

Mufon UFO Journal

Official Publication of the Mutual UFO Network Since 1967

Number 281
September 1991
\$3.00



GERALD ANDERSON:

Truth vs. Fiction

By John S. Carpenter

Mufon UFO Journal

September 1991

Number 281

CONTENTS

GERALD ANDERSON: Truth vs. Fiction.....	John S. Carpenter	3
TRACKING TRACES	Irena Scott	8
LOOKING BACK	Bob Gribble	10
THE UFO PRESS	Stanton Friedman, W. Ritchie Benedict	13
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.....	Hopkins, Beckjord, Good	19
THE OCTOBER NIGHT SKY	Walter N. Webb	22
DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE	Walt Andrus	24
COVER PHOTOGRAPH: Gerald Anderson	Photo courtesy of Springfield News-Leader	

EDITOR
Dennis W. Stacy

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Walter H. Andrus, Jr.

COLUMNISTS
Walter N. Webb
Robert Gribble
Lucius Farish

MUFON UFO JOURNAL
(USPS 002-970)
(ISSN 0270-6822)
103 Oldtowne Rd.
Seguin, TX 78155-4099
Telephone: (512) 379-9216

Copyright 1991 by the Mutual UFO Network.
All Rights Reserved.

No part of this document may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the Copyright Owners. Permission is hereby granted to quote up to 200 words of any one article, provided the author is credited, and the statement, "Copyright 1991 by the Mutual UFO Network, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155," is included.

The contents of the MUFON UFO Journal are determined by the editors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Mutual UFO Network.

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. Bequests, legacies, devises, transfers or gifts are also deductible for estate and gift purposes, provided they meet the applicable provisions of Sections 2055, 2106 and 2522 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The MUFON UFO JOURNAL is published monthly by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas. Membership/Subscription rates: \$25 per year in the U.S.A.; \$30 foreign in U.S. funds. Second class postage paid at Seguin, TX.
POSTMASTER: Send form 3579 to advise change of address to:
MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155

GERALD ANDERSON: TRUTH vs. FICTION

John S. Carpenter, M.S.W.

The following news should please quite a few readers. Gerald Anderson underwent an extensive six-hour polygraph examination in Kansas City, Missouri on July 24, 1991. The highly-qualified, independent polygraph examiner was strongly recommended by the American Polygraph Association and backed by the Fund for UFO Research. Regarding Gerald's account of having seen a crashed saucer, alien bodies and a military retrieval in 1947, the examiner concluded that:

- There was no evidence whatsoever of deception.
- Mr. Anderson has an excellent memory.
- Mr. Anderson is not a pathological liar.

Not only is it significant that these conclusions establish additional credibility to Gerald Anderson, but it's also significant in that this may be the only first-hand crash/retrieval witness to undertake and pass a polygraph.

I would like to express much praise and appreciation for the hard work and many hours Kevin Randle and Don Schmitt put forth to produce *UFO Crash at Roswell* (Avon Books, July 1991). It is always wonderful when the public gets another good dose of facts regarding the existence of UFOs — especially when it concerns the retrieval of one and subsequent secrecy. Their tireless efforts are to be commended.

However, I am startled and disappointed at their quick and bold dismissal of the Gerald Anderson/Barney Barnett saucer crash accounts on the Plains of San Agustin — which have very little to do with the Roswell case at all. The authors will both tell you that they spent very little time themselves investigating Gerald's account, but yet they write as if they were well-informed and very much a part of the investigation. They have no business dismissing an account that they have not thoroughly or properly investigated. As a major participant in the Gerald Anderson investigation, I would like to clarify, correct and present facts which will hopefully set the record straight from my first-hand role in this case.

I recently reviewed the article by Don Schmitt and Kevin Randle entitled "Gerald Anderson and the Magdalena Connection," which appears in *The Roswell Report: A Historical Perspective*, published by the J. Allen Hynek Center for UFO Studies, July 1991. I expected to find a careful consideration of the facts followed by probing questions and naturally, some kind of argument or challenging hypothesis. Instead I was dismayed and disillusioned with the article because it contained many blatant errors, distortion of facts and conclusions based on assumptions. Therefore, any arguments posed against the credibility of Gerald Anderson are built on very

shaky ground themselves and must be considered now against true facts in this case. I am not surprised that this article is so misinformed and full of errors. This would naturally occur if the authors had had little or no contact with the witness or the principal investigators. Don Schmitt has never met or talked with Gerald Anderson. Kevin Randle has never met Gerald Anderson, but has talked with him by phone one time for 26 minutes (verified by phone records), long before our investigation ever began. Neither Kevin nor Don has ever talked with me despite my conducting investigative interviews, hypnosis sessions, background checks, going to New Mexico, and countless other contacts with the witness. I understand that Stanton Friedman was rarely consulted either. So their article is on very shaky ground from the beginning. Now let's take a closer examination of several points.

1) "They (the bodies) were up under this thing. It wasn't torn up and they weren't scattered around." "... This is consistent with the way the discovery of the bodies was portrayed on the 'Unsolved Mysteries' program."

Here the authors imply that Gerald simply echoed what he watched on TV. Gerald describes the four beings as laying next to each other on metal sheets in the shade of the crashed domed disc. "Unsolved Mysteries" portrayed the beings as scattered in the grass around the disc. Note that this is *unlike* Gerald's story and also one of the reasons why he called "Unsolved Mysteries" to correct them.

2) "In fact, most of the discrepancies between what he told us in February 1990 and what he remembered and told to Stan Friedman under hypnosis seven months later could be explained by his age."

Neither one has ever met Gerald Anderson in person, but the article makes it sound like they both sat down with him and had a long discussion. Secondly, Stan Friedman was in Canada while

Gerald was recalling his details with me while under hypnosis in Missouri. There is no excuse for these obvious inaccuracies. The differences in the amount of detail simply results from the length and depth of our interviews in comparison with Kevin Randle's 26-minute phone call. Age has little to do with it. Hypnosis was more responsible for the obtaining of 20 per cent more detail to add to his conscious recall.

3) "First, according to Don Berliner, Anderson was able to take them right to the crash site. He had to walk around for a few minutes, but once he spotted a windmill, he knew he was close. Even after 43 years, he was able to find the site easily."

Don Berliner will certainly verify my following statements. As Don and I sat talking in the restaurant portion of the Eagle Guest Ranch, Stan, Gerald, Robert Bigelow and the helicopter

Gerald Anderson Passes Polygraph

pilot flew to the area designated by Gerald's handwritten map made during the hypnosis session in Springfield, Missouri. Gerald was certain that they had located the correct area but felt disoriented and unsure as to the exact hill or ridge. He felt bothered that night because the rocky ridge he first designated along the arroyo "did not feel right" for some reason. He continued to feel unsettled because he could see the town of Horse Springs from this site and not enough of the Plains as he had remembered. And there had been no windmill to be seen anywhere.

Later the next morning we drove to the area and suggested that Gerald retrace on foot the car's path and their hike down into the arroyo. Without an invitation toward any of us or a desire for any kind of an audience to watch him, Gerald climbed over a barbed-wire fence and set out across the desert, determined to find the landmarks he knew must be out there somewhere. For various reasons the others chose to wait in the four-wheel drive vehicle. However, I decided that somebody ought to follow and watch *how* he finds the site, and since I was familiar with the details of landmarks from the hypnosis session, I climbed over the fence to follow and photographed him at each point in the search. Although the old rutted road could not be found, Gerald finally saw the ridge with big rocks where the family had abandoned their car and continued on foot. From this ridge Gerald really seemed to get his bearings because now you could look down into the arroyo clearly. The first hill he had selected as the crash site was now obviously wrong because it was readily visible at this point and should not have been. The actual site is obscured by a nearby sloping hill at this point. Walking down into and along the arroyo toward the Plains brings you around to the other rocky ridge (just like he had remembered under hypnosis) where the crashed disc would have been obscured not only from the parked family car but also from the town of Horse Springs. Now Bat Cave can be seen across the

Plains and the terrain is "feeling right" for Gerald. *Still no sign of any windmill.* Assuming this was the correct ridge for the crash, we returned to the others and encouraged them to drive to the approximate area where there *should be* an old windmill. When we found it behind the trees, it was right where it should have been in correlation with all the other landmarks. Thus, one can see that Gerald did not find it quickly, easily, or with the help of seeing a windmill first!

4) "Anderson remembered new details about the crash as he walked around the field."

I was with Gerald as he walked around the crash site. There was not one utterance of any new data, recollections or additional detail. Much of the time he was deep in his thoughts, reflecting on his childhood memories, and searching for desert terrain carefully so as to be certain of where the events took place. I was with Gerald in New Mexico for the next few days and traveled home seated next to him on various planes. Not once did he add or alter one single detail from the interviews and hypnosis session performed on September 4, 1990. Since Randle and Schmitt do not acknowledge my interviews, hypnosis sessions, or presence in New Mexico in their article, it is quite possible that they did not understand where this "new" information suddenly came from.

Since they were not communicating with Gerald, Stanton or myself, it is quite understandable how confused they must have become about the process of our investigation. When they apparently thought they were hearing "new" details from Gerald, they were actually just acquiring bits and pieces of our original interviews over a period of time through the only means of acquiring knowledge they utilized — occasional news articles and radio interviews.

Details regarding "50-foot diameter," "small dome," arriving "15 minutes before the archeologists," "girl named Agnes," and captain named "Armstrong" are described as *new* additions to his story. Again, all of these aspects were fully included in the hypnosis session performed earlier that month.

5) "The next day, Berliner, who was trying to find the site again, got lost. He had been there only about 24 hours earlier, had flown over it in a helicopter, but still had trouble finding the right place."

Don Berliner was never on the helicopter! Don Berliner did not follow Gerald across the desert terrain and did not know the landmarks that it took for Gerald to find the site. Don only saw the site after we drove up behind it and led him over several hills to it. I think I would have had trouble finding it from that direction also, because I wouldn't be following the story's landmarks.

6) "In December 1990 he went farther, saying that one apparently was uninjured and had been trying to help its fellows."


Again they use this December date to imply that Gerald is once more adding new details. December 9, 1990 was the date that the *Springfield News Leader* printed the first extensive article on Gerald's recollection, obtained in a three-hour interview in which I was also present. All the details were in keeping with the original interview. Of course this article would seem *new* to Randle and Schmitt since they had not been in communication with Gerald or myself during the investigation. The news article would have been their only method of learning anything about the case. So:

7) "In a newspaper account, Anderson mentioned the news reports on July 7, 1947, concerning the debris found near Roswell. In their 1980 book, *The Roswell Incident*, Charles Berlitz and William L. Moore report erroneously that the first stories appeared on July 7. Later research shows conclusively that the first newspaper stories appeared on July 8. Anderson, since he gave the wrong date must have read *The Roswell Incident*."

I was with Gerald for the newspaper interview. When the reporter asked for the date, Gerald didn't know. I gave it to the reporter from what I had remembered reading.

8) "In later interviews Anderson added still more detail." "More details are added, others are changed, ..."

Here again, later in the article, details



regarding "Buskirk," "Agnes," the "huge gash in the side of the craft, and the military presence are portrayed as new revelations and further additions to Gerald's account. I must again emphasize that *all details* were acquired during four hours of tape-recorded conscious as well as hypnotic investigation on September 4, 1990.

9) "All those who have heard his story through the years are gone ... all documents have been supplied by the same source, Gerald."

Wrong again. Recently, Stanton Friedman interviewed an elderly friend of Gerald's father from the family's church in Albuquerque. That man recalled Gerald's father describing a strange saucer crash on the Plains of San Agustin and "not being able to examine it closely" for very long. Stan also located Gerald's stepsister — whom Gerald had lost track of for 33 years — and she told Stan that she recalled Gerald telling of the saucer crash on the Plains, although she really couldn't remember any of the

When we first interviewed Gerald some seven months later, he still hesitated and was uncertain about seeing any blood. He emphasized how "banged-up" they appeared.

details. Gerald's cousin Vallejean sent her hand-written copy of her father's (Uncle Ted) diary directly to Stanton in Canada along with her comments in a cover letter. Gerald had only been given a Xerox copy at his father's funeral in 1978. I asked Gerald if he thought Vallejean could have made her own written copy of her father's document. He said that he doubted what we had copies of was in her handwriting because hers was always neat and easy to read. Remembering that, I checked the cover letter sent to Stan and found indeed her signature neat and easy to read — much different from the scrawling style in the diary.

