

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

NUMBER 240

APRIL 1988

Founded 1967

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.

\$2.50

- CONTENTS -

FROM THE EDITOR	Dennis Stacy	2
FOO-FIGHTERS: THE STORY SO FAR	Andy Roberts	3
GREAT BALLS OF FIRE	Paul Davies	6
DO WE NOW HAVE TWO UFOLOGIES?	Jennie Randles	10
GULF BREEZE SUPPLEMENT	Ware, Flannigan & Andrus	13
MUNDRABILLA INCIDENT - PART II	Walt Andrus	14
LOOKING BACK	Bob Gribble	19
THE APRIL NIGHT SKY	Walter N. Webb	22
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE	Walt Andrus	24

(Illustrations by Karen Pennison)

MUFON UFO JOURNAL

(USPS 002-970)

(ISSN 0270-6822)

103 Oldtowne Rd.

Seguin, Texas 78155-4099 U.S.A.

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

PAUL CERNY
Promotion/Publicity

MARGE CHRISTENSEN
Public Relations

REV. BARRY DOWNING
Religion and UFOs

LUCIUS FARISH
Books/Periodicals/History

ROSETTA HOLMES
Promotion/Publicity

T. SCOTT CRAIN
GREG LONG

MICHAEL D. SWORDS
Staff Writers

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
(Formerly SKYLOOK)

The MUFON UFO JOURNAL is published by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas. Membership/Subscription rates: \$25.00 per year in the U.S.A.; \$30.00 foreign in U.S. funds. Copyright 1987 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 78155-4099.

FROM THE EDITOR

Minor improvements continue to make their way into the Journal this issue and we hope ultimately everyone will be satisfied with its final format. We could have called this issue a special English edition because so many of its contributors hail from England. Jenny Randles, of course, will be familiar to most of you. Not so, perhaps, Andy Roberts, who makes his first appearance here with a recap of his research into the Foo-Fighter phenomenon of WW II. Roberts edits his own journal in the UK, *UFO Brigantia*. Interested parties should write him at the address found at the end of his article. We also welcome physicist and author Paul Davies to our pages. Davies and the editors of *New Scientist*, the English weekly where "Great Balls of Fire" originally appeared, graciously granted permission for us to reprint it. We trust you will enjoy it and that the relevance to UFO phenomena as a whole is obvious. You'll also find updates on both the Gulf Breeze, Florida, and Mundrabilla, Australia, cases, as well as our regular departments. Our new artist is Karen Pennison of Cypress, Texas.

In this issue

FOO-FIGHTERS: THE STORY SO FAR by Andy Roberts	3
GREAT BALLS OF FIRE by Paul Davies	6
DO WE NOW HAVE TWO UFOLOGIES? by Jenny Randles	10
GULF BREEZE SUPPLEMENT by Ware, Flannigan & Andrus	13
MUNDRABILLA INCIDENT - PART II by Walt Andrus	14
LOOKING BACK by Bob Gribble	19
THE APRIL NIGHT SKY by Walter N. Webb	22
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE by Walt Andrus	24

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 1987 by the Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155" is included.

FOO-FIGHTERS: THE STORY SO FAR

By Andy Roberts

Roberts is the editor of England's *UFO Brigantia*.

The subject of Foo-Fighters, the mysterious aerial phenomenon seen by aircrew during WW II, is probably the most neglected area of study in the field of ufology. Once ufologists realized that their world did not in fact begin on June 24th, 1947 with Arnold's infamous sighting, it has become fashionable to conduct research into "historical" UFOs which has led to some useful insights into the nature of the UFO phenomenon as a whole.

The pre-war Airship and Mystery Flier Waves and the post-war Mystery Rocket Waves have all been admirably covered by researchers in the UK, USA and Sweden, but foo-fighters have been virtually ignored. With this in mind, I began in 1987 to seek out all material extant relating to foo-fighters to try and put the subject into much-needed perspective and with the hopeful intention of publishing the end results in book form as a reference tool for other ufologists. This is some way off yet and so I think it may be worthwhile detailing the progress made and the problems encountered so far.

Neglected as an area of study they may be, but every ufologist has at least heard of foo-fighters and almost every writer on the subject has mentioned them. Therefore, you would think a mass of information would exist on the subject. Unfortunately this is just not the case. Look in any UFO book and you will find that foo-fighters are just given a few lines, at most in some rare cases a few pages and in only one or two instances a whole chapter. This is pathetic really for an area of UFO activity which immediately preceded the modern era and one which, if we are to believe the more "enthusiastic" ufologists, was the start of the so-called "Government Cover-Up."

The history of foo-fighters, as represented within the subject of ufology, is riddled with problems which have put foo-fighters in the historical niche they occupy today. These problems need stating and dealing with before the foo-fighter phenomenon can be seen in anything approaching perspective. For a start, even the name "foo-fighter" is problematic; did it come from the old Smokey Stover cartoon character saying "Where there's foo there's fire"; or was it from the French word *feu*, meaning fire, or was it, according to one ex-B17 waist gunner I spoke to, from "phooey". Needless to say, he didn't believe they existed!

Also, what exactly is the definition of a "foo-fighter"? It usually depends on what obscure theory a particular writer is trying to prove. For the purposes of my study I have used the criteria of any unexplained light source seen in conjunction with an aircraft either from the air or from the ground. This is deliberately descriptive, as to include all wartime UFOs, which are as diverse as the ones we report nowadays, would need many years research in itself.

STOLEN RESEARCH

Firstly, when considering the written sources in the literature, it should be made known that almost every author who has mentioned the subject, in a book or a magazine article, has literally stolen his or her material from someone else and invariably left it unreferenced to create, no doubt, the illusion that the author in question discovered the facts themselves. Furthermore even the copied facts are often misquoted or conveniently "re-arranged" to suit the authors' particular argument and all obviously done without checking the salient facts at source.

For instance, if we constructed a

"family tree" of foo-fighter material we would find, almost without exception, that the "grandpappy of them all" is the 1945 American Legion Magazine article, written by Jo Chamberlin. This article forms the substance of almost every piece written on the subject of foo-fighters. Fortunately this article is based on accounts which can be (have been) checked harn with squadron records and appears largely correct, but its incessant copying has precluded any original work being done on the subject and has subsequently led to many writers extrapolating generalizations about the foo subject as a whole, most of which are demonstrably untrue.

Examples of this armchair theorizing are legion but for instance; many items dealing with foo-fighters state almost as an article of faith that foo-fighters only appeared in the later stages of the war, specifically around the winter of '44/'45. This is a direct result of Chamberlin's article and has led to further speculation that perhaps they were Nazi secret weapons pulled out of the hat at the last minute, or even perhaps that the foo were extraterrestrials keeping an eye on us before we used the atomic bomb. This time scaling is false and the first record I have of a foo-fighter being seen comes from 1940, and they were seen often throughout all the war years.

Another false fact of the foo-fancier's faith is that the phenomena was mainly seen over the European theatre of war and just occasionally over the Pacific. This is again false and the product of sloppy research. So far I have accounts of foo-fighters being seen over Norway, Germany, France, Italy, Sicily, the Pacific, Burma, Tunisia, and all the sea areas adjoining these countries. It was clearly an international phenomenon.

Still another mistake is the statement made by many authors that the

Axis pilots also were seeing the phenomena and that they thought, just as our pilots did, that it was an Allied secret weapon. This may yet be proved true but I have so far to find an original reference made by an Axis pilot, or authority, that this was the case. The statement seems to be a ufological canard employed on the basis of "well if our boys saw them they must have too", and again has been used to support the ETH argument. The facts behind the rumor must await further verification. Axis aircrew were in fact seeing unexplained aerial phenomena but as yet most of their accounts await translation.

HOAX

We have at least one outright hoax, too, in foo-fighter lore. For years rumors had been flying around that the Germans had been fully aware of the foo-fighter phenomenon (perhaps that's where the above canard originated) and that they had a special study group formed to look into the problem under the name of Project Uranus, backed by a shadowy group by the name of Sonderburo 13 (reminds you of Majestic 12 doesn't it?). This was first detailed in *Le Livres Noir De Soucupes Volantes* (The Black Book of Flying Saucers - 1970) by French ufologist Henry Durrant. The rumor spread in Europe and eventually took physical form in the English language in Tim Good's acclaimed book, *Above Top Secret*, where it is used to help substantiate further vague rumors of an Anglo/American foo-fighter study. Good had not checked his facts and had in fact just copied the information direct from Durrant's book.

When I checked this out with Durrant he informed me that the whole Project Uranus affair was a hoax which he had inserted in his book precisely to see who would copy it without checking. The hoax apparently had been revealed in France some years before, but hadn't percolated its way through to English-speaking ufologists. Perhaps other foo hoaxes await discovery.

I could go on listing mistake after mistake and misquote after misquote

In one case a Lancaster almost burnt its engine out in an effort to lose its incandescent follower, but to no avail.

from which we have drawn the current idea of foo-fighters. The quality of research and writing on the subject of foo-fighters has been truly appalling. Once these primary problems were realized I found trying to research the subject from within the UFO literature was pointless and incestuous, and so attempted to get back to the source material — the pilots and crew themselves and the official records.

OFFICIAL RECORDS

With this in mind I wrote to every air-related magazine in the UK with a request for information from ex-aircrew. To date I have had some thirty replies from pilots and crew detailing their experiences with strange balls of light (incidentally not one of them knew them by the name "foo-fighters", or any other name for that matter). None of these respondents connected their sighting in any way with the modern idea of UFOs and their information is so much the better and clearer for that. In many cases I have copies of entries made in log-books immediately after the flight which details what took place.

In the main the descriptions are similar to the many already portrayed in the literature. Balls of light of varying color and number would appear from nowhere and play tag with aircraft for up to forty minutes. They were not hallucinations, being in some cases seen by the entire crew of a Lancaster bomber, and were not reflections as they were seen from many different angles or from two planes at once.

Evasive action to shake them off was no use. In one case a Lancaster almost burnt its engine out, going "through the gate", a slang term used by pilots to denote pushing the engine to its limits, in an effort to lose its incandescent follower, but to no avail. None of my respondents had fired on the phenomena, in some cases fearing it to be a secret weapon


which would explode when fired upon and in others just attempting to evade it on the basis that as long as it wasn't firing at them they weren't going to antagonize it.

Having said this I have heard an unsubstantiated tape of an interview with an American gunner which cites a case in which a foo was fired on ... and the shells went straight through it! Although some books note the (unreferenced!) fact that some foos appeared inside the planes or affected the electrics, etc., I have found no record of that taking place. Nor is there any verified account of foo-fighters showing up on ground radar. The phenomena whatever it was, clearly distinguished by the aircrew from common natural phenomena such as St. Elmo's Fire, was a separate entity from the plane they were in. It appears to have been totally independent and able to change shape, speed and position at will.

Clearly *something* was being seen. A few pilots and crew chose not to report their experience at the time for fear of ridicule or for fear of being grounded for having hallucinations. Many did record and report what they saw, though the response of the intelligence de-briefing staff varied considerably from total disinterest or hilarity to, in one case only, great interest and a further interview by intelligence officers. This apparent lack of interest on the part of the intelligence services begs the question of whether any official RAF or US 8th AF study was ever actually undertaken. It was certainly claimed to have, instigated by the untraceable Massey in the UK and Eisenhower in the US. Although my sample of respondents is small it seems odd that only one crew out of thirty or more were actually de-briefed at length specifically on the subject.

My research so far with the RAF/MOD/PRO* in the UK has drawn a total blank regarding official documentation and investigation of the

* Ministry of Defense/Public Records Office



subject, as have preliminary investigations in the USA. UFO sceptics will of course say that this is because it doesn't exist, proponents, especially cover-up buffs, will say it is because it is being kept secret.

