



Issue #8

ORBITER

The New England Aerial Phenomena Report

Editor: Jim Melesciuc
Address: 43 Harrison Street
Reading, MA 01867 USA
Hotline: (617) 944-0686

May 1988

GULF BREEZE, MOUNTBATTEN AND SOUR GRAPES

When one takes an overall view of the current Ufological situation in America, it seems that a showdown is inevitable. The nonsense that is being dumped into this subject is now knee-deep with no ending in sight. Psychics are now promoting abduction conferences. Prominent Ufologists are putting their books up for sale next to tarot cards and New Age movement material. The ova and sperm samples taken by entities to create their hybrid race are given more media attention than Ollie North and the Iran-Contra connection.

Two of the MJ-12 promoters declining to answer the questions posed by CAUS decided to take their work underground. The third MJ-12 promoter is mailing material to everyone containing everything except the answers. Maybe when the two re-surface and join the third they'll become war correspondents and give us a first hand account of the underground battle between the entities and American forces.

MUFON investigators and the media recently converged on Gulf Breeze, FL which rivaled the U.S. 82nd Airborne assault on Grenada. A Mr. X had taken polaroid pictures of an object from a polaroid camera that was held together with tape. He had them publicized and suddenly found himself a lot of friends. Someone else called Believe Bill (no one has ever seen this person) also sent in pictures of Mr. X's object. Believe me, Believe Bill was not the only believer in Gulf Breeze.

Just a quick word on UFO photos. Since the historic Kenneth Arnold sighting, hundreds of pranksters have engaged in such hoaxes as filling up plastic bags with hot air from candles or photographing tossed hubcaps to create excitement for those who were anxious to see a UFO.

Lessons should have been learned from cases such as the Alec Birch photos. In Feb., 1962 Alec Birch took a photo of several "unknowns". This photo was carried by numerous UFO publications as a bona fide UFO photograph for over ten years. In June, 1973 Alec Birch disclosed how he deceived the world of ufology. He had painted the objects onto a window pane and then took the photo. Another infamous photo hoax is the Paul Knight photo at St. Catherine's, Ontario, Canada in April 1976. The Canadian investigators with project SUM (Solving UFO Mysteries), after studying the photos, released the photograph to several magazines. One year later in April, 1977, Paul Knight's photo was being discussed on CJRW radio of Niagara Falls during a call-in talk program. Knight called the station and to approximately 300,000 listeners, admitted that he had faked the photograph by using a Volkswagen hubcap.

Now several members of the UFO community have discovered serious problems with the 30 plus photos and the "enlightened" investigation by MUFON. Now those critical of the Gulf Breeze events are feeling the sting of a hate campaign. Hopefully, those who have launched the hate campaign will give a second thought to what they're doing. There are only a handful of researcher/investigators remaining in this now fringy subject who care enough to voice their opinions when they see the problems. Only a few are trying to keep this subject respectable because they feel beneath the compost heap there is paydirt.

The big question here is how long are these few going to hold out. How many more researchers, scientists, and laymen are going to be driven out. I've recently read a biography on Lord Mountbatten (Mountbatten authored by Philip Ziegler). Here is a man born and raised in royalty. He became one of the three Supreme Allied Commanders of World War II. The others were Eisenhower and MacArthur. He had a quarter of a million Americans under his direct command. He also became one of the most influential politicians in the British Empire. He was the

architect of the post-war world and much more. He had a keen interest in the UFO phenomena and even tried to set up a Center to filter reports. His interest in the subject faded due to the nonsense (contacteeism) surrounding the subject. How many more will exit the subject through the same door as Lord Mountbatten and I'm not talking just sour grapes.

CAUTION ON WORLD-WIDE UFO

The work of Lucius Farish - UFO Newscipping Service (UFONS) is being duplicated by an individual(s) residing in the Orlando Florida area. They are simply removing the UFONS title and applying their own title World-Wide_UFO. Lucius Farish has been the editor of UFONS since 1977 and has been researching the phenomena since 1957. Since the early sixties he has had articles published in numerous UFO magazines and has contributed to several anthologies on UFOs. People should be cautious of anything Ufological being promoted out of the Orlando, Florida area.

NEW BOOK

UFOS AND THE COMPLETE EVIDENCE FROM SPACE. Authored by Daniel Ross, Pintade Publishing, P.O. Box 3033, Walnut Creek, CA 94598. This book leans heavily on Adamski material, "lush green side of the moon" theory, etc. On a rating system of 1-10, I'll give this a -3.