10) "Under hypnosis, Anderson ex-

plained that only two were dead when he and his family arrived. One was moaning and died while they were there."

Neither under hypnosis nor in the December 1990 news article is there ever the slightest suggestion of any creature "moaning." Even in the transcript of their only contact with Gerald, Gerald says "The creature never made a sound."

11) "His description of the aliens does not match that of either other witnesses at Roswell or any other reliable account found in UFO reports involving humanoids."

First of all, we are not talking about the Roswell crash. Three bodies in some kind of canoe-shaped ejection pods were discovered near Corona. At the San Agustin crash site both Barnett and Anderson describe *four* beings with oversized heads, thin, small bodies, dark eyes, and hands with four long, slender fingers, wearing some kind of gray clothing. Not only do Barnett's and Anderson's descriptions match, but Gerald went into much more depth and

detail about them than has ever been printed. These details — despite my efforts with leading, suggestive questions — match anatomical descriptions and feelings from abduction accounts perfectly! In fact, several of the abductees I've worked with get chills over hearing his description or seeing his drawing because it's *so close* to their own memories and feelings.

12) "... Anderson told us that he could see the cliff dwelling .. No such structure is visible from the claimed location." "Anderson watched them approach from the east."

There *are* cliff dwellings in the crash site vicinity. Gerald had always described the "cliffs" and "caves" to us. Bat Cave, an archeological dig site across the Plains, would have offered a clear view of any fiery object coming down or reflecting sunlight in the morning. In Randle's phone transcript Gerald assumed the dig site would be "three or four hours of walking" in distance. There are also cliffs with small caves just west of the site and much closer. It's interesting to note that Gerald originally recalled under hypnosis that the archeology group tried to get the military to let them return to the west from which they had come. He didn't speculate why, but later we decided that if they had been just hiking it would not have mattered if they were forced to go up to the road. But if they had driven across the Plains from Bat Cave on a road that runs up behind the crash site *to the west*, then they would need to retrieve their car and would insist upon returning to the west.

13) "None of the archeologists mentioned the event to anyone." "All efforts to locate the archeologists have failed."

If one has never ever located any of the archeologists, then how could one interview these witnesses to learn whether they ever told anyone? It is rather presumptuous to claim knowledge of what the archeologists did or didn't do when contact has not even been made with them. If this statement is based on the assumption that people would have come forth to tell the saucer-crash story if they had been told by an archeologist, then that in itself is a rather naive assumption — and cer-

tainly not sound enough upon which to build one's argument. We know that plenty of people have remained silent due to fear of reprisal, ridicule, or simply a lack of knowledge as to whom to tell or trust.

14) "According to one witness, the archeology group had been rock hunting."

Anonymous Witness

Who is this one witness? Earlier Randle and Schmitt state that none of the archeologists ever told anything to anyone or could even be found. So who is this unnamed person? When Stanton asked Don Schmitt at our breakfast in Chicago who the archeologist/source was in their book, the answer simply was, "An anonymous phone call." No name. No verification. No credibility. But they use this unverified source to discredit Gerald.

I must agree with the following statement from their article: "An eyewitness, repeating a story he has lived, will make minor changes in each telling of it." This described Gerald perfectly! Not only was I with him through the first four hours of interviews, the plane flights to and from Albuquerque, and the four days spent together in New Mexico but I have spent countless other hours with him on the phone and in person, including local UFO gatherings, several radio interviews, a newspaper interview, a local TV interview, and at the 1991 Ozarks UFO Conference in Eureka Springs, Arkansas. His story remains consistent despite many opportunities to elaborate and "fill in the blanks" posed by many probing questions from others. Even when we placed him under hypnosis for Linda Howe's television documentary, he relived the experience again with remarkable accuracy and detail. Only a few new details emerged which is not surprising when under hypnosis for a "second look." Their claim of "major revisions" and an ever-changing story are untrue and unfounded.

A few other researchers have made some noise about the idea that Gerald is seeking publicity or financial gain. First of all, Gerald has always been

cautious as to with whom he would share any information. He turned down the TV program "*Hard Copy*" because he felt it was too sensational. He turned down an all-expense paid trip back to the crash site and a \$1,000 honorarium that the Japanese offered him and only allowed them to film him (and myself) in Springfield, Missouri. He questioned me carefully about Linda Howe and Bob Oeschler before he had any contact with them. The extensive Springfield news article came about when the writer read about my activities with Gerald in our local UFO newsletter. I encouraged Gerald to allow this writer to interview us because I knew this man had written about UFO incidents previously in a factual and respectful manner. Knowing that the account would eventually get publicized by someone, I felt it was crucial that we take the opportunity to have it done right. Because the writer respected the importance of the story, he offered for both Gerald and I to proofread his work for accuracy. So Gerald certainly did not run out to the media or seek opportunities to make money!

So, is there any basis for which Randle and Schmitt stake their claims? The authors state they have two taped interviews with Gerald Anderson that are full of contradictions and discrepancies. Upon finally receiving transcripts with help from Fred Whiting of FUFOR, I was surprised to find the short 26-minute phone call on February 4, 1990 with Randle as the one and only contact with Gerald Anderson. My first 90-minute interview with Gerald was originally transcribed in the same format and spacing as theirs but occupies 75 pages in contrast to the 12 pages for this phone call.

The second "interview" is merely a transcription of Bob Oeschler's phone interview with Gerald Anderson for Bob's national radio program on March 24, 1991 — more than a year later and long after our investigation, hypnotic sessions, and trip to New Mexico. Does this constitute a proper follow-up interview *by Randle and Schmitt* with Gerald Anderson? Gerald had always stated he had had only one relatively short phone call with Kevin Randle. Therefore, the

full extent of Randle and Schmitt's investigative interviewing adds up to this one 26-minute phone call.

Transcript

There are many interesting things about this transcript. First of all, I was struck by the many similar rather than contradictory details — often described with the same vocabulary as in our interviews months later. No one has disputed the fact that the tape is of poor quality with many parts difficult to decipher. Linda Howe, author and TV producer, told me she had much difficulty understanding it. The transcript itself contains remarks about the difficulties with transcription. Nevertheless, the authors claim that every word is transcribed accurately. However, I found some obvious mistakes the first time I read through it:

"This vessel *was not* torn open. The side *was* torn out of it and there was a lot of cables and junk like that (hanging out) ... this craft *wasn't* torn open in the side ... You *couldn't* see inside this thing .. There was some kind of material that resembled wires that were *hanging out of this hole ...*"

Having transcribed many tapes myself, I understand the difficulty in hearing the difference between "was" and "wasn't" or "could" and "couldn't." The inconsistencies in the above content indicate something isn't being transcribed correctly.

Another transcript error occurs with the names "Ted and Dick." (Who is "Dick?") There is no "Dick" in any part of this story. It's clear to me that the name "Victor" was heard as "Dick" since "Ted and Victor" are mentioned in the next few sentences. But my point is that the authors claim the transcript is free of any errors!

If poor tape quality and subsequent troubles with transcription aren't enough, the authors clearly twist the words of their own transcript several times for their article.

1) *Article*: "To Anderson .. it (the craft) looked like a bomb lying there."

Transcript: "My dad told me to stay right here. He kept saying, 'Well, it might be a bomb or something like that.'"

Anderson turned down the TV program "Hard Copy" because he felt it was too sensational. He turned down an all-expense paid trip back to the crash site and a \$1,000 honorarium that the Japanese offered him.

2) *Article*: "When asked if he was sure they (archeologists) were from the University of Pennsylvania, Anderson said that he was."

Transcript: "Well ... I think so, but it has been a long, long time. They worked with the university and I'm thinking Pennsylvania .. bear in mind, I've heard this story so many times, and I know how people add things to them."

3) *Article*: "One (creature) was moaning and died while they were there."

Transcript: "I never heard a sound from this creature."

4) *Article*: "The side of its (creature's) face was abraded and oozing red blood."

Transcript: "... it wasn't oozing blood."

Claiming that Gerald was certain that he saw red blood is rather misleading when one actually studies this first phone contact with him. In their own transcript Gerald says, "I can't recall ... maybe ... there was blood .. bruising. Looked like bruising ... like he'd been scraped. Like thrown against something ..." Randle then asks a leading question, "Was it good red blood?" — to which Gerald ponders, "It seems to me that it was. I'm trying to visualize." But then Gerald continues to emphasize that it was more "like a scrape." When we first interviewed Gerald some seven months later, he still hesitated and was uncertain about seeing any blood. He emphasized how "banged-up" they appeared. Under hypnosis he never saw any blood at all and now feels quite certain that he has remembered correctly.

They also stated that he claims the aliens had "big, milky-blue eyes" — which *is* in the transcript as well. But also in the transcript Gerald states, "not blue like blue in human eyes ..." When he told us on tape that the eyes were "almost black," we asked him again later (while he was making drawings)

what he meant. He stated (unfortunately not taped) that the black eyes had a bluish tinge, giving a "murky-blue" appearance. This might resemble the bluish shine of black satin or the iridescence of a butterfly's wings. It's quite conceivable that the transcriptionist misunderstood "murky-blue" as "milky-blue." With further questioning of a witness these difficulties in comprehension vanish because of spending many hours and days clarifying various points. Neither Randle nor Schmitt ever followed-up with Gerald to clarify anything!

It *wasn't* that Gerald added or changed details; it was the fact that Randle and Schmitt did not make contact to learn anything further about what we had obtained and researched.

Recently, another claim is sending a premature shock wave through researchers. According to Fred Whiting of FUFOR, Kevin Randle called, claiming he now had "irrefutable evidence" that Gerald Anderson took an anthropology course from the archeologist Buskirk at Albuquerque High School. This is a curious claim especially after reviewing these facts:

1) Federal law prohibits the release of information without signed consent. School officials refused to give Randle information.

2) School transcripts do not indicate the teachers for the classes. Officials indicated it would be nearly impossible to learn who taught a particular class in 1957.

3) There is no absolute proof that any Buskirk from Albuquerque High School is the same Buskirk from the crash site.

Although each of these points might seem trivial to take the time to clarify or correct, their accumulative effect serves to distort the facts of this case,

Continued on page 12

TRACKING TRACES

Irena Scott

State Section Director Scott is a MUFON Consultant in Physiology.

Crop circles and other traces have been of intense recent interest in UFOlogy. Many of these crop circles are in England and are composed of bent over grain. Other traces are similar to the one in *Intruders*: "The main area was a circle, eight feet in diameter, in which all the grass had turned brown and was now crumbling away. Extending out from this circle was a 49-foot-long swath which ran perfectly straight and was nearly three feet in width. Here, too, the grass was dead and disintegrating. This long track ended in a nearly perfect arc, and seemed absolutely artificial. Two smaller 'jogs' appeared to emerge from the main circle, and one of these contained a deep crack which looked, superficially, as if it had been caused by intense heat."

These traces are rarely seen being made; however there are often reports of UFOs in the area. I investigated a trace similar to, but larger than, the one Budd Hopkins described. I first found out about it in August of 1984, while conducting the survey described in *Ohio Jr. Sci.* 87(1):24-26, 1987, and described it briefly in the *MUFON UFO Journal* (May 1986). Budd Hopkins subsequently expressed an interest in it to my sister. Because of the current high interest in such "circles," more detailed information might be helpful in comparisons and studies of this kind of particular physical trace. As in many other such reports, there were no immediate eyewitnesses; however, there were some related UFO observations (including an extreme close encounter in which the UFO "was followed by a jet-like rocket propellant, which was a bright white rocket exhaust," and which left, or came down, in the approximate direction of the burn) within a month of the approximate time of the trace's appearance and within a mile of its location. The trace was located in an

area that was not visible from any habitation.

