases have been recorded. Perhaps your readers can help me.

Any examples of alleged alien writing, along with background data on the UFO case, would be greatly appreciated. The name and address of other known sources of such material will help. Please mail to me at 662 Fairway Avenue, Ft. Walton Beach, FL 32548 and include a bill for your copying/ mailing expenses. Perhaps, if enough data is obtained, I can prepare an article on the subject that would interest your readers.

Donald M. Ware
MUFON State Director
Florida



JIGSAW, continued

preconception. When we ask whether the object moved erratically instead of posing a neutral question about its flight, we might as well announce ourselves as true believers and dispense with any pretext of objectivity.

One of the most frequently overlooked aspects of our investigations is the matter of collateral contacts. In how many cases would a check with neighbors have brought the reliability of the witness into question? How many times would a contact with the air traffic control tower have revealed an airplane or helicopter in the immediate vicinity? How often have we guessed at the altitude of cloud cover rather than asking the national weather service?

There is no mystery in why we do these things, why we conduct poor interviews and fail to follow up. Again, it is fed by a hefty portion of bias. We are too often lured by the prospect of admiration from our peers or publication of the account, and so we stop short of making all reasonable efforts to find an explanation.

EXAM

Over the past year, MUFON consultants and state directors nationwide were asked to comment on separate drafts of a proposed field investigator's examination. There was overwhelming support for the concept of establishing such an instrument in order to measure investigative credentials, and scores of suggestions were made to improve it.

The exam covers twelve specific areas of science, technology, and human perceptions as related to claimed UFO observations, as well as major events and trends in modern UFO history.

Throughout the hundred questions in total, the test emphasizes an investigator's ability to distinguish between cases of mistaken identity and genuine UFO encounters. It is designed to be open-ended. The examinee can take whatever amount of time necessary and call upon any source of information for the answers. Over two-thirds can be readily found in a

dictionary or encyclopedia. The remainder are a matter of direct observations or comprise fundamental points by major authors on the subject. It will be administered to all MUFON investigators over the coming year.

Beyond the particular information afforded, the exam makes an overall statement to those who would present themselves to their communities as seriously interested in the proper evaluation of aerial phenomena. The message it conveys is that the position of field investigator is an earned privilege. Moreover, it allows all of us to read sighting reports in the future with the assurance that the author knows what he or she is talking about.

If we are to eliminate the cheap shots by debunkers and the snide remarks by the media, we must demonstrate more professionalism. It is, in the final analysis, our responsibility to silence the skeptics by putting our own house in order.

We can no longer afford to be a loose confederation made up of a few who have truly devoted their lives to this quest and a vast majority of fringe members. Whatever lies ahead, our commitment to excellence must be equal to the task. And that means every one of us.

DELPHOS, continued

light in the sky towards Delphos at 7:30 p.m. No other details as of this date.

SUMMARY

Based on the interviews with Mr. and Mrs. Johnson and Ronald, Sheriff Enlow and reporter Thaddia Smith, and after seeing the alleged landing site over a period of 71 days, it presents, I believe, considerable evidence which would seem to confirm the unusual event described by the witnesses. I would suggest that this may be a most significant report.

If one eliminates the observation of the object and the evidence found at the site, the ring remains, and this unusual ground mark is indeed a mystery. Although, according to the Concordia, Kansas, Weather Bureau, there had been several inches of rain and snow at the site, the ring soil remains extremely

dry and light brown in color. The contrast between the ring soil and the surrounding soil is incredible.

It is my belief, based on the information at hand, that we have here an excellent example of the unusual phenomena which has been reported by so many for so long.

UFO NEWSCLIPPING SERVICE

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

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

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

MUFON
AMATEUR RADIO NET
EVERY SATURDAY MORNING
AT 0800 EST (OR DST)
ON 7237 KHz SSB

MESSAGE, continued

MUFON members with computer equipment who would be interested in participating in this growing communications medium, please contact Mike at The Compufon Network, P.O. Box 954, Duvall, Washington 98019 or the voice line (206) 788-5307.