DOCUMENT DELAY

The simple facts are that if documentation does exist in the UK I am unlikely to be able to get at it easily because of our archaic procedures for obtaining any government documents. We are not blessed by an FOI Act and obtaining any document depends on whether a department can be bothered to answer your letters, or if so, can be bothered to undertake a meaningful search of their records. The situation is further complicated by the fact that many records in our Public Records Office are hard to locate due to how it is organized and furthermore are sub-

ject to "rules", such as the 30 year rule whereby information is not available for 30 years from date of classification. Worse still, many WW II records are languishing under a 75 year rule for reasons I have not yet fathomed!

In addition to this fact I have spoken to some ex-wartime RAF intelligence people in the UK and they claim no knowledge of the phenomena. This area is clearly a matter for further study but, as with contemporary UFO research, it should be borne in mind that while there are many rumors of government interest and intervention regarding foo-fighters, the actual hard evidence cannot be found. I do not think this points to a "cover-up" in any way. The situation in the US may yet turn out to be different as regards obtaining official documentation and I would welcome help from any US readers who have an interest in the foo-phenomenon.


SECRET WEAPONS?

The German secret weapon hypothesis (GSWH) promoted by such writers as Renato Vesco is unlikely to be valid. The reports are too widely spaced throughout the war and come from too many differing theatres for them to be a secret weapon of any kind. Certainly the Germans were experimenting with saucer-shaped craft, flying wings, etc., but they had not got beyond the drawing board and model stage. In addition, if foo-fighters were a weapon they were clearly ineffective as one. The GSWH can be seen in the same light *vis a vis* foo-fighters as the way many people relate modern UFO sightings to alien craft. It is a cultural or, in the case of foo-fighters, an occupational artifact which when seen in retrospect (as will be the ETH no doubt) can be identified and discounted.

Out of all this some clear facts are apparent. Hundreds of aircrew saw and recorded what we now call foo fighters during WW II. There must be many thousands of ex-aircrew who have stories to tell. The problem is finding them and the odd ad or article is only going to draw a few out and I have yet to attempt to get to American information from squadron survivors, units, etc. The situation regarding German information is further complicated by a language barrier but it is only a matter of time.

I firmly believe that foo-fighters were a real, although non-solid phenomena and I reject the hallucination/misperception hypothesis almost entirely. These people's lives depended on being able to see and identify aerial objects very quickly. One mistake and it was their last. Some crew have admitted misperceiving Venus, etc., but realizing it in seconds, and certainly not a whole crew being fooled for any length of time. Foo-fighter reports give us a "genuine" UFO report, uncluttered by contemporary ideas about aliens, saucers and the like and which, as appear to be many "genuine" UFO reports when they are stripped of cultural bias, consists basically of rudimentary light sources performing odd maneuvers in the sky.

My research has a long way to go yet but I would offer the suggestion



that foo-fighters and their pre and antecedents which are still being seen today by both pilots and ground observers are a type possibly not. They are also the stimulus for many of today's UFO reports which are subsequently overlaid by the prevailing cultural perceptions, i.e., alien craft. Mystery Airships, Ghost Fliers, Foo-Fighters, Flying Saucers — they

may well turn out to be different facets of the same phenomena.

Information about foo-fighters is as can be seen in short supply and at best fragmentary and I appeal to any MUFON Journal readers with information on any aspect of the subject, however trivial, to contact me at 84, Elland Road, Brighouse, West Yorkshire, HD6, 2QR, England.

Great Balls of Fire

By Paul Davies

Paul Davies is professor of theoretical physics at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK. Apart from many specialist contributions in his own field he has published widely for laymen, including *The Cosmic Blueprint*, about complexity in nature, and a science-fiction novel, *Fireball*, based on real encounters with ball lightning. Both were recently published by Heinemann (UK). The following article is reprinted with the kind permission of Mr. Davies and *New Scientist*, where it originally appear-

ed (24/31 Dec., 1987). The Journal also wishes to thank Mr. Ralph Noyes of London for his kind assistance in obtaining reprint rights.

It was a dark, moonless night. Thunderclouds brooded high over the eastern seaboard of the United States. A sleek airliner, bound for Washington, climbed steadily skywards over New York City. It was five minutes past midnight. Suddenly a bright electrical discharge enveloped the plane — Eastern Airlines, flight number EA

539. In the cabin, a startled passenger looked up to see "a glowing sphere a little more than 20 centimeters diameter which emerged from the pilot's cabin and passed down the aisle of the aircraft." Its color was blue-white, with an almost solid appearance. It glided along at walking pace about 75 centimeters from the floor.

This nightmarish description is no extract from a horror movie, but a verbatim account of a close encounter of the worst kind: a fiery ball that appeared out of nowhere inside an aircraft and frightened the passengers.

Eyewitnesses include no lesser scientists than Niels Bohr, Victor Weisskopf and Martin Ryle

It would be enough to put most people off flying for life. The cool-headed witness was Roger Jennison who is professor of electronics at Kent University. He is not the only one to have encountered an airborne fireball. An acquaintance of mine, a pilot, told me of a very similar incident.

The phenomenon responsible for these manifestations — ball lightning — is one of the more bizarre scientific riddles of our age. The idea that balls of fire can just pop out of nowhere, meander around for a while putting the fear of God into people, and then disappear again, seems patently absurd. For many years, few scientists would admit to their existence. As recently as the 1970s, some physicists maintained that lightning balls were nothing more than spots before the eyes. But the fearsome things have stubbornly refused to go away. Furthermore, we cannot attribute all reports to deluded laymen. Eyewitnesses include no lesser scientists than Niels Bohr, Victor Weisskopf and Martin Ryle. Now, people write textbooks on the subject.

TYPICAL BALL

A typical ball is about 25 centimeters in diameter and glows a pale red or orange color. It may have a halo, or corona, around it. Sometimes, it emits sparks or rays. These balls materialize — if that is the word — literally out of the blue, or perhaps out of the clouds. They can last for anything up to a minute or more before extinguishing. The mode of their demise varies. Some balls explode violently. Others, like the proverbial old soldiers, don't die but simply fade away.

For some weird reason, the fiery orbs have a predilection for interior spaces. They seek out the insides of aircraft, buildings and chimneys, often gaining entry through narrow apertures. It is this aspect of ball lightning that is most alarming. The experience of watching a glowing fireball sprouting from a keyhole, cavorting around

the living room and exploding up the chimney can all too readily be imagined.

To add to the sinister flavor of this unpleasant phenomenon, the incandescent globes seem to have a will of their own. They move with a creepy bobbing or swaying action, usually close to the ground and often gliding against the wind. They tend to sense nearby objects, especially if the objects are made of metal. People have seen them roll along telephone wires or hover over electric power lines. Sometimes they emit a menacing hiss or crackle, and exude a sulphurous smell.

Given the truly striking character of ball lightning, it is surprising how many people have witnessed such a ball in action. A quick survey among one's friends usually elicits at least one vivid recollection of a typical fireball. As with ghost stories, people love to tell ball lightning stories. I once heard about a lightning ball that was audacious enough to manifest itself in the middle of a school football pitch — during the game. Then there was the occasion in 1975 when my friend Mark Stenhoff, a dedicated collector of reports of ball lightning, presented me with a fragment of an incinerated frock. Its owner, a plucky housewife from Smithwick, had given an impertinent fireball the brush-off when it assaulted her in the kitchen of her home one evening that August.

In spite of the name, there is no clear link between ball lightning and ordinary lightning. True, most sightings of ball lightning occur during thundery weather, but not always in conjunction with a conventional lightning strike. And fair-weather balls are by no means unknown. This raises the obvious question of whether the fireballs are by-products of electrical activity in the atmosphere or are the result of something more peculiar.

Nikola Tesla, of the magnetic units, made early attempts to recreate ball lightning in the laboratory. Tesla was a bit of an oddball himself. A Yugoslav emigre to the US, he pioneered

many electrical inventions in the late 19th century, but he also entertained fanciful dreams of transmitting electrical power without wires. He dabbled, somewhat secretively, with all sorts of fiendish electrical contrivances such as coils, high voltages, sparks, and allegedly conjured up glowing, floating balls of fiery plasma.

More recent efforts to manufacture artificial ball lightning have met very limited success. Long-lived balls that are independently mobile seem strangely reluctant to form. If they do form, they disappear again almost immediately. Evidently nature can do something that we cannot yet. The significance of creating balls of plasma has not been lost on those who work on controlled nuclear fusion. They spend their working lives struggling to confine unruly plasmas for mere fractions of a second. The UK Atomic Energy Authority's fusion laboratory at Culham in Oxfordshire has hosted some of the more imaginative research into ball lightning.

In the 1950s, H. Nauer conducted a series of elaborate laboratory experiments. He tried to create fireballs by inducing an electrical discharge between a pointed electrode and a water surface. Bright orange spherical objects appeared above the water, but their structure was altogether too complicated to resemble ball lightning. Nauer also experimented with discharges inside a closed chamber containing hydrocarbons. He produced vague luminous shapes, but again, the resemblance to ball lightning was slight.

James Dale Barry, at the University of California, Los Angeles, and author of *Ball Lightning and Bead Lightning* (Plenum, 1980), repeated Nauer's experiments in the late 1960s to test whether the combustion of hydrocarbons might be the explanation for ball lightning. He used a bank of capacitors to produce sparks between copper electrodes, placed about half a centimeter apart, inside a Plexiglass tank laced with propane gas. At a concentration of propane of about

1.4 per cent — less than that necessary for ordinary combustion a small yellow-green fireball appeared which whizzed around the tank and faded away.

Sometimes people have produced fireballs inadvertently. Several well-documented cases have occurred inside American submarines. In 1974, the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard carried out circuit-breaking tests on the switchgear of the USS Cutlass. The vessel had two sets of batteries connected to two generators, which charged the batteries through a circuit breaker made of copper and silver. The electricians had installed a reverse-current relay that would separate the contacts of the circuit breaker automatically if current from a charged battery accidentally passed through a generator that was not operating. When such short circuits did occur, an arc appeared between the silver contacts of the circuit breaker. On occasions, the engineers saw a green incandescent fireball floating off the contacts into the surrounding area.

Physicists have also been moderately successful in making fireballs by focusing electromagnetic fields operating at radio frequencies. Julio Powell and David Finkelstein, at Yeshiva University in New York, experimented with a generator producing 30 kilowatts of electrical power at a radio frequency of 75 megahertz. The generator had movable terminals located inside a glass tube containing a vertical chimney. The researchers gradually drew the terminals apart until they obtained a discharge. Eventually, a luminous column appeared which changed into a quasi-spherical object that slowly ascended the chimney. The ball persisted for a second or so after they switched off the power. Sometimes the ball disintegrated explosively. The researchers found that they could repeat the phenomenon, so they could carry out a detailed spectral analysis of the discharge.

Fireballs have also appeared during experiments with thunderstorms. In one famous affair in 1753, a certain Dr. Richmann of St. Petersburg met an untimely end when a lightning ball struck him on the head. Richmann had apparently connected a lightning



conductor directly to an electrometer in his laboratory, with a view to measuring atmospheric charge, when lightning struck the rod. The experiment produced a blue-white globe of fire as large as a man's fist. The fireball flew up and struck the scientist dead.

More recently, scientists tried to trigger lightning deliberately by firing rockets with trailing wires into thunderclouds. In one series of experiments in France, reported in 1975, researchers saw one or two luminous balls, near the base of a strike, slowly rising into the air. They also observed strings of luminous beads.

THEORIES

Attempts to explain — or explain away — the mystery balls have been

as ingenious as the experimental work. The great Michael Faraday accepted the accounts of balls of fire, but he was sceptical that electricity was responsible. Many scientists have claimed that the reports are due to nothing more than optical illusions or afterimages on the retina. The weakness of this theory is that many incidents are reported by several witnesses, or involve balls passing behind other objects.