INTERNATIONAL UFO CONGRESS

Date: Sept. 3-6, 1988
 Place: Rio Othon Palace Hotel
 Speakers: Eric von Daniken, Jacques Vallee, Jimmy Guieu, Karl Veit, Colman Vonkevizky, Cynthia Hind, Lic Fabio Zerpa, R. Leo Sprinkle, William Moore, Bob Pratt.

For further information write to: Adam Congressos E. Eventos Ltda. Av. Almte Barroso, 63 Grupos 1413/1414 20031 - Rio de Janeiro - RJ/Brazil. Tel (021) 220-18561/220-2781.

RADIO-TV LOG

May 2, Jerry Williams Show on WRKO-radio discussed "Face on Mars" theory.
 May 4, Wil Shriner Show, Phil Klass guest.
 May 6, WBZ-radio, Budd Hopkins guest.
 May 8, Documentary, "UFOs Are Real", Channel 38, 5:30 p.m.
 May 9, Channel 5, Good Day program, Budd Hopkins guest.
 May 16, New York radio WROR, Travis Walton guest.

ARTICLE LOG

Christianity Today 3/10/78 (two articles).
Yankee Magazine 6/88
The New Yorker 2/4/67.
Saturday Evening Post 1-2/84, 3/84
Society 1-2/84.
New Republic 10/26/53.
Psychology Today 10/76.
Physics Today 3/74-12/76.
New Science 2/8/79, 1/18/79 (page 158).
Science Teacher 12/74.

GULF BREEZE, FLORIDA ACTIVITY SUMMARY

(As of May 1, 1988)

A. Biased one-sided investigation

1. The principal investigators have made public statements authenticating the photographs prior to the conclusion of the investigation. (Attachment #1, "For The Record" dated April 25, 1988)

2. Negative aspects of the reported events in and around Gulf Breeze, Florida have been restricted and covered-up by principal investigators. In fact, the investigators have actually taken sides with the photographer of the objects to the point of furnishing that photographer with internal correspondence pertaining to the investigation and research of the reported events. (Attachment #2, correspondence referenced or distributed on a limited basis)

B. Questionable factors concerning principal witness/es

1. The principal witness made his initial report to the Sentinel newspaper; not to an official agency such as the police department, for whatever reason he may give. This is a factor always considered when reviewing a UFO report. In the Hickson/Parker case; for example, the two witnesses went first to Keesler AFB, Mississippi and then to the local police department. (Report content)

2. No known person independent of the principal witness has reportedly observed the same object/s, despite the number of photographs taken, in presence of the photographer.

3. The witness has been writing and submitting manuscripts to Mr. Budd Hopkins' agent, Ms. Phyllis Wender, for possible publication of a book. (Correspondence from Mr. Donald Ware, Mr. Budd Hopkins and verbal confirmation by the photographer)

4. Some residents in the Gulf Breeze, Florida area have related a number of disturbing incidents in regard to the principal witness that causes concern to several investigators and researchers in the UFO phenomenon community. One example is a statement alleged to have been made during the summer of 1987 by the witness: "The Ultimate Prank". (Interview with sources by four witnesses)

5. The witness has not impressed me, as well as other investigators and researchers, of having had a truly traumatic experience. (Derived from several personal visits with the witness, a review of a fairly lengthy video tape and investigation report content)

C. Conflicting and inconsistent characteristics to actual known patterns of the UFO phenomenon

1. The area in which the majority of related experiences are said to have taken place is a heavily populated residential and business location. The great majority of high quality UFO encounters occur in rural areas away from such populated areas.

2. The number of reports made by local residences were prompted primarily by the news media (assisted by the principal investigators). Flaps or waves (large distribution of sighting reports over a geographical area) created by the phenomenon itself cover a larger area than what has occurred in the Gulf Breeze/Pensacola reports. This is additional evidence that the reports were primarily generated by the news media although some of the independent sighting reports may very well be legitimate reports.

3. Although one experience related by the witness involved an "attack" by the UFO as it moved over and in front of his vehicle (in an isolated location for that particular incident) there were no E/M effects reported. Also, the progression of events are dissimilar to other low level encounters reported in higher quality cases.

