

# UFO Intelligence Newsletter

Produced & Published By: The UFO FILTER CENTER, 618 Davis Dr., Mt. Vernon, IN 47620  
Director, Writer & Editor: Francis L. Ridge, (812) 838-9843

AUGUST 1992

## WHAT HAPPENED TO THE GOOD CASES?

Most of the sightings listed at the right occurred in November 1957. Only two cases were simply described as lights and one of those cases involved police officers. This was a flap year where UFOs started a stepped-up close approach pattern beginning at Leveland, TX.

Date	Time	Location	StaHynWitSound	Durat	Source	PrnWit	F Code	Descript
570124	XXXX	Indianapolis	IN NL Mw N/a		UFOE,15,36	a/1 pilot	11	Eggs,4
571015	DAYT	Covington	IN C2 1		UFOE,74,136	farmer	3	Disc
5711XX	AFTM	Murphysboro	IL DD 1 None		UFOE,15,167	housewife		Oval,3 i
5711XX	2000	Valparaiso	IN C1 1 None	m+	Edwards	Codge		F.Sphere
571101	1630	Campbellsville	KY DD 1		UFOE,163			Elongate
571104	0317	Elmwood Park	IL NL 3 None	m+	Michel-1958,23	police	3	Egg
571105	EVEN	Ringwood	IL C2 1 None		UFOE,74		3	Object
571105	XXXX	E.St. Louis	IL NL 3 None		UFOE,136	RR emplys		Eggs
571105	0430	Galesburg	IL NL 1 None		UFOE,165			Ellipt
571105	1812	Vabash	IN NL 1 Humming		UFOE,165			Obj w/lt
571106	EVEN	Richmond	IN NL Mw None		UFOE,166			Ellipt
571106	EVEN	Danville	IL NL 2 None	20m	UFOE,64,75	Showers/Ma3		Light
571106	EVEN	Merom *	IN C2 Mw Sizzling	10m	UFOE,97,98,166	Gilham	5	Disc
571106	1822	Bloomington	IN NL Mw None	45m+	Press	police		Lights
571106	1930	Marion	IN NL Mw None		UFOE,146,151,166			Cigar
571106	2004	Western Springs	IL NL 1 None		UFOE,166	?		OBOL
571110	1900	Hammond	IN C2 5 Beeps	m+	UFOE,64,75,167	police		Obj w/lt
571114	EVEN	Tamaroa	IL NL Mw None		UFOE,75		3	Object

As you can see from the 1957 preliminary printout above, something truly unusual was taking place in the midwest, and not just lights in the sky. This printout is a six-state representation only (MO,IL,IN,OH,KY,TN), and the UFOCAT printouts and Eberhart Geo-Bibliography listings have not been researched for additional sightings. But note the location of the sighting described below:

November 6, 1957. Close Encounter Of The Second Kind. Rene Gilham, a young ironworker employed in Terre Haute, lived with his wife and children on the outskirts of the little community of Merom, Indiana, about 25 miles south of Terre Haute.

While Gilham was eating his evening meal, a neighbor's child came in and urged Gilham's youngsters to hurry out and see the funny star in the sky. The children rushed out, were properly excited by what they saw, and in turn urged the parents to come see for themselves.

Could this really be one of those strange objects which were discussed so widely on the air and in the press for the past few days? Gilham and his wife followed the children out into the street in front of their home. The family which lived across the street was already there. They were watching a circular thing which hung motionless in the sky an estimated 200-300' overhead. Both Gilham and his neighbor guessed that it was not less than thirty or more than forty feet in diameter. None of the little group of witnesses heard any sound from it, not even the buzzing oftentimes reported.

When brilliant beams of bright blue light began projecting downward from the center of the object, the family across the road decided it was time to retire. Mrs. Gilham suggested that they, too, should get back inside the house. Gilham laughed and told her to "take the kids and go on inside. I want to see this thing!"

He stood there under the object for a total of about ten minutes, in the recurrent blue beams of blue light, each of which lasted about half a second. Then, he said, "The thing made a sizzling-like a high speed electric motor- and away it went!"

That was on a Wednesday night. He felt no discomfort on Thursday but by Friday he had eye inflammation and his face was beginning to swell and to itch; by Saturday

the top of his head and his face were showing such unmistakable swelling and reddening that he went to a doctor: and Dr. Joseph Dukes sent him to a hospital in Sullivan, Indiana, for treatment. He was treated there and released a few days later after being interrogated by Air Force officers who advised him not to discuss the matter with civilians. Fortunately, they were too late, once again.

Dr. Joseph Dukes of Dugger, Indiana, told the FI that the burns Gilham suffered were similar to the burns caused by overexposure to the rays from an electric welding torch. Gilham contended that he had not been near a welding torch for three weeks nor, for that matter, anything else that could have caused burns, except that blinking light on the UFO.