Proposed physical mechanisms vary from the sublime to the ridiculous: burning balls of gas, plasma vortices, incandescent metallic vapor, atmospheric masers, nuclear reactions. Two tough problems confront the theorist. The first is to explain the prodigious energy incarcerated within a typical fireball. One estimate of the energy content of a ball of lightning comes

The significance of creating balls of plasma has not been lost on those who work on controlled nuclear fusion.

from a celebrated case when a ball conveniently popped into a barrel of water and boiled it. For good measure, the culprit also struck a house, cut a telephone wire and burned a window frame. All this from an object reportedly no larger than an orange. A simple calculation indicates a total release of energy of several megajoules — equivalent to the output from an electrical heater with the power of a kilowatt for more than an hour. Anything that can pack this kind of punch is unlikely to be some sort of will-o'-the-wisp.

The second enigma concerns the lifetime of the balls. All laboratory fireballs persist for less than a second or so, whereas ball lightning may endure for minutes at a time. It is hard to understand how such an energetic object can remain stable for so long. Witnesses nearly always report that the balls remain perfectly round. Changes of radius, color or luminosity are invariably slight. So not only do we need to find a mechanism for confining the glowing substance but it must also be remarkably robust.

The riddle of ball lightning attracted the attention of one of the heavyweights of 20th-century science — Pyotr Kapitza, a Soviet physicist who won a Nobel prize for his work on superconductivity. Kapitza neatly explained the energy problem. He argued that ordinary lightning can generate radio waves that could become channelled or focused in the gap between the cloud and the ground. If the electromagnetic field becomes intense enough in a localized region it could ionize the air, producing a fiery ball. As the pattern of the field shifts, so would the ball.

Soviet scientists tied this work to their program of controlled thermonuclear fusion, in which confining plasmas is the major challenge. They have taken Kapitza's theory very seriously. Teams of meteorologists, from the Institute of Physics Problems in Moscow, apparently roamed the Lenin Hills with radio receivers, tuning into lightning flashes. They reported detecting signals, lasting for a fraction of a second, in narrow bands of frequencies around 0.1 gigahertz. But the levels of power were

extremely low. Kapitza's hypothesis has a certain appeal, however. It could explain nicely how ball lightning comes inside buildings, because these would tend to act like waveguides.

In spite of the fact that fireballs are often seen in isolation, it is tempting to attribute them to ordinary lightning strikes, for which ample energy is available. One theory suggests that a lightning strike may throw up fine particles of soot. The flow of electrical current would then heat the particles until they glow. Another theory proposes that droplets of water from humid air might sustain a separation of charges induced by a lightning strike. The water would prevent the charges recombining, this storing the electrical energy.

In the early 1970s, some physicists suggested a more extreme explanation for the high energy of fireballs. The researchers, M.D. Altschuler, L. House and E. Hildner, of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado, proposed that thunderstorms could behave like gigantic natural particle accelerators, producing protons with an energy as high as 1 megaelectronvolt. These protons could then induce nuclear reactions by colliding with atomic nuclei in the atmosphere, thereby creating isotopes of oxygen and fluorine, ^{18}O and ^{19}F . The isotopes would then decay, emitting positrons and gamma rays which would provide the energy for ball lightning.

If some sort of nuclear mechanism were involved, a close encounter with a fireball might well result in a lethal dose of radiation to the hapless observer. Researchers then checked objects in the vicinity of reported lightning balls for signs of irradiation. They tested bricks, from an archway through which a ball had passed some years previously, for thermoluminescence — a persistent relic of exposure to radiation. They found no

anomalous effects.

In a related series of experiments, scientists at Culham Laboratory, David Ashby and Colin Whitehead, decided to set up a gamma-ray detector and leave it for several months to see if they could detect any surges of radiation. Remarkably, four such cases occurred, one of them at the height of a severe thunderstorm. The level of radiation rose as high as 50 times that of the background level for a few seconds. The equipment was operating automatically, so nobody was around to spot any fireballs, but Ashby and Whitehead were so struck by the results that they came up with the most radical suggestion of all. The surges of gamma radiation did not fit the characteristics of ^{18}O or ^{19}F , so something else had to be responsible. The physicists were looking for a phenomenon that would release a lot of energy at a fairly uniform rate, would not involve energetic protons or radioactive isotopes, yet would still produce gamma radiation. The answer that they hit upon was antimatter.

ANTI-MATTER?

Ever since Paul Dirac first predicted antimatter in 1929 (*New Scientist*, 10 September 1987, p 43), physicists have speculated about its role in nature, but Ashby and Whitehead's suggestion that it might be the power behind ball lightning is the most bizarre application of the concept so far.

Theorists believe that every type of fundamental particle has a corresponding antiparticle which has the same mass but opposite charge. For example, the antielectron, more usually known as the positron, has the same mass as the negative electron, but has a positive electrical charge.

Antiparticles exist. Cosmic rays are a prolific source of positrons and antiprotons. Physicists can also make antiparticles in the laboratory. The

European Laboratory for Particle Physics (CERN) boasts the largest anti-proton factory in the world. Physicists employ antiparticles to probe the fundamental physics of matter, although so far they have detected or produced only individual antiparticles. There is no reason why anti-protons, antineutrons and positrons cannot combine to make antiatoms and then antimatter.

Cosmologists have had a long-standing flirtation with the idea that some large fraction of the Universe might be in the form of antimatter. The key feature of such a theory is that when antimatter meets matter, wholesale annihilation results in a huge release of energy, in the form of gamma rays.

If there really is antimatter out there somewhere, some of it may hit the Earth. The result could be pretty devastating. A particle of the stuff the size of a pea would see off a major city. The late Willard Libby, the man who won the Nobel prize for devising the technique of radiocarbon dating,

once speculated that the famous Tunguska explosion which created a huge crater, in 1908, devastating many square miles of the Siberian tundra, was caused by an antirock plunging to Earth from space. This event, devastating many square miles of the Siberian tundra, has never been satisfactorily explained.

Ball lightning, of course, is not that destructive. Ashby and Whitehead had in mind only minute grains of antimatter. These micrometeorites, so the theory goes, slowly filter down through the Earth's atmosphere. A hypothetical potential barrier caused by certain quantum effects prevents instantaneous annihilation. These tiny specks would tend to become negatively charged as a result of positrons being emitted, and would thereby be drawn inexorably towards the ground during thunderstorms, whereupon some instability would trigger their annihilation. The result would appear as ball lightning to witnesses. A grain of only 5 micrometers in radius would liberate 100 kilojoules, more than

enough to power the average lightning ball. As the outer layers of the grain of antimatter began to annihilate, the release of energy would produce a shielding effect, slowing down the process and extending ring lifetime. On occasions the shielding would become unstable, leading to an explosive release of energy.

As far as I know, no one has pursued the antimatter theory. Ashby and Whitehead published their paper in 1971. Although people have suggested searching for composite antinuclei in cosmic rays, few scientists have looked at what would happen if antimatter in any quantity entered the atmosphere. In view of the profound consequences for fundamental physics and cosmology that the discovery of bulk antimatter would imply, this seems a distinct omission. Could it be that those eerie fireballs hold the key to a mystery of literally cosmic proportions? Might they have locked inside them a clue to the riddle of the origin of the Universe?

Do We Now Have Two Ufologies?

By Jenny Randles

Jenny Randles is director of investigations for the British UFO Research Association (BUFORA) and the author of numerous books on the subject. Her most recent title is *The UFO Conspiracy* (Blandford Press).

1987 was a fundamental year in the UFO movement for numerous reasons. I know that a great many UFO researchers from foreign climes, including myself, were extremely grateful to MUFON for inviting us to the festival of ufology that was held in Washington, DC. It was a delight and instructive entertainment. But I highlighted a dilemma that we must face in the coming years.

I understand that the surprise (and mild skepticism) demonstrated by some of us toward both the MJ-12 affair and the rise in abduction

research went down, as we say in Britain, like a lead balloon. I think there are many reasons for that, which I do not intend to discuss here. Essentially it stems from the fact that there are major differences between ufology as it is practiced in the USA and in other places. I can of course only speak for Britain, but I know enough of European ufology and spent enough time with Bill Chalker at Washington to assess Australian ufology, to realize that both are more akin to British than American modes of thinking.

To an extent this is our conservatism and caution showing through, plus an increased (I think over-obsessive) approach to sociological and psychological theorism. But I suspect the problem goes deeper than that. I am beginning to wonder if our arguments which look to be at

cross purposes are not generated at heart by a failure to spot a significant clue. Perhaps we are trying to reconcile differences between approaches and data that are irreconcilable, because there is not *one* UFO phenomenon, but *two*.

Whenever I do media interviews in the UK I am always faced with journalists who make the presumption that UFO and Alien Spaceship are interchangeable terms. To believe in the reality of an unknown UFO phenomenon is to accept that the earth is being visited by little green men. Of course, those of us involved in the subject know that this is an oversimplification. It is taking one theory to account for the unknowns and turning it into the only solution.

ALIEN ASSUMPTIONS

MUFON UFO Journal, No. 240 April 1988

There are many reasons why this occurs. Partly, it is due to the way the phenomenon appears to support this hypothesis. It appears like alien travelers and behaves as we might predict (incidentally, always to my mind a negative factor, because surely aliens should behave in an alien way — and not like the interstellar equivalents of NASA).

Also there is a kind of reductionist logic that is applied. We have got into space. There are millions of stars out there. Ergo, life from space can come here. If it does, we should see it. We see UFOS, therefore it is alien life. That's a superficially plausible analysis. But it is riddled with assumptions that frankly we have little justification in making at this stage.

However, above all of these is the fact that UFOs as Alien Spaceships is the answer most human beings want to be true. Be honest with yourself. If it could be proven to you beyond any shadow of a doubt that UFOs were not alien, but some product of science on the fringes of comprehension (eg. a new atmospheric phenomenon) — would you still pour in all that time, money and effort to investigate these things? Would you bang your head against the brick walls marked ignorance and sensationalism just to satisfy curiosity about these things? Especially when deep down you know that you don't have the scientific credentials to handle the data and learn very much about these new phenomena.

Some people would answer yes. They are involved in the UFO field for altruistic reasons. But I suspect that the vast majority, even when they deny it thrice until the cock crows, really have an inner longing to see their belief vindicated that UFOs are advanced alien visitors who have come here, will change the world and maybe help us get out of the mess we are in.

When I am honest with myself I know that's true of me. It's a constant struggle to keep my feet on the ground and this sometimes manifests as ultra-skepticism. Of course, I know too that the ET theory is a viable concept. It may not be proven, but it isn't disproven, either. It deserves to live on as a catalyst for meaningful research.

Anyone involved in field investigation to the sort of extent that I am, handling cases day in, day out, to and from BUFORA's team, can see a number of realities about the UFO subject that are commonly glossed over. I suspect that this even gives a different perspective on the whole subject for those of who regularly follow through cases, as opposed to those who read reports in journals on the most glamorous cases and then speculate from there.

90% IFOs

For a start, most UFOs turn out not to be UFOs at all. We may all say we know that, but unless you face a situation where 90 percent of your time is spent recording IFOs, then the significance does not really home in.

Take a sighting in Britain in early January 1988. A young girl, Zena Sfeir, reported a bright shape in the sky through her telescope. The police were called and eight officers eventually arrived (including a senior detective). All were baffled by this amorphous blob of light in the sky that stayed there for an hour or more.