4. Repeated sightings and experiences related by the witness are similar to other questionable reports and "contactee" claims. In most high quality reports the witness experiences a single short duration encounter. In longer term encounters ~~the witness/es often relate a time and/or memory lapse following the particular experience.~~

5. Repeated abilities by the witness of being able to resist the anomaly (UFO/occupants) have been claimed. This is contrary to the results of studies in the field.

6. Several similarities with Mr. Whitley Strieber's book Communion have been found. The most curious similarity is the related smell of "Cinnamon" with the Gulf Breeze report which can be found on page 19 of Mr. Strieber's book. This is the only known reference to that smell in UFO literature to date. It is also of interest to note that the book Communion was released during the winter/spring of 1987 and that on page 11 of Mr. Strieber's book he states: "I have never seen an unidentified flying object."

7. The abundance of photographs taken by the witness is a negative aspect in itself contrary to the actual exhibits of the UFO phenomenon. Most high controversy reports involve a large number of pictures -- especially when the photographer claims to be a contactee.

8. The majority of high-quality photographs depicting disc or vertically positioned cylindrical-shaped objects do not exhibit propulsion units as shown in the Gulf Breeze, Florida photographs.

9. The objects depicted in the Gulf Breeze photographs are always tilted in a manner showing a portion of the base but never the top towards the camera. This is also a curious feature because of the number of photographs taken.

D. Questionable factors concerning the photographs

1. The first 5 photographs taken on November 11, 1987 depict a rapidly darkening of the sky that is not consistent with the 3-4 minute duration that the witness related.

2. Accurate cloud movement data for the altitude depicted has not been completed although there are questions concerning the speed of the clouds in the first 5 pictures. Mr. Ray Stanford (PSI) informed me this date that he has reinstated his analysis of weather data and that information supported by documents from weather bureau stations will be provided in the near future.

E. Inherent flaws with the depicted object/s

1. The circular base at the bottom of the object is tilted in a manner that creates a non-symmetrical ellipse. An ellipse must always be symmetrical. There are, however, certain factors caused by the atmosphere and photographic lens that may reduce imaging the true symmetry of an ellipse.

2. There is an ambient light on the entire surface of the object depicted in the first 5 photographs (especially in photograph number 5) that can not be easily attributed to sky light (reflected from clouds at a distance), the object itself, the moon, the sun, or local utility lighting. This indicates the possibility of artificial illumination by the photographer.

3. There is a distinct flaw at the base of the object on the outside edge of the rim. This is evident in photograph numbers 11, 14, and 17.

4. In photograph number 16 inside the bottom base of the object a circular light is visible. There is a dimmed area visible at one portion of that circular light which is similar to a kitchen fluorescent light where an electrical connection may be. Mr. Ray Stanford (PSI) is conducting comparative research with such lighting fixtures.

5. There is possible evidence of an overlap between the object and a tree in photograph number 7. The object appears to be in front of the tree or integrated with the tree itself. Dr. Willy Smith is conducting analysis of this photograph as well as others.

6. The object depicted in the first 5 photographs appears to be non-symmetrical; that is, the upper and lower portions of the object are off-center from one another. This may be caused by reflection off of a glass surface or another form of medium between the object and the lens of the camera.

7. According to Dr. Willy Smith (UNICAT Project) there is at least one "window" that does not line up horizontally with adjacent "windows" on the object.

8. The spacing between the "windows" on the object are not proportional to one another horizontally. This is obvious to the unaided eye and measurements reveal mathematical inconsistencies contrary to good geometry.

Robert D. Boyd
CUFOS Investigator Coordinator
MUFON State Director, Alabama



May 1, 1988

FOR THE RECORD

Re: Alleged UFO events of Gulf Breeze, Florida commencing on November 11, 1987. Sampling of some public statements made by principal investigators up to and including April 21, 1988.

Mr. Donald M. Ware (MUFON State Director, Florida) & Mr. Charles Flannigan (MUFON Lead Investigator, Escambia County, Florida), The Sentinel, December 10, 1987: "Preliminary evaluation, prior to the completion of the photogrammetric analysis, is an unknown of great significance because of the quality of the five photographs..."

"The Sightings" news/documentary, WEAR-TV Channel 3 broadcasts, February, 1988:

Mr. Budd Hopkins (author): "...and I feel that there is absolutely no sign of a hoax; that the photographs are genuine; that the witnesses are telling the truth and that this presents probably the best uh, without any doubt the best photographic evidence; in, in forty years of UFO investigation."