The Compufon Network, Puget Sound Aerial Phenomena Research, The National UFO Reporting Center, and The UFO Information Service have entered into an agreement to publish a tri-monthly Journal. The Journal will be available to anyone who might be interested at no charge. To receive a copy of the first edition of the Journal, please send your request to the address in the prior paragraph of this article.

* * *

James W. Deardorff, Ph.D., MUFON Consultant in atmospheric physics, has taken a very serious interest in the validity of the Billy Meier photographic case, popularly known as "UFO: Contact from the Pleiades." During the month of June, Jim traveled to Schmidruti, Switzerland to interview Mr. Meier and to also interview other witnesses or witnesses to secondary events in order to evaluate the authenticity of the case for himself. Dr. Deardorff has submitted a "letter to the editor" commenting briefly on the Philip Mantle article in the Journal of June 1985 and references to the E. Meier case. We have invited Jim to submit a paper for publication in the MUFON UFO Journal elaborating upon what he learned that either substantiates Billy Meier's claims or identifies fallacies or both based upon his personal on-site investigation. Since the Elders have now published Volume II, with new photographs, this case is not closed as far as some researchers are concerned. We look forward with anticipation to Dr. Deardorff's personal evaluation, because he originally felt that there was considerable validity to the case and photographs.

* * *

At the MUFON annual corporate meeting in St. Louis on June 30, 1985, **Joe Santangelo**, Director of the

(continued on next page)

THE NIGHT SKY

By Walter N. Webb

MUFON Astronomy Consultant

October 1985

Bright Planets (Evening Sky):

Jupiter and Saturn, the largest planets, can still be seen simultaneously at dusk—the former shining brightly in the SE, the latter (nearly 15 times fainter) very low in the SW. Resuming eastward motion on the 3rd, Jupiter appears due south at 8 PM Daylight Time in midmonth. Saturn sets about 7:30 PM in midmonth and disappears from sight by month's end.

Bright Planets (Morning Sky):

Venus, brightest of all celestial objects except for the sun and moon, rises in the east 2 hours before the sun in midmonth. It approaches ruddy Mars on the 4th and 5th, appearing less than $\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ from its much dimmer companion (Mars is 145 times fainter!). After that, the gap between the two widens so that Venus ends up 16° south of the red planet by month's end. Our brilliant neighbor planet is very near a thin crescent moon on the 12th.

Jupiter now sets in the WSW about 12:30 AM in midmonth.

Meteor Shower:


Conditions are quite favorable this year for the peak of the Orionid meteors on the morning of the 21st. Since the first-quarter moon sets before midnight, observers may watch this shower as it reaches about 25 per hour toward dawn. These meteors are swift and mostly faint, although some are fireballs leaving persistent trains behind them. Viewers should be alert for enhanced activity due to the proximity of Comet Halley, from which the Orionid particles originate.

Halley's Comet:

Halley closes to within 145 million miles of earth by midmonth, brightening to 10th magnitude and becoming accessible to observers with 3-to-4-inch telescopes. Rising then in the NE about 10 PM Daylight Time, the comet is visible for the rest of the night, achieving its highest altitude due south about 5:30 AM. On the 15th it lies $\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ north of Ch^2 Orionis at R.A. 6h 00m, Dec. $+20^\circ 41'$ (1950 coordinates). Avoid interference from moonlight by looking for the comet around the middle of October.

Moon Phases:

Last quarter--Oct. 7
New moon--Oct. 14
First quarter--Oct. 20
Full moon--Oct. 28 (Hunter's Moon)



The Stars:

At 9 PM in mid-October the nose of Pegasus the upside-down Flying Horse touches the celestial meridian (imaginary line through north-zenith-south

(continued next page)

points). At that hour the Summer Triangle is still prominent high in the SW. Both the V-shaped Hyades and dipper-shaped Pleiades star clusters appear for the first time above the eastern horizon--a hint of the winter season yet to come.