Now any experienced UFO investigator would quickly be suspicious of this. Indeed, Mike Wootten, our Accredited BUFORA Investigator of Kensington, London, where this event took place, was on the scene doing his job as soon as we learned of the story. It took him minutes to reconstruct the sighting with Zena and ascertain that she had only just got the telescope, was a complete novice, did not realize that the cheap lens distorted point sources into blurred shapes and was pointing it straight at a bright planet. A computer simulation showed us immediately the planet was Jupiter (as suspected, because there had been other misperceptions of it) and other key facts emerged. For instance, the "UFO" had been seen the following night by Zena in the same place ... a dead giveaway in investigation terms.

None of this prevented the British media going crazy with the story. Many national newspapers carried it as a serious sighting. It even became just about the only British case that

has made the national BBC TV news. Not even the Bentwaters case achieved that! Doubtless, these reports filtered around the world, as did quotes picked up from "experts" like the Yorkshire UFO Society, or "Dr" Richard Lawrence of the Aetherius Society (he usually being presented as plain Dr. Lawrence, the leading UFO expert, to give outsiders no sense of his highly dubious status).

BUFORA's "solution" to this case barely got a look in. Mike did one radio interview in London and I did two in other parts of the country. None of this put a dent in the millions of TV viewers and newspaper readers convinced to this day that the case is a "real UFO".

Nor is this experience in any way unique. It happens all the time. Ordinarily we instruct BUFORA field investigators to focus on promising cases and virtually junk simple IFOs, beyond basic checks and then logging them. But it is often necessary to try to correct the false impressions put over about these innocuous stories.

Of course, there are a few cases each year (never more than 20 or 30 in a typical twelve months) which do pass the tests of genuine investigation. It is these which represent what most would call "real ufology," although the IFOs are important in various ways and cannot be ignored.

ONE OUT OF TEN

The fact that very critical investigation goes on is in my view important. Any investigator who does not go into a case fully aware that the odds are stacked nine to one against it being a genuine UFO is not doing their job. This inevitably adds a degree of cynicism. How could it fail to? But it produces better quality "unknowns" in the long run.

So, what of these "unknowns"? They, presumably, are the spaceships. At least, that is almost always what a journalist says to me by the time we reach this point in the argument. But this simply isn't so.

Let's look at a selection of typical cases from recent BUFORA records covering this one out of ten residue.

On 19 May 1985 a very small oval (just a few feet in diameter) flew

Any investigator who does not go into a case fully aware that the odds are stacked nine to one against it being a genuine UFO is not doing their job.

within close proximity to a man at Ventnor on the Isle of Wight. It made a quiet rush of air noise. The case was investigated by Paul Fuller.

On 4 April 1986 a white ball of light sped over the head of a man in Dukinfield, Lancashire, making a throbbing noise. This was investigated by Georgina Mills, who found no simple answers.

In early June 1987, a case I followed up at Whitchurch, involved a series of three white lights in a triangle that remained stationary for some moments and then just switched out.

These do not misrepresent the remainder of the "unknowns," but what do we have when we review them?

The Whitchurch UFO (the pawnbroker sign, as we call it because this three ball triangle used to hang over such establishments) is rare but very consistent. I found about 15 such cases on BUFORA archives in the past quarter century. It is evidently some sort of optical, atmospheric phenomenon which nobody is fully aware of. There's no reason at all to assume these were three lights on an otherwise invisible and stationary spaceship.

The Dukinfield "ball of light" is a classic UFO (or as we would call it in Britain to avoid presumptions — a UAP *Unidentified Atmospheric Phenomenon*). It may have links with ball lightning, earthlights or other such events. It may be a new sort of anomaly. But again it would be silly to ascribe it to a spaceship on the strength of the report itself.

Only the Isle of Wight case seems to offer much hope for those convinced that material craft do exist. I would say that around one in three of the residual cases are of this sort, ambiguous or more concrete observations of actual aerial devices. Yet in this instance Paul Fuller did not simply write it off as a UFO. He probed deeper. Suspicions tumbled

out as he did so. There is a secret radar base on the hills where this occurred. A Navy exercise involving "drones" was taking place off the nearby coast. The Navy and MoD clammed up when Paul mooted the possibility of classified military technology. All in all, this small disc seems most suggestive of some sort of remote controlled spy craft.

Three cases, three different probable phenomena behind them. None are solid evidence for the extraterrestrial hypothesis.

Which is not to say that no case ever is. I am, remember, not attempting to disprove the existence of aliens, merely to challenge the presumption that this has to be the implied answer.

However, any experienced investigator also knows how shapes and structure are read into collections of lights. This occurred in another widely publicized case, on 9 December 1987. Literally dozens of witnesses observed what they termed "A football field in the sky." This glided slowly across several counties and out to sea. The media carried endless reports, but we suspected an explanation immediately. Having the investigational experience to suspect this led us to the right channels. Philip Mantle, David Clarke and Clive Potter (the three relevant BUFORA investigators) combined forces and quickly established through two independent routes that the "fairground of lights" (another widely used description) was a US Air Force training mission from RAF Mildenhall involving two KC-135 tankers and a series of F-111 fighters hooked up to the giant gas tanks.

Yet despite this proof I am sure the undigested reports will have filtered across the Atlantic to be taken more seriously than they deserve by unsuspecting ufologists. This is because almost all the witnesses saw the lights on the various aircraft as part of one giant UFO. From this they interpo-

lated a shape and drew it quite consistently (because the light formation was accurately seen and the only error was the false assumption that the lights were fixed on one object.).

Ironically, I recently did a BBC radio interview in Nottingham (the city at the center of most sightings). I explained all of this and was met with incredulous looks from the presenter. "But you are supposed to believe in these things!" he told me. Then he added that he had interviewed some of the witnesses and was convinced they were sincere. So am I. But he was also convinced that, because they said they saw a mile-wide craft strung up with lights, that was what they saw. But it probably was not, in this instance.

Cases like that soon teach the dangers of becoming over-attached to pro-spaceship arguments based upon this myth of independent witnesses to a clearly defined craft *proving* such a craft was really present.

Again, let me stress, I am not disputing its value as one of our working hypotheses. But I am cautioning against forgetting the counter problems that it generates.

I hinted that there might be two ufologies. Perhaps I should elaborate on what I meant.

Partly, I did mean that there is a difference between American and British ufology. The former is undoubtedly far more committed to the ETH. I think too committed. But British ufology falls into the same trap with its over-zealous endorsement of rather vague psychological theories.

UFO CHARACTERISTICS

But there is more to it than that. I believe that these residual UFO cases that I have just discussed cover many things. But they do have important characteristics.

You can get photographs of them. They are occasionally tracked on radar. There is some limited movie film evidence. If you plot the average number of witnesses per case across a large sample it is very similar to the figure for misidentifications (IFOs). It comes out at around 2.5 or 2.6 witnesses per case. Debunkers use this as evidence that the residual cases

are the same as IFOs, ie., unconfirmed misidentifications. But it proves no such thing. All it says is that just as most sources of IFOs are *real* (viz aircraft, planets, etc.) so most of the residuals are *real* things too. Anyone in the right place at the right time can see one, often several people in proximity to the event can see it simultaneously.

These UFOs are undoubtedly objective phenomena of one sort or another. Or, as I would contend, several different sorts of objective phenomena. I believe it to be a mistake to instill the idea that these must be alien, hence my use of that term, UAP, for these cases.

But, I can almost hear you shouting, what about the abductions? Quite right. This is indisputably the growth area of ufology and a genuine problem does exist. I am not in the least satisfied with any existant attempts to explain it all away, either in psychological or space kidnap terms. The evidence is supportive of both ideas some of the way and yet also disputes both ideas, too. This is a worrying factor.

I agree that we may not yet know the full extent of the abduction phenomenon and there are bound to be complications now the event has become legitimized following the events of 1987.

For instance, less than six hours after transmission in the UK of the episode of *Dynasty* where Fallon first describes her on-board abduction a

"real" event occurred near Accrington, Lancashire. An hysterical woman claimed to be kidnapped from her bed by figures with leathery skins that smelt of cinnamon. This was obviously based on the TV show (which she admitted having seen) since these unusual Strieber-type images were featured on that. Yet the woman believed otherwise and was deeply upset by her vivid encounter. Literally as I write, this case is only a few days old and I put BUFORA investigator Philip Mantle onto it. But, as he said when we compared preliminary notes, "we may feel that it is a subjective experience, yet it was still real to her."

I have investigated a number of British abduction reports (see my book *Abduction*, Robert Hale). I do not believe from this first-hand experience that they are "just hallucinations" or "products of the human psyche"; or some pseudo-Jungian claptrap. But I am aware, as all abduction researchers should be, of the way these cases *differ* from the events that I've just called UAP.

Abductions do not get filmed. Nor do they have radar support. There aren't even any credible pictures of aliens in non-abduction situations, let alone during the abductions themselves. The average number of witnesses per case is much closer to 1.0, which is of course total subjectivity. Only the percipient perceives. Abductions are far more isolated events than UAP encounters.

Indeed, UAPs are seen, abductions are experienced.

These do hint at abductions being separate from what we think of as UFOs. It may be that we have both an objective UAP phenomenon and an essentially subjective abduction phenomenon.

But, of course, I repeat that I am not suggesting that abductions are purely psychological events. Only that they seem to occur in a psychological form. I think that there are grounds to postulate an alien trigger factor in these experiences.

To close with an analogy. Think about a mythical scientist studying "things in the sky". To simplify matters he has just birds and radio waves to contend with. The birds he can record, classify, go to the places where they congregate from time to time, track on radar and photograph. Doesn't that all sound rather familiar?

Radio waves are quite different. You can't go somewhere and expect to see one. You can't photograph them. Indeed you need a special decoding instrument to be in the right place at the right time so as to tune into the signal and make it real. Of course, it always *was* real. But real in a very different way from birds.

I strongly suspect this is what we face right now. The trouble is the program being broadcast through our receivers seems to be one about ornithology. This tempts us to make what may be a serious miscalculation.

The Gulf Breeze, Florida Photographic Case - Supplement To Part I

By Donald M. Ware, Florida State Director, Charles D. Flannigan, Lead Investigator
and Walter H. Andrus, Jr., International Director

Copyrighted by the MUTUAL UFO Network, Inc. (MUFON) March 1988

INTRODUCTION

When the original five color Polaroid photographs were delivered to Duane Cook, Editor and Publisher of the Gulf Breeze *Sentinel*, he was so impressed that he published three of the best with the letter "To Whom It May Concern" from the photographer in the November 19, 1987 issue. Des-

pite the fact that the fear of public ridicule to report UFOs or flying saucers is still very prevalent, the article in the *Sentinel* produced positive results. Numerous witnesses came forward to report their personal experiences during the November 11, 1987 time period when the first five photographs were made by "Mr. Ed". Joe

Turner and Allison Brown, reporters for the *Sentinel*, interviewed many of these people. After Donald Ware and his team of investigators had studied the five original photos and later a photograph depicting the "blue beam", two of the visual sightings reported seemed to offer corroborating testimony to the objects Mr. Ed had photo-

graphed. These two reports will be reviewed because they are significant under the circumstances.

SOMERBY SIGHTING

At about 5:00 p.m. on November 11, 1987, Mr. Charles I. Somerby and his wife Doris were walking their dog on a rural part of Hickory Shores Boulevard (Bay Drive) about 10 miles east-northeast of the site where Mr. Ed made his first five photos. By way of introduction, Mr. Somerby is a retired Navy officer and past editor of the "Sentinel" with a masters degree in journalism. Doris Somerby is Duane Cook's mother. While watching cloud formations and colors in the late afternoon sky, Charles spotted a "bogey". Since it was not a plane, helicopter, or bird, he was mystified. They stopped and watched the object move from the northeast to southwest (toward Gulf Breeze) for about two minutes. Mr. Somerby said it was grey with white "porthole" lights on the bottom and one light on top. There were no colored or blinking lights observed. Doris asked Charles if that could be a UFO. She said it had no blinking lights, just a circle of bright white lights at the bottom and a dome light. They heard no noise.