Mr. Donald Ware: "There are repeated, apparently staged photographic sessions. I mean, somebody up there wants somebody down here to take these photographs; for what reason I'm not sure but..."

Mr. Duane Cook (editor, The Sentinel): "Its got to be real, I mean, how do you fake a Poloroid? (laughs)"

Mr. Donald Ware, The Sentinel, February 25, 1988: "The photographs show an unknown of great significance because of the quality of the photographs and the reputation of the independent witnesses."

Mr. Budd Hopkins (author), The Sentinel, February 25, 1988: "The credibility of the pictures and the photographer should not be questioned. The fact that the photos are clear, detailed, and contain so much information that can be validated, shows they are authentic. The abundance of sightings and witnesses is of such magnitude as to render the orchestration of a hoax highly unlikely."

Mr. Budd Hopkins, WEAR-TV Channel 3, 6pm news: "...and we find no problems with any of his statements or his uh, uhh, or the photographs so far." - April 21, 1988.

Robert D. Boyd
April 25, 1988

CUFOS Investigator Coordinator
P. O. Box 66404
Mobile, Al. 36606

Attachment #2

(1) General.

The small city of Gulf Breeze, in Florida, has been the focus of a series of UFO sightings which started on November 11, 1987 and have continued unabated to date. During those four months numerous Polaroid photographs have been taken by a local resident, Mr. Edward Hillman (assumed name). The case and the photographs have been extensively publicized by the Sentinel, the local newspaper.

Two, and only two interpretations are possible:

(1) We have a genuine UFO occurrence, substantiated by a large number of photographs, or:

(2) It is a very elaborate hoax perpetrated for financial gain or motivated by intellectual arrogance.

The problem is then to decide which of the above hypotheses is correct. Normally, the investigator should look for other sightings in the area with additional witnesses which would confirm the central incident. But this is not a normal case as the photographs were given wide local publicity and numerous alleged sightings were reported to the offices of the Gulf Breeze newspaper. The editor of the Sentinel has become directly involved in the case, and has an obvious vested interest in maintaining the notoriety created by the sightings. Still worse, the investigators have learned about the secondary cases through the editor himself, and very likely a filtering of the information received by the paper has occurred.

The dilemma is then whether to pursue each and every one of those secondary cases, or to concentrate the investigative efforts on the photographs and the photographer. From the viewpoint of the analyst, his time would be better spent in the study of the photographs, instead of attempting to evaluate a myriad of secondary cases which may or may not be related. We have an unprecedented number of photographs containing a wealth of information, and Mr. Hillman's sightings will stand or fall on the merits of the photos themselves.

The problem becomes then very simple: if the photos are genuine, they depict craft of unknown origin. The information therein contained is all real, and no inconsistencies could or would be discovered. The data revealed by any one photo would be applicable to all of them, and a coherent overall pattern would emerge.

On the contrary, if unresolvable inconsistencies are found in the photographs, or if even a single photo shows conclusive evidence of manipulation, then the whole structure collapses, and all the photos would be considered false, even if the hoaxer had been clever enough to hide his tricks in some of them.

(2) The photographic evidence.

This analysis will be limited to the first five photographs taken on 871111 (November 11, 1987) using a Polaroid camera loaded with 108 film.

Allegedly, the five photos were taken in the front of Mr. Hillman's residence shortly after sunset and all look in an approximate westerly direction. According to the witness's description of events (Ref.1), the five photographs were taken in a total time of 3 to 4 minutes. This interval included the time required to go inside the house, procure a new film package and install it in the camera. It is reasonable to assume that all this took at least one minute, and consequently, the first 4 photos were taken -- always adhering to the information provided by Mr. Hillman -- at the most in three minutes. This implies that the interval between any two photos was of the order of 1 minute.

The short time during which the photos were taken is emphasized by the witness when he described how he dropped the film in the driveway after taking each picture.

Concentrating now on those first 3 photos, all of them were taken from the same point and show, in addition to the anomalous object, a telephone pole on the left side, and a utility post with a street light on the right. The light is on, confirming the time of the day.

From daylight photographs (taken Dec. 4, 1987) and additional information provided by Charles Flannigan (Ref.2) one can determine that the telephone pole (h = 23 ft.) appearing in photo #1 almost below the object, is at a distance of 115 ft from the camera. The segment of the pole showing above the not-so-distant pines has a length of 8.2 ft.