The FI stated that Mr. Gilham fully recovered from the effects of his unique experience.

In the late 60's my sister married a man who had been a lab technician at Mary Sherman Hospital in Sullivan, Indiana. He told me that Mr. Gilham was under treatment there and was told to return to the hospital every year for blood tests!

#### ROSWELL DEBRIS UNDER ANALYSIS?

The hottest rumor of the month is that the CUFOS investigation team which, as you know, re-examined the Roswell UFO crash site, found some of the original debris that had been buried in concrete. The rumor adds that the debris is being examined at a lab and that a high official of CUFOS declined comment.

I am aware that certain individuals knew of the existance of actual crash material that was embedded in concrete and I always wondered why money wasn't spent to retrieve it. The Fund for UFO Research spent \$50,000 to get an investigation and produce a video on Roswell. For a small amount of money this small area of old concrete could have been busted up and replaced with new. The Roswell material should withstand the breaking up of the concrete, allowing us to retrieve perfectly-preserved artifacts from July of 1947. Finding the pieces should be relatively easy, too. The location is known and a sledge hammer should be all that's needed.

Anyway, I am not sure that the recent rumor is true and I wouldn't blame CUFOS for declining comment, for if they do have this material there is a good chance that someone might try to get it back.

And if they haven't checked the other location, for God's sakes, somebody needs to. And with haste!

#### MY THOUGHTS ON ROSWELL

I recently viewed the video, RECOLLECTIONS OF ROSWELL, Part II. I was very impressed with most of the 28 witnesses. However, I still have a few problems with the data, but nothing to convince me that we don't have the greatest story of the century. Barney Barnett was supposed to have been the first at the crash site where the main part of the craft came to rest after exploding west of Roswell over the Brazel ranch. (I still feel that maybe the craft struck the ground at the Brazel ranch and bounced back into air before crashing, creating the gouge. Schmidt and Randle believe the craft exploded near the Corona site). After Barnett got there, supposedly along came a team from a university (Pennsylvania?). But, according to Anderson, they (his group with his father, uncle and brother) were there first. He described Barnett's arrival, then the university team. But he did say one of aliens was still alive! Remember that!

But, Barnett never said anything about this, nor did he mention a little boy being there. (Last report says there were two boys).

And is it possible that a 5-year old (Anderson) could recall so much detail? Even after hypnosis? Anderson spent a lot of time in the following years around the family members and could easily have picked up a lot of what his 5-year-old mind might have missed. Anderson's story is riddled with contradictions.

Could Barney Barnett have seen Anderson's group and mistook them for university people? The rock hunters may have "posed" as university archeologists to explain their presence in this unusual and somewhat scary situation, not knowing who Barnett was. (When confronted, sometimes Indian artifact hunters have told others they were

doing official hunting for universities, especially if they were unsure of whether or not they were trespassing). If they had done this, would they have made up the university story to cover their fabrication?

Mr. Dennis, the mortician at Roswell, said that the nurse he talked to had described only three bodies at the base hospital. Everybody at the crash site described four. The fourth may really have survived the crash! Or, the mangled and decomposed bodies could have been used for an autopsy while the intact humanoid may have been frozen, if it did survive long enough.

If we can believe the witness' testimony, then the MJ-12 document has even some serious problems than we thought. It describes four dead aliens and doesn't mention one was ever alive when retrieved. But it does say that they were badly decomposed due to exposure and the action of predators, just as Mr. Dennis's nurse friend had stated.

Could there have been about another craft or crew compartment? Some researchers think there were two craft that collided. Anderson said the craft he saw looked as if it had been struck by another saucer, the area on the craft pushed-in by a disc shaped object. If so, why does MJ-12 only mention one craft? Since it was a TOP SECRET EYES ONLY briefing paper for Eisenhower, presented years later, it should have been more accurate. And here's the killer: Ike was chairman of the Joint Chief's Of Staff in July of 1947. No briefing paper would have been needed.

And the big fuss about the Identisketch of Dr. Buskirk? There's no clear resemblance to Buskirk or anyone, unless you want to implicate Ed Asner.

There definitely was a crash and there were alien bodies recovered. There's no longer any doubt about that.

#### MORE ON GULF BREEZE

We've all witnessed the up & down controversey over these sightings in Florida. As I stated recently, the only stand I can take as a researcher in another state is based only on what I see coming out in the form of computer data. All we do here at UFOFC is log reports according to the Hynek classification system. We may have a genuine UFO situation down there. However, the data suggests quantity, rather than quality, with a predominance of Nocturnal Lights. If we compare NL's and CE's, many states have better-quality CE cases with fewer cases reported.