Mrs. Somerby said the object seemed to drift like a balloon. Cha-

rls said it appeared to be the size of the full moon and as bright as a star. He estimated that it was as big as a house. Since darkness was rapidly approaching and they did not have a flashlight, they walked back towards their cottage. They hoped others had seen the object and would report it.

At about 11:00 a.m. on November 18, 1987, the Somerbys went to the Sentinel office where Duane Cook showed them the photos and letter. Duane said he was quite surprised when Charles and Doris Somerby said they had seen it too. The letter said, "Should these photos and story spark any interest from your readership, I may identify myself. I am a prominent citizen of the community; however, I need anonymity at this time. I know what I saw and would feel much better if I knew I was not alone."

Duane Cook gave the MUFON team investigators Somerby's address on November 23rd and the interviews were completed that day. (The description provided by Charles and Doris Somerby was certainly evidence that "Mr. Ed" was not alone.)

ZAMMIT SIGHTING

Between 2:00 and 2:30 a.m. CST on November 11, 1987, Mrs. Zammit, age 72, was awakened by Sam her

11-year-old female Labrador Retriever. The dog woke her by placing her muzzle against her cheek and growling. Mrs. Zammit sensed the unusual behavior and got out of bed to investigate. She held the growling, restless dog by the back of the neck and was led through the house to the back door. Upon exiting, the dog became even more agitated and started barking. Mrs. Zammit and the dog walked a few feet on the lawn, when the dog stopped and looked up at a round object emitting a "pathway" of bluish light to her dock on the canal. The light "pathway" contacted the dock between the first and second support poles and was about 8 inches in diameter.

The object appeared to be 2 to 3 times the size of the full moon and was as bright as the planet Venus ... that is, very bright. The color of the object was pastel yellow to orange. Her first thought was "unbelievable," which later turned to fright. The dog was growling and barking while standing in place looking up at the object. Its hair was "standing on end." Mrs. Zammit thought maybe the object was there to "get my dog," so she took Sam back into the house. The sighting lasted about five minutes.

Mrs. Zammit reported her sighting

Continued on page 21

The Mundrabilla Incident - Part II

By Walt Andrus

DATE: January 20, 1988

TIME: Early morning hours, approximately 4:00 a.m. Western Australia time. (Exact time unknown)

LOCATION: Approximately 40 kilometers west of Mundrabilla on the Eyre Highway in Western Australia known as the Basin or Nullarbor Plain.

DURATION OF INCIDENT: 90 minutes

INTRODUCTION

Part I of "The Mundrabilla Incident" was published in the March 1988 issue, No. 239 of the MUFON UFO Journal. Due to the numerous witnesses scattered over Western and South Australia, and the vast distances involved to locate and interview them personally, this sighting report continues to evolve. Information in Part II is based upon the report submitted to MUFON by Keith Basterfield and Ray Brooke, dated February 29, 1988. To avoid

duplication, this article will elaborate only on new information obtained and interviews conducted after the report published in the MUFON UFO Journal, issue No. 239.

Briefly, it concerns three major pieces of information. (1) An interview with John De Jong (nickname Porky), and his friend and co-driver, Anne; (2) Various slight discrepancies between witnesses' reports and clarifications and (3) Details of an independent laboratory test results of the

MUFON UFO Journal, No. 240 April 1988

ash deposit on the automobile. Interviewing the Knowles family has been complicated by the three months exclusive contract that they signed with the Channel 7 Television Network in Adelaide immediately after the incident. As Keith and Ray previously stated: It appeared that "checkbook journalism" had scored over scientific evaluation. However, in spite of these obstacles, the team of investigators composed of Keith Basterfield, Ray Brooke, Steve Bolton, Vladimir and Pony Godic in Adelaide; Gary Little in Melbourne, and Joan Johnston in Perth, continued to interview other witnesses and participants, seeking answers to this intriguing case.

Due to the distance of the site from Adelaide (1100 kms by air) and the ephemeral nature of the physical evidence at the spot, Mr. Basterfield and Mr. Brooke have not visited Mundrabilla personally. However, truck driver John De Jong (Porky) has provided the team an excellent description of the location, and showed them pictures of the area. Together with TV video shots of the area, this has given the team of investigators an understanding of the isolated nature of this stretch of road, the terrain, road surface and vegetation present.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. DE JONG

Mr. John De Jong (nickname "Porky") and a woman friend named Anne were traveling by truck from Perth, W.A. to Adelaide, S.A. at a speed of about 95-100 km/hr. They had stopped at the top of the Madura Pass, W.A. in order to change drivers. Mr. De Jong went to sleep in the rear cabin, while Anne took over the driving.

A colleague of theirs, Graham Henley was driving a truck along the same road, in the same direction, but he was ahead of them. They were far enough behind him that they were not able to see his lights at all during the trip between Madura and Mundrabilla. (See the March 1988 issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal* for an interview with Graham Henley by a newspaper reporter.)

At a point forty kilometers West of Mundrabilla (close to the 40 km. sign-

post), they passed an "S" bend in the road when Anne saw two people waving on the right hand (opposite) side of the road. (In Australia, vehicles drive on the left hand side of the road.) Within 150 meters further down the road, there was a car, also on the right hand side of the road. The front of the car was facing in a South-Westerly direction, i.e. back towards Perth.

Anne asked Porky whether or not she should stop. After raising up from the bunk, he said "no". They continued on.

Later a car overtook them at high speed. After passing their truck, Anne noted that the vehicle's lights were switched off. In her opinion the night was still too dark for a vehicle not to have its lights turned on. Then the lights of the vehicle came back on.

Arriving at Mundrabilla, they noted that another truck driver, Graham Henley, was present and talking to a group of people around a car. After inspecting their truck, Porky and Anne went over to Henley. They then established that it was these people who had been waving at the side of the road and also the same people who had passed their truck at high speed.

The group in the car consisted of a woman and three young men. Porky said the woman appeared hysterical and the boys also looked disturbed. One of the boys had a very white color to his face. They told a story of a UFO. The behavior of the woman convinced Porky, Anne, and Graham that something very unusual had occurred out there.

The woman, established later to be Mrs. Knowles, had a red blotch on the back of her left hand which she was worrying about. She told them she had touched something on the car roof. She kept repeating: "Someone's got to do something," and "Someone's going to get hurt".

KNOWLES' STORY AS TOLD TO DE JONG

The family were heading Eastwards towards Melbourne for a holiday visit with relatives. Sean was driving at the time, Patrick was believed to be in

the front bucket seat, Mrs. Knowles in the rear left seat behind Patrick, and Wayne in the seat behind the driver.

Initially, they saw a bright light ahead of them which they took to be a truck. Something was then over their car. They heard a whirring, high-pitched noise. Their minds and bodies seemed to be taken over by an unknown control. Their voices appeared to sound slow and funny. Mrs. Knowles put her left hand on top of the car roof and felt something. This frightened her. The car was lifted off the ground to an unknown height. They did not know how long it was airborne. The car dropped to the ground. They left the scene heading Westwards (towards Perth). Then they stopped to change the blown tire. After changing the tire, they made a "U" turn and headed Eastwards again. Porky estimated that all of this happened in 15-20 minutes.

QUESTIONS BY GRAHAM AND PORKY

Graham and Porky questioned the family about this incident and solicited the following answers:

Graham asked them if the noise they had heard could have been a helicopter? The family said the noise was definitely different from that of a helicopter. One of the boys said it was a "whirry" noise, not a helicopter "chuffy" sound. When asked how high they were off the road, they said they didn't know.

The two drivers then volunteered to take the family back to the spot to have a look at the area, to which they declined. The vehicle was inspected by the two drivers with Graham pointing out features to Porky following behind.

INSPECTION OF THE VEHICLE

Porky later related his observations to Keith and Ray.

1.) The burst or blown tire: There was nothing inside the casing of the damaged tire.

2.) There was a smell about the car which he said was closest to "bakelite".

3.) There was nothing underneath the vehicle, i.e. no saltbush. He concluded the vehicle had not been driven off the road into the scrub.

4.) Porky did not see any black ash/dust on the vehicle, neither inside or outside. The car was dusty and dirty, as per normal road travel.

5.) The boot (trunk) was in a shambles, everything scattered about.

There were no suitcases in the boot nor in or on the car. (As previously reported, the family had two suitcases banded to the roof of the 1984 Ford Telstar automobile.)

6.) There were four marks on the roof, one at each corner. These were indentations not cuts. They looked the same as a mark one would make by hitting the roof with a fist.

The Knowles family left Mundrabilla, heading towards Eucla, W.A. and then to South Australia after spending no more than 30 minutes at Mundrabilla. Graham and Porky went into the roadhouse and discussed the episode with the manageress, Mrs. Shirley Landon. Following this discussion, Mrs. Landon telephoned the Sergeant at the Eucla Police Station. Porky spoke to him and told what he knew.

After this the two truck drivers borrowed an automatic "ute" (automatic drive utility vehicle) from the roadhouse and went out to the site together with Anne. They drove back along the road to see what they could find, but especially to look for three things.

1.) Clumps of rubber on the bitumen which would indicate a blowout.

2.) Pieces of glass from the driver's side mirror. The mirror was reportedly smashed after a kangaroo hit the Knowles' vehicle. This was said to be during the time they had their vehicle lights out while in front of the truck.

3.) The car jack and car jack handle reportedly left at the scene.

The group could not find evidence of any of these, despite knowing the area/road well and knowing exactly where the car was parked, and the kangaroo hit. Both sides of the road, now daylight, were inspected at low speed.

THE SITE

They located the spot where they

had seen the car stationary on the side of the road. The road at this spot is slightly undulating. By this time it had been an estimated one to 1 and ½ hours since they passed the spot the first time, and was now between 0545 and 0615.

The evidence at the location which they saw for themselves consisted of the following:

1.) FOOTPRINTS: There were footprints where persons had been walking around. There were four sets of prints heading from the car away into the bush in a South-westerly direction. These prints were not full marks, but more front foot and toe marks as if running.

From a point in the bush there were prints leading back to the road in a Northerly direction in a straight line. There were four sets of prints plus dog paw marks going back along the side of the road in the sand ... full patterns as if people were walking. One set of prints was that of someone with bare feet, one with thongs and two with shoes or runners (tennis or running shoes).

2.) JACK: There was an impression in the ground of a car jack where they had changed the tire. When questioned, Porky believed it was a "suarish" mark and not one of the old round jacks.

3.) TIRE PRINTS: On the bitumen (bituminous road surface), there was a skid mark 15 - 20 meters long, apparently made by the rear left hand tire when they pulled up. In the dirt there was evidence of a flat tire on the vehicle coming off the road, and no flat tire when they got back onto the road. There were signs that the vehicle was driven backwards on to the bitumen before doing a U-turn and proceeding Eastwards.

There was no sign of the car jack or car jack handle reportedly used to change the tire. They performed a grid pattern search for these and were perturbed when they couldn't find them. They failed to find any trace of the clothes they believed to have been loose in the boot (trunk), which the Knowles said they took out to get access to the spare tire, and which they left at the scene.

AFTERWARDS

The group (truck drivers) then returned to Mundrabilla where Porky had another talk with the Eucla police. He learned that the Knowles vehicle had passed through Eucla by this time. Porky suggested the police call Penong police in South Australia and have the car stopped, as there was something definitely wrong.

After a whole morning had passed, the two truck drivers finally left Mundrabilla and headed East. Porky and Anne drove to Penong where they stopped for a while and then proceeded to Wudinna, S.A. for coffee. A helicopter was already there (probably Channel 7 personnel).