From the above information, the angle subtended by the telephone pole is found to be very close to 11 degrees. From the weather information for November 11, 1987, we know that the cloud base was at 15,000 ft. and we can calculate the distance from the camera to the clouds as:

$$D = H/\sin 11 = 15000/0.1908 = 78600 \text{ ft.}$$

or about 14.8 miles. Likewise, the horizontal distance to the vertical of the cloud location can be estimated as:

$$D = H/\tan 11 = 15,000 \text{ ft}/0.2 = 75000 \text{ ft}$$

Returning now to the first-generation copies of photos #1, #2 and #3 (slides taken by Dr. Maccabee), all of them show well defined layers of clouds in the area next to the telephone pole. As shown above, those clouds are very distant, near the horizon, and could not have changed appreciably in an interval of 1 minute. Yet, close inspection of the photos

reveals very sizeable changes in the cloud configuration.

The photos show a layer of darker clouds just behind the top of the telephone pole. We select a characteristic identifiable spot at the bottom of the dark cloud, and we follow it on the three consecutive photographs, using as reference the vertical of the telephone pole.

On photo #1, the selected point is 8 mm to the left of the pole, while in photo #2 it has moved to a distance of 6 mm to the right of the pole, and appears on photo #3 at a location 16 mm to the right of the pole. Times will be measured starting at photo #1; then $t = 1 \text{ min}$ corresponds to photo #2, and $t = 2 \text{ min}$ to photo #3.

The best results are obtained when comparing photos #1 and #3. The total displacement of our feature is then: $8 + 16 = 24 \text{ mm.}$, which at a distance of 78600 ft corresponds to an actual displacement of:

$$d = \frac{24 \text{ (mm)} \times 78600 \text{ (ft)}}{110 \text{ (mm)}} = 17149 \text{ ft}$$

The velocity of the clouds follows at once:

$$v = \frac{17149 \text{ (ft)}}{2 \text{ (min)}} \times \frac{60 \text{ (min)}}{1 \text{ (hr)}} \times \frac{1 \text{ (mile)}}{5280 \text{ (ft)}} = 97.4 \text{ mi/hr}$$

which corresponds to 84.6 knots per hour, a clear impossibility!

Next, we reverse the calculation, and determine the actual time elapsed using the reported surface wind velocity for that day, which was 11 knots (12.7 miles/hr). Thus:

$$t = \frac{17149 \text{ (ft)}}{12.7 \text{ (mi/hr)}} \times \frac{1 \text{ (mile)}}{5280 \text{ (ft)}} \times \frac{60 \text{ (min)}}{1 \text{ (hr)}} = 15.3 \text{ min}$$

If one uses instead a wind velocity of 30 knots (Ref.3), one obtains $t = 5.6 \text{ min}$. Thus, the total time for the five photographs can be estimated between 11 and 30 minutes. This numerical result, extracted directly from the information recorded in the photographs, has dire consequences for the genuineness of the photographs.

First of all, it is evident that Mr. Hillman has lied, because the discrepancy is too great to be explained. And of course, the photographer needed a few minutes in between shots to set up his model and photograph it in the house.

The second conclusion is that we would have to admit, to pursue the notion of genuine photos, that a brightly illuminated object, 10 times the size of the moon, remained unnoticed at low altitude, perhaps as long as half an hour, in a very populated residential area, particularly at that

time of the day when people were returning home from work. This is very unlikely.

And finally, we have photo #5 to deal with.

The object appears very clearly, showing abundant detail in the superstructure as well as a bright bottom and a light at the top. While these features could be the result of internal lights, the main body could not be illuminated by those same lights, and it is obviously not transparent or glowing. Thus, its perfect clarity in the photo reveals the presence of an external light source.

Could it be illuminated by the moon? The answer is no, because the moon set that day at 11:23 AM. In addition, other objects in the photo, namely the telephone and utility poles, are indistinct and poorly illuminated, indicating that the ambient light was limited.

The characteristics of this photo could be explained by assuming there was a double exposure, with an externally illuminated model placed against a black backdrop. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that high contrast copies of photo #5 clearly show two supports extending from the lower part of the object toward the ground.

In addition, the assumed windows or portholes in the wider part of object are incorrectly spaced; not only the separation is irregular, but it does not decrease toward the rim to satisfy the sine distribution law. Moreover, the dots are not located in the same plane perpendicular to the axis, as can be seen even in the poor reproductions published in Ref.1. A remarkable flaw for an alien craft!