Now, in an effort to detect and illuminate the object, the Research Team will soon deploy a SLRODS (Small Laser Remote Object Detection System). Dr. Bruce Maccabee is providing this equipment (may already have), and under his direction they hope to illuminate the object with a special harmless red light beam. The Research Team hopes to use this to be more successful with photographs showing the structure of the alleged craft.

One of the problems I have with the chronological sequence of events in the UFO history is that in the last ten years UFOs have become very bold. In the Hudson Valley sightings and the Belgian wave they allow many witnesses to see them and, in many instances, actually walk right under them at a normal pace. Now, in Florida, we have a situation where the preparation for overt contact evidently has taken a step backward. We're back to lights or distant objects.

In an effort to explain away the local sightings, critics have promoted theories such as "advertizing airplanes", and "top secret stealth helicopters," but their most frequent explanation is that the witnesses are only seeing "emergency flares". When questioned, the witnesses are very sure the flare theory is "ridiculous" and point out that the critics making such a claim have never bothered to go to one of the nightly "sky watches" and see the UFO for themselves. The MUFON team used a defraction lens to photograph the object, then a test shot of a flare. The spectrum analysis indicated there was no match.

The investigators and researchers involved in the Gulf Breeze sightings have done a great job. But let's hope they can get to the bottom of this situation soon.

#### CROP CIRCLE NEWS

Still a very weak case for the UFO connection, except for this from John Carpenter: "A second silvery disk has now been videotaped darting through the crops

and vanishing up into the sky and the presence of at least four or more unusual radioactive isotopes has now been confirmed under analysis by Michael Chorost and systems engineer, Marshall Dudley."

#### LETTER TO EDITOR ON EVENT DENSITY LOG

Your Event Density Log graph is a bit confusing. Each year that has a 4 after it is how many CE4 reports there were? For example, "1988 4444", does that mean that 4 CE4's were reported? To who were they reported. You? Thru the MUFON net? Total reports everywhere? Also, your response might drastically change if you entered CE1 & CE2 cases that are suspected as being CE4, like the XXX case for example. I

am as positive as I can be that his was a CE4 of at least one family member, most likely the wife and kid in the house, maybe him too! (A Reader).

Response: Yes, the 4 means 1 CE4 case for each number. I'm sorry about the confusion. At the last minute, right before going to the printer, my source for reduction was eliminated and I couldn't reduce the graph and explaining caption to fit the space. For the same reason I couldn't get the full drawing of the three aliens on page 3. I had to cut it down to fit the space. And since I don't have a extensive database on national sightings extending back far enough, these listings are just the ones reported through my sources and on computer in the geographical research study limited to the six-state region. You may be surprised when you hear this, but the XXX case you mentioned occurred in May of 1984! Look at the graph! The case is listed as a Nocturnal Light because of the distance factor, but I, like you, suspect it really was an abduction or an attempt at same. The effects described should have made it a CE2, but the distance observed was the killer. I would bet that this person was either immobilized and something interfered (the neighbors?) or he was abducted or "switched off" while somebody else was abducted. But look at the date! It should have been there with the others and was!

#### ON SHORT DURATIONS

I would like to thank Willy Smith for submitting a copy of his paper, entitled ON SHORT DURATIONS. Dr. Smith is head of the UNICAT computer project.

I still stand by my criteria concerning close encounters and nocturnal lights. We can't toss out NL's, but we can't do much with them either. The cases where there are details and where stereoscopic vision can provide depth and structure are our best evidence, which includes poorly lighted objects hovering over cars causing E-M effects, etc.

What about such cases where there is little time to observe a unusual craft? A car enters an area where buildings obstruct the object, etc? Or the object passes over a car at high speed?

Dr. Smith is correct. We make life-threatening decisions every day based on little time and fairly good sighting conditions. When you turn into the left lane to pass a car or truck you look into the rearview mirror or sidemirror for a very brief period before you make that turn.

Short duration sightings of UFOs may be mostly meteors, etc., but we cannot base the value of all sightings on duration. It's more important what a person saw and how relatively close they were. That's where reliability really becomes important. I know of one example where there was a satellite re-entry that was observed all over the country and several persons in Posey County reported this to the UFOFC. One witness told me that the object was right over her truck!

#### 12-MONTH EVENT DENSITY LOG: 1991,2

---

JUL91	1NNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNTT
AUG91	1NNNNNNNTTTT
SEP91	211111DNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNNN
OCT91	NNNNNT
NOV91	111NNNNNNNNNNNN
DEC91	1111DDNNNNNN
JAN92	111NNNNNNNNNNNN
FEB92	11NNNNNN
MAR92	111NNNNNN
APR92	211NNNNN
MAY92	5
JUN92	D

---