Below Pegasus lies a portion of the sky called The Sea, occupied by the inconspicuous watery constellations of (from west to east) Capricornus the Sea Goat, Aquarius the Water Bearer, Piscis Austrinus the Southern Fish, Pisces the Fish, and Cetus the Whale or Sea Monster. The only bright star in this whole "aquatic" region is Fomalhaut, a white first-magnitude star in the Southern Fish; it is the southernmost bright luminary seen from northern latitudes.

The Big Dipper, following its counterclockwise path around the north celestial pole as the earth rotates, skims along the northern horizon at this season. This popular asterism never goes below the horizon for latitudes above 40°.

MUFON Amateur Radio Net submitted his activity report for the first half of the year. This net meets every Saturday morning on 7237 KHz at 8:00 a.m. Eastern Time. Radio propagation conditions varied considerably plus interference from other ham stations, directly influencing the number of stations reporting into the net each Saturday. For the first six months, the weekly average was eleven with a high of 15 stations checking in and a low of 7 each week. Again, our thanks to Joe, N1JS, WA3QLW, and Dave, W8NQN for sharing the net control station responsibilities. On March 2nd, your International Director operated KE5QW, belong to **Paul Littlejohn** in Seguin, Texas, and thus had the privilege of reporting into the net. A long skip that morning made solid communications with all stations difficult.

Ann Druffel, Contributing Editor of the Journal, was very concerned when she noted in a recent letter to the editor by Hilary Evans, stating that Flying Saucer Review (FSR) was folding. (This could have occurred due to the failing health of Charles Bowen - Director's (Note.) Mrs. Druffel called Gordon Creighton in England to determine the status of FSR and found that it was alive, well, and proceeding on schedule. Your Director has been in correspondence with Gordon Creighton, since he became the Editor of FSR and I confirm Ann's information. Mrs. Druffel was recently concerned when she read the unpleasant news in Mr. Evan's letter. The Flying Saucer Review is considered by some to be the finest UFO magazine in the world. FSR is highly recommended to the readers of the MUFON UFO Journal and to anyone interested in the world scene.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION

- 1. Title of publication: MUFON UFO JOURNAL (USP 002970) (ISSN 0270-6822)
- 2. Date of filing: Sept. 23, 1985
- 3. Frequency of issue: monthly
- 4. Location of known office of publication: 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, Guadalupe, Texas 78155-4099
- 5. Address of the headquarters: 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155-4099
- 6. Names and complete addresses of publisher, editor, and managing editor:
 Publisher: Walter H. Andrus, Jr., 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155-4099
 Editor: Dennis W. Stacy
 P.O. Box 12434, San Antonio, TX 78212
- 7. Owner: MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC. (MUFON), 103 Oldtowne Road, Seguin, TX 78155-4099

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 423.12 DMM.

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	1377
B. Paid circulation	
1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales	0
2. Mail subscriptions	1185
C. Total paid circulation	1185
D. Free distributions by mail, carrier or other means: samples, complimentary, and other free copies	72
E. Total distribution	1258
F. Copies not distributed	
1. Office use, left over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing	119
2. Returns from news agents	0
G. Total	1375

(signed) Walter H. Andrus, Jr.
 Publisher

MUFON

103 OLDTOWNE RD.
 SEGUIN, TX 78155

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

by
Walt Andrus

The first "National UFO Information Week" was a successful event in a majority of our states where participation was the key to measuring its effectiveness. The answer to "where have all the UFOs gone?" in the news media was dramatically addressed in the form of exhibits, TV documentaries, radio and TV talk shows, one-day UFO seminars, etc. After the State Director's activity reports are received by **Marge Christensen**, MUFON Public Relations Director, fresh plans will be devised for 1986. Mrs. Christensen is to be complimented for having originated and implemented this unique program to make the public aware of the UFO phenomenon.