Discovery

It was discovered by a farmer, in June 1984, in a field of green, knee high alfalfa. He believed that it had not been made much before then. This field had been in alfalfa for several years and had shown no previous damage in this or any other area. The field was not plowed or replanted for four more years and the trace remained devoid of alfalfa. There was a large high-tension power line, about 1/4 mile south of the burn, that was near a freeway. Several times these power lines had broken and come down, creating a highly dangerous situation because of the freeway. The farmer was worried that people might have trespassed on his property and shot the power lines down. Because of this he kept the only lane to the field blocked by a steel cable locked to a post. He kept the only key himself. No one could have taken machinery on this property without his knowledge. The farmer was mystified about the cause of the burn. He said that he had never seen anything like it in 70 years of farming. He had reported it to the fire department. When asked about UFOs, he did not think that they existed, and did not link the burn to UFOs. I know the farmer well. Neither he nor his wife wanted attention; in fact, they didn't tell me about the burn, another neighbor did.

The trace's appearance was that of a standing green alfalfa that was blackened and charred to its roots. The area of the burn was very localized; plants next to the burned area were undamaged. I obtained this description from the farmer and his two workers, who also saw the burn before the hay was cut. All of them said that nothing had been applied (e.g. no fertilizer or pesticides) to any area of the alfalfa. There had been wet weather during this time and water was standing in the

fields.

When I first saw the area in August 1984, several cuttings of hay had been made. However, no alfalfa grew in the area of the trace. It was around 130 feet long and around six feet wide. Like the trace described in *Intruders*, it consisted of a central circular area (the farmer referred to this as a "blast area"). But there was also a secondary smaller circular area beside it. The largest was around 6-7 feet in diameter. Extending from it to the south was a swath, which ran straight for around 20-25 feet. It had a clear-cut strip of vegetation down the center. Extending in the other direction from the circular area was a distinct swath that curved over the hillside and slowly became less distinct. As in the *Intruders* trace, the central area contained deep cracks.

I discussed the burn with the farmer, his wife, and his two farm workers, the fire chief and a senior industrial chemist. The farmer and his wife could not think of a way for the burn to have been made. They did not believe lightning would make this pattern. If a hot air balloon had landed and blasted its burners sidewise, it would have mashed the hay. Also it is doubtful if the gas would blast for 130 feet (over the side of a hill) or leave two discrete traces. If an airplane had dumped gasoline it would need to have flown higher than the power line and would most likely not be able to make such a discrete mark either, because the gas would disperse in the air. There is no evidence that helicopters burn the ground. Both the farmer and the fire chief said that green alfalfa does not easily burn. The fire chief said that in order to burn green alfalfa it has to have had the water vaporized first since it is chiefly composed of same. It would be almost impossible to set a fire in the area and burn this vegetation without the use of special equipment. The area was on the other side of a very long, steep hill from the freeway. It would have been a very poor site for anyone hoping to perpetrate a hoax.

For one thing, the slope was earmarked by a lot of thick vegetation and topped by a tall fence. Anyone

hauling a liquid or other chemical component would have required a considerable amount, necessitating several trips up and down the hill, all within full view of the freeway. Moreover, there were no visible tracks, either coming from the freeway, or in the field.

I was reminded of certain other effects associated with the trace case mentioned in *Intruders*: "The hedge in the immediate area of the bird feeder also began to wither and ... (they) had to cut the plants back almost to the roots to force new growth. In the spring the Davis family had planted a few tomato plants in the general vicinity of what became the burned circle. The fruit these plants eventually produced were abnormally large and so mealy as to be inedible." They believed the area had possibly been effected by microwaves or some other form of radiation.

In order to investigate further, I took a sample of the soil and of nearby soil from an undamaged area. Seeds grew in both samples. Thus, there was nothing in the soil that interfered with plant growth. Later on, however, as a few dandelions began to grow in the area (possibly from seeds that had already been in the soil), an unusual number looked somewhat deformed. A more than normal number of dandelion stems seemed to grow together so that there would be large-diameter dandelion stems with numerous flower heads. Many of these crept along the ground instead of growing up. So while there did not seem to be anything in the soil that damaged new seeds, some of these already in the ground seemed somewhat abnormal. I noticed this only with dandelions. Not much else grew there. Several years later I noticed that portions of the soil, the clay-like parts, and some of the rocks in the area were red. This red color was not visible in other areas.

Analysis

For further analysis, I sent a sample (taken in August) of the soil to the chemist. He analyzed it using mass spectrometry. (For separation, he used a fused silica capillary column. He injected vapor from the heated soil sam-

ple into it, heated the column from 50 to 300 C. at 15 c/min. to drive off the separate compounds, and then collected them. For analysis of the separated peaks, he used electron impact and chemical ionization spectrometry. Since we wondered about gasoline, he also analyzed for gasoline residue.) He found no trace of gasoline in the area. I took the chromatograms to several agricultural experts. They said there was no trace of any products or degradation products of pesticides or herbicides. Most of what they found were common organic chemicals from farm plants and weeds. They thought two of the chromatograms might have been from DMSO (dimethyl sulfoxide). Therefore there is no indication that the burn was made by any commonly used or known chemicals.

I used a Geiger counter (August 1984) to look for radioactivity in some samples, but if there was any it was close to background and not enough to detect that way. I was not able to use a gamma or scintillation counter at that time, but still have the samples. Although the seeds that I planted grew in the burn and in the control soil, several weeds grew in the control soil only, again suggesting that seeds in the burn area might have been damaged. When I watered them, seeds in the control sample only sometimes floated to the top and needed replanting. Later after a rain, algae grew in the control sample soil, but not in the burn area sample.

One thing I was curious about was lightning. I have seen lightning hit an open field, but have not noticed that it leaves a trace, except when it starts a fire. However, several weeks ago lightning hit my neighbor's transformer. Several neighbors, myself and my husband saw the fireball. Others saw it short down the ground wire. This ground wire had poison ivy climbing it. This poison ivy still looks alive and healthy. Thus, it is unlikely that lightning or an electrical field would have produced the stunting effects mentioned above.

Budd Hopkins suggested microwaves as a possible cause for such burns.

Others have suggested an electromagnetic force or some still undiscovered energy, such as a plasma vortex, might be related to the formation of crop circles (*MUFON UFO Journal*, 8/1991).

I placed alfalfa, some of which was green but growing in dry ground, and other of which looked somewhat dry and desiccated, in a microwave oven. It did not produce a charred appearance in either after several minutes of microwaving on high. The somewhat desiccated alfalfa looked pretty much the same after seven minutes (stopping a few times to check it) of microwaving. Neither looked charred several days later, but they both looked desiccated. The stems remained stiff and did not bend or fall over.

Thus it appears that it would take quite a bit of energy to produce this appearance in that type of vegetation. It also appears that this trace was made from above, because of the lack of any other pressed down vegetation anywhere in the area. There was no evidence that the trace was made with chemicals. Therefore, although crop circles may be the best known and most common kind of trace, this type of trace also is difficult to explain, or reproduce, and needs further study.

1971 Midwest UFO Conference Proceedings Still Available

Theme: UFOs — Defiance to
Science, 115 pages

Speakers: Walter H. Andrus, Jr.,
Hayden C. Hewes, Sherman J.
Larsen, Ted Phillips, William H.
Hunkins, Stanton T. Friedman and
Leonard H. Stringfield.

(A limited special reprint.)

\$8 plus \$1.50 for postage and handling.
Order from: MUFON, 103
Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155

Looking Back

Bob Gribble

September 1951 ■ Two Air Force jet pilots chased a mysterious, round flying object over the state of New Jersey on the 10th. Lt. Wilbert Rogers told Mitchell Air Force Base authorities that he and Capt. Edward Ballard sighted the object over Sandy Hook while they were on a routine flight in a T-33 jet training plane. "I don't know what it was, but it sure was something I've never seen before," Lt. Rogers, pilot of the plane, said. Rogers described the object as disc-shaped, the size of an F-86, and shiny silver in color. "I pointed it out to Capt. Ballard, who suggested we try to follow it." Lt. Rogers followed the object in a diving turn to the left. "but we soon found it was no use. It was going too fast."

The object moved in arc from Sandy Hook at Redbank, then headed out to sea at Ashbury Park. Rogers estimated it traveled the 30-mile course in two minutes, or at a speed of 900 mph. "This couldn't have been a balloon," he said, "because it was descending and no balloon goes that fast." Both pilots also watched it make a 90 degree turn to the left. The encounter with the unidentified object occurred at 11:35 a.m. At 11:10 a.m. the same morning a radar station at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey tracked two unidentified objects traveling at over 700 mph in approximately the same location where Rogers and Ballard were flying their jet. (*The Daily Gazette*, Berkeley, CA, 9/11/51; Two declassified Air Force Intelligence reports, 9/21/51)

1956 ■ Early one morning, while dozens of employees of Holloman Air Force Base were driving to work on U.S. Route 70 in New Mexico, a domed, disc-shaped craft landed alongside the highway. This was at a point approximately 12 miles west of the base. The closest eyewitnesses were within 25 yards of the disc. Associated

with the landing of this craft there appeared to be a strong electromagnetic energy field, because the ignition systems and radios of the vehicles close to the disc ceased to function. The stalled engines caused the morning commuter traffic to back up for several miles. The craft was on the ground for 10 to 15 minutes. Eyewitnesses noted that there was a whirring sound associated with the landing and takeoff of the disc.

The landing was the "talk of the base" that day and within a few hours Air Force Intelligence officers and Central Intelligence agents arrived from Washington, D.C. Employees were assembled in a hangar, questioned, and sworn to silence regarding the incident. The veil of secrecy forced upon all witnesses was not a directive from the Air Force; rather, it was the instrument used by the CIA to enforce a policy of absolute silence. Their conclusion was that the UFO's origin was unknown. The report containing the above information includes the names of 10 persons having knowledge of the landing, including two Air Force sergeants and two colonels. (San Francisco Bay Area Subcommittee of the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP), Paul C. Cerny, Chairman; *The Register*, Santa Ana, CA, 11/23/72)

■ A young couple was driving on the road from Argent-sur-Saulne to Serdon, France one night when the engine of their car stalled. The young man got out to check the engine, suddenly looked up and shouted, "Hurry! There's something around us!" They jumped into a ditch near a field of maize, and hid there. An enormous silent mass was stationary about 200 meters above them. After about five minutes a light flashed onboard the machine. "The beam of light did not come straight

down like the beam of a projector, but it unrolled like a rope ladder! It came down quite slowly, yes, just like a rope being uncoiled. Once it had reached the ground you would have said it was just an ordinary beam of light from a lamp. And we had the impression it was looking for us. That is to say, every time anything stirred, the beam moved towards it.

"At one moment my hand, outside the field of maize, was caught by the beam and my hand became a lemon-yellow color! I felt a slight tingling in the hand. We stayed there a good hour-and-a-half. The machine remained stationary above us all that time. There were lots of rabbits and birds around us, and they did not seem to be affected by what was going on. Suddenly the machine rose up vertically; it did a perfect right-angle turn; then it vanished towards the river Loire, in the direction of Les Bordes." The next morning it was learned that the dairyman had the same experience. He saw the craft at Les Bordes when he was doing his rounds picking up the milk. The engine on his truck stalled and he was delayed for 25 minutes. He crawled under his truck, and swore that "he had never been so frightened in his whole life." (*The Crack In The Universe*, by Jean-Claude Bourret)

■ Shortly after lunch on the seventh, a farmer and his wife saw a small, egg-shaped object with a flat underside descend vertically and land on their farm at Moneymore, Northern Ireland. Cautiously the farmer approached the red object which had dark red bands running horizontally around its girth and gingerly kicked it over. Immediately the object righted itself and began to spin. Moving rapidly, Thomas Hutchinson grabbed the object and picked it up. In the center of the flat base was a small projection, by which the farmer held the two-foot by three-foot object which spun rapidly in both directions. During the spinning, however, he experienced no pulling away of the object which he took for some new-fangled gadget of the Air Force or meteorological office.

