

The MUFON **UFO JOURNAL**

NUMBER 120

NOVEMBER 1977

Founded 1967

\$1.00

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF



MUTUAL UFO NETWORK, INC.

Major Lawrence J. Coyne
and Crew Chief
1973 Helicopter Case
(See story, Page 3)



MUFON UFO JOURNAL

103 Oldtowne Rd.
Seguin, Texas 78155

RICHARD HALL
Editor

WALTER H. ANDRUS
Director of MUFON

PAUL CERNY
Promotion/publicity

REV. BARRY DOWNING
Religion and UFOs

ANN DRUFFEL
California Report

LUCIUS FARISH
Books/Periodicals/History

MARJORIE FISH
Extraterrestrial Life

MARK HERBSTTRITT
Astronomy

ROSETTA HOLMES
Promotion/Publicity

TED PHILLIPS
Landing Trace Cases

DAVID A SCHROTH
St. Louis/Mass Media

JOHN F. SCHUESSLER
UFO Propulsion

NORMA E. SHORT
DWIGHT CONNELLY
Editor/Publishers Emeritus

LEN STRINGFIELD
Commentary

The MUFON UFO JOURNAL is published by the Mutual UFO Network, Inc., Seguin, Texas. Subscription rates: \$8.00 per year in the U.S.A.; \$9.00 per year foreign. Copyright 1977 by the Mutual UFO Network. Second class postage paid at Seguin, Texas. Publication identification number is 002970. Return undeliverable copies to: The MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas 78155.

FROM THE EDITOR

The apparent disinclination of NASA to undertake an open-ended UFO study at this time should not be interpreted as a total rebuff, or as a sign that the Carter administration will do nothing about UFOs. Many signs suggest that there is "more to come" in this story, and there are many different ways and different levels of involvement by which the Federal government could participate in or "encourage" UFO research.

Some small indications of possible administration maneuvers behind the scenes appear in Len Stringfield's account of his experience at the UN, and also reports from countries half a globe apart that have reached me. Two MUFON foreign representatives have reported sudden interest on the part of their governments in certain UFO cases, wherein they have contacted private UFO groups or individuals for information. With the known history of other countries looking to the U.S. for leadership in UFO investigations, these could well be signs that UFOs are being discussed seriously in Washington diplomatic circles. We shall have to wait and see whether this is merely wishful thinking, or correct interpretation of straws in the wind.

(Cover photograph furnished by *National Enquirer*)

CONTENTS:

| | |
|---|----|
| Helicopter Case Update | 3 |
| By Jennie Zeidman | |
| The Birdwood UFO | 4 |
| By Keith Basterfield | |
| NASA Letter (News) | 6 |
| What Can We Learn From Hypnosis of Imaginary "Abductees"? | 7 |
| By Alvin H. Lawson | |
| The UFO Status Quo | 10 |
| By Leonard H. Stringfield | |
| UFO Related Information From the FBI Files | 12 |
| By Bruce S. Maccabee | |
| California Report | 15 |
| By Ann Druffel | |
| In Others' Words | 17 |
| By Lucius Farish | |
| Director's Message | 18 |
| By Walt Andrus | |
| Magazine Hoax Exposed | 20 |
| By Ann Druffel | |
| Astronomy Notes | 20 |
| By Mark R. Herbstritt | |

The contents of the MUFON UFO JOURNAL are determined by the editor, and do not necessarily represent the official position of MUFON. Opinions of contributors are their own, and do not necessarily reflect those of the editor, the staff, or MUFON. Articles may be forwarded directly to MUFON.

Permission is hereby granted to quote from this issue provided not more than 200 words are quoted from any one article, the author of the article is given credit, and the statement "Copyright 1977 by the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, 103 Oldtowne Rd., Seguin, Texas" is included.

HELICOPTER CASE UPDATE

Jennie Zeidman
(MUFON Field Investigator,
Columbus, Ohio)

The Coyne helicopter-Close Encounter of October 18, 1973, near Mansfield, Ohio, continues to be of interest to both serious investigators and "throwaway" skeptics. Within a few months of its occurrence, the four-man crew had divided the *National Enquirer* award for the best case of 1973, and Philip Klass had published (with dark insinuations that the crew should return the money) that the object was merely "a fireball of the Orionid meteor shower."

At the request of Dr. J. A. Hynek, I have been working on this case since May 1976. I have personally interrogated each of the crew and a family of five who apparently witnessed the event from the ground.* My work represents over 18 hours face-to-face with the witnesses, the study of several hours of tapes made with them by Hynek and others as early as the day following the event, plus many hours of additional investigation and analysis.

The general details of the case are well publicised; my specific findings are:

- The object was in continual view for approximately 300 seconds.
- The object, as a red light, was visible on the eastern horizon for approximately 90 seconds before it turned and began its run toward the helicopter.
- The object definitely decelerated, and maintained a hovering relationship over the helicopter for as long as ten seconds.
- The ground witnesses were apparently within 1,000 feet of the actual encounter; they corroborate the crew testimony.
- There is no physical evidence to indicate that the 1,800 foot - 1,000 feet per minute climb or the apparent radio malfunctions were in any way a product of the object's proximity.
- The object presented to the crew a precisely defined opaque oval shape, slightly domed, without wings, engine pods, empennage, logo, numbers, windows, strobe, or rotating beacon.
- The ground witnesses described the object as "pear shaped," "like a blimp," "big as a school bus," "bigger than the helicopter."
- At no time was there an overall luminosity to the object or an irregularly defined train or trail. The lights were emitted from specific positions on the otherwise featureless object.
- The event took place at the shore of Charles Mill Lake, which is 997 feet above sea level. Thus, at the lowest altitude noted (1700 ft. msl) the helicopter had a near 700 foot margin of safety.
- As it proceeded away from the helicopter, the object's intensity remained quite bright until it "snapped out" on (or over) the northwestern horizon.
- Klass and Coyne have never met. Klass's contact with the witnesses (and hence the basis of his "rigorous investigation") consisted of three long distance calls to Coyne and a talk-show chat with crew member Healey. Klass never talked at all to the other two crew members and of

course did not know of the existence of the ground witnesses, nor the exact site of the encounter.

A full report, covering the details of my work, will be published by CUFOS. Meanwhile, I refer readers to *Flying Saucer Review* Vol. 22, No. 4, for my detailed arguments against the meteor hypothesis, and to FSR Vol. 23, No. 4, for a discussion of the ground witness testimony and my arguments against the possibility that the object was a conventional aircraft.

*Credits for finding the ground witnesses and the first two interviews with them are due to Warren Nicholson, MUFON State Section Director, Ohio, (Civil Commission on Aerial Phenomena, Worthington, Ohio) and to William E. Jones, MUFON Field Investigator (formerly CCAP, now CUFOS).

UFO upsets a trawler

Lisbon

An unidentified flying object (UFO) upset a Portuguese trawler's electrical system recently setting off its alarm sirens, the official news agency Anop reported yesterday.

The UFO, emitting a glaring light, hovered above the 300-ton Pardelhas off Southwest Africa (Namibia) for eight minutes then departed at high speed, Anop said.

Buenos Aires Herald
11/25/77

THE BIRDWOOD UFO

By Keith Basterfield

(A report on an alleged observation of an unusual aerial object at Birdwood, South Australia, July 30, 1977. A preliminary report appeared in No. 118, Sept. 1977. This report is copyrighted by UFOR (SA) Inc.)

(1) Summary of details as given by the reporter (based on interviews August 26 & 27, and September 17, 1977).

Date: Saturday, 30 Jul 77

Time: 1540 CST (0610 GMT)

Location: Approx. 5 Km NNW of Birdwood, on the Birdwood to Williamstown road, some 32 Km NE of Adelaide, South Australia.

Duration: 3½ minutes.

Reporter: High school science teacher. Male. Aged 36 years. PhD in organic chemistry. Name withheld on his request. Available on file.

Account: "I was driving along the Birdwood-Williamstown road about 5 Km from Birdwood when I noticed an object in the sky. I thought for a while that it was an aircraft, but then I realized that it was not. It was descending from an altitude of 1-2 Km at a 15-20° glide path. As it approached the ground, its nose lowered and it settled between a clump of trees and a power pylon about 400 meters from the road. As I got out of my car, a cream 1969-1970 Torana stopped behind me and the driver got out and shouted, 'did you see that?'."

"I replied that I still could and pointed it out to him. We observed the object for 3 minutes; during this time I took particular notice of the position of the object and other reference points so that I would be able to estimate its size and location. It then raised its tail a little and slid backwards and upwards a little, then it accelerated vertically to disappear in three seconds. I calculated

its vertical velocity to be on the order of 6000 Kph.

"At no time did it emit any light or sound. Its descent and departure did not seem even to disturb the foliage of the trees. Its ascent was also noiseless—not even a supersonic 'bang'."

(2) The object as described

"When it came down it came down nose up, a bit like a Mirage coming in, many, many times bigger than that and instead of rolling as it touched, it just stopped there. I would say its speed was round about 120 Kph coming in, because it was paralleling me and then it just stopped dead.