Their own personal investigation disclosed that the Knowles family was in a motel and various media organizations were also present. After a period of time, Porky and Anne were allowed to talk to the Knowles family. After talking to them Porky drove to Adelaide where he appeared on Channel 9 TV for a short interview.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

- Porky knows the road (Eyre Highway) well since he has been a truck contractor traveling between Perth and Adelaide for several years.

- They did not know the Knowles vehicle was ahead of them during the section Madura/Mundrabilla, i.e. they didn't see the car lights ahead of them until the Knowles passed them later.

- Porky said the Knowles car couldn't have been on the side of the road when Graham passed the spot.

- Anne saw no unusual lights at any stage, especially not when they passed the Knowles car. No unusual effects were noted on the engine, lights, UHF or CB radio, steering, etc. No unusual sounds were heard.

- TIMING: It was between 0400 and 0430 local time when they passed the stationary car on the side of the road. Porky confirmed the time as about 0445 when he got to Mundrabilla. They said it was definitely still dark when they passed the stationary car.

- Mrs. Knowles was sitting on the left hand side passenger seat, not behind the driver, according to Porky.

- Sean was driver at this time. He

appeared hysterical to Porky and was unable to speak at all at Mundrabilla.

• **WEATHER:** At Madura Pass, Porky had checked out his vehicle while changing drivers. He noted that the sky was clear, stars were visible, there was no moon, and no sign of any lightning in the area. Sunrise occurred definitely after they saw the people waving at the side of the road.

• Graham told Porky that he had seen an unusual light in his rear vision mirror and tried to call Porky on his CB radio. Porky did not receive such a call, but believes he was out of range at the time. Graham did not know Porky had stopped at the Madura Pass, thus increasing the distance between the two trucks. When they passed the Knowles car, both the CB radio and a UHF radio were adjusted for a low volume level. Anne was listening to a cassette.

• They were asked if the Knowles had mentioned any other vehicles being involved in the encounter. Porky said no they hadn't. Anne was asked if she saw vehicles going West during the time between Madura and Mundrabilla. She said "yes". Without being led, she was asked if she had recollections of a car and van (house trailer) passing the other way? She stated she did not remember such going by, and added that it would be rare for someone to pull a van during the night.

• Upon the return trip to investigate in the "ute", they found a man asleep in a car 20 kms West of Mundrabilla. They apparently woke him up by looking in his car.

DISCREPANCIES NOTED AND CORRECTED

It is clear that there was a discrepancy between which of Mrs. Knowles' hands was affected.

On initial media advice, it was thought that there was a fifth vehicle involved, but that now appears to be spurious.

Vehicle one was a car and caravan that was reported by the Knowles family to have almost collided with their car when driver Sean took evasive action by swerving to avoid a close encounter with the object on the highway. The team of investiga-

MUFON UFO Journal, No. 240 April 1988

tors have placed an article in a Perth, W.A. Sunday newspaper in an attempt to locate the person/witness.

Vehicle two was a truck being driven by Mr. Graham, age 57, a transport operator of Forest Hill, Victoria. The investigators have contacted Henley's wife and asked for an appointment to interview him, but to date he has not responded. (He travels consistently.)

Vehicle three was a 1984 Ford Telstar sedan (car) containing the Knowles family from Perth, W.A.

Vehicle four was a truck owned by a transport operator, John De Jong (Porky), and was being driven by a woman friend of De Jong's named Anne.

The odometer reading of Knowles' 1984 Ford Telstar was 002414.2 kms, but since the car is four years old, this would suggest a total of 102,414.2 kms had been travelled.

The entire valve for pumping air into the damaged tire was missing

upon inspection.

The reported indentations on the car roof were roughly at the corners of the roof.

AMDEL VEHICLE EXAMINATION REPORT

The AMDEL Technology and Enterprise vehicle examination report, as requested by Channel Seven, is published with this article in a reduced format to conserve space. As other witnesses are personally interviewed, their reports will be published. We hope that the crew of the tuna fish trawlers in the Great Australian Bight will be interviewed when the ships dock, since the media have reported that an egg-shaped object "buzzed" one of the trawlers and the crew members were reported to have had slow garbled speech as a result. (If this is true, it would lend further credibility to the Knowles family experience.)



Amdel
31 Flemington Street,
Frewville, S.A. 5063
Telephone: (08) 372 2700

Address all correspondence to:
P.O. Box 114,
Eastwood, S.A. 5083

Telex: AA82520
Facsimile: (08) 79 6623

29 January 1988

Channel Seven
PO Box 7
WALKERVILLE SA 5081

Attention Mr. Frank Pangallo

REPORT M4375/88

YOUR REFERENCE	Request - Mr. F. Pangallo.
TITLE	Vehicle Examination.
LOCATION	Mudina, Adelaide.
DATE RECEIVED	22 January 1988.
WORK REQUESTED	Examine vehicle, analyse dust and report on alleged U.F.O. incident.

Investigation and Report by: Anthony M. Luke.

Manager, Materials Services: Philip J. Parry.

for Dr William G Spencer
General Manager
Applied Sciences Group

1. INTRODUCTION

Amdel was requested to investigate a motor vehicle which had been involved in an alleged U.F.O. incident on the Nullabor Plain. It was reported that a tyre had failed during the incident and that a black dust or ash had been deposited on the car. An examination of the vehicle and associated features was requested.

2. PROCEDURE

A visit was made to the storage site of the vehicle in Mudina. A visual examination of the failed tyre, front and rear wheel arches, roof and vehicle interior was carried out. Samples of dust were removed from the left front wheel. The vehicle was inspected using a portable radiation meter.

The dust samples were analysed using X-ray diffraction and emission spectroscopy techniques. The analysis was compared to analyses of material taken from front wheels of vehicles in the Adelaide area.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Visual Examination

The examination of the failed tyre revealed circumferential casing break up on the inner shoulder. A number of radial splits ran approximately half way down the inner shoulder. The steel wires were exposed at the edge of the tread. An area of circumferential abrasion was found on the outer shoulder.

The tyre damage observed is consistent with running on a deflated tyre for some considerable time, possibly 5 to 10kms. The cause of deflation was not identified at the time of the investigation. It is likely that deflation was caused by a puncture, since the tyre had not been damaged by blow out, impact or rollover.

The bell support at the base of the rear right macpherson strut was polished and showed evidence of overheating. It was found that the exposed steel wires from the tyre would have had contact with the component. In the same area, rear right wheel arch, the plastic mudguard had been abraded and rubber had been deposited on the metal panel.

The examination revealed no evidence of any significant ash or dust on the body of the vehicle or in the interior. A quality of black dust was found on the exterior of the front wheels. The dust was also found in greater quantities on the inner surface of the wheels. Some of this material was sampled for further analysis at the Amdel laboratories.

Three shallow dents were observed on the roof of the vehicle. Two dents were located at the rear left corner of the roof, one dent was found at the front right corner. The dents were approximately 50mm long and 0.5mm deep. The front dent was found to have associated paint cracking which showed evidence of corrosion.

The dents were consistent with an object being pressed into the roof rather than an attempt to lift the roof. The corrosion indicated that dent had been present for at least 2-3 days prior to examination depending on exposure to moisture.

Inspection of the vehicle using a radiation meter revealed no areas showing count rates above the background levels. Areas inspected included the roof, front and back seat, and the front wheels. A comparison on a granitic rock from the Mudina area showed rates double the background level.

3.2 Chemical Analysis

Emission spectroscopy indicated the following chemical compositions for the dust and a control sample taken from brake pads.

Element	Results in Percentage	
	Ford	Amdel Control
Iron as oxide	43.4	80.1
Silicon as oxide	14.3	2.6
Calcium as oxide	2.4	0.5
Aluminium as oxide	2.3	0.4
Magnesium as oxide	4.6	2.9
Barium	3.5	3.3
Copper	5.5	<0.005
Zinc	2.6	0.2
Lead	0.9	0.03
Tin	1.9	<0.005
Molybdenum	0.8	0.006

The X-ray diffraction patterns showed the presence of the following crystalline forms in the samples.

Sample - Ford

Compound	Abundance
Magnetite	Abundant
Brass	
Molybdenum Sulphide	
Quartz	
Hematite	Trace
Baryte	
Calcite	

Sample - Amdel ControlCompound

Graphite Iron	◆ Abundant
Barvte Magnetite	◆ Minor

The analyses are considered to be characteristic of dust from wearing brake pads and discs. No significant foreign compounds were present in the dust samples.

4. SUMMARY

The investigation revealed that the damage to the tyre was consistent with running on a deflated tyre for an extended period. It is considered that this would account for the odour, smoke and vibrations sensed during the incident.

The material taken from around the front wheels was typical of residual dust from wearing brake pads and discs. No significant dust was observed on the vehicle as presented for inspection.

dt:3

LOOKING BACK

By Bob Gribble

FORTY YEARS AGO — April 1948: On the 5th three trained balloon observers from the Geophysics Laboratory Section, Watson Laboratories, New Jersey reported seeing a disc-shaped object in the vicinity of Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico. It was very high and fast and appeared to execute violent maneuvers at high speed. The disc was about a fifth the size of a full moon. A yellow or light colored sphere 25 to 40 feet in diameter was reported by Lt. Commander Marcus L. Lowe, USN, just south of Anacostia Naval Air Station, D.C. while he was flying on the 30th. It was moving at a speed of approximately 100 miles per hour at an altitude of about 4,500 feet. Although winds aloft were from the north-northwest the course of the sphere was to the south.

★★★

THIRTY FIVE YEARS AGO — April 1953: At 3:15 pm on the 12th
MUFON UFO JOURNAL, No. 240 April 1988

10 disc-shaped metallic colored objects were observed near Sweetwater, Nevada changing formation while moving at a high rate of speed at an estimated altitude of 7,500 feet. The discs passed under the right nacelle of a C-47 aircraft and were observed by the pilot and co-pilot. The pilot turned the aircraft in a tight 300 degree turn for a better view of the discs which were then seen by two more members of the crew. Observers were unable to estimate the speed of the discs. On the 15th a mass of mysterious white substance drifted down from the sky over Ongaonga, New Zealand. It covered fields, buildings, wires, trees and fences for hundreds of yards around. The substance quickly disintegrated when handled.

★★★

THIRTY YEARS AGO — April 1958: At 6 am (date unknown), on a beach in northeastern Brazil, several

witnesses observed a strange UFO descending from the sky from the direction of the ocean. They could hear a humming sound as the craft approached. When the object was at a distance of about 40 meters and about 15 meters above the water, it began to rock sideways and then became stationary. Described as being very large, the craft was shaped like two bowls placed together rim-to-rim. The top half was aluminum color with a small dome. The bottom half was dark in color. There was a band around the area where top and bottom sections met. The band had a number of square openings which were illuminated by a red light. The openings facing the witnesses were darkened as though someone was looking through them. Directly under the object the water seemed to be boiling or being sucked up without touching the underside of the craft. The UFO was watched for about an hour.

★★★

TWENTY YEARS AGO — April 1968: A Beausejour, Manitoba, Canada man was badly shaken by his experience on the 3rd after a large UFO followed him in his truck to his home. John Kryschuk said the object was some 40 feet in diameter at the bottom and about 30 feet high. As he drove south along P.T.H. 12 at 11:30 pm, he noticed a light shining on the highway from above his moving vehicle. "I stopped my truck," said Kryschuk, "looked up and saw a big light about 400 feet above the highway and hovering above me." He said the light was on the bottom of the craft and he could hear a loud humming sound. Some seven bands of different colored lights were spinning around the object as though they were on belts. Kryschuk said he watched the object for some 10 minutes as it hovered above the highway. Then, he said, he got into his truck and drove to Beausejour. He was shocked to find that the object followed him the remaining four miles, shining such a bright light onto the highway that he said he need not have used his headlights. He said the object suddenly went up and into the southwest like a bolt of

lightning.