He proceeded to his home with the

object and on placing it down momentarily to make room for himself and the object to pass through a hedge, he and his wife were amazed to see the object suddenly spin at great speed, take on a fluorescent glow and speed vertically skyward, disappearing in a few seconds through the low cloud layer. Both witnesses were adamant that although it was raining very heavily at the time of the incident, the object at no time showed any sign of becoming wet. A high ranking British Air Force officer said he was nearly certain that the strange object was an escaped weather balloon that had broken away from some station. (*Flying Saucers* magazine, New Zealand, April/June 1957; *The Times*, Shreveport, LA, 9/9/56)

■ A Twin Falls, Idaho attorney reported that a UFO swooped down on his ranch on the afternoon of the seventh and apparently made off with a 400-pound steer. E.L. Rayburn said "I was at my ranch about 40 miles south of Twin Falls when I saw a strange object about 200 feet in diameter flying overhead. It had a whirling effect on top and gave off an orange glow. It came in fast overhead and swooped to the ground near a spot where a 400-pound whitefaced steer was standing. Then the craft sped off like a streak of light and the steer was gone." Rayburn said two employees on the ranch, Joe and Dick Parker, also saw the object. (*The World-Telegram and Sun*, New York, NY, 9/14/56; *OR-BIT Newsletter*, 10/5/56)

1961 ■ On the 21st, two jet-airliner crews flying over the Pacific Ocean sighted a large, circular UFO which quickly out-distanced their Boeing 707s. Reports were radioed to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) towers at Wake Island and Honolulu, Hawaii by Capt. R.F. Griffin, commanding a British Overseas Airways Corporation plane, and by a Pan American Airways captain. Capt. Griffin said the BOAC jet was at 37,000 feet, in a gray, pre-dawn sky, when the UFO appeared. "Suddenly we saw this bright ring in the sky, about 50 degrees up." The

British pilot described the object as round, with sharply outlined edges and a "very clear hole" in the center. "It was traveling in our direction but at far greater speed. There appeared to be reflected light coming down from it. The object went over the horizon in seven minutes. In a surprise press statement on the 25th, Air Force Headquarters admitted being flooded with reports of "flying objects" near Wake Island. (*The UFO Investigator*, [NICAP] October 1961)

1966 ■ A cone-shaped UFO described as "a good city block" long completely shadowed and paced a small private plane piloted by James J. O'Conner at approximately 10:00 a.m. on the 20th, on "a beautiful clear day" over Sebring, Florida. Flying at an altitude of 9500 feet, the pilot — who spent eight years with the Army Security Agency — first saw the object "about 500 or more feet above me." He then began an ascent and leveled off at 10,000 feet. The UFO "began to get bigger, taking 37 seconds for it to enlarge from the size of a silver dollar to the size of what I would estimate (as) a football field," the shadow of which completely engulfed the small plane. O'Conner said he was in the shadow of the object for about three minutes.

"I then pulled power off on my craft," he said, "and dropped to 3500 feet before I looked up again, and that's when I was frightened; that thing had not changed size at all, but was still with me and pacing me. It was still as big as a football field; I banked to the left, it was still above me, or beside me ... I banked to the right — same thing. I pulled up in a power stall, and peeled off .. the thing was with me all this time ..." Just as he was ready to shoot at the object with a .38 caliber pistol, the object moved away. (*The UFO Investigator*, [NICAP] October/November 1966)

1976 ■ "Radar operators of the 754th Radar Squadron at Port Austin, Michigan Air Force Station, reported tracking five unknown objects for about 30 minutes early on the morning of the seventh," according to Major William

Frensley, an information officer at North American Aerospace Defense Command headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colorado. He also confirmed that two police officers and a civilian who observed the UFOs from the ground were questioned by NORAD. The UFOs were first reported to the police at 9:30 p.m. on the sixth by Carl Bailey, 28, one of the witnesses questioned by NORAD. He said the objects were "shaped like bat wings. There were a lot of them. It seemed like a whole fleet. It was amazing."

Bailey said he got a phone call at home from the radar base at about 2:30 a.m. on the seventh. "They asked me to go outside and see if I could still spot something. I took a look and they were still up there. When Bailey reported what he saw, he was connected with the senior officer in charge at the 23rd NORAD Region Headquarters in Duluth, Minnesota. "He asked me what the objects looked like. I told him and he asked a couple more questions and then said: 'Well, the Air Force doesn't investigate UFOs anymore, Mr. Bailey,' and he thanked me." But Huron County sheriff's deputies Greg Gordon and Gary King were also interviewed about what they saw. Gordon, 24, reported: "We observed one object .. It would descend very rapidly, looking as though it was going to land. It would then return to its original height."

At 5 a.m., two men from the 754th Radar Squadron came out to the scene. Major Frensley said it's not unusual for NORAD to question people who've reported seeing UFOs. "We like to talk to as many people as possible so we can correlate these sightings ..." But the Port Austin UFOs remain a mystery. "We don't know what the objects were," Major Frensley admitted. Major Richard W. White, station information officer, later said, "Our scope covers hundreds of square miles. At any time of day, we may have as many as 100 to 150 'UFOs' on the screen." (*The Huron Daily Tribune*, Bad Axe, MI, 9/8/76; *The News*, Saginaw, MI, 9/25/76; *National Enquirer*, Bob Pratt, 11/9/76)

■ At about 10:30 p.m. on the 18th, Hossain Perouzi, veteran air traffic

controller at Mehrabad Airport began to receive telephone calls from citizens living in the Shemiran area of Tehran, Iran, saying that they had seen strange objects in the sky. Shortly after midnight, Perouzi notified the Air Force and General Abdulah Youssefi, senior officer on duty, responded by phone. Said Perouzi: "He went out on the porch of his house and on the telephone said to me: 'Yes, I can see something. It isn't a star.'" He decided to scramble an F-4 jet fighter from Shahrokhi Air Force Base to investigate.

At 1:30 a.m. on the 19th, the F-4 took off and proceeded to a point 40 miles north of Tehran. Due to its brilliance the object was easily visible from 70 miles away. As the jet approached a range of 25 miles he lost all instrumentation and communications (UHF and Intercom). He broke off the intercept and headed back to Shahrokhi. When the F-4 turned away from the object and apparently was no longer a threat to it, the aircraft regained all instrumentation and communications. At 1:40 a.m. a second F-4 was launched. The backseater acquired a radar lock-on at 27 miles, in a 12 o'clock high position, with the VC (rate of closure) at 150 mph. As the range decreased to 25 miles the UFO moved away at a speed that was visible on the radar scope and stayed at 25 miles.

The size of the radar return was comparable to that of a 707 tanker. The visual size of the object was difficult to discern because of its intense brilliance. The object and the pursuing jet continued on a course to the south of Tehran when another brightly-lighted object, estimated to be one-half to one-third the apparent size of the moon, was launched from the original object. This second UFO headed straight toward the F-4 at a very high rate of speed. The pilot attempted to fire an AIM-9 missile at the object but at that instant his weapons control panel went off and he lost all communications (UHF and Intercom). At this point the pilot initiated a turn and negative G dive to get away. As he turned the object fell in trail at what appeared to be about three to four miles. As he continued in his turn away from the primary object the second

object went to the inside of his turn, then returned to the primary object for a perfect docking.

Shortly after the second object docked with the primary one, another object was launched from the other side of the primary object, descending straight down at a rapid speed. The F-4 crew had regained communications and their weapons control panel and watched the UFO approach the ground, anticipating a large explosion. This object appeared to come to rest gently on the ground and cast a very bright light over an area of about two to three kilometers. The crew descended from their altitude of 26,000 to 15,000 feet and continued to observe and mark the object's position.

During daylight the F-4 crew was taken out to the area in a helicopter where the UFO landed. A very noticeable beeper signal was detected. At the point where the return was loudest was a small house with a garden. They landed and asked the people within if they had noticed anything strange last night. The people talked about a loud noise and a very bright light like lightning. (*The Journal*, Tehran, Iran, 9/20/76; *The Kayhan International*, Kayhan, Iran, 9/21/76; *The UFO Investigator*, November 1976. A United States Department of Defense Document confirming the above incident was declassified on August 31, 1977)

ANDERSON, Continued

discredit Gerald Anderson's character, and destroy the importance of this incident. I have every right as a major participant with first-hand knowledge in this investigation to come forth with the truth and set the record straight. I needed to put these distortions and unfounded remarks to rest. I had no desire to stroll into the midst of this heated controversy, but I must do so to preserve the truth and correct the record. Randle and Schmitt have demonstrated much effort, time and dedication to the Roswell incident and should be praised for their hard work. Their book will help raise the public

consciousness. We are all on the same side working toward similar goals.

In conclusion, the authors present their arguments based on one first-hand 26-minute phone call on February 4, 1990 and no follow-up effort to clarify any concerns until August of 1991 — after their book and articles present publicized conclusions! Results of our investigative efforts have reached them in bits and pieces which would easily create the effects which they label as "major revisions" and "additions to an ever-changing story." Lack of communication and the hurry to reach conclusions not only harms the credibility of the case but the reputation of Mr. Anderson, himself. Please, let us proceed with the caution of scientists, collecting all the data, and not rushing to hasty pronouncements without verifying the sources. If Gerald Anderson's story is *somehow* proven to be phony in a credible and convincing manner, then so be it, and we shall have learned something from it all. But premature conclusions and nasty public debates reflect a war of egos rather than the work of researchers with a scientific approach.

UFO NEWSCLIPPING SERVICE

The UFO Newsclipping Service will keep you informed of all the latest United States and World-Wide UFO reports (i.e., little known photographic cases, close encounters and landing reports, occupant cases) and all other UFO reports, many of which are carried only in small town and foreign newspapers.

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

For subscription information and sample pages from our service, write today to:

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

The UFO Press

By Stanton T. Friedman

I am publicly on record as appreciating the substantial research efforts of Don Schmitt and Kevin Randle in extending Bill Moore's and my intensive investigation (mostly 1978-1986) of the recovery of crashed saucers in New Mexico in July 1947 by the U.S. government. I know they made a great many trips to New Mexico and elsewhere in search of new witnesses and while going over old ground. I have cooperated with them especially with regard to activities sponsored by the Fund for UFO Research. The Fund in consultation with Randle, Schmitt and myself, had a conference for which ten witnesses plus the investigators were brought to Washington, DC, for a few days and also sponsored trips by Randle and Schmitt to visit a number of witnesses unable to make it to Washington. I was present on a number of those, though my expenses were not paid by the Fund. In all, FUFOR has spent \$49,000 on this research.

Now it is possible to evaluate the results of the Schmitt-Randle efforts since they have published their book, *UFO Crash at Roswell*. In addition they have written supplementary articles published in a strange new report, *The Roswell Report: a Historical Perspective*, published by the J. Allen Hynek Center for UFO Studies (CUFOS).

Unfortunately, both the book and the report are fatally flawed by pettiness, by selective choice of data, by false reasoning and by serious errors of omission and commission. The tools of the propagandists seem to have been used far more than those of investigative journalism or science. These are strong words and I regret having to say them, but because of my closeness to the whole question of serious research on crashed saucers for more than a decade, I feel it necessary to express them.

One of the most serious acts of misrepresentation is the incredible attempt to place Civil Engineer Barney Barnett's experience in the Plains of San Agustin (many maps have San Augustin or Saint Augustine) at the same ranch northwest of Roswell and southeast of Corona that was visited by then Major Jesse Marcel, the Intelligence Officer of the 509th Bomb group stationed at Roswell Army Air Field. Marcel had responded to a visit to the Roswell site by rancher Mac Brazel, who had discovered a large area strewn with relatively small pieces of very strange material and had eventually visited the Sheriff at Roswell, who in turn called the base, setting in place a chain of events described in some detail in *UFO Crash*. It adds many details and many new witnesses to those presented by Moore and Berlitz in *The Roswell Incident*, and by Moore and myself in a subsequent series of papers. I had begun the research and was a consultant to Moore for the latter book.

Barney Barnett had either on the way to or from his work activity in the Plains come across an almost intact saucer which had plunged into the ground. Alongside the vehicle, which had a major gash in it, were four small alien bodies. The five members of the Anderson family were already there. Soon there were also a team of archaeologists and the military who took charge and threatened everybody that bad things would happen if they ever spoke about the experience.

I was the first to find out about Barney (who died in the 1960s) from his friends Jean and Vern Maltais who spoke to me in Bemidji, Minnesota, October 25, 1978, after a lecture I had presented at Bemidji State College. I shared the information with Bill Moore, then living in Minnesota, the very next day. I was also the first to talk (Feb. 21, 1978) to, and later meet with,

At last...the complete,
uncensored and indisputable true story
of America's closest encounter

UFO CRASH AT ROSWELL



UFO CRASH AT ROSWELL
By Kevin D. Randle &
Donald R. Schmitt

Avon Books, NY, paper,
photos, 327 pp., \$4.95

Jesse Marcel at his home in Houma, Louisiana, in May 1979. As part of our extensive effort Bill located and spoke to Barney's niece, Alice Knight, and his boss Fleck Danley. Both placed the crash in the Plains. Barney lived in Socorro but also worked out of the SCS office in Magdalena, 27 miles to the west on the Eastern edge of the Plains.