"As it approached the ground just behind some trees, the nose dipped and it stopped. . . It descended at a glide angle of 15-18° . . . Velocity slowed down tremendously as it approached the ground and then it dipped its nose and was down."

It was first noted at an angular elevation of some 35-40° to the right hand side of the car through the closed driver's window, descending at about a minus 15° angle from the horizon, towards the ground. Initially seen at about 1-1½ minutes and 2-3 Km South of where it was reported to have settled.

The ascent: ". . . then it just went vertically straight up. I would say almost instantly to a very definite supersonic speed. . . It lifted off and went tail first backward, then levelled off and went vertically upwards. Within three seconds it was lost to view almost directly overhead."

Size: ". . . probably about the 60 meter mark in length. . . about ten meters thick. . . probably about 20-30

meters wide and this rear section was high from the ground level about the 20 meter. . ."

"I would estimate the average part of it to be 5-8 meters in height, length 50-60 meters and I would conjecture that its width could have been in the 20 meter mark. . . Its width being about one third of its length."

Color: ". . . it was a light pinkish color. Salmon pink. It just appeared a clear color to me. In other words it was just an object and I was only getting reflected light from it. I don't think it had any source of its own. . . There was not metallic luster. It wasn't shiny, but not dull. A light pink in color. A satin finish."

Shape: "It seemed to have a little bit of a drooped nose and this was all scalloped. Like one of those fan shells that I used to collect when I was a kiddie. It smoothed out into just straight lines as it went back, and then the rear section of it seemed to point a little into the air, and it had these two other, it almost looked like an airfoil surfaces, but I wouldn't say exactly. . . I didn't see any landing gear as such. I didn't see any legs or pegs. . ."

"It had a rounded front, i.e., a three dimensional point. The rear tail surfaces were visible through the first gap in the main body upon settling down. The underside of the entire thing was concave—this was noticed as it took off. The two tail pieces were also concave underneath."

Effects: The reporter says that there was no unusual noise noted at any stage throughout the observation, and no movement of vegetation was noted by him. The weather was clear skies and light winds. It was not noted if there were any livestock in the paddock

concerned at the time.

(3) Reactions according to the reporter

"I was sitting there and quite frankly it absolutely stunned me. Not that I didn't believe such things exist but for me to actually see one myself. . . 'I looked at it for about three minutes. That was two getting over the shock and I was considering going across to it. I would have gone right up to it and knocked on its hull if it stayed there long enough."

His immediate reaction was to look again. Then he saw it coming down and so stopped his vehicle. He got out, crossed the road and watched—amazed. Then the other person arrived and after the object had gone he talked to him for 10-15 minutes about it. He doesn't know why he didn't think to go over to the spot after the object had left. He says he considered life to probably exist elsewhere in the universe, didn't think too much about UFOs prior to the event, but has clearly seen something beyond him.

The reporter stated that there was a woman in the car with him at the time. The following comments are made:

"The passenger in my car though, is very adamant. She doesn't want to open her mouth to anyone, anywhere for fear of ridicule. . . I don't think that I could convince this particular person. It shattered her belief enough as it is. A very, very religious woman, elderly woman."

At the interview on September 17, 1977, he stated that he was in fact doing a "demonstration drive" at the time and that the person with him was a "student". Age, early twenties. A very religious or Christian person. She took a quick look at the object and then didn't want anything more to do with it. She remained in the car when he looked at it. In his opinion she was in a state of

"shock" or similar. She was very quiet on the way back, but still sees him.

Comments on the people in the car which pulled up:

"The bloke ran across to me and said 'Did you see that, did you see that?'. To which I said, 'Yes. There it is over there.' We both stood just looking at it for about three minutes. . . A man, a woman, and three children."

"I stopped when it stopped and as I got out of my car, another man got out of a car behind me. He was driving an earlier model Torana, big bloke and he ran up to me and said 'Hey did you see that?' and I said, 'Yes, there it is.'"

The man was described as 55 years old, stout, balding, grey suit, tie, white shirt, monacle, early model white Torana. SA registration—clean. The man mentioned having heard of the magazine of which the reporter is editor. The reporter gave this man one of his business cards. They did not discuss telling anyone about the event.

Record of Investigations To Date:

1. The reporter telephoned UFOR (SA) Inc. on the evening of August 26, 1977 and related details of his report. Arrangements were made for two investigators to visit the location together with the reporter on August 27th.
2. The location of the reported event was inspected by two investigators with the reporter, paying particular attention to the ground beneath the location where it was stated to have "settled". Nothing out of the ordinary was noted. No sign of any disturbed grass, tree branches, no holes, indentations, burns, etc.
3. A detailed inspection of the location was made on September 4, 1977, when photographs and rough measurements of the area

were taken. The area was further inspected on September 11, 1977, for refined measurements and further pictures to be taken. The occupants of the houses to the north and south of the paddock concerned were interviewed but had heard, seen, nor felt nothing they considered out of the ordinary.

4. A further personal interview was undertaken on September 17, 1977, to check on several points. Photographs and tape recorded interviews are on file.
5. Soil samples were taken on November 27, 1977, and forwarded to the ACOS consultant for tests.

APPENDIX A: NOTES ON INTERVIEW CONDUCTED SEPTEMBER 17, 1977

We called on the reporter at his home in a quiet residential suburb. The reporter is married with two children aged 7 and 3. He is an Australian aged 36 years; his wife was born in Belgium.

He used to be a Major in the regular Australian army and is now on the reserve list. However, his occupation for the last few years has been that of a teacher. The family live in a housing trust home and run a Ford Capri sedan motor car. As we talked to him his wife returned home and for the rest of the evening she remained in the lounge where we were talking to her husband.

Appearing a very friendly, confident person, he answered all our questions in a forthright manner and gave the impression of a person who was adamant about that which he had observed. Discussions centered on what he had reported but deviated into topics of astronomy and physics. He mentioned he had a PhD in organic chemistry but that he couldn't get any work with that so turned to teaching.


(Continued on next page)

(Birdwood UFO, Continued)

During the interview we clarified all points that we wished to and the only real discrepancy noted in this interview as opposed to previous discussions was that he now says he had a young woman in the car with him. Previously he had mentioned that his companion was an elderly lady.

When queried about the possibility of locating the other people in the white car he said that the man intimated to him that he read the magazine of which the reporter is editor. The reporter agreed to put an item in the November issue of his magazine and ask the other man to get in touch with him. No developments have occurred so far. (11/27/77). We suggested the use of hypnosis to try and find this other man's name or car registration number, but the reporter firmly declined this.

We asked re: the young lady who had been in the car with him, as to the possibility of talking to her. He said she did not wish to talk to anyone.



NASA Letter Declines

UFO "Research Activity"

December 21, 1977

Honorable Frank Press, Director
Office of Science and Technology Policy
Executive Office of the President
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Frank:

In response to your letter of September 14, 1977, regarding NASA's possible role in UFO matters, we are fully prepared at this time to continue responding to public inquiries along the same lines as we have in the past. If some new element of hard evidence is brought to our attention, in the future, it would be entirely appropriate for a NASA laboratory to analyze and report upon an otherwise unexplained organic or inorganic sample; we stand ready to respond to any *bona fide* physical evidence from credible sources. We intend to leave the door clearly open for such a possibility.

We have given considerable thought to the question of what else the United States might and should do in the area of UFO research. There is an absence of tangible or physical evidence available for thorough laboratory analysis. And because of the absence of such evidence, we have not been able to devise a sound scientific procedure for investigating these phenomena. To proceed on a research task without a disciplinary framework and an exploratory technique in mind would be wasteful and probably unproductive. I do not feel that we could mount a research effort without a better starting point than we have been able to identify thus far. I would therefore propose that NASA take no steps to establish a research activity in this area or to convene a symposium on this subject.

I wish in no way to indicate that NASA has come to any conclusion about these phenomena as such; institutionally, we retain an open mind, a keen sense of scientific curiosity, and a willingness to analyze technical problems within our competence.

Very truly yours,

Robert A. Frosch
Administrator (NASA)

WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM HYPNOSIS OF IMAGINARY "ABDUCTEES"?

By Alvin H. Lawson*

(Copyright Alvin H. Lawson, 1977)

(This, the first of a three-part article, starting with the November 1977 issue, is a continuation of the paper presented by Dr. Lawson at the 1977 MUFON UFO SYMPOSIUM in Scottsdale, Arizona, on July 16, 1977 and published in the 1977 MUFON UFO SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS.)

ABSTRACT: Imaginary UFO "abductions" were induced hypnotically in a group of subjects (Ss) of varied ages with no significant knowledge of UFOs. Eight situational questions comprising the major components of a "real" abduction were asked of each S. Responses indicated a wide range of imaginative invention, but an averaged comparison of the imaginary sessions with "real" abduction regressions from the literature showed no substantive differences. Many presumably obscure "patterns" from UFO literature emerged in the imaginary narratives. In addition, there was evidence that ESP-like effects were manifest during some of the hypnosis sessions. The implications of the study for future hypnotic regression of Close Encounter cases, and for abduction cases now deemed of the highest credibility, are unclear at this time.

Introduction

Some remarkable abduction cases have recently been the focus of research in Southern California. Each of the cases emerged under hypnosis, and each is uniquely interesting; but together they pose questions for ufology of perhaps unparalleled seriousness and complexity. Summaries of six of these imaginary hypnotic "abductions" follow.