And where are the clouds? If photo #5 had been taken shortly after the others, the cloud pattern should be there, as the weather report confirms that the clouds were still there at 7 P.M. But we see no clouds, and that verifies that photo #5 was taken at a different date than reported.

(3) The final blow

More damaging evidence is contained in the photos, as has been shown by Ray Stanford (Ref.3).

Although some controversy has occurred with reference to the wind direction on November 11, 1987, the newest and best information seems to indicate that at 15,000 ft or so it was blowing from an azimuth no more than 20 or 30 degrees south from the direction in which the camera was pointing. To make an order of magnitude calculation, assume that the angle was in fact 45 degrees, which in fact determines that the wind transversal component and the component toward the camera were equal, regardless of the actual wind velocity. That being the case, the photos should show a perceptible progression of the clouds toward the camera. Since this does not occur, we can safely conclude that photos #1, #2 and #3--

were NOT taken on the reported date.

Again, these results have damaging consequences. Since photo #5 was also taken at a different date, the inescapable conclusion is that the photos were not the result of the unscheduled appearance of an anomalous craft, but were taken during an unknown period of time in the preparation of a hoax.

Photo #4 has not been included in this discussion, as I have not seen a clear copy. With regard to the cloud motion, Ray Stanford has made some suggestions concerning the only possible date during that week compatible with the wind direction shown in the photos.

Another consequence of determining that the photos were NOT taken on the reported date is that the presumably supporting sighting on November 11 by Mrs. Somerby, mother of the editor of the Sentinel becomes highly suspicious, as in fact it could not verify a non-existing craft.

At this point, the credibility of the witness and the belief in the genuineness of the photos have evaporated, and only a great deal of wishful thinking may preserve the illusion that the Gulf Breeze sightings reflect real events.

Dr. Willy Smith
(C) UNICAT Project
May 5, 1988

REFERENCES

1. Ware, D.M., et al.; in MUFON UFO JOURNAL #239, March 1988, p.5.
2. Flannigan, Charles; private communication.
3. Stanford, Ray; private communication, April 1988.

DEPARTMENT OF FURTHER AMPLIFICATION

I have reprinted this open letter which reflects the current scene of American Ufology. This open letter was squashed at MUFON headquarters. Unfortunately, the two well-detailed and objective reports on the Gulf Breeze events reported in this issue were also suppressed.

Joe Nyman, who authored this letter, has studied and investigated UFO reports for close to 30 years. He is one of the quiet giants in the field of Ufology and has put a great amount of time and effort in the study of abductions throughout New England.

April 27, 1988
19 Longmeadow Road
Medfield, MA 02052

An open letter to all Journal readers

As a shy but well meaning MUFON member of long standing, I am perplexed and befuddled (I have, at times, been compared to the fellow in hat, glasses and suspenders who hawks wine cooler on TV).

This Gulf Breeze stuff! Wow! and the MJ12 stuff! Double wow! Aren't we making such great progress? This abduction stuff! Wow! Wow! Wow!

But, as I say, I'm confused. I've heard a lot of weird stuff recently and I'm writing to get some answers.

Is it true that:

1. One investigator thinks Mr. Ed's photo #17 is of Mr. Ed's behind while another thinks it is of Mr. Ed's elbow.
2. Investigators in abduction case investigations have been mysteriously distracted from heaving breathing on their couches by the sounds of distant cash registers?
3. The letters "MJ" and the number "12" are going to replace "H-O-L-L-Y-W-O-O-D" in the Hollywood Hills?
4. Some investigators have finally seen the light at the end of the tunnel and recognized that light as the glare of media hype?
5. Media reps have been riding through the country in trucks with loudspeakers calling "Give us your abductees (our ratings are slipping)!?"
6. An investigator was recently trampled by a legion of woman, all mysteriously pregnant?
7. Part of the new investigator's exam will be a screen test?
8. A well known abductee will shortly be endorsing toilet paper and condoms?
9. A writer is suing a well known abductee because she gave birth to her alien baby before his book was ready?
10. MJ12 proponents have had their library cards revoked?

Gee, that sure is a lot for anyone to answer, but I hope someone can get me untangled 'cause I thought there was supposed to be some cooperation and objective research going on.

Maybe the Weekly World News knows the answers.

Yours innocently,

Joe Nyman

P.S. Phil, if you read this, don't worry. We're doing your job better than you ever knew how.