One of the new items turned up by Alice Knight in 1990 was a diary kept by Barney's wife Ruth (Alice's aunt) during 1947. That same year I also was able to locate a man named Harold Baca who had lived across the street from Barney and Ruth in the 1960s prior to Barney's death from cancer. He, too, testified that Barney had told him briefly of the experience that took place in the Plains. A retired local postmistress told me "in the Plains." Alice had always thought of the crash location as being in the Plains, as she recently repeated to researcher Linda Moulton Howe. Baca also spoke to Howe about the Plains as the crash site.

For reasons which I cannot fathom, R/S have attempted to move the Barnett crash site way east to the Brazel ranch as unfortunately portrayed on "Unsolved Mysteries," one of the few mistakes made in that production. R/S try to make the date the one that would be appropriate to a recovery of bodies a couple of miles away, complete with half-canoe-shaped devices in which they had apparently crashed as described, for example, by Mortician Glenn Dennis of Roswell. His nurse friend at the base hospital had seen the bodies and told him about it. I was the first researcher to whom Glenn told his story in August 1989.

Another witness, Gerald Anderson, came forth after the second broadcast (January 24, 1990) of the "Unsolved Mysteries" program and also described in detail the scene in the Plains of San Agustin, including a gash in the craft, four small bodies, an archaeology group under a tall bald professor named Buskirk, and a nasty red-headed officer named Armstrong who did the threatening. Because of the timing of his family's move from Indianapolis to New

Mexico, and because of a copy of his Uncle Ted's diary (given him in 1978 at the time of his father's funeral), the date of early July was put forth. The handwritten diary said July 5, and also said "Adrian" Buskirk. Gerald had told me of the red-headed officer within two weeks of when I had heard of a nasty red-headed officer being the one who had threatened Glenn Dennis at Roswell. No one knew of that conversation.

Checking Ruth's diary, one finds entries for just about every day of the year, mostly dealing with various domestic activities, visits to/from friends and family, the building of their new home, etc. On work days there was almost always an entry indicating that Barney had been either in the field or in the office. Ruth seems to have always noted when Barney was outside of the immediate area of Socorro and when he came home if it was later than usual.

There are 40 entries mentioning Barney being at various locations in the Plains such as Magdalena, Datil, Pie Town or in the High Country. There were a number of entries saying Barney had been to Polvadera, Lemnitar or San Antonio, towns which are less than 15 miles directly north or south of Socorro. Trips to Albuquerque straight north are also mentioned as are the many times that Ruth or Barney had car trouble. When he was in the field he often used an SCS (The Federal Soil Conservation Service) pickup truck. There is not one entry in 1947 that mentions *any* site East of Socorro such as Carrizozo, Corona or Capitan, all of which, incidentally, are at a lower altitude than that of the Plains, which are at about 6800 feet.

Further, note that, as described by R/S and others who have been to the Corona site, such as aviation writer Don Berliner of the Fund, the roads are difficult indeed, starting with a poor road followed by a gravel road and then two tire ruts meandering for many miles during which an auto's speed would be greatly limited even now and certainly back in 1947. The R/S book has no map, so the reader can't tell how far away and hard to get to the Corona site really is.

R/S acknowledge that the entries for July 2 and July 8 are as follows: July 2 - "Barney went to the high country near Datil, came home from Datil at 6 p.m." July 8 - "Barney went to Pie Town for the day to do some work, home about 8:30."

July 2 was the night when Mac Brazell heard the loud explosion. July 8 was very likely the date of the recovery of the bodies a few miles away after an aerial reconnaissance.

In order to get Barney to the Corona site which is indeed a very long and difficult haul from Socorro, Randle and Schmitt simply say in *UFO Crash*: "Because of the military officers, did Barnett mention Pie Town because it was so far away? Was he covering his tracks by suggesting he was more than 300 miles from the crash site? Was he actually in Lincoln County on July 8?" There isn't the slightest evidence on which to base a yes answer.

In an article in *The Roswell Report* they say "We believe that Barnett, returning to Socorro after discovering the craft and being threatened by the military, was reluctant to give the correct location. He told his wife he had been in Pie Town because it explained why he had not returned home until 8:30 p.m., and he didn't want her to know that he had been to Corona." Keep in mind that July 2 was a Wednesday and July 8 a Tuesday, both work days for Barney. Repeatedly I have been told by Vern and Jean, and by others I have interviewed, including the former Mayor of Socorro and his boss, Fleck Danley, in 1990, that Barney was very much a straight shooter who was totally trustworthy. Vern Maltais says the chances that Barney lied to Ruth are nil. Furthermore it is clear from other entries that normally Barney told Ruth where he would be *prior* to leaving, especially when he went out in the field. Parenthetically, I should add that almost no ranches back then had telephones so Barney was out of touch and could not call when he was leaving for home.

R/S for obvious reasons also do not mention that the diary entry for July 9 was "Barney went to the High Country again this a.m. Got back mid-

afternoon. I went to the office for B at 5 p.m." Note especially *again*, which often appears in the diary when Barney went to the same place two days in a row. Nor do they mention all the other entries relating to the High Country and the total absence of entries indicating any trips anywhere near Corona (more than 100 miles away) in all of 1947. It was out of his SCS district. There are no entries indicating he played hooky from work either, a not very likely scenario for a straight arrow who was 55 years old at the time.

They also do not mention the entry dated September 17 when Ruth wrote: "Barney went to the L.B. Moore ranch at Horse Springs for the day, didn't make it home." The L.B. Moore ranch is the location of the windmill spotted by Gerald Anderson, John Carpenter, Don Berliner, myself and our sponsor, Robert Bigelow, during a September 1990 trip to Anderson's crash site and matching a drawing he had made earlier after a long session with psychiatric social worker John Carpenter. John is very skilled at misdirecting people to see if they are reciting their own story or echoing what he tells them.

R/S are particularly distressing in their attempts to discredit Anderson. They confuse the information in Ted's diary with that coming from Gerald. Their story about Dr. Buskirk is illustrative of their trying to make a square peg fit a round hole. Gerald had, with the aid of an artist, come up with sketches of Captain Armstrong, one of the students Agnes (the diary gives a last name of Shedlefski or Shedletski), and of Buskirk. He was tall, bald, in his late 30's or early 40's. I had located a Winfred Buskirk when I contacted the University of New Mexico Anthropology department, but he claimed all too quickly that he had been in Arizona in the summer of 1947. Almost all of the many people I have discussed 1947 with have had to think about it and figure out what they were doing that year. Not Winfred.

I went on to search unsuccessfully and at considerable expense for Adrian. I was called by Tom Carey of the

Philadelphia area to whom I sent a copy of Buskirk's sketch and told of Agnes because, according to the diary, she was from Tom's River, NJ. I had contacted the high school there, but was unable to locate her or Buskirk at the University of Pennsylvania which had come up as his possible affiliation. Tom could find no trace of a Buskirk connected with UP or of a Shetlefsky in Tom's River. However, he discovered a 1986 book by Buskirk, *The Western Apache*, made from Buskirk's 1949 Ph.D. thesis. According to the man who wrote the foreword, this was Buskirk's only publication. The book, as obtained by George Eberhart of CUFOS, had a jacket on which was Buskirk's picture. Clearly he was a round-faced, very bald man. I think almost everybody would agree that the picture strongly resembles the Anderson sketch, especially allowing for the difference in age.

One would think R/S would presume, therefore, that perhaps Anderson was right after all. I did some checking and found that Buskirk was 39 in 1947, so Anderson was right again.

Instead, R/S were guilty of gross misrepresentation in their attempt to keep Buskirk away from the crash scene. They spoke with him, got the "I was in Arizona story" and bought it hook, line and sinker. In *The Roswell Report* they say "In his book *The Western Apache* Buskirk states unambiguously that from June through September 1947 he was at the Fort Apache Indian Reservation in Arizona doing research for his Ph.D. thesis on the Apache. In fact, Winfred Buskirk must have been nowhere near the Plains of San Agustin during the first week of July 1947 because his book contains a photograph that he took at Fort Apache, captioned: 'A World War II veteran celebrates the Fourth of July 1947.'" This is, frankly, unambiguous nonsense.

In fact the caption of the picture is four lines long, not one. There is no indication as to who took the picture or where or even when it was taken and nobody said the Plains' crash date was July 4. A quick look at a map clearly shows that Eastern Arizona is very close to Western New Mexico. The drive to Horse Springs is shorter than

the drive from Socorro to the Corona site. Much more important is what Buskirk actually says in the book (p.xiv): "My field work was carried out on the Fort Apache Reservation in Arizona in June 1946, June-September 1947, and March-April 1948, a total time of five months." But Buskirk himself notes a total of seven months: June 1946, June, July, August and September 1947, and March and April 1948.

Therefore, he was *not* there all of the time. It doesn't really matter since a quick trip to Apache areas in New Mexico near the Plains would have been no problem at all. As a matter of fact our helicopter pilot for the trip to the Plains refueled in Arizona. What is strange here is that throughout the book R/S stress that crashed saucer witnesses had been very strongly intimidated, with several citing their more than 40-year-old security oath as a basis for not talking. Buskirk, according to Robert J. Drake who knew him when Drake was a much younger UNM student, had been a navy officer during the war and was in the Naval Reserve. He certainly could have been intimidated. It is strange that his actual thesis contains no background sheet and no listing of others with him in the field. I am doing further checking.

R/S employ the typical propagandist trick of "absence of evidence is evidence of absence" frequently in the book and the articles in *The Roswell Report*. For example, they cite 91-year-old Francis Martin, who grew up on the Plains and claimed she would have known about anything like a crash out there, and therefore there wasn't one. I might equally and truthfully say that many of the people I contacted who were based at Roswell in July 1947, said they knew nothing about the crash. Does that mean it didn't happen? R/S also claim there were no other archaeologists digging near the Plains other than Herbert Dick who explored nearby Bat Cave, apparently based on somebody's quick check. There certainly were brief exploratory visits searching for sites for later Ph.D. theses which were nowhere listed. Drake had told me years ago of hearing in September 1947,

of an earlier crashed saucer and alien bodies on the Plains from a ranch hand near Datil.

With regard to archaeologists, R/S pull an unforgivable trick of trying to pass off an anonymous phone caller as a bonafide witness (p. 115). They say "A firsthand source who was one of the archaeologists came forward, but because he was worried about professional repercussions, he didn't want his name used." This guy, if genuine, had to be at retirement age. They spend another page reciting his story, noting he was north of the Capitan Mountains which puts him where they wanted him to be. Then they give his testimony equal weight with Barnett's, and surprisingly, with that of Cactus Jack, whose tale was told me as well, by Iris Foster who heard him speak of a crashed saucer in 1971. Cactus Jack is long gone. No one knows his real name and there is no verification at all for his story, which of course doesn't mean it isn't true.

In Chicago, on July 7, 1991, in front of several witnesses, I asked Don Schmitt if there was some way we could get his unnamed archeologist to testify, perhaps privately, to a congressional committee. Presumably he was a Ph.D. and after all a live witness to bodies and wreckage. I, and the others present, were shocked to have him respond: "He was an anonymous caller. We don't know his name." There is no hint of this small limitation on legitimacy in the book.

Another example of false reasoning occurs in their *Roswell Report* article. R/S say, speaking of the archaeologists at the Barnett site: "None of the archaeologists mentioned the event to anyone." Since they didn't know who the archaeologists were, there is no possible way they could determine the truth of this statement. Each of them may have talked to six or ten people for all we know. Presumably, R/S really meant that they have heard no scuttlebutt from any associates of the archaeologists.