In view of this complicated study, some observations and speculations about abduction reports are in order:

1. "REAL" AND IMAGINARY Ss' CONSCIOUS MEMORIES OF UFO ENCOUNTERS

It has been supposed that a major distinction between allegedly real and imaginary witnesses is that "real" Ss usually have a vivid conscious memory of at least part of the UFO event. However, a recent regression casts doubt on this thesis and indicates that some imaginary Ss may develop post-regression conscious "memories" of a UFO encounter.

In an attempt to analyze multiple-witness testimony more thoroughly, two pairs of Ss, a man and woman, and a set of identical female twins, were given simultaneous imaginary abductions. The protocol followed was identical in each case, except that the twins were asked to hold hands during their session. The Ss were able to hear each other during the hypnosis. Some contrasting details follow:

COUPLE

- (1) Each individual had a distinct experience
- (2) Male S asked to be awakened midway
- (3) Female S "borrowed" exam details from male S after he was awakened
- (4) After awakening, couple could not affirm they had **not** had a "real" abduction

TWINS

- (1) Both shared a near-identical experience
- (2) Neither asked to be awakened

- (3) No borrowing; narratives were supplemental with few differences

- (4) After awakening, twins agreed their experiences were imaginary

The most significant contrast between the two is that, despite extensive discussion, the couple were unable afterwards to say whether or not they had actually experienced a CE-III. This finding shows that "real" witnesses might similarly confuse fact with fancy, a possibility which could cast doubt on the credibility of many established CE-III's. (It may be objected that we inadvertently chose a couple who had actually experienced an abduction, though before the session neither had any conscious memory of such an event--in part or whole.)

The twins' apparently shared experience suggests that additional hypnosis of multiple Ss will reveal much about the many psychological mysteries in "real" cases. Their seemingly identical experiences may have involved paranormal communication which, as we will see below, may be a significant aspect of all close encounters.

2. DOMINATION BY ONE WITNESS IN MULTIPLE-WITNESS ABDUCTIONS

Multiple-witness abduction cases have usually been dominated by one of the witnesses: one is more observant, often seems less negative in his or her emotional response to the event, and is inclined to be more cooperative and even more articulate with investigators. Betty Hill, Charles Hickson, Sandy Larson, and Elaine Thomas are good

(Continued on next page)

*Professor of English, California State University, Long Beach

('Abductees', Continued)

examples in their respective abduction incidents of domination (in this restricted sense) over their fellow witnesses. It is interesting that even the male S of the imaginary couple (see above) requested to be awakened, thereby indicating a less active interest in the proceedings and so deferring to his more intrigued partner. The meaning of this domination pattern is unclear, but Charles Tart's discussion of what he terms "discrete altered states of consciousness" (or d-ASC) may have relevance to the emotionally traumatic experiences of UFO abductees:

...one person's illusion in a given d-ASC can sometimes be communicated to another person in the same d-ASC so that a false consensual validation results.*

Exactly how one abduction witness might communicate an "illusion" to another is not known, but if it is reasonable to expect witnesses to undergo an alteration of consciousness during the excitement of a UFO encounter, the single-witness domination pattern may tell us something about the "reality" of UFO abductions. To the extent that such experiences are "real", their sensory record may depend largely if not totally upon the sensibility of a single witness who, through some mysterious means, induces or otherwise communicates a sensory experience of an abduction to fellow witnesses.

Thus multiple-witness abductees may merely be sharing in the abduction illusions of another witness's dominating sensibility--rather than truly participating in actual events--illusions which their memories or hypnotic sessions ultimately "recall". Of course we are left with a series of still-baffling questions, not only about reported abduction-caused physical and

physiological effects, but also about why the dominant witness undergoes the "illusion" of a UFO experience in the first place: in short, what is stimulus for the event which witnesses describe as a UFO abduction? These and other questions may lead us to wonder whether the elaborate explanations offered are any less exotic--or improbable--than what some witnesses evidently believe has happened to them.

3. WHY AREN'T THERE MORE INTERRUPTED ABDUCTIONS?

Of the hundred-odd UFO abductions reported, none has been a half-way affair. Each has a wholeness or integral quality (although details and duration vary) which differs from other close encounters. Many witnesses have reported, for instance, that a CE-I or CE-II was in progress when an approaching vehicle or other interruption apparently caused the UFO to leave. Occasionally there have been CE-III's where the entities have made a hurried departure apparently because of some human intrusion. But no partial abductions have been reported and I think that is very curious.

It could be suggested that aliens with sufficiently exquisite knowledge and control of time could well know in advance when such interruptions were going to occur, and so schedule their abductions accordingly. But this idea, aside from its ET assumptions, does not explain the persistence of reported interruptions of other kinds of close encounters, nor why only abductions should be unique in this regard.

It seems to the writer that abductions, for whatever reasons, are qualitatively distinct from other types of UFO experiences. One may speculate that their wholeness or psychologically integral nature, along with alleged mental effects such as time-lapses, amnesia, and blackouts, suggests--in

the absence of unambiguous physical data--a psychic rather than a simple physical interpretation. This relative abundance of psychic effects does not seem typical of other UFO sightings and close encounters, where the ratio of physical to psychic effects is roughly reversed. But even if abductions should prove to be some sort of mental phenomenon, the question of why--if abductions are the ultimate in close encounter experiences--they are fundamentally different in these ways from other UFO adventures, is another in a long line of puzzlers which cannot be ignored by thoughtful researchers.

4. WHY DO WITNESSES' MEDICAL HISTORIES PARALLEL UFO "PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS"

An interesting pattern in "real" abduction narratives is that details of witnesses' personal medical histories are sometimes reflected in their alleged physical examinations by aliens on board the UFO's. For instance, in her North Dakota abduction Sandy Larson told of having her sinuses "scraped" by her alien examiner. But she had had her sinuses operated on by an MD previously. In the Woodland, California case (see Appendix #1) a woman, who was allegedly abducted with her two sisters in 1971, described how she was "catheterized" (had urine drawn from her bladder) by a grasshopper-eyed alien and his human-like female assistant; she later revealed that she had been catheterized while in a hospital. There are other examples in the literature, and it is probable that more parallels might be found if a diligent search of abductees' personal medical records were made.

But such parallels are not limited to "real" cases; one of our imaginary abductees' narratives involved personal medical history as well. Under hypnosis a college student told of having a large mask-like apparatus put over her face during her "examination"

*In *States of Consciousness* (New York, 1975), pp. 223-224.

on board a UFO; afterward she remembered that a similar mask was used when she was given a tonsilectomy as a child.

Thus: there is an irresistible invitation to see a basis in memory and/or imagination for at least some details of "physical examinations" during alleged UFO abductions. Further, if medical histories play a significant part in abduction narratives, there is no reason why other biographical data could not similarly emerge during other aspects of the UFO encounter tale. This does not necessarily mean that all such details are baseless; rather, it tells us that the interplay of imagination and memory may make determination of the unvarnished truth very difficult indeed.

5. SIMILARITIES BETWEEN UFO ABDUCTIONS AND AN IMAGINARY "DIVINE VISITATION"

The possibility of a significant relationship between UFO encounters and events of religious mythology such as "miracles" and "visitations" has been widely noted, and particularly by Jacques Vallee. In order to test this idea, we enlisted a student volunteer who described herself as a "reborn Christian" with a serious religious commitment. The S was hypnotized and told that an unspecified "divine figure" would visit with her. The data from her session suggest obvious parallels with UFO abduction narratives. A general summary of the imaginary regression follows:

1. S sees "divine figure" floating towards her.
2. S is fascinated by the being's eyes.
3. S senses "power" in being, is drawn to him.
4. S is touched by being, feels soothed "special".

5. S, being "talk" about heaven, end of world.

6. S sees being float upward "in a cloud", and disappear.

7. S feels positive about experience, "Glad I've been picked!"

One can interpret this scene as a rather routine UFO close encounter: The S saw an alien entity float towards her. She was fascinated by its eyes and she was aware of an exotic power in it. At one point she was tranquilized by its touch. They communicated telepathically about another world and about the end of this world. Finally the entity floated upward "in a cloud" and disappeared. Afterward, the S felt very special about her experience.

There are doubtless other parallels in the S's narrative, though these few support the hypothesis that UFO encounters and alleged miraculous religious events have a closely related or even common origin. If religious "miracles" such as allegedly occurred at Lourdes and Fatima were "real" events, either physically or psychically for the immediate witnesses, a similar case may thus be made for the "reality" (in the same restricted sense as for religious events) of UFO close encounters. To reverse the argument, if there is no relationship between the two classes of alleged phenomena, why then the substantial parallels? (Some may find the similarities unconvincing; others may object that the hypnotic protocol utilized leading questions which predetermined the desired data: I do not feel these responses have merit, though I will not take time to argue the points beyond suggesting--yet once more-- that replication of each and all of our hypnosis experiments be attempted before our data are rejected.)*

Supposing, then, that a case for a UFO-religious mythology parallel to have been made (both here and by

others), vast questions remain as to the nature and meaning of the common stimuli for religious events such as Lourdes on the one hand and the Hill abduction on the other. Is a divine light thus cast on the Hills? Or, were Fatima and Lourdes caused by ET and/or psychic phenomena? The questions get curiouser and curiouser!