* * *

Donald M. Ware, State Director for Florida, has appointed **Juan Manuel Quiros** of Miami to become the new State Section Director for Dade and Monroe Counties replacing **Irving Lillien**, Ph.D. Dr. Lillien will continue as a Consultant in Chemistry.

Bruce A. Widaman, State Director for Missouri has approved the appointment of Jim Middleton to be the State Section Director for St. Francois and Ste. Genevieve Counties and a Research Specialist in Clinical Psychology. Mr. Middleton has an M.A. in Clinical Psychology and a B.A. in Administration of Justice.

Since the success of MUFON may be directly attributed to the leadership of the State Directors, we are searching for people who would be interested in filling vacancies in the states of Alaska, Montana, North Dakota and Puerto Rico. Several existing State Directors have realized that they do not have adequate time, have health problems, or new job responsibilities, preventing them from fulfilling their MUFON-assigned duties adequately and have asked your Director to seek replacements for them. We need people to volunteer to become State Directors in Colorado, Kansas,

Oregon, Nevada and West Virginia. Please write to MUFON in Seguin, Texas, indicating your sincere interest and qualifications. Many of our State Directors have not selected an Assistant State Director to share their administrative duties, which we encourage and recommend. We are in the process of revising our TELUFONET, so it is imperative that we have enthusiastic state leadership in every state.

* * *

James R. Leming, a former State Section Director in Montana, and just recently the former editor of the "S.B.I. Bulletin," has rejoined the MUFON UFO JOURNAL as a staff artist. Many of our readers can remember Jim's professionally done illustrations that have graced the cover of the Journal and UFO sighting reports. We welcome Jim back to the staff where he joins **Simone Mendez**, who will be moving from Las Vegas, Nevada to Oklahoma City.

Dan Wright and his host committee are continuing their planning for the seventeenth annual MUFON UFO Symposium at Michigan State University in East Lansing, Mich. for June 27, 28, and 29, 1986. Additional speakers will be announced as they are confirmed. **John F. Schuessler** is the latest to be announced. The MUFON 1985 UFO Symposium Proceedings, emphasizing the theme "UFOs: The Burden of Proof" are now available from MUFON in Seguin, Texas for \$10.00 plus \$1.50 for postage and handling (180 pages). All foreign orders must be by International Postal Money Order or cash in U.S. dollars.

A sad announcement appeared in "The APRO Bulletin" Volume 33, No. 1 published in July 1985, which may signal the demise of the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization. So that there will be no misunderstanding this announcement is hereby quoted verbatim.

"Dear Members and Subscribers:

With this issue of the APRO Bulletin publication will be suspended for an indefinite period. It will be resumed just as soon as the health of the editor will permit. As you may know, health problems in the Lorenzen family have been the main cause of delayed publications in the recent past. Mrs. Lorenzen's doctors have strongly advised that she take a complete rest for several months. Therefore it will be impossible for her to devote sufficient energy to the task of turning out a quality publication.

There are those of you who may wish to keep your subscription in force until conditions return to normal. Some of you may choose to terminate your affiliation. In this case APRO is offering back issues from available stock at a valuation of \$.50 each against remaining credit. Symposia papers can also be selected to offset extant credit at regular rates. See Bulletin cover for prices.

This step is a very painful one, as the subject for our mutual interest remains one of greatest importance, even after 32 years of study. You are all urged to continue your reading, searching, and where possible, reporting events that take place in your areas.

Many thanks for your faithful support.

Coral and Jim Lorenzen"

* * *

The Compufon Network Newsletter for August 1985 addresses several pertinent points in the Director's Comment by **Mike Hart**. The cost for producing the monthly newsletter plus three dedicated telephone lines will necessitate that annual dues must be charged because the Director and a few founding members cannot continue to absorb these monthly expenses. For those

(continued on page 18)