It is difficult to understand why it is so important for R/S to get rid of Anderson instead of tracking down the

facts wherever they lead. Their article in *Roswell Report* about him gets just about everything wrong, which is perhaps not surprising since their only contact with him was a single phone conversation in February of 1990. They try to show he couldn't have found the site by saying that Don Berliner got lost when he tried to take R/S there, despite having been there in a helicopter the day before. The fact is Don wasn't on the helicopter; only Gerald and Bob Bigelow and I were. They totally ignore the very important involvement of John Carpenter and the fact we all spent three days together in Datil, at the site, and in Albuquerque. They dismiss Anderson's story partly on the basis that there are supposed discrepancies between what he said initially and what he said later. They don't specify these. Two other places in the book they say that discrepancies indicate the witness is truly recalling rather than reciting a story. Which is it?

R/S and CUFOS seem to have taken a strong anti-position with regard to the MJ-12 Documents but without virtue of doing any research. They say on p. 231: "There is no evidence that the document is authentic." Equally, there isn't any evidence that R/S or Mark Rodeghier, who reprints a very negative, fast-pass attack on MJ-12 in the *Roswell Report*, have done any archival homework, or have paid any attention to the two very lengthy reports, one done by myself and the other by William Moore and Jaime Shandera, which deal with MJ-12. Neither is listed in the 71-item bibliography in the book. But then none of the MUFON papers about Roswell, including Moore's 49-pager of 1985 are cited either, not even Schmitt's own 1990 paper.

There is very much an attitude of don't bother me with the facts my mind is made up. Rodeghier, for example, in a good illustration of twisted logic, comments that a fraudulent document should have some fact that nobody knew which will help people think it is genuine. He notes that the previously unknown work by Dr. Donald Menzel for various intelligence agencies was such a fact. He avoids dealing with the question of how any hoaxer

knew about it before I discovered this work well after the MJ-12 documents were received with debunker Menzel's name listed as one of the MJ-12 members. Somehow this fact makes the document a hoax? Of course, he doesn't deal with more than 30 other details in the documents which turn out to be true and previously unknown.

Randle stresses that the document is a fraud because the list of MJ-12 members say Admiral Hillenkoetter rather than Rear Admiral Hillenkoetter. He doesn't mention that it lists General Montague rather than Brigadier General Montague and that it is standard protocol to use General for ranks of General, Colonel for Colonel and Lt. Colonel, Admiral for Rear and Vice Admirals. This has been verified by numerous former military personnel such as now Colonel in the National Guard Dr. Jesse Marcel, and former Navy Commander Tom Deuley, and former Naval Officer Dr. Scott Jones.

R/S try to put a double whammy on by saying the Plains of San Agustin can't be a real site because it isn't mentioned in MJ-12 and that MJ-12 can't be genuine because it doesn't mention the Plains and that the date of the beginning of the coverup listed as July 7 is wrong. It is interesting indeed that they mention in passing that General Twining went to Alamogordo Air Field after canceling plans for a trip to Seattle, on July 7. Alamogordo is much closer to the Plains than is Roswell. They pass this off by commenting: "Twining was just a short drive from the Roswell Army Air Field." I have made the drive. It goes over a mountain pass and is not short (over 115 miles). Besides, Twining was assigned his own plane, a B-17G and crew, which could have been flown directly to Roswell.

There is no evidence that Twining went to Roswell that week at all, but he did go to Kirtland. There is no reason to expect that Roswell would have been informed of a Plains crash retrieved with all witnesses effectively silenced on July 2 and 3. They had no scientists, but Alamogordo, White Sands Missile Range and Kirtland and Sandia Base and Sandia Labs did. R/S

know about but don't mention that the Alamogordo newspaper took almost a whole front page on July 9 to describe the staged launch of a weather balloon radar reflector which the base claimed must have been what people were calling flying discs. They clearly were protesting too much.

Later the paper noted that Twining and several other generals did a routine inspection of the base on July 11. It obviously wasn't routine since it hadn't been planned in advance, included no pictures, and was much too high powered. R/S will do anything to evade a crash site in the Plains, and therefore two crashes and two sets of bodies, even though Barnett's body description differs significantly from the nurse's to Glenn Dennis'.

They are also willing to change witness testimony when it suits them. They use the word "Doctors" three times for the person(s) at the Roswell Base who called Glenn Dennis. Both in person to me and on NBC's "A Closer Look" he always used the word mortuary officer ... less impressive but more accurate.

The book is loaded with pettiness. For example while R/S do mention *The Roswell Incident* twice in passing, they mention none of Bill Moore's papers and his major research contribution. They say of the book (p. 33) "A brief though somewhat inaccurate chronology of events was constructed and a few of the participants had been identified." At least on p. 219 they say that "Moore and Friedman located more than 60 witnesses who had some knowledge of the event." By 1985 the total was up to 90. Surely even 60 is more than a few?

One illustration of the pettiness is the failure to even mention The Fund for UFO Research in the three and one-half page acknowledgements section despite the fact that the Fund gave R/S more than \$10,000 for research expenses. When asked about this Schmitt at first claimed that the research wasn't included in the book. In fact the list of interviews and dates of those interviews clearly established that they were indeed used in the book. "It was just an oversight." It seems strange that

CUFOS is lauded throughout the book even though R/S claim that they had no financial support from CUFOS. MUFON which has featured Roswell information in its published Symposium proceedings for a decade is also never mentioned, but then those papers aren't either, even though one was by Schmitt.

Strangely the longest acknowledgment (8.5 lines) goes to Robert Hastings, touting his 300 college lectures and giving his address. He is nowhere mentioned in the text! It is like a paid ad. I admit I am jealous. They don't mention my more than 600 college lectures and don't give my address.

Perhaps I should stress that I am treated well in the book, unlike Moore. Though one might think from Rodeghier's introduction to *The Roswell Report* that nobody else besides the CUFOS group had done anything about Roswell research. My problem is to try to understand why the book is so biased, why the authors and associates are so determined to stick with their in-

itial assumptions instead of carefully reviewing all the evidence?

I think I must settle for the simple fact that Randle bragged to me about having published a total of 70 books, of which 67 are fiction, not exactly good training for an investigative journalist. Schmitt is best known as an illustrator and entertainer. The line between what is and what might be seems to be poorly drawn for artists and fiction writers. They seem to live in a black and white world with no possibility of withholding judgement for items in a gray basket. It seems a pity, since there is indeed overwhelming evidence that at least two crashed saucers were recovered in New Mexico in 1947. I hope the Paragon hardcover book by Don Berliner and I about what happened will be more accurate, better reasoned and less easily rejected. It will certainly include details of the polygraph test of Gerald Anderson, on July 24, which he passed with flying colors.

Another View

ALIEN LIAISON: The Ultimate Secret By Timothy Good

Little, Brown & Co., NY, hb, 242 pp., illus.

W. Ritchie Benedict

There is a scene in the 1968 science-fiction movie "Planet of the Apes" where Maurice Evans tries to deter an insistent Charlton Heston from further exploration. He says in effect, "You may not like what you will find." I think the current ufological scene finds itself in a similar position. We are like a dog who has been chasing cars for years — he finally catches one and the enormity and power of it frightens him to death, leaving him to wonder what he can or should do about it.

Author Timothy Good is regarded as one of the two major authorities in Britain on UFOs (the other being Jenny Randles). His previous book, *Above Top Secret*, topped the best seller lists in Britain, Australia, the United States,

Canada, Germany and Japan. He has travelled worldwide, gaining access to several thousand declassified intelligence documents and has lectured on the topic since 1967. In addition to his other credentials, he is also a professional musician and photographer. It is a measure of his personal integrity that this new book is prefaced by a commentary by Admiral of the Fleet, The Lord Hill-Norton GCB, who was Chief of Defense Staff in Britain from 1971-73.

The subject of this book is a highly controversial problem — have any UFOs crashed with subsequent retrieval of alien bodies? And what, if anything, do our governments know about all of this? Such a book would have been treated with scorn in the early 1950s, but such a wealth of information has

emerged in the past decade that it is now a chilling possibility.

This is no poorly documented tabloid report — each chapter is heavily footnoted as to source, which is absolutely essential for a book that claims alien contact is an accomplished fact and has been for years. Good quotes Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev speaking to a group of workers in the Urals in early 1990 that “the phenomenon of UFOs does exist and it must be treated seriously ...”

Some cases are familiar to ufologists, but even in the older ones you will find new and startling disclosures, such as the checking of cattle on the Apache Indian Reservation near Dulce on July 5, 1978 using five different types of ultraviolet lamps. At least five members of the herd were observed to have bright fluorescent splashes on their back and sides — as though they were being marked by someone in advance.

It is refreshing that Good states he believes we are being confronted by a diversity of UFO beings, not just the little gray-skinned, black-eyed variety that are so prevalent in the reports of the 1980s. He also maintains an open mind on the interdimensional hypothesis. In the case of the now-famous Roswell, New Mexico saucer crash of July 5, 1947, he indicates that the evidence for the event is virtually incontestable. There is no mention of the Keel Fugo balloon theory. A former deputy sheriff and police chief named Gerald Anderson has a vivid memory of the crash even though he was only five years old at the time. These memories, enhanced by hypnotic regression, suggest that one alien may have survived the crash without harm. Good examines the MJ-12 controversy, expresses some doubts and refuses to get bogged down in the pros and cons. A complete chapter is devoted to “Dreamland” — a highly restricted area in the remote Nellis Air Force Range and Nuclear Test Site in Nevada with particular attention to the Groom Dry Lake area and surroundings.

I was surprised to learn that there is a precedent for statements issued by Bob Lazar that the U.S. has a number of alien craft under wraps. In April

1953, journalist Robert Dorr, a former Air Force veteran, claimed to have been told of a 30-foot saucer which was somewhat the worse for wear (its propulsion system had been totally destroyed along with most of the instrumentation and wiring). Although Dorr swears his information is accurate, it is almost impossible to determine whether some government or CIA program of disinformation was in effect even at that early date. Dorr did work for a certain intelligence agency before his retirement. Lazar claims that one of the reasons he went public with his information is that the discs are being analyzed by a bunch of people who do not even have the proper facilities, and the regular scientific community could get to the bottom of the advanced technology much faster. Also, he feels he had no other choice as a matter of

self-protection. Good reproduces Lazar's W-2 Wage and Tax Statement for 1989 which clearly shows MAJ for “Majestic” in the top right corner, giving the lie to allegations that Lazar had no connections with any top secret operations. On the other hand, his credibility was dealt a severe blow by his involvement in the ownership of a legal brothel, the “Honeysuckle Ranch,” in the early '80s.

In the end, we are left with nothing confirmed absolutely, but a lot of suspicions that something extraordinary is going on behind the scenes, and that the ultimate disclosure could come at any time. Good has delivered an enthralling balanced treatment that leaves you feeling decidedly uneasy after you have read it. Not to be missed by anyone who is concerned over excessive government secrecy on UFOs.

Calendar of UFO Conferences for 1991

- September 29 — New Hampshire MUFON UFO Conference - Yokens Convention Center, Portsmouth, New Hampshire (Peter Geremia)
- October 3-6 — International UFO Congress - Sponsored by European UFO Network, Belgium
- October 12 & 13 — The UFO Experience - Holiday Inn, North Haven, Connecticut (John White)
- October 12 & 13 — Fourth Symposium on Ufology and Exobiology - Sao Paulo, Brazil (Phillippe Piet van Putten)
- October 19 — Show-Me UFO Conference III - Holiday Inn Airport-West, Bridgeton, Missouri. Near St. Louis Airport (Bruce Widaman)
- October 19 & 20 — First International Conference on UFOs in France and in countries of the South - Hotel Arcade, Marseilles, France (John F. Gille, Ph.D.)



1991 Galactic Cross adjacent to Checkers near Butlers Cross.

Letters to the Editor ...

Dear Editor:

In his final *Communion Letter*, Mr. Whitley Strieber describes virtually all UFO researchers as "the cruelest, nastiest and craziest people" he has ever encountered. He further characterizes these researchers as: "fanatic, looney, ignorant, cultists, brainwashers," and so on, adding that progress in the field is unlikely "until organizations like MUFON and CUFOS disintegrate."

He also makes several statements about himself, one of which brought to mind a famous Richard Nixon denial. "I am not a skinflint," Strieber announced. As if to demonstrate the extent of his largesse, he adds, "Even Budd Hopkins has been generously treated, and I have the canceled checks to prove it."