(To be continued)

*It should be noted that a partial replication of our experiment took place during a public session of the International UFO Congress in Chicago, June 25, 1977. Three voluntary "abductees" were hypnotized and reported patterned imaginary CE-III's. Two "real" witnesses, however, had unsatisfactory hypnosis experiences, and no meaningful comparison was possible.

POSTAL EXCHANGE

The MUFON program of trading cancelled foreign stamps to a collector in exchange for current U.S. postage stamps continues to be successful, thanks to generous contributions by MUFON members. This program helps to underwrite the expense of extensive correspondence, and results in better information exchange internationally.

We would like to thank Harry Cohen, editor of *Aerial Phenomenon Clipping and Information Center (APCIC)*, for a recent contribution and pledge of contributing stamps on a regular basis. (APCIC offers a UFO newsclipping service for \$5 per month. For more information, write H. R. Cohen, P. O. Box 9073, Cleveland, OH 44137).

Please continue to send cancelled foreign stamps in any quantity from 5 to 500. It takes a lot of them to equal the value of current U.S. stamps. (Send to Richard Hall, 4418 39th St., Brentwood, MD 20722).

THE UFO STATUS QUO

MY ADVISORY ROLE FOR GRENADA'S UFO MISSION AT THE UNITED NATIONS

By Leonard H. Stringfield

On November 14, 1977, I got word from Dr. Wellington Friday, Ambassador At Large for Grenada, that I was chosen to serve as his adviser at the United Nations where he was scheduled to propose the establishment of an agency, within the United Nations framework, to study UFOs.

As I now look back on my five days spent in New York with Grenada's Prime Minister and his delegation, and being witness to their dramatic endeavors at the UN, I must hasten to say that my experience in playing a part in the affairs was rewarding. I saw history being made and I have the satisfaction of getting a good inside glimpse at diplomatic maneuvers, especially on an issue so sensitive as the UFO!

Before departing from Cincinnati, Sunday, November 27th, I pondered the possible pitfalls of such a bold venture. I could see the cynical press being amused by the blatant antics of a flyspeck Caribbean island nation; and I could see the great powers, secretly knowledgeable of the UFO, glowering down at a country so puny, poor, and politically unstable who would dare champion the UFO instead of taking issue with other world problems like human rights in South Africa or the ownership of the Panama Canal.

But, in my point of view, I saw Grenada as a nation standing legitimately alongside other nations as a member of the UN. Moreover, Grenada's Prime Minister Sir Eric

Gairy seemed willing to risk his political future as he crossed swords in support of the UFO in open forum — a matter too long delayed in the UN. It was in this spirit that I was willing to serve as adviser.

The man behind Grenada's UFO thrust was Prime Minister Gairy. Openly admitting he witnessed a UFO and knowing of other UFO close encounters on his island, he addressed the UN's 32nd General Assembly, October 7, 1977, requesting that the UFO question be placed on the agenda for serious review and that steps be taken to establish an agency for "... coordinating and disseminating the results of its research."

It was prior to Gairy's October address that I first became involved as adviser. Following a meeting in New York on September 16, 1977, when I met Grenada's Ambassador to the United States, Franklin Dolland, at his mission's office, I was introduced to Dr. Friday. During a private meeting later at my hotel, Friday asked if I would submit a paper to him describing the objectives for serious UFO research. I promptly responded with a 4-page guideline which I later learned was used as the theme in the Prime Minister's address.

As "official" adviser, I was greeted Sunday, November 27, at LaGuardia Airport by limousine and a Grenada staff member.

Shortly after arrival at the Roger Smith Hotel I got into action. Dr. Friday, in a nearby room, gave me a rough draft of his address for review

and editing. Working far into the night and rising early Monday to resume, I had sharply edited the 45-page text. Parts were deleted, parts added, and statements factually corrected or rhetorically rephrased. Friday, however, had done his homework well. He had searched UN files, exhuming old data from the 1960's when the late Secretary General U Thant had expressed his interest in the worldwide UFO problem. He had also uncovered many records showing that Major Colman Von Keviczky of ICUFON had pressed the UN in 1966 to act on the UFO question. Friday had also included in his draft many quotes from Dr. Hynek's two books, *The UFO Experience* and *The Hynek UFO Report*, and, from my book, *Situation Red, The UFO Siege*.

On November 28th, the day when Dr. Friday was scheduled to make his address at 3 p.m. in the General Assembly, the phone in his room jangled all morning. One call standing out above the others occurred while Ambassador Dolland and I were rushing some last minute copy changes which were to be delivered to his mission office for typing. It came from Coast Guard Commander John Feigle, a member of the U.S. delegation. In a polite manner, he at first offered the United States' hopeful support for Grenada's UFO stand at the UN, even though the text of Friday's address was unknown to him. Then Feigle inquired about Grenada's objectives which drew from Friday only a rhetorical response. Feigle then stated that the U.S. position was based on the Condon Report. Friday, indicating some annoyance,

stated that he was aware of the Condon Report, that he knew of new UFO data since the report's release in 1969 which made the Condon Report invalid, and then promised to call back. In a matter of minutes, Friday and I discussed and formulated Grenada's policy. We had hoped for US support but hopes were fading fast. Our decision: Stand firm!

Dr. Friday's hour-long oratory, following the Prime Minister's opening statement, was in my opinion, a moment for history. Sitting with the Grenadan staff, I watched the reaction of delegates representing certain countries which I knew beforehand would be mentioned as having a part in UFO affairs. Notably, only the Communist Chinese delegate arose during the talk, and smiling inscrutably, strolled out of the assembly.

The U.S., as expected, requested time for rebuttal, but any chance for debate was cut short as the delegate from Nepal had asked for adjournment to allow time to review Friday's text. The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, November 30. Disappointingly, I had no recourse to open my briefcase where I had stored UFO data to offer Dr. Friday if needed in the debate.

The day at the UN ended but the day of the diplomat never ends. Meetings and phone calls go far into the night. For me, I was privileged to be invited by the Prime Minister as his guest to see Close Encounters of the Third Kind at the Ziegfeld Theatre. Arriving by limousine, with adequate Secret Service cover, we avoided a long queuing line outdoors and went up the back stairs to reserved seats. I not only saw the movie royally but never felt so protected, as stone-faced agents deployed to seats nearby.

The next two days, November 29 and 30, were focused on extensive work on the draft resolution which was scheduled for presentation at the General Assembly at 3 p.m. of November 30. Both days were active

for the U.S. delegation. Calls came from Delegates, Commander Feigle, and John Krindler. After consulting the White House, they said they could "sympathize" with Grenada's efforts but could not support the existing draft resolution. Several items were too demanding, such as the lines underscored from the text as follows:

"(1) Requests the Secretary-General to consider the scope and various aspects of this item and to undertake for consideration by the 33rd session of the General Assembly, a survey of the UFO phenomenon which should include...(b) the results of studies and such documentation and other data pertinent to this item as may be provided from records of representative governments, the committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Spaces, etc. etc."

On Wednesday at 11:30 a.m., a press conference was held at Prime Minister Gairy's suite at the Plaza Hotel. I was there with my briefcase containing UFO data just in case it was needed. Gairy fielded questions about the UFOs by the media well, and, of course, there were political questions about human rights in his country and about alleged Chilean Communists operating in his country. This he emphatically denied, calling his political opposition "liars". Gairy said Grenada is a quaint, non-military, religious country which rejects communism as he does. In my opinion, at no time was Gairy evasive, nor lacking in forthright answers to questions on UFOs or politics.

At the close of the conference, the Prime Minister was pressed to share his opinion of the movie, "Close Encounters of the Third Kind". He said that he was "favorably impressed" and then asked that I state my views. As I gave my critique, the Secret Service agents standing behind me had quietly ushered in the U.S. delegates, Feigle and Krindler. They had kept an appointment with Gairy for a discussion of the draft resolution. In bounds of protocol, the meeting was

conducted behind closed doors.

In essence, the closed-door session was triggered by a maneuver by the British UN delegation. Having met with the U.S. team they had averred that the establishment of an UFO agency in the UN, on the basis proposed by Grenada, would be prohibitive in measure of cost and time. The U.S. agreed and reiterated that the terms in the draft resolution were too demanding.

Once again the resolution was reworked to a more moderate posture, however, the salient points remained intact. The last word I had before departure from New York, December 1st, was that the U.S. was in a "supportive" mood of the draft resolution, probably knowing that given time for more diplomatic maneuvers the final wording of the document would hopefully be revised more to its liking.

On December 7th, the draft resolution (with few changes) was shelved until next year's General Assembly to be convened in September 1978. This would allow the delegates of member nations to consult with their home governments for an evaluation of their own UFO status quo.

Dr. Friday, a man of great vigor and an astute diplomat, toasted my departure from the Roger Smith Hotel. He thanked me for my contributions and we agreed that the UFO had won new international respectability through Grenada's efforts. The United States got off the limb at the UN without embarrassment. Perhaps, the U.S. was hoping that by the time a crucial vote would come up in September 1978, that Prime Minister Gairy's views might change on the UFO. After all, President Carter had gifted him, during a diplomatic exchange in September 1977, with a copy of the Condon Report.