On the 16th Henry Ford II was aboard a Ford company plane, a Jet-Star, with several other company executives. They were flying at 35,000 feet en route from San Antonio, Texas to Detroit, Michigan. Near Austin, Texas the pilots sighted a huge, round object overhead. Because of its size they first thought it might be an unusually large research balloon. Then they realized it was moving with them. After checking for a few minutes they found the unknown object was apparently pacing the jet, matching its ground speed of 535 knots (616 MPH). "It looked twice the size of a DC-8," the senior pilot reported. "Our guess was 500 to 600 feet in diameter. There were no protrusions or windows. All the passengers saw it, but no one could identify it." Mr. Ford confirmed the sighting to the *Detroit News*. The UFO, he said, had paced the JetStar for at least an hour.

During the week of the 28th there were several UFO incidents in the Selah-Yakima, Washington area. On one occasion a large UFO was observed launching five smaller objects which moved away from the area at high speed. Later that evening a 16-year-old boy was driving in the same area when he noticed a light off to his left. He stopped his car for a better look and was astonished to see three "beings" emerge from a wooded area and approach his car. He said they appeared to be wearing orange-colored clothing of a shiny texture. The beings were human-like in appearance and four feet tall, or less. There was no hair or other covering on the heads. The boy began honking the car horn in an attempt to frighten the beings away. Then two similar beings emerged from the right side of the road and came toward the car. According to the witness the beings had approached to within 25 feet when they suddenly turned around and walked back to the wooded area. The next morning investigators found six imprints in the soil which resembled foot prints. They were eight inches long, had a narrow heel, no instep and a "paddle-shaped" foot.

★★★

FIFTEEN YEARS AGO — April 1973: Mrs. Raymond Stucker was driving near her home in Ellsinore, Missouri about 11:30 am on the 6th when she saw a large, metallic-colored, disc-shaped object either landing or taking off from a grove of trees off the highway. The object was described as circular with a band around the center and a domed top with porthole-like openings. Landing pods or stilts protruded from the bottom of the craft. It made no noise as it hovered in the air. Several investigators went to the area and located several trees that had been damaged. They also discovered three holes in the ground set in a triangular pattern. Three trees were damaged next to the area where the holes were found. The three holes were about six inches deep and two to three feet across. Of the three damaged trees near the holes, one was split down the center and splintered to pieces, another had the bark stripped down one side of it about 40 feet high. A third in the triangle had only a small amount of bark torn off at the trunk next to one of the holes in the ground. Several other trees were damaged within the triangle which was estimated to be about 50 feet between points.

A young Proston, Victoria, Australia couple had a UFO terrorize them during an eight-mile pursuit of their car on a lonely roadway at 9:30 pm on the 8th. Mr. and Mrs. David Herbohn were returning home when a large, bright disc appeared beside their vehicle. Mr. Herbohn, 18, said he heard a noise like a jet passing overhead and then saw the disc which gave off a reddish-yellow light. "After it became obvious it was chasing us, there was no way we were going to pull up," he said. "Just before it disappeared it seemed to come very close and bright and I felt I could have reached out and touched it. Then the car gave a shudder as if hit by a strong gust of wind and the object disappeared."

★★★

TEN YEARS AGO — April 1978: On the 2nd, just before dawn, a shrill noise cut the air on Bell Island, New-

foundland, Canada and suddenly the little village was rocked by a tremendous explosion. "Sheets of fire" appeared in some homes. The sky glowed red and balls of fire up to three feet across drifted through the village. An electrical surge raced through power lines blowing up television sets and turning wall outlets into blow torches spurting blue flame almost two feet long. The boom had been enormous, rattling homes eight miles away and making people up to 40 miles away turn their heads.

Just before this happened, people living in Portugal Cove, across the bay, reported seeing "a bright, glowing straight line" come out of the sky "slanted toward Bell Island at about a 45-degree angle." Miraculously, no one had been killed and there was little damage. The copper wiring in one house was vaporized. A cabin behind the house was left with a hole in either end. A small barn nearby had collapsed outward while chickens lay dead on the floor, bleeding from the eyes and mouth.

Two scientists from Los Alamos, New Mexico journeyed to Newfoundland to investigate the Bell Island incident. One of the scientists, Robert Freyman, identified himself as a weapons-design engineer interested in ball lightning. He said he'd been expecting the event as a result of a theory he entertained about weather systems. He couldn't go into detail but said there had been similar events in New Jersey and South Carolina. When the Bell Island incident occurred, he said, "someone in Washington" asked him to check it out.

"We were all terrified," admitted Dennis Kiteveles, a police dispatcher, who with his family watched a UFO from his home in Van Buren, New York for 15 minutes. Shortly after 10 pm the lights suddenly went out in Van Buren for several seconds. Then Kiteveles's coonhound began to howl "very, very strangely. It was completely different from his normal howl, like he was in pain. I looked out the window and saw this object hovering about 2,000 feet from the house, very large and roughly oval in shape. It had to be bigger than a 747 jumbo jet and looked like two pie tins, one on

top of the other," Kiteveles said.

The sheriff's department sent a helicopter to the area but could not find the UFO. Helicopter pilot Sgt. Paul Zemenz said "We contacted Hancock Airport and they admitted having an unidentified object on their radar." The next morning Kiteveles' wife discovered that despite the power failure the night before, the electric clocks in her home had actually gained over three minutes.

At 5:15 am on the 10th Officer Ben Eldridge was on a stake-out at Goochland, Virginia waiting for whatever or whomever it was that killed eight cows. He was standing in a corner of a field near a hay barn looking at a herd of 30 to 40 black Angus and white-faced cattle which were to the east. He looked over his right shoulder. "Here the thing was," he recalled, "pointed directly at me. It was round, red and real bright, about 10 to 12 feet long, probably longer. It really scared me when I first saw it." A red glow surrounded the cylinder, about eight inches out from the silver metal it seemed to be made of. Eldridge described the UFO as being "300 to 400 yards away". At first he thought he was going to have to run to dodge the object, "but then, in a few seconds, it was going sideways. There was no noise at all. It was level, slow, smooth. The farther away it got, the smaller it got. It was traveling about 20 feet over the tree tops."

Six youngsters said they saw a large, "really spooky" UFO hovering low over Enfield, Connecticut on the 13th. A woman who says she was drawn from her house by the youngsters' screams, said the object appeared to be an airplane but a very large one like a 707 or 747. She estimated it was flying less than 100 feet off the ground. Asked what kind of sound it made, she hesitated, thinking for a moment and then said she didn't remember a sound.

One of the youngsters said the object, square on the top and round on the bottom, was flashing its red, white and yellow lights and making a buzzing sound. At one point it extended three or four metal legs from its underside. The boy said he hit the object with a rock which made a "ping" sound on impact.

The youngsters, who are between 11 and 13-years-old, said their bodies felt "weird, like something was going through us" while the object hovered overhead. They compared the feeling to someone's foot falling asleep. After the UFO remained overhead for about 10 minutes, they said it went into a high speed vertical climb and vanished into the night sky.

FLORIDA, Continued

by telephone on November 20th to the *Gulf Breeze Sentinel* newspaper after seeing the November 19th article. She was interviewed by Charles Flannigan and Gary Watson in her lovely Oriole Beach home on November 25th and again on December 3, 1987. The Oriole Beach subdivision is half-way between the photo site and the Somerby sighting. Mrs. Zammit said she has not read UFO books and related material. She lives with her husband, Captain Joseph Zammit (U.S. Navy, retired), who formerly commanded the largest U.S. Navy communications base in the U.S.A. He slept through the excitement on November 11th. He stated that his wife had assisted him many times with detailed research while he was in the Navy and she pays particular attention to details. She has earned a B.S. degree in Education.

INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION

The weather at 2:30 a.m. on November 11th was reported as clear, 7 miles visibility, 42 degrees F., and wind at 340 degrees (NNW) with gusts from 12 to 20 mph. At 5:00 p.m., the weather report showed scattered clouds at 15,000 feet, visibility 10 miles, 51 degrees F. and winds at 350 degrees (NNW) at 11 mph.

The Public Affairs offices at Pensacola Naval Air Station and Eglin Air Force Base could not provide any explanation for the sightings. F.A.A. representative, Ron Wehunt (432-2323) said they often have 100 targets on their radar screen at one time, but no fantastic speeds or strange reports were made in that area in November.

Character references for Mrs. Zam-

mit and the Somerbys were favorable. The Somerbys provided a good description of the object photographed by "Mr. Ed" and Mrs. Zammit reported a "blue beam" independently and without any knowledge of the events that Mr. Ed would experience.

The first five half-tone photos on pages 6, 7, and 8 in the March 1988 issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal* were provided through the courtesy of Duane Cook, Editor and Publisher, *The Sentinel*, 1200 Gulf Breeze Parkway, Gulf Breeze, FL 32561, who holds the copyright.

MUFON AMATEUR RADIO NETS

Saturdays
0800 EST/EDT - 7.237 MHz
Sundays
1500 EST/EDT - 28.470 MHz

NATIONAL EMERGENCY CALLING

EST/EDT	MHz
0000-0015	3.990
0400-0415	3.990
0800-0815	7.237
1200-1215	7.237
1600-1615	7.237
2000-2015	3.990

LOCAL
EMERGENCY CALLING
Same times - 28.470

SUPPORT UFO RESEARCH

MUFON

103 Oldtowne Rd.
Seguin, Texas
78155

living in the area. Due to limited space in the Director's Message, only the dates, theme, locations and the person to contact for more information will be provided.

• May 6 and 7. "The UFO Experience"; Best Western TLC Hotel west of Boston, MA. Contact: PSI Symposium, 117 Stanley Road, Swampscott, MA 01907.

• April 16 and 17. "Extraterrestrial Visitors: Fact or Fantasy"; Sheraton Hotel — San Francisco Airport, Burlingame, Calif. Contact: Senzar, Inc., 999C Edgewater Blvd., Suite 308, Foster City, CA 94404, Telephone: (415) 578-9667.

• May 14 and 15. "Extraterrestrial Visitors: Fact or Fantasy"; Ramada Inn Airport North, Phoenix, Arizona. (Same contact as above).

• June 11 and 12. "Extraterrestrial Visitors: Fact or Fantasy"; Convention & Performing Arts Center, San Diego, Calif. (Same contact as above).

• July 9 and 10. "Extraterrestrial Visitors: Fact or Fantasy"; Reno, Nevada. (Same contact as above).

• September 3 to 6: International UFO Congress, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Contact: Irene Granchi, Cx. Postal 12.058 Copacabana, Rio de Janeiro, 22022 Brazil. Telephone (021) 246-6187.

• September 16 and 17: "National UFO Conference"; Cleveland, Ohio. Contact: United Aerial Phenomena Agency (UAPA), P.O. Box 347032, Cleveland, OH 44134.

THE NIGHT SKY

By Walter N. Webb
MUFON Astronomy Consultant

April 1988

Bright Planets (Evening Sky):

Venus reaches its greatest separation from the Sun on the 3rd, 46° east of our sun, and can be seen about 35° above the western horizon (from midnorthern latitudes) at midtwilight. Through a telescope the planet appears as a small half Moon. Look for the Pleiades star cluster close to Venus during the first few nights of April. The brilliant planet (magnitude -4.4) sets as late as 11:30 PM daylight time by the middle of the month. Venus is in close conjunction with the crescent Moon on the 19th. This event offers a fine opportunity to see the planet during daylight. Sometime before sunset look for the Moon high in the west; Venus will be only about two lunar diameters south of the Moon. Binoculars will provide a better view.

Jupiter, at magnitude -2.0 in Aries, lies low in the west at dusk. Its separation from Venus continues to grow. Early in the month the giant world sets about 8 PM, but by midmonth it vanishes only an hour after sunset. Jupiter passes into the morning sky May 2.

