

the Ufologist

Formerly St. Johns River MUFON UFO Newsletter

Vol. 1 Nos. 3 & 4

Palatka, Florida

July - August 1992

In this double issue:

Close Encounter leaves Florida policeman shaking and crying

1992 MUFON Symposium leaves Albuquerque humming

Bruce Maccabee on Flares and Photographs

News and Views on the Roswell Crash



Plus new *Readers' Forum*

and more

Something wicked this way hums

While in Albuquerque for the MUFON Symposium last month your editors became aware of a mysterious problem plaguing New Mexicans. For more than a year residents of an area bordered by Taos, Albuquerque and Dulce have noticed a strange, pulsing hum which has been likened to the noise from a high-voltage transformer or tin pans reverberating.

The hum has caused people to sell their homes and has induced one couple to get divorced (he heard it; she didn't, but he's pretty sure she did and just said she didn't to annoy him.)

James Garner, a communications specialist with the Albuquerque water department, has studied the hum for a year and determined that the water pipes have nothing to do with it. Some residents blame the noise on the huge alien base supposedly secreted under Archuleta Mesa. Others, naturally, blame the government.

We didn't hear the Albuquerque hum, but we are aware of a pulsing, irritating disturbance in the bedrock of the current ufological scene. Look at the state of things:

The continuing saga of Gulf Breeze and the Walters photos has people arguing over how many pounds of concrete blocks placed in the bed of a pickup truck will tilt the dented hood high enough to prevent the top light from the UFO in Walters' photo 19 from reflecting in the hood. (The answer, in case you, too, were wondering, is that no one can tell, except that enough blocks will);

the Ufologist Volume 1, Numbers 3 & 4

Formerly St. Johns River MUFON UFO Newsletter

July – August 1992

Terrell W. Ecker, Editor and Publisher

Frances Anne Ecker, Associate Editor

Copyright ©1992 Terrell W. Ecker & Frances Anne Ecker

Published monthly by Terrell W. Ecker at 706 River Street, Palatka, Florida 32177. Subscription price \$15 per year.

The RUFO watchers gather regularly at Shoreline park to observe something that, whatever it is, does not act like any other UFO event known (lights in the sky cases have always been weak, and regularly occurring lights in the sky, particularly in an area full of military installations some of which use radio controlled drones, have to be viewed with a jaundiced eye);

Jacques Vallee uses the MUFON conference to announce that he is divorcing himself from organized ufology to study the phenomenon on his own;

Budd Hopkins presents an abduction case so outrageous that he is forced to conclude that it appears to have been staged;

The Corona event, possibly the watershed case in the field, is bogged down with side issues such as whether or not Jerry Anderson took anthropology in high school, what type of agates are to be found in the plains of San Agustin, and the provenience and attribution of the papers alleged to be copies of his uncle's diary.

Is this the highest use of the time, talent and money ufology has to spend on investigating