UFO RELATED INFORMATION FROM THE FBI FILES: Part 2

By Bruce S. Maccabee
MUFON State Director for Maryland
(Copyright Bruce S. Maccabee, 1977)

As of July 31, 1947, the FBI was officially involved with the UFO phenomenon. Agents were ordered to carry out intense investigations of reports which came to their attention. The Washington office began to accumulate a mass of UFO-related data. This would seem to be an ideal situation for an investigative agency that wanted to understand what was going on. However, only two months later the FBI left the center stage and began its retreat into the shadows. To understand part of the reason why, it is necessary to consider the types of reports that the FBI investigated.

By the time Gen. Schulgen contacted the FBI (July 10, 1947) the FBI had a collection of newspaper clippings and teletype messages. The first teletype message was rather brief, to say the least. It read: "About 12 so-called flying discs passed over Darlington, S.C. approximately 5:30 PM today. Advise if wish details."¹¹ Two other teletype messages that had been received by July 10 were more detailed, but they were reports of mechanical hoax devices which were apparently typical of the hoaxes that were perpetrated during the early days of UFOs. On July 7 a report was filed from Shreveport, La., of an object that had "Made in USA" written on it. It was a disc which reportedly landed and smoke issued forth. It was found to be a thin aluminum disc, 16 inches in diameter with coils of wire attached. The Army at Barksdale Field retrieved the disc before the FBI agent had a chance to look at it.¹² On July 8 a "disc" was found near Roswell, N.M. This "disc" was hexagonal in shape and was suspended from a balloon. This "disc" was sent to Wright Field by a special

plane for analysis.¹³ On July 9 the resident agent in Burbank, Cal., called the main FBI office to report that a fire in a nearby wood had been caused by the landing of a "flying disc". A further report on July 10 described the disc as being made of aluminum, about two feet in diameter, and "having a sort of radio tube in the center of the disc."

By the time the FBI had agreed to investigate UFO witnesses (July 24, 1947 communication to Gen. Schulgen), the files contained several more reports of hoax objects and only three reports that could be considered good. These reports will be referred to later. The hoax reports included a report from Twin Falls, Idaho, about a dome, wires and "tubes similar to radio tubes". It was about 30 inches in diameter and apparently had some wiring burned off and "looked as though something might be missing". This saucer was reported by a woman who claimed she had heard a noise like a collision in her back yard.¹⁴ Another hoax object was found by Mr. . . . (name crossed off) in Laurel, Md. He called to report that a buzzing object had landed in his back yard "and the machinery is still buzzing".¹⁵ Still another object was reported from Black River Falls, Wisconsin. It was a large, possibly cardboard, disc that had a small propellor attached to the side.¹⁶ A disc found in Seattle on July 16 was analyzed by the ONI (Office of Naval Intelligence). It had a hammer and sickle painted on it.

The three good reports in the FBI file at the time of the response to General Schulgen all came from the Army Air Force (AAF) and were the following. (1) Two meteorologists in Virginia wrote "We hesitate to make this report concerning our pilot balloon observations in regards to a flying disc

because of the considerable national skepticism regarding the subject at present. However, local newspapers inform us that the U.S. Government admits no authority for such a ship or object and for its flights. Then we must assume this strange object to be foreign." The report goes on to describe several sightings. "Mr. . . . (name removed) has observed this strange metallic disc on three occasions through the theodolite while making his pibal observation during the last six months. Miss Baron (name accidentally not removed) has reported observing it on one occasion. Miss Baron's report agrees with Mr. . . . observations except as to the color which she reported as a dull metallic luster. Mr. . . . last observed this disc in April 1947 (underlining by present author) at the 1100E. Pibal Observation when the balloon was at 15,000 feet. The disc was followed for 15 seconds, apparently moving on level flight from east to west to the far north of the station. The object was a metallic like chrome-shaped something like an ellipse with a flat level bottom and a dome like-round top. The disc appeared below the balloon, was much larger in size in the instrument (sic; this may mean it appeared larger than the instrument package hanging below the balloon), and shined like silver. It was impossible to estimate the height or speed of the disc except that it appeared to be moving very rapidly. Miss Baron observed the disc when her balloon was at about 27,000 feet. All days observed were either clear or with very few clouds and good visibility." This report was received by the FBI on the 22nd of July. It stands out as one of the highly credible pre-Arnold reports.

Aside from the early dates of the sightings, one is struck by the detailed description by trained meteorologists

using instruments to track and observe the "saucer". One is also struck by the, in retrospect, amusing references to many sightings of "this disc" and "the disc" as if there were only one object of its type which had been seen on several occasions. It is clear from the report that the meteorologists were afraid that "the disc" represented foreign technology of which the U.S. government should be made aware. They even suggested that the occurrence of flying discs might be sufficiently serious that if they sighted such a disc again they should consider ending their weather measurements to observe the disc: "If sighted again, we wonder if it would be a good idea to drop the balloon and instead make observations on this disc."

The second and third reports in the FBI file by July 24 were both sightings from the air in southern Wisconsin. They both took place on July 7, the second at 1145 CST and the third at 1430 CST. Each was a two observer report, with an A.F. captain involved in the second sighting. The second report stated: "saucer descended vertically edgewise through altocumulous clouds, stopped at 4000 ft. and assumed horizontal position and proceeded in horizontal flight from a horizontal position for 15 seconds covering 25 miles and again stopped and disappeared." This observation was made from an altitude of about 800 feet above ground, while the "saucer" was estimated to be about 4000 ft. above sea level. The speed of the saucer was estimated at 6000 mph.

The third report stated: "Observed in horizontal flight in a horizontal attitude for a period of 20 seconds covering 22 miles. By the time pilot had removed his camera from the glove compartment of his plane, the saucer disappeared and again reappeared approximately 10 miles farther along its course after 6 seconds making its final disappearance." This third observation was made at an altitude of 3500 ft. above sea level and the saucer was estimated to have been

at an altitude about 1000 ft. lower. The speed of the saucer in the third report was estimated at 3690 mph. The weather during both of the sightings was clear ("CAVU") with scattered altocumulus clouds at 6000 ft. Both of the above reports were sent via the Civil Air Patrol in Wisconsin to the Commanding General at Bolling AFB. There was no suggestion that the observers might have been mistaken or that they were attempting to create (independent) hoaxes.

I have presented these three reports in detail to show that the FBI did have some interesting evidence available which could not be explained as simple hoaxes by the time the decision was made to investigate UFO reports. Although it wasn't the job of the FBI to investigate aerial phenomena, it was the job of the FBI to investigate subversion within the U.S. Thus, if all reports of saucers had been (a) clearly hoax objects and/or (b) clearly mistakes of observers, the FBI could have concluded that there was no reason to investigate. However, with a few good, detailed observations of what seemed to be real craft that exhibited capabilities far beyond our own, the existence of hoax reports became more suspicious because one could argue that a foreign power (e.g., Russia) was flying a new type of aircraft over the USA (for intelligence purposes or whatever) while trying to cover up its flights by *discrediting witnesses by means of hoaxes*. To be more explicit, suppose John Doe (or Kenneth Arnold) reports seeing a flying disc. Whether or not he gives a detailed description is immaterial. Then soon after many other people also report seeing objects in the sky and also they report *finding* objects. Suppose, moreover, that the objects which are found have the same general shape as the descriptions of objects *reportedly* seen in the sky but that they are clearly hoax devices. Then John Doe's (and Kenneth Arnold's) story is discredited, and the few discs that the foreign power has are free to fly wherever they wish (as long as they stay away from cities) because

they "know" that whoever sees them will not be believed.

A scenario as just described (Russia has real discs and flies them over the USA while "covering up" the flights by discrediting witnesses) may have been considered by the FBI in its decision to investigate, but in any event the suggestion of subversion and creation of hysteria by a "foreign power" was definitely made (see Schulgen's letter in Part I). Whatever reasoning may have been invoked to connect the "bonafide" reports with the hoax reports, the FBI entered the UFO "arena" with the intent to discover whether or not any of the UFO reports could be directly attributable to subversion. For example, Gen. Schulgen asked that Kenneth Arnold and Byron Savage (an RCA field engineer who reported seeing a disc in May 1947) be investigated "since they were among the first to sight the alleged flying discs. He indicated that he desired that the investigation be directed toward ascertaining whether or not either of these individuals have any subversive background or to ascertain whether or not they had any ulterior motives for reporting these sightings." (According to a note on the document that included this request, "a review of Bureau files failed to reveal any derogatory information that could be identified with these individuals.") Many of the teletype messages to FBI headquarters and reports on investigations made after July 30, 1947, were headed "security matter X", "internal security", and sabotage".