This claim of generosity is a bit different than it appears. When Whitley first called me early in 1986 for help in dealing with his abduction experiences, he proclaimed an enthusiastic admiration for my art. I am a professional painter, and painting sales have been my main means of support throughout my adult life. Whitley said that he had a modest art collection, and would very much like to own one of my paintings; he brought his wife, Anne, to my studio to view the work and consider which one they might eventually buy.

After the first few weeks of our working together, he announced that he had begun writing a book about his abduction experiences and wanted to hire me as a consultant. I agreed to help him with his manuscript (eventually titled *Communion*; I had no input on his later book, *Transformation*), but I declined any payment for my services. However, I suggested that if he truly admired my paintings as he frequently claimed, he could, as a personal friend, purchase one directly from the studio without paying the 50% gallery commission. He eagerly accepted this offer. He and Anne selected a large painting from my *Guardian* series, priced at the time at \$6,000. He sent me a check for \$3,000, as our 50%-off agreement specified,

and proudly displayed the painting in his New York apartment. (He later bought a very small *Guardian* painting for several hundred dollars for his young son Andrew, who insisted his father buy it for him.)

About seven months after I met Whitley and he first began to write about his experiences, he sold the ongoing manuscript to a publisher for \$1,000,000. At that time I needed money to pay some overdue bills, so I asked Whitley for a loan of \$2,000 for a period of three weeks; a substantial check was due me at the end of that period, so the loan would be very short term. After some surprising delays and hesitations from Strieber, he decided to make the three-week loan. I repaid him the \$2,000 a few weeks later, and, as Whitley would say, I have my cancelled check to prove it. (A photocopy of the check with Strieber's endorsement will be placed on file at MUFON headquarters, along with a photo of the large painting he bought earlier from me.)

Since that time I've been astonished to hear that Whitley Strieber displays the \$3,000 check he paid for my painting, and the \$2,000 check for a loan I repaid several weeks later, as evidence of contributions to my work in UFO abduction research. It is demeaning for me to have to spell out such details, but the record must be set straight. I have never received so much as a nickel as a contribution to my work from Whitley Strieber.

I am frequently asked to give my opinion of Strieber and his alleged UFO encounters, so perhaps this is the appropriate place to do so. Whitley is an undeniably imaginative and inventive writer of fiction, and his memory is conveniently flexible. But despite the attacks so many have made on his truthfulness, I believe he *has* undergone harrowing UFO abduction experiences, and is not a deliberate self-aware liar. He has even described himself at various times as feeling suicidal, and there is no reason to doubt his genuine emotional turmoil. In fact, his books

clearly demonstrate this deep personal anguish and confusion. I believe that, like thousands of others, he has suffered profoundly at the hands of UFO occupants, and is perhaps coping less well than many (facts which may help explain his odd and misplaced fury at UFO investigators). Despite his subsequent behavior towards me and many dedicated fellow researchers, it is impossible not to feel compassion for him. His life and mine were intimately entangled for nearly a year as I helped him and his family to begin the painful healing process of discovery and integration of their traumatic encounters. It has always been a matter of personal satisfaction that Whitley inscribed his book to me with these words: "You saved my life."

— Budd Hopkins
New York, NY

Dear Editor:


I am flattered that editor Stacy has taken some 1,155 words to respond to my trivialities, as he seems to view them, concerning his article on circles (June 1991). First let me mention that French circles researcher Thierry Pinvidic, and his two associates from France, are in agreement with me that nobody who has not spent at least several hours in the fields, constructing an actual circle formation or words, as five of us did together July 24, in Wiltshire, has any right to debate the issue of hoaxes, pro or con. It took five of us (including Englishman Arthur Mills) four hours to use a cutter and cut out the 8 meter high words "TALK TO US!" in barley. It was a ragged job, and it made us nearly come down with the flu, having done it in the rain.

Regarding Stacy's latest comments, he seems to have no solid view of which theory to adopt, but rather seems to hold an amorphous position, standing to one side, as it were, with no side taken at all, yet nitpicking and criticising those who do take positions, particularly those he regards as "miracu-

lous" positions. To fight back, he pounces on a dozen slight spelling errors, ("then" instead of "them") and instead of correcting them as he word-processed the letter into the computer, he adds "(SIC)" to emphasize the mistake, as if to diminish the logic of the piece somehow thereby. This tack is also taken by Paul Fuller, another editor who seems to hold to hoaxes (mainly) and to a lesser extent, "a prosaic solution." This may be Meaden's plasma vortex theory, says Fuller, but he too, uses errors I made in spelling while packing to dash off to England in a rush, as "evidence" that I am incompetent as a thinker. This is absurd on its face. A smoke screen. Stacy then pounces on the differences between a "circular vortex" (an innocent redundancy) and a "square vortex." Again, more smoke screen to cover a losing argument, and indeed, a lack of any coherent argument or position.

What I and my French and English colleagues discovered in Wiltshire this summer was basically that the hoax argument is totally dead. It has already been pointed out by other circles researchers that "just because counterfeit coins exist, that does not mean all coins are counterfeit," and this applies to circles. If even ONE is not hoaxed, then we have a mystery. Thus, hoaxing is an irrelevant argument, used only by desperate theorists, like Dr. Terence Meaden, who use them as an out when they see a large formation, such as the giant one at Barbury Castle, that cannot possibly fit within their theoretical structure. (If it wasn't done by a plasma vortex, then it *has* to be a hoax, goes the story.)

Our PROJECT ALPHA effort, using words, is backed up by several hours of effort by writers from *National Geographic World Magazine*, in Lockeridge, near Alton Barnes, who spent hours and hours making natural-looking circle formations, as a message and as a test. The result, from the air, was ragged, and out-of-kilter with all other circles, and there was a disturbing lack of smoothness when seen on the land. The point however, is that hoaxing circles, and pictograms in particular, is extremely difficult and tiring



Farmers Four: (l-r) A wet and weary Thierry Pinvidic, Yves Chosson, Erik Beckjord and Arthur Mills, having just carved out "Talk to Us!" in letters 8-meters high at Hackpen Farm, Wiltshire, last summer. Photo: Crypto-Phenomena Museum/Gilles Munch.

by day, and flat-out impossible by night. It should be noted that 95% of all circles are made by night.

I invite editor Stacy to go out into a Texas wheat field, put on his leather gloves, and man a roller or wire, and make some passable circles. *Then*, then he has earned the right to discuss hoaxes in terms of crop circles. But not before.

— Jon Erik Beckjord
Malibu, CA

Mr. Beckjord is more than ingenuous with his complaints. At the same time, I definitely did not word process his original letter into my computer. There are simply too many PC viruses running around these days, and one never know where one's correspondents have been, or what they've been up to. (Ed.)

Dear Editor:

I would like to comment on J.R. Johnson's insidious review of my new book, *Alien Liaison: The Ultimate Secret*.

The threat of an injunction was treated as a serious possibility by my

publishers, particularly since Admiral Inman's executive assistant had cautioned Bob Oechsler that any public disclosure of the sensitive information that Bob had acquired from the retired intelligence director would be in violation of U.S. national secrecy laws. Legal consultation was therefore extensive, necessitating certain changes to the text.

So *Alien Liaison* lacks worldwide scope? While it is true that my book focuses on the American scene (and why not?). I have included cases from Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Britain, Canada, Germany, Mexico, Puerto Rico and the Soviet Union.

"Here are all the tales of alien malevolence and human tampering; disappearing planes and pilots; the Robert Lazar story ... animal mutilations ... the five-year-old Roswell saucer crash witness; the Kecksburg, Pennsylvania and other crash/retrievals; contactees, both named and anonymous" writes Johnson, who evidently deems these topics to be worthless and dismisses the new evidence I have provided, ignoring the many disclaimers sprinkled throughout the book.

I resent particularly Johnson's comment that "little in the way of original

investigation by the author in order to establish 'the truth' is in evidence, despite references to numerous trips to the USA," and that I made inadequate primary source checks. In fact, I made several trips to the USA, at a cost of thousands of dollars, specifically to check on primary sources, such as Colonel William Coleman, Robert Emenegger, Gene Huff, George Knapp, Bob Lazar and Bob Oechsler. In addition, I paid Bob Oechsler's expenses to come to London last year in order to double-check on his sensational revelations. Yet Johnson has the nerve to say: "Perhaps the intent was not to check too closely; why ruin a good story by investigating the people mentioned in it ...?" Even the normally sceptical *Glasgow Herald* (a British national paper) commented that "This book is a tour de force of determined ferreting, checking, crosschecking ..."

"That much of this retold 'information' is suspected by American researchers of being disinformation is hardly mentioned," Johnson writes, despite the fact that I took pains to emphasize this very point throughout the book.

Johnson reserves his main criticism for Bob Oechsler. Since Bob's rebuttal is due to appear in this issue of the Journal,* I will only comment briefly on this section of the review. For example, Admiral Inman's recollection that the subject matter of his telephone conversation with Bob was about "underwater vehicles" is in error, and I understand that Inman has now conceded that UFOs were indeed the subject of the conversation. Furthermore, when the Admiral finally responded to my letters seeking further information on "recovered" vehicles, he wrote that he was unable to help me, but nevertheless wished me success with my findings.

Does Johnson seriously believe that either Inman or Shapiro, or those involved with the Cosmic Journey project, would readily confirm the revelations given (in confidence) to Bob Oechsler? I doubt that Johnson is so naive. Could it be, then, that he has an ulterior motive in his attempt to discredit a man who within a few years of research has provided some of the crucial evidence that most of us have

been unable to come up with in decades?

Finally, I would like to add that my book is available to American readers from Arcturus Book Service, P.O. Box 831383, Stone Mountain, Georgia 30083-0023, for \$29.95 plus postage.

— Timothy Good
Beckenham, UK

**We spoke with Mr. Oechsler at the Chicago Symposium the first week of July of this year. He was well apprised of Mr. Johnson's comments and promised a prompt response. As of press time, we have yet to receive a reply. (Ed.)*

MUFON Amateur Radio Net

80 meters — 3.929 MHz
Saturday, 9 p.m.

40 meters — 7.237 MHz
Saturday, 8 a.m.

10 meters — 28.470 MHz
Sunday, 3 p.m.

All times Eastern Standard
or Daylight

MUFON 1991 INTERNATIONAL UFO SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS

"UFOs: The Big Picture" 301 pages.

Price: \$20 plus \$1.50 for postage and handling.

Order From: MUFON, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, TX 78155-4099



Walt Andrus inspecting crop circle formations south of Silbury Hill. One of eleven circles in adjoining fields.

The Night Sky

Walter N. Webb

October 1991

Bright Planets: (Evening Sky)

Saturn (magnitude 0.5), in Capricornus, is low in the south at dusk and sets in the WSW about midnight in mid-October. The ringed planet can be seen near the quarter Moon on the 15th and 16th. For telescope-users, the rings now are tilted at their best angle for some years. After this, the ring angle increasingly diminishes.

Bright Planets: (Morning Sky)

Watch Venus (-4.5) pass Jupiter (-1.8) during the month. They rise in the east about 3 AM daylight time in midmonth, moving higher in the ESE by dawn. On the 4th the brighter planet lies just below the lunar crescent — a stunning sight. Venus rises occulted by the Moon from Hawaii on the same morning, reappearing at the Moon's dark edge about 3:53 AM (HST). The crescent Moon shifts below the planet pair on the 5th. Three mornings later, on the 8th, Venus lies 3° below Regulus. For a week before and after their conjunction on the 17th, both Venus and Jupiter appear within the same binocular field. The brighter world slides 2° below the giant planet on October 17, their last pairing until next summer.

Meteor Shower:

The Orionid meteors peak on the mornings of October 21 and 22. The light from the gibbous Moon will reduce the normal count of about 25 meteors per hour. Try observing during a window of darkness on the morning of the 20th after the Moon sets and before dawn begins. Most Orionids are faint, although some are bright leaving glowing "trains" for a few seconds in their wakes. Late in the month the much slower, redder Taurids begin to appear.


Moon Phases:

New moon — October 7

First quarter — October 15

Full moon — October 23 (Hunters' Moon)

Last quarter — October 30



The Stars:

At 9 PM daylight time in mid-October, the nose of Pegasus, the upside-down flying horse, touches the celestial meridian. From the nose star Enif, a bent row of stars (head and neck) traces eastward to Markab, one of the four stars in the Great Square, the horse's body. The other three stars, moving clockwise, are Algenib, Alpheratz and Scheat. The sides of the square measure roughly 15° each. Alpheratz actually belongs to the Chained Princess Andromeda, a twin row of stars curving NE from the square.