Bright Planets (Morning Sky):

Mars, moving from Sagittarius into Capricornus, rises in the ESE about 3 AM daylight time in mid-April. Shining at 0.5 magnitude, the red planet stands in the SE at dawn. It continues to separate from yellower Saturn to the west and is about the same brightness. The Moon lies below Mars on the 10th.

Saturn, in Sagittarius, rises in the ESE about 12:30 AM daylight time in midmonth and arrives in the south by dawn. The ringed giant begins retrograde or westward motion on the 11th. The last quarter Moon is below Saturn on the 8th.

Meteor Shower:

The Lyrid meteors achieve maximum on the morning of the 22nd (the shower lasts from about April 19 to 24). Radiating from the little constellation of Lyra the Harp, these swift white streaks will dart across the sky free of disturbing moonlight after about 1:30 AM (on the 22nd). Though amounting to only about 15 meteors per hour at maximum, the Lyrids nevertheless are bright and frequently leave luminous "trains" which persist a few seconds.

Moon Phases:

- Full moon — April 2
- Last quarter — April 9
- New moon — April 16
- First quarter — April 23



The Stars:

Leo the Lion lies due south now in mid-April at 10 PM daylight time. Look for the lion's sickle-shaped head with the star Regulus below. Leo leads the procession of springtime constellations in the east.

**MUFON
AMATEUR
RADIO
NET**

**EVERY SATURDAY
MORNING
AT 0800 EST (OR DST)
ON 7237 KHz s.s.B.**

MESSAGE, Continued

Gloria Colon, a teacher in San-turce, P.R., has been appointed State Director for Puerto Rico. **Darin D. Hooper**, vice president of Tri-Tel Communications in Tahlequah, Oklahoma is the new State Section Director for Cherokee and Adair Counties. **Francis Ridge**, State Director for Indiana, selected the team of **Brian** and **Linda McCormick** to become the Co-State Section Directors for Dekalb, Allen and Adams Counties. **Ray W. Boeche**, State Director for Nebraska, approved the appointment of **Paul F. Hicks** of Omaha to be the State Section Director for Douglas and Sarpy Counties.

Other new State Section Directors volunteering this past month were **Charles D. Baer** of Pollock Pines, Calif. for El Dorado County; **Robert W. Ryan**, residing in Raymond, Wash., for Pacific County; and **James E. King**, a retired banker in Albia, Iowa for Monroe, Appanoose, Lucas and Wayne Counties. Two medical doctors have volunteered their expertise in specialized fields as consultants to MUFON. **Duane A. Diller**, M.D. of Oregon City, OR in Ophthalmic Surgery and **John G. Miller**, M.D., living in San Pedro, Calif. for Emergency Medicine.

Four talented people have joined MUFON as Research Specialists in applicable areas of UFO research. They are **James D. Buchanan**, M.S. of Chicopee, Mass. for Computer Science; **Les P. Beard**, M.S. of Austin, Texas for Geophysics; **Naomi Rosborough**, M.A. of Houston, Texas for Psychotherapy; and **Joe Pantermuehl**, M.A. of Seguin, Texas for Physics. Joe is a Principal Scientist at Southwest Research Institute in San

Antonio.

★★★

The Annual MUFON Award for the most outstanding contribution to Ufology for 1987-88 will be presented at the MUFON 1988 UFO Symposium in Lincoln, Nebraska on June 25, 1988. Only members of the MUFON Board of Directors may place candidates in nomination for this prestigious award. However, a member may recommend a candidate for nomination to any Board Member with a brief statement of his/her accomplishments in Ufology. The deadline for receiving nominations from Board Members is April 15, 1988. The following people have been nominated as of March 19, 1988, listed in alphabetical order: **Barry Greenwood**, **Budd Hopkins**, **David M. Jacobs**, **Bruce Maccabee**, **Paul B. Norman** and **Dan Wright**. A ballot will be enclosed with the May 1988 issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal* so all members and subscribers may vote for their choice to receive the plaque and recognition by their colleagues in Ufology.

Marge Christensen, Director of Public Relations, has announced that the Third Annual National UFO Information Week will be held August 14 to 21, 1988. Now is the time for each state to start making their preparations for this important UFO public education event.

There are now four candidates vying for the position of Central Regional Director to fill the vacancy created when Dan Wright became the Deputy Director of Investigations on the Executive Committee. In alphabetical sequence they are: **George Coyne**, Co-State Director for Michi-

gan; **Richard P. Dell'Aquila**, State Section Director for Cuyahoga County in Ohio; **Bill Pitts**, State Section Director for Sebastian, Crawford, Scott and Logan Counties in Arkansas; and Mrs. **Jennie Zeidman**, State Section Director for Franklin and Delaware Counties in Ohio. Three of these outstanding people attended the Regional UFO Conference held at Eureka Springs, Arkansas on March 25 and 26, hosted by Bill Pitts and Arkansas MUFON. All four candidates have expressed a sincere desire to serve as the Central Regional Director, if elected to the MUFON Board of Directors by their peers. A ballot will be enclosed in the May 1988 issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal* to all members in the Central States Region so they may vote for their choice. Each of the four has recognized that Dan Wright has done a superb job, therefore they have accepted the challenge to maintain his track record of leadership and accomplishments.

Robert D. Boyd, State Director for Alabama, has published an "International Who's Who in Ufology Directory," (1988 edition), 280 pages, soft-bound, that is now available for sale through Mr. Boyd at P.O. Box 66404, Mobile, Alabama 36606, U.S.A. The price for a single copy is \$6.95 plus \$2.00 for postage, packaging and handling. There is a reduced P. and H. for multiple copies. Please remit a check or money order (international orders in U.S. dollars) made payable to Robert D. Boyd. (Please allow 4 to 6 weeks delivery time.)

Francis Ridge, State Director for Indiana, has advised that *Journal* subscribers can obtain an "update" on UFO activity by periodically purchasing a copy of the UFO INTELLIGENCE SUMMARY whenever they wish. The price for a current issue is only \$1.50 and includes foreign sightings. The annual subscription price is still \$10.00.

★★★

Several UFO Conferences are being scheduled in the near future which may be of particular interest to those

To find some of the prominent seasonal patterns, use the Big Dipper's built-in pointer system. (The Big Dipper rides high in the north.) A line through the two stars on the end of the bowl can be extended one way to Polaris, the North Star, and the other way to Leo. If the curve of the dipper's handle is followed backwards, the arc will take you first to the orange star Arcturus in Bootes the Herdsman and then onward to blue-white Spica in Virgo the Maiden.

To the west the bright Winter Circle stars drop even lower this month. Look out for two "IFO" stars near the horizon — Sirius, as it sets in the WSW about 11 p.m. daylight time, and Vega, as it rises in the NW about 9 p.m.

DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE

By Walt Andrus

1988 has been greeted with exciting gusto for UFO sightings. Part II of "The Mundrabilla Incident" in Australia is published in this issue of the *Journal*. Regretfully, the deadline for publishing the April issue of the *Journal* arrived before the latest information for Part II of the Gulf Breeze, Florida photographic case arrived. Starting Nov. 11, 1987, photographs and unusual experiences are continuing as this message is being composed. "Mr. Ed" took ten shots of an object on February 26, 1988 with a NIMSLO 3-D camera that was provided by **Tom Deuley** and MUFON of San Antonio under sealed and controlled conditions. **Walt Andrus** flew to Pensacola, Florida on March 3rd to supervise the controlled processing of the ASA 400 color print film at Coast Photo Service laboratory in Pensacola. Mr. Ed had drawn sketches of the object which he photographed, therefore the investigators felt that there was a strong possibility that he may have obtained ten exposures of a long, cigar-shaped object with many lights.

At a press conference on March 4th, with TV cameras from Channels 3 and 5 electronically documenting each step of the controlled process, Walt rewound the film into the canister, cut away the wax seal on the camera back, removed the 35mm color film and handed the canister to **Betty L. Amick**, the manager of Coast Photo Service, Inc., for developing and printing. TV cameras and press representatives recorded and observed every step of the controlled processing, an event that was to become the first in recorded UFO history using a 3-D camera.

The *Pensacola News Journal* and both Channel 3 WEAR-TV and Channel 5 in Pensacola/Mobile were given color enlargements of the object photographed for publication on Saturday, March 5 and the 10:00 p.m. TV news on March 4th. Further photo analysis and investigation will determine the identity of the object photographed. All ten exposures contained

multiple images of the object, since each of the four lenses in the 3-D NIMSLO camera recorded an image. Walt turned the negatives over to Tom Deuley for further processing and study, in conjunction with Dr. **Bruce S. Maccabee**, who had previously spent four days in Gulf Breeze, Florida analyzing the color polaroid photos made by Mr. Ed.

On March 26th, Mr. Andrus presented a slide-illustrated lecture in Eureka Springs, Arkansas at the Arkansas MUFON UFO Conference of all photographs made through February 26th. This same presentation will be made in Des Moines, Iowa on May 31st at Drake University for an Iowa MUFON meeting. My only regret is that we cannot afford the cost of publishing the copyrighted photos in glorious color in the *May Journal*. (Readers will have to be content with the black and white reproductions similar to those that were published in the March 1988 issue.)

The Gulf Breeze case has the combined aspects of CE I, CE II, CE III and potentially CE IV classifications. MUFON consultants have responded to the in-depth investigation. In addition to Dr. Maccabee's photo analysis, **Budd Hopkins** flew to Florida to personally interview Mr. Ed, probing the possibility of regressive hypnosis to disclose a suspected in-plant within his right forehead. If regressive hypnosis reveals that there is a strong chance that an in-plant was inserted, MUFON has authorized the expenditure for a CAT scan to be conducted at the hospital in Pensacola. Mr. Ed has agreed to this medical procedure. The investigative team is scientifically documenting all of the evidence, because this could develop into one of the most significant cases in UFO history. Even the skeptics may be overwhelmed with incontrovertible evidence.

★★★

"Abductions and the ET Hypothe-

sis" is the theme for the MUFON 1988 UFO Symposium to be held June 24, 25 and 26, 1988 at the Nebraska Center Hotel, University of Nebraska in Lincoln. The speakers presently scheduled and the titles of their papers are the following: Key-note speaker, **Marge Christensen**, "Hynek's Last Wish for Ufology"; **Jerome Clark**, "The Fall and Rise of the Extraterrestrial Hypothesis"; **Walter N. Webb**, "Encounter at Buff Ledge: A UFO Case History"; **Raymond W. Boeche**, "Public Reaction to Extraterrestrial Contact" (A survey of psychologists and psychiatrists); **Budd Hopkins**, "The Abduction Experience"; **David M. Jacobs, Ph.D.**, (A preview of his new book on abductions); **Bruce S. Maccabee, Ph.D.**, "Analysis of the Gulf Breeze, Florida Photographs"; **Walt Andrus**, "The Gulf Breeze, Florida Case."

Special hotel rates will be \$35 for single occupancy and \$38 for double occupancy plus tax per night. Reservations should be sent to Nebraska Center Hotel, 33rd and Holdrege Streets, Lincoln, NE 68583-0901 or telephone (402) 472-3435. Registration information will be provided in the *May 1988* issue of the *Journal*. Meetings will start on Friday, June 24th at 6:00 p.m. and extend to 5:00 p.m. on Sunday, June 26th. The package price will be \$35 for all sessions. A meeting for State and Assistant State Directors will be held on June 24th from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. If you plan to fly to Lincoln, please make your airline reservations now so that you may take advantage of the special reduced fares.

★★★

As MUFON membership continues to increase in healthy strides, the need for leadership in every state must compensate accordingly for this growth. It is a pleasure to confirm that volunteers are stepping forward to accept these responsibilities. **Anna**

Continued on page 23