By the end of September, the FBI file contained many reports, about equally divided between good reports and poor reports/hoaxes. Many of the reports had been supplied by the AAF merely as information for the FBI with no investigation requested. Many of these reports concerned sightings by technically oriented individuals (pilots, military personnel, scientists). There

(FBI Files, Continued)

was even an early analysis of sightings that had been carried out by someone in the AAF (no name given). It contained 18 sightings up to late July 1947, and broke these sightings into their various characteristics for comparison according to Date, Hour (local time), Location, Observer's Name, Occupation, Ground or Air Observation, Number of Objects, Altitude, Direction of Flight, Speed Distance Covered, Length of Time in Sight, Deviation from Straight Flight, Color, Size, Shape, Sound, Trail, Weather, Manner of Disappearance, and "Remarks". The analysis included copies of all the sightings analyzed, but there was no conclusion expressed. However, associated with the analysis in the FBI file, but not necessarily a part of it, is an updated page with no signature which expresses someone's interesting conclusions. The paper, which was very likely written in late July or in August 1947, reads as follows:

"From detailed study of reports selected for their impression of veracity and reliability, several conclusions have been formed:

(a) This "flying saucer" situation is not all imaginary or seeing too much in some natural phenomenon. Something is really flying around.

(b) Lack of topside inquiries (i.e., lack of requests by top echelon military officers), when compared to the prompt and demanding inquiries that have originated topside upon former events, give more than ordinary weight to the possibility that this is a domestic project, about which the President, etc. know.

(c) Whatever the objects are, this much can be said of their physical appearance:

1. The surface of these objects is metallic, indicating a metallic skin at least.

2. When a trail is observed, it is lightly colored, a Blue-Brown haze, that is similar to a rocket engine's exhaust. Contrary to a rocket of the solid (propellant) type, one observation indicates that the fuel may be throttled which would indicate a liquid rocket engine.

3. As to shape, all observations state that the object is circular or at least elliptical, flat on the bottom and slightly domed on the top. The size estimates place it somewhere near the size of a C-54 or a Constellation.

4. Some reports describe two tabs, located at the rear and symmetrical about the axis of flight motion.

5. Flights have been reported from three to nine of them, flying good formation on each other, with speeds about 300 knots.

6. The discs oscillate laterally while flying along, which could be snaking."

All of the previous information has been presented to indicate the types of reports and the sort of information that was available to the FBI by the end of September. About 60 non-trivial, non-hoax reports, some from FBI sources and many from AAF sources, were filed by the end of September. Also filed were documents giving viewpoints on the situation regarding "flying discs". All of this information played an important part in the decision of the FBI to end its official investigatory status. However, the FBI investigation might have continued anyway, if it hadn't been for "the last straw", which I will describe shortly.

However, first I would like to present some information which suggested to the FBI that it might be investigating our own secret weapons. The document of interest reads as follows:¹⁸

"Special Agent Reynolds (call him SA) of the Liaison Section, while discussing (flying discs) with Lt. Col.

Garrett (Col. G) of the Air Forces Intelligence, expressed the possibility that flying discs were, in fact, a very highly classified experiment of the Army or Navy. SA was very much surprised when Col. G. not only agreed that this was a possibility, but confidentially stated it was his personal opinion that such was a probability. Col. G. indicated confidentially that a Mr., who is a scientist attached to the Air Forces Intelligence, was of the same opinion."

"Col. G. stated that he based his assumption on the following: He pointed out that when flying objects were reported seen over Sweden, the "high brass" of the War Department exerted tremendous pressure on the Air Force Intelligence to conduct research and collect information in an effort to identify these sightings. Col. G. stated that, in contrast to this, we have reported sightings of unknown objects over the United States, and the "high brass" appeared to be totally unconcerned. He indicated this led him to believe that they knew enough about these objects to express no concern. Col. G. pointed out further that the objects in question have been seen by many individuals who are what he terms "trained observers", such as airplane pilots. He indicated also that several of the individuals are reliable members of the community. He stated the above has led him to come to the conclusion that there were objects seen which somebody in the Government knows all about."

"SA pointed out to Col. G. that if it is a fact experimentations are being conducted by the United States Government, then it does not appear reasonable to request the FBI to spend money and precious time conducting inquiries with respect to this matter. Col. G. stated that he agreed with SA in this regard and indicated that it would be extremely embarrassing to the Air Forces Intelligence if it later is learned that these flying discs are, in fact, an experiment of the United States

(continued on page 19)

"California Report"

By Ann Druffel

NOTE: Walt Greenawald, the author of this month's guest column, is a mechanical engineer with 25 years' experience in rocket engine research and development. In 1972, he observed a UFO over California from the window of a commercial airliner and since that time has

studied the UFO phenomena on a continuing, volunteer basis. The following article has been taken from a much longer report written recently by Mr. Greenawald. The full report, including tables and graphs, is available to interested researchers.

AIRLINE PILOTS AND UFOs

Several years ago, after I had become sufficiently intrigued by the UFO enigma to digest everything I could afford on the subject, I had a casual conversation with a pilot friend of mine who flew for American Airlines. He, being somewhat surprised at my interest and position on the alien spacecraft theory, insisted that folks who reported discoidal-shaped craft were viewing airplanes at odd angles. Since that conversation, I wondered if anyone had specifically polled a group of airline pilots for their impressions of these controversial UFOs.

I speculated that the average pilot, highly trained and with so much responsibility, would make an excellent observer and would be considered a very credible witness. From their unique vantage point, observing airspace for hours on end for anything near the flight path which could endanger the airliner, I expected that they would see more than their share of UFOs.

The following questionnaire was subsequently sent to approximately 170 airline pilots, mostly captains, all actively flying for a major US airline. I received 24 responses or a 14% return.

1. In your opinion what is the probability that some UFOs are intelligently controlled spacecraft from some other planet?

ANSWERS: 0-10% Probability 16 (69.5%)
11-50% Probability 1 (4.5%)
51-100% Probability 6 (26.0%)

2. Do you think there are intelligent beings elsewhere in the universe?

ANSWERS: Only three pilots could correctly identify this UFO research group.

9. Do you think the UFO phenomena should be studied openly by the U.S. Government?

ANSWERS: Yes 14 (63.5%)
No 8 (37.5%)

10. Do you have a college degree?

ANSWERS: Yes 17 (74%)
No 6 (26%)

11. Most UFO sightings are explained as known phenomena—approximately 80%. Give an opinion as to what you think the remaining 20% may be (some rare, unknown thing, hallucinations, alien spacecraft, a new weapons system, etc.)

ANSWERS: Six pilots, 25%, gave their opinion that UFOs came from an alien source. Five pilots, 20.8%, responded that UFOs probably were caused by unknown phenomena.

12. True or false: People with more education are more likely to report a UFO sighting?

ANSWERS: Yes 4 (20%) (right answer)
No 16 (80%)

13. At least one major college offers a course on UFOs for credit?

ANSWERS: Yes 13 (56.5%)

Possible 4 (17.5%)
No 6 (26.0%)

3. Have any of your flying colleagues ever reported (publicly or privately) a UFO sighting?

ANSWERS: Yes 8 (34.8%)
No 15 (65.2%)

4. What UFO literature have you read (books, reports, private publications, magazines, etc.)?

ANSWERS: Books 5 (22.7%)
Magazines 5 (22.7%)
Reports, articles 2 (9.1%)
None 10 (45.5%)

5. Does your airline have an official (or unofficial) policy on UFO sightings?

ANSWERS: Yes 1 (4%)
No 22 (92%)
Unknown 1 (4%)

6. For what is Professor George Adamski famous?

ANSWERS: Only one pilot could identify Adamski, as an early "contactee" and author.

7. Who is Dr. J. Allen Hynek?

ANSWERS: Only one pilot could identify Hynek, as an astronomer and UFO researcher.

8. What did the Condon Committee (University of Colorado) do?

(continued on next page)

ANSWERS: Yes 4 (16.7%)
(right answer)
Other 20 (83.3%)
(responses like
"hope not", un-
known, "waste of
money", etc.)

14. Have you ever seen a UFO?

ANSWERS: Yes 5 (20.8%)
No 19 (79.2%)

One pilot reported two sightings in his 23,000 hours in the air, briefly describing them as:

"In a mid-1948 night 50 miles west of Phoenix, Arizona, sighted a cigar-shaped object, white-lighted proceeding south at high speed. It appeared to hover then disappear. The other pilot saw the same thing as I."

And "In 1950, on a night trip to Salt Lake City, Utah, sighted a delta-shaped object, green lighted, proceeding west, south of the airport at what appeared to be a rather slow speed. This sighting was reported on TV by the other pilot."

Another pilot reported the most interesting UFO event: "About 1964 approximately 75 miles west of Allentown, Pa., at 37,000 ft. and over a 25,000 ft. solid overcast, an object appeared as a small moon. Several smaller objects seemed to fly into and away from the brightly lit object. Several other airline pilots in the area sighted the objects and questioned the New York Center about it. The center had no radar contact with the object. The object was viewed for about 10 minutes until we descended into the overcast. There appeared to be no way that the object would have been a reflection because the overcast was solid for at least 20,000 ft."

This event appears to have involved a rare "mother-craft" type of UFO. . . similar sounding to those

reported over France in the great flap of 1954. This particular UFO may have been relatively huge to have been seen by other nearby pilots, as normally airliners are spaced far apart for safety considerations.