The two types of star clusters are represented at the same time during mid-evening hours. Low in the east is the Pleiades, while higher in the NE is the Double Cluster of Perseus. Both are fine examples of open or galactic clusters. Binoculars and telescopes show them as rather widely separated groups of stars. Globular clusters, on the other hand, are very compact assemblages of hundreds of thousands of stars. M15, just off Pegasus' nose, and M13, the famous Hercules Cluster located in Hercules in the western sky, are examples of this

second class of clusters. Visible with the naked eye, the Hercules Cluster was described in the June Night Sky.

Be alert to a number of celestial IFO candidates near the horizon around 9 PM. Atmospheric refraction close to the horizon can cause stellar objects to appear to move and change color, brightness and shape. These low-level objects are Capella (NE), Aldebaran (ENE), Fomalhaut (SSE), the planet Saturn (SSW), and Arcturus (WNW). Contrary to popular belief, even the normally steady planets can be affected by the atmosphere if they are low enough.

MESSAGE, Continued

menon as experienced by Luca and others.

Mr. Fowler is Director of Investigations on the MUFON Board of Directors and author of four other books. Ray is selling autographed copies of both editions; the hardcover at \$21 and the paperback at \$8.50, both postpaid. His address is 13 Friend Court, Wenham, MA 01984.

Photo Exhibit Schedule

John Timmerman has advised that the CUFOs UFO Photo Exhibit has two dates scheduled for the month of October; October 12 and 13 — Omega Conference, "The UFO Experience," Holiday Inn, North Haven, CT and October 25, 26 and 27 in Camillus, NY. Camillus is a small town just a few miles west of Syracuse outside of the loop. This is an opportunity for MUFON members to assist John, distribute MUFON literature and receive UFO reports from visitors to the exhibit.

MUFONET-BBS Network
Electronic Bulletin Board
8-N-1 300-14,400 Baud
901-785-4943

MESSAGE, Continued

Counties. **Jerold R. Sorrensen**, D.D.S. (Hanford, CA), presently a Consultant in Dental Surgery, has assumed the additional role of State Section Director for Kings and Tulare Counties. **James L. Jeffries**, M.S. (Clarkston, WA) is not only a new Research Specialist in Physics, but the State Section Director for Asotin, Garfield, Whitman and Columbia Counties. **Eric W. Reymore**, M.S. (Lewiston, ID), Research Specialist in Physics, is the new State Section Director for Lewis, Nezperce, Latah and Clearwater Counties, working in close coordination with his counterpart **James Jeffries** across the Snake River in Washington.

New Consultants and Research Specialists

John E. Mack, M.D. (Chestnut Hill, MA), a Professor of Psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School, has volunteered to be a Consultant to MUFON in Psychiatry. **Edward J. Zeller**, Ph.D. (Lawrence, KS), a specialist in the evaluation of landing trace cases, becomes a Consultant in Geology. Dr. Zeller has made at least 15 tours of duty to the Antarctica on special assignment. **Lee Balan**, D.C.H. (Long Beach, CA) has joined MUFON as a Consultant in Clinical Hypnototherapy. **Michael P. Smodish**, J.D. (Boynton Beach, FL) has joined the MUFON legal staff as a Consultant in Law. **Richard G. Shoup**, Ph.D. (San Jose, CA) is a new Consultant in Computer Science. **Jack Cohn**, Ph.D. (Norman, OK), a Professor of Physics, and MUFON Consultant in Physics, has joined the Oklahoma team.

New Research Specialists this month are **Dan T. Smith**, M.S. (Towson, MD) in Physics; **Kathleen A. Carson**, M.S. (Scottsdale, AZ) in Chemical Engineering; **Janice A. Duval**, M.A. (New York, NY) in Social Work and Psychotherapy; **Jonathan W. Randall**, M.A. (North Harwich, MA) in Psychology; and **William Hellstrom**, M.A. (Oak Lawn, IL) in Psychology.

Translators volunteering their expertise are **Kathryn Hennesey** (Concord,

CA) in French; and **Yoshiie Hamada** (Yokohama, Japan) for Japanese.

OMNI Article

MUFON is deeply indebted to *OMNI* magazine for the outstanding full page article on page 83 in the September 1991 issue under ANTI-MATTER, authored by **Paul McCarthy**, MUFON member in Hawaii. The headline "Help Wanted: Amateur psychologist, meteorologist, and Renaissance person to hunt down UFOs" automatically attracts the attention of the reader to an appeal for MUFON field investigators in a format and style far surpassing any trade magazine "want ad." The article was based upon interviews by **Paul McCarthy** with **Walt Andrus** and **Dan Wright**.

No other single article has produced such a deluge of telephone calls and letters from competent people volunteering to offer their expertise to MUFON in UFO investigations. *OMNI* magazine appeals to a scientific clientele, which is precisely the caliber of people desired to expand MUFON's investigative team worldwide. Our thanks are specifically extended to **Pamela Weintraub**, UFO Editor for *OMNI* magazine, who was responsible for publishing this outstanding article.

UFO Conference in October

The Third Show Me UFO/IAC Conference will be held Friday and Saturday, October 18 and 19, 1991 at the Holiday Inn Airport-West, I-270 at St. Charles Rock Road in Bridgeton, MO 63044 near the St. Louis International Airport. **John Carpenter**, M.S.W. will speak on Abductions Research at 7:00 p.m. on Friday. Saturday speakers and their topics will be **Stanton T. Friedman**, New MJ-12 book; **Stan Gordon**, Kecksburg, PA Case, UFO/IAC; **Ken McCulloch**, Ancient Aspects, UFO/IAC Connections; **John Schuessler**, Deputy Director for MUFON; and **Ed and Francis Walters**, Gulf Breeze Encounters. (Three of the speakers are MUFON Board of Directors members.)

Conference admission is \$30 through August 31, 1991 and \$35 thereafter. Motel reservations at \$50 per night should be made directly with the Holiday Inn listed above or telephone (314) 291-5100 or 800-325-1395 and specify that you are attending the UFO conference to obtain this reduced rate. For more information or advanced tickets write to: UFO Study Group of Greater St. Louis, Inc., Show Me Conference Committee, P.O. Box 31544, St. Louis, MO 63131 or call **Bruce Widaman** at (314) 946-1394.

John W. White has announced his annual UFO conference with researchers and contactees titled "The UFO Experience." It is scheduled for October 12 and 13, 1991 at the Holiday Inn, North Haven, CT. Confirmed speakers are **Budd Hopkins**, on Children Abductees; **Linda M. Howe**, Animal Mutilations; **Larry Warren** and **Peter Robins**, Rendlesham Forest Case; **Charles Hickson**, his Pascagoula Experience; **Michael Swords**, UFOs and SETI; **Philip Imbrogno**, the Belgium UFO Scene; **Stanton Friedman** and **Don Berliner**, Crashed Flying Saucers; **C.B. Scott Jones**, UFOs, Law and Government; and **John Salter** on his abduction. There will be a Saturday night banquet again this year. For more information, price and advance registrations, please contact: **John W. White**, Omega Communications, 60 Pound Ridge Road, Cheshire, CT 06410 or by telephone (203) 272-2151.

The Watchers

The new book *The Watchers: The Secret Design Behind UFO Abduction* by **Raymond E. Fowler** was so popular in hardback that it has now been chosen as Bantam's lead non-fiction paperback book in their summer catalog. This provocative work takes a close look at the case of **Betty Andreasson Luca**; a case which is remarkable for the vividness and drama of the subject's recall under hypnosis. With illustrations and investigation transcripts of Luca's encounters, *The Watchers* paints a clear picture of the total abduction pheno-

Continued on page 22

Director's Message

Walt Andrus

"UFOs: The Global View" was the theme for the 6th International Congress held in Sheffield, South Yorkshire, England on August 16, 17 and 19, sponsored by BUFORA, IUN, MUFON and ICUR. The sponsoring committee must be congratulated for their planning and implementation of the most successful UFO Congress in England in the past decade.

Speakers and their subjects were **John Spencer** (UK), Foreword: Major Sir **Patrick Wall**, Retiring President of BUFORA; **Bertil Kuhlemann** (Sweden), The UFO Phenomenon and its Meaning; **Cynthia Hind**, Zimbabwe, Africa, To believe or not to believe; **Kathryn Howard** (USA), On the Edge of Earth; **Jenny Randles** (UK), Crop Circles: the search for an answer; **Paul Norman** (Australia), UFO update from down under; **Thomas A. Coate** (Australia), The Jamestown Incident; **Walter H. Andrus, Jr.** (USA), The Gulf Breeze Sightings; **Thomas E. Bullard** (USA), Folklore as an explanation for UFO abductions; **Stephen J. Gamble** (UK), Computerizing UFO Data: Applying low-cost computing to UFO Research; **Odd-Gunnar Roed** (Norway), Project Hessdalen; **Ken Phillips** (UK), The Anamnesis Report; **Budd Hopkins** (USA), What they're doing to us; **Paul Vanbrabant** (Belgium), The Belgium UFO Wave; **Kenneth Higgins** and **Ron Halliday** (Scotland), UFOs: A Scottish Viewpoint; **Bertrand Meheust** (France), Abductions in France? and **John MacNish** (UK), Crop Circles: The Aerial Viewpoint.

To my knowledge, this is the first time that a Congress Proceedings has been produced in England prior to the Congress and made available to the participants. An added feature was the first appearance in England of "CEIV Live In Concert," a unique Scottish rock band that entertained attendees Satur-

day evening. Each of the three band members has had UFO experiences, thus their name.

Director Visits Crop Circles

Prior to speaking and attending the 6th International Congress, **John Spencer** and **Walt Andrus** spent the majority of two days investigating and photographing the current crop circles on August 13 and 14 at Butlers Cross, Avebury and south of Silbury Hill. A large Galactic Cross at Butlers Cross with an arrowhead pointing north is adjacent to Checkers, the weekend residence of Prime Minister John Major. A good aerial view of this crop formation can be seen from a nearby hill in a national park. Eleven different crop circles were counted in several connecting wheat fields directly south of Silbury Hill (the ancient mound that is the world's highest man-made hill). Two new unusual formations depicting a long ellipse with circles and concentric rings on each end were found in one of these fields.

While investigating the latter two formations, John and I met **Michael Hesseman** from Germany who had flown over these formations in a helicopter that morning videotaping the crop circles. Two different groups of people had been arrested and fined for damaging wheat fields while trying to create hoaxes. It is understandable why some farmers object to hoards of visitors tramping through their fields instead of walking along the tram lines made by their tractors and farm machinery. I photographed one Galactic cross where a sightseer had carelessly thrown a cigarette, igniting the dry wheat and burning a section of the field, requiring two fire engine crews to extinguish.

One of the noted investigators claims that 50 percent of the crop circles are

hoaxed. Legitimate crop circles can be confirmed by carefully raising the bent over wheat stalks by hand or a tool and noting the direction that the stalks face. In several of the Galactic cross arms, the wheat stalks were lying in three different directions in distinct layers at the same point which eliminates the hoax hypothesis. This implies that the force, energy or whatever creating the circles first moved down one of the legs, then secondly produced a circle in either clockwise or counterclockwise rotation and thirdly it returned down the leg or column to the main center circle. I visited the wheat fields not to solve the mystery, but to observe this unusual phenomenon firsthand. The heated debate between crop circle specialists continues unabated, but with no reasonable explanations forthcoming to outside observers.

I saw videotape of a 160-ft. diameter circle with five concentric rings surrounding it that measured 300 ft. in total diameter. I challenge anyone to explain how this could have been created by hoaxers during hours of darkness. Few people debate that a majority of the crop circles are complex and unique formations currently defying logical explanations. Preliminary reporting indicates that the number of formations occurring may have peaked out in 1990. In spite of these statistics, the enigma rages on.

New Officers

Peter H. Jones (North Adelaide) has volunteered to be the State Director for South Australia. **Craig D. Passman**, M.S. (Murfreesboro, TN), Research Specialist in Computer Science, is also the new State Section Director for Rutherford, Wilson, Williamson, Cannon and Bedford

Continued on page 23