PILOTS ATTITUDES: One of the most striking results of this poll was an emergence of an extremely skeptical viewpoint regarding the reality of UFOs among those pilots who had never observed something in the sky which they could not explain. Graphs available from the author indicate that the airline pilots studied by him were at least twice as skeptical of UFO reality as the U.S. national average.

Exploration of the reasons for this variance, most likely psychological in nature, could very well be the subject of some future study.

In contrast to the skepticism noted relative to the belief in UFOs, airline pilots are much more prone to accept that intelligent life exists elsewhere in the universe. Results of Question 2 show that 56% of the pilots polled believe that there are smart beings out there. Comparing this to a survey of participants in a Center for UFO Studies (CUFOS) conference at Lincolnwood, Illinois, in early 1976, it was learned that approximately 50% of those polled attributed UFOs to an extraterrestrial source. *In other words, pilots tend to support the ETI belief but generally refuse to accept that an alien has arrived on this planet.*

These skeptical attitudes on the part of the polled pilots should not be assessed without an evaluation of an individual's knowledge on the subject. In an area so controversial as UFOs, it is not surprising that the most skeptical ones are those who have not investigated the great wealth of information available. The most skeptical pilots had never heard of Adamski, Condon, or Hynek, and had read little at all on the UFO subject. Regarding UFOs, skepticism correlates well with the ignorance factor.

There also appeared to be a definite trend of skepticism with age for those pilots who had not sighted a UFO. The older pilots are predominantly skeptical of UFO reality.

Regarding the feeler as to airline policy on UFO sightings, only one respondent said "yes" to this query, and added, "not official airline position when making statements." I would presume that he means that a pilot may report a UFO sighting on his own, and whatever he says does not reflect the airline's position on the matter. No other pilot reported that this particular airline had an official or unofficial policy on UFO matters.

My own opinion is that all airlines have an unwritten rule—DON'T PUBLICIZE UFO SIGHTINGS AND OUR AIRLINE! This is conjecture on my part, but UFO stories associated with commercial airline travel is bad for business. Any pilot reporting one to the press is sticking his neck out.

The most interesting character from this effort was the pilot who responded that he never seen a UFO, had never talked to another pilot who had seen one, had read some books and articles, and was 100% convinced that some UFOs were alien spacecraft. He even admitted that he carried a loaded 35-mm camera in the cockpit—just in case.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. Airline pilots see significantly more UFOs than the average person, 20.8% as compared to 8% of the U.S. population polled in 1973. In early 1977, the *National Inquirer* reported in their own poll of airline pilots that 11.4% had seen a UFO, somewhere between the two previous percentages.¹

2. Airline pilots are significantly more skeptical regarding the reality of UFOs than is the average citizen.

3. Airline pilots "shoot the bull" about UFOs.

(continued on next page)



Lucius Farish

In Others' Words

The October 18 issue of *NATIONAL ENQUIRER* reported on the new NASA examination of UFO reports since 1967. This preliminary study will determine if a further investigation is necessary. A total of 92 UFO sightings were reported to the *ENQUIRER*, following its "Operation Skywatch" on September 10, according to an article in the October 25 issue. This issue also contains a very interesting item about a Martian formation which resembles a ruined city. The November 8 *ENQUIRER* tells of the Defense Department's continuing interest in UFO reports. Dr. Robert Jastrow, director of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, gives his views on the likelihood of contact with extraterrestrials within the next 40 years in this same issue. A proposal for a United Nations examination of the UFO subject is discussed in the November 15 *ENQUIRER*.

The November issue of *READER'S DIGEST* contains an anti-UFO article by Ronald Schiller. He "explains" specific UFO cases by using classic methods, apparently unaware of the total inadequacy of Klass' "research."

Another report on the Acapulco UFO conference appears in the November 7 issue of *NEW WEST*. Some errors are evident, but it is a generally interesting report on the goings-on. A related article in this issue deals with Steven Spielberg's film, "Close Encounters of the Third Kind."

The Vol. 1, No. 3 issue of *NEW REALITIES* has three articles of interest: a survey of ufology after 30 years, a report on Ray Stanford's Project Starlight International, and still another examination of the Acapulco

conference.

Wendelle Stevens' article on UFO activity in the area of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and William Leet's report on Kentucky UFO cases are about the only two items of interest in the #8 issue of *TRUE FLYING SAUCERS & UFOs*.

December's *UFO REPORT* contains articles by Wendelle Stevens, Brinsley Le Poer Trench, John A. Keel, and others, including an interesting interview with Dr. James Harder.

The January issue of *OFFICIAL UFO* contains a couple of semi-decent articles, but the remainder of the issue is total garbage. Ditto for January *ANCIENT ASTRONAUTS*, whose only redeeming feature is a reprint of one of Wendelle Stevens' good articles.

Leonard Stringfield has been interested in UFOs since that day in August, 1945, when three glowing "blobs" affected the engines of the plane in which he was flying. In later years, his interest was responsible for producing the CRIFO (Civilian Research, Interplanetary Flying Objects) periodicals, *NEWSLETTER* and *ORBIT*.

These excellent additions to UFO literature were followed by his first book, *INSIDE SAUCER POST 3-O BLUE*. His latest book, *SITUATION RED, THE UFO SIEGE!*, is, in the words of the sub-title, "An Update on Strange and Frequently Frightening Encounters." Essentially, it is a report on the events of the 1973 UFO flap, plus later happenings which Stringfield has investigated. It is filled with reports of sightings, landings, occupant and abduction cases—the fascinating and often mind-boggling events which make even the most seasoned UFO

researchers ponder the vast complexity of the subject. In relating UFO cases which he has heard from various sources, Stringfield provides a wealth of potentially important material, but one might wish for a bit more documentation for these stories. However, *SITUATION RED* is currently well worth your attention. The rather dramatic title is the publisher's choice, not the author's, incidentally. The book is available for \$8.95 from Doubleday & Co., Inc., 245 Park Avenue, N.Y., NY 10017.

Readers who are interested in Leonard Stringfield's earlier writings might like to know that the full set of 36 CRIFO publications is available from the author (4412 Grove Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45227) for \$18.00. Copies of his first book, *INSIDE SAUCER POST 3-O BLUE*, are also available at \$3.00 each. All items are well worth the price, in my estimation.

California Report, continued

4. Airline pilots are grossly under-informed about the UFO phenomena.

5. Older pilots tend to be more skeptical than younger pilots regarding UFO reality.

(There is only one comment which can be added to Walt's splendid study. Why in the world hasn't the U.S. Government made use of this vast built-in monitoring system—all the pilots on the U.S. airlines—to gather detailed and expert UFO reports?—Ann Druffel)

NATIONAL ENQUIRER, Feb. 8, 1977

Director's Message

By Walt Andrus

As promised, Columbia Pictures' epic film "Close Encounters of the Third Kind" made its nationwide debut December 14, 1977, opening in 460 selected theaters. Preliminary attendance figures indicate that it could surpass "Star Wars" in popularity, although this prediction is premature, since both continue to run week after week in major theaters. Nearly every publication has given "CE3K" favorable reviews as an entertainment film, that leaves viewers very impressed as they depart from the theater. Steven Spielberg has built up the final scene to a climax which could only be described as "beautiful". Others come away feeling that it has religious connotations, which was also intentional in the Script. An evaluation of the film by scientific UFOlogists would lack the enthusiasm expressed by motion picture film critics. Even though actual UFO cases were the inspiration for the story, Hollywood sensationalistic techniques embellished the action, lighting, and sound effects far beyond the real event, causing some phases to ring of Walt Disney, while others are reminiscent of a horrible nightmare. A prior concern that the humanoids depicted and the shapes of the craft might influence future UFO sighting reports may be discounted, since nothing new was injected into the film in this respect.

MUFON has received numerous telephone calls from newspaper reporters coast to coast, inquiring whether the influence of "CE3K" has caused the number of UFO reports to increase and to what degree. Since we have been going through a very low intensity period, the impact of the film would be significantly apparent if it had a bearing. To date, it has only been a conversational item. Since it has only been showing for a few weeks, it would

be premature to speculate upon its overall influence. However, we do not believe that it will create an abnormal number of hoax reports.

On the other hand, the film has many positive aspects which we predict will be forthcoming.

(1) Older UFO sighting reports by respectable citizens, that have been shared only with their immediate families due to the fear of ridicule, will now rise to the surface. The personal feeling that the experience was "too fantastic" for anyone to believe had compelled the observer to remain silent.

(2) Even though the film is considered science-fiction by a large segment of the population, there will be thousands of competent scientists, engineers, educators, etc., who will recognize this scientific problem and be motivated to volunteer their services toward its resolution.

(3) It may provide the necessary incentive to individual nations to open their own UFO investigations study if they are presently in the evaluation stage.

Just as we recommend that every MUFON member should be conversant with the contents of the MUFON "Field Investigator's Manual", viewing the film "CE3K" is essential groundwork for recognition of reports that may be so influenced by this Hollywood extravaganza.

Needless to say, we are disappointed that Dr. Robert Frosch, NASA Administrator, in his response to Dr. Frank Press, Scientific Advisor to President Jimmy Carter, did not recommend that NASA launch their

own investigation into the study of the UFO phenomenon. We should not be discouraged, because they clearly kept the door open for response to any bona fide physical evidence from credible sources. For further details, please read a copy of Dr. Frosch's letter to Dr. Press published in this issue of the *Journal*.

As readers have no doubt noted, each recent issue of *THE MUFON UFO JOURNAL* has contained an add for the "1977 MUFON SYMPOSIUM PROCEEDINGS". For those who may have forgotten to order or who are relatively new on the UFO scene, MUFON still has copies available of prior Symposium Proceedings for 1973 at \$3.25, 1975 at \$4.00, and 1976 for \$5.00 postpaid. All other years are out of print and no longer available.

Plan your 1978 vacations so that you may attend the Ninth Annual MUFON UFO Symposium to be held July 29 and 30, 1978 (Saturday and Sunday) at the Dayton Convention Center in Dayton, Ohio, former home of Project Blue Book at Wright-Patterson AFB. Confirmed speakers are Ted Bloecher, Ray Fowler, Richard Hall, Leonard Stringfield, and Major Donald Keyhoe.

If "CE3K" was found to be inadequate by UFOlogists as a documentary on UFOs, the new TV series directed by Jack Webb, titled "Project UFO", may have a far greater impact on the viewing public. Allegedly, it is based upon sighting reports taken from the files of Project Blue Book, and will, hopefully, be more factual in content. Please consult your local TV station program listings for this series scheduled to start in February.

At the Eighth Annual MUFON UFO SYMPOSIUM in Scottsdale, Arizona, on July 16, 1977, Bill Pitts, MUFON State Director for Arkansas, disclosed preliminary information concerning telephone conversations, correspondence, and personal

Director's Message Continued

interviews with influential government people in Washington, D.C., in their inquiry into the status of the UFO situation in the United States. Bill was apparently selected as a contact due to his work in organizing and chairing the Fort Smith UFO Conference, wherein all the major UFO organizations were represented. Since NASA has given their response to President Jimmy Carter via Dr. Frank Press, Bill Pitts feels that he can now be more specific. Starting on February 11, 1977, Bill received an unsolicited telephone call from the office of the Secretary of the Air Force Liaison for Legislative Inquiry (S.A.F.L.L.I.) at the Pentagon. After sending a letter with the UFO information requested, he received another call on April 4th. This was followed by another phone call on May 11 from Mr. William Montgomery of Dr. Frank Press' office, in the Executive Offices of the President. While in Washington, D.C. from July 4 to 10, Bill met with Mr. Stanley Schneider, Assistant to the Director (Dr. Press) on July 6 for approximately two hours. Mr. Schneider had been handling the mail on UFOs for Dr. Press, as well as serving as the initial contact and subsequent contact with NASA on UFOs. This information and other items were discussed with Bill during the two hour session in the Executive Office of the President. During this meeting, Bill was told that NASA was being contracted in order to take the matter of UFOs away from the U.S. Air Force and, hopefully, establish an agency which could give an honest effort toward a solution. Nothing of a confidential matter has been disclosed in Bill's statements herein, but only a confirmation that he would provide names and dates at an appropriate time.



FBI Files continued

Government."

"SA subsequently discussed this matter with Col. L. R. Forney of the Intelligence Division of the War Department. Col. Forney stated that he had discussed the matter previously with Gen. Chamberlain. Col. Forney indicated to SA that he has the assurance of Gen. Chamberlain and Gen. Todd that the Army is conducting no experimentations with anything which could possibly be mistaken for a flying disc."

"Col. G. of the Air Force Intelligence subsequently contacted SA and indicated that he had discussed this matter with Gen. Schulgen of the Army Air Forces. Gen. Schulgen had previously assured both SA and Col. G. that to the best of his knowledge and information no experiments were being undertaken by the Government which could be mistaken for flying discs. Col. G. indicated to SA that he had pointed out his beliefs to Gen. Schulgen and had mentioned the possibility of an embarrassing situation arising between the Air Forces Intelligence and the FBI. Gen. Schulgen agreed with Col. G. that a memorandum would be prepared for the signature of Gen. McDonald, A2 to Gen. LeMay, who is in charge of Research and Development in the Air Corps. Col. G. indicated that this memorandum will set forth the characteristics of the objects seen by various reliable individuals. The memorandum will then request Gen. LeMay to indicate whether or not any experiments are being undertaken by the Air Forces which could possibly be connected with any of the observed phenomena. Col. G. stated that when a reply is received from Gen. LeMay, a communication will be addressed to the Bureau."

"SA will follow this matter closely with Lt. Col. Garrett and Gen. Schulgen so that the Bureau will be promptly advised of all information

regarding the flying discs, especially any information indicating that they are, in fact, an experiment of some Governmental agency."

On Sept. 5, 1947, the FBI received the following note from Gen. Schulgen:¹⁸

"In answer to a verbal request of your Mr. S. W. Reynolds, a complete survey of research activities discloses that the Army Air Forces has no project with the characteristics similar to those which have been associated with the Flying Discs." (signed) Geo. F. Schulgen, Brig. General, USA; Deputy, Ass't. Chief of Air Staff - 2.

This officially laid to rest the possibility that the US government had any devices which could have generated flying disc reports, although the possibility was again discussed in 1950.²⁰

(To be continued)

Part 3 will appear in December 1977 issue of
The Journal

REFERENCES

11. FBI document; filed 7/6/47
12. FBI document; filed 7/7/47
13. FBI document; filed 7/8/47
14. FBI document; filed 7/11/47
15. FBI document; filed 7/11/47
16. FBI document; filed 7/11/47
17. FBI document; filed 8/20/47
18. FBI document; filed 8/19/47
19. FBI document; filed 9/15/47
20. FBI document; filed 8/19/50



MAGAZINE HOAX EXPOSED

By Ann Druffel

In the January 1978 issue of *OFFICIAL UFO*, the title of a lead article blared out the startling news of "The Night an American Town Died of Fright". The story was listed on the magazine's cover as "Saucers Loot and Burn Chester, Illinois: Story Suppressed by Officials".

The skepticism with which objective ufologists and investigators met this "information" was justified when followup research by the *Benton Evening News*, Illinois, and the *Southern Illinoian* of Carbondale, Illinois, revealed the entire story to be fraudulent:

Neither reporter Bob Nesoff nor Joseph Arimond found the town of Chester looted, burned, destroyed or otherwise damaged by UFOs or any other marauders.

OFFICIAL UFO, until a few months ago, was a fine magazine publishing honest research. The Chester hoax, however, follows hard upon its July 1977 issue in which another blatant hoax was published and later exposed by *MUFON UFO JOURNAL* then-editor, Dennis Hauck.

The Chester, Illinois, story in the January 1978 issue was written by someone purporting to be "City Sheriff Luke Grisholm" (an admitted pseudonym), who conveniently stated in the article that he was leaving town after revealing the facts of the UFO assault on his home town and moving elsewhere so that he could not be located.

The article contained the following falsehoods:

1. That giant UFOs repeatedly swept over the town, setting homes and

other property in flames. Investigative reporters from the above-mentioned newspapers could find no evidence of fire or other destruction.

2. That the entire town of 5,300 experienced a night of terror from the continually attacking, low-level UFOs. The truth is that not even Chester's Mayor nor any of its citizens who were interviewed have any idea of what attack the author was writing about.

3. The "City Sheriff" Luke Grisholm repeatedly called nearby Chanute Air Force Base to send jet fighters to chase away the UFOs. The truth is that Chester has no Sheriff, but a Police Chief, Harold Howie, who denies the entire story as a deliberate canard.

4. That Channel 8 went blank on television sets in Chester, followed by the appearance of an alien figure, presumably from one of the attacking craft. There was no verification whatsoever of this rumor.

In New York, *OFFICIAL UFO's* editor, Jeffrey Goodman, attempted weakly to defend the article by stating that it had been submitted by a freelance writer and that the magazine's staff had tried to check out the story. Evidently, their methods of checking leave much to be desired. Goodman would not comment further.

OFFICIAL UFO is distributed widely throughout the United States and Canada, as well as overseas. Publication figures are not available, but about 150,000 newsstand sales per issue are claimed.

It has become plain that information published in *OFFICIAL UFO* is untrustworthy and that the

magazine no longer deserves the support of ufologists. In view of its widespread popularity, however, we wonder how many more hoax articles must be printed before the unworthiness of the magazine is universally recognized.

(Credit: James A. Williams, Benton, Illinois, for local news reports)



Mark R. Herbstritt

THE SKY FOR JANUARY 1978

Mercury — For a few days around the 11th, it may be seen low in the southeast before sunrise. At greatest elongation west, the planet is about 14 degrees above the horizon at sunrise.

Venus — It is too close to the sun for observation, being in superior conjunction on the 22nd.

Mars — In Cancer, it rises at about sunset and is visible all night, opposition being on the 21st.

Jupiter — Moving from Gemini into Taurus, it is well up in the east at sunset and sets before dawn.

Saturn — In Leo, it rises about three hours after sunset and is low in the west at sunrise. On the 20th, it is 1.1 degrees north of Regulus.

The Quadrantid Meteor shower in the constellation Bootes occurs Jan. 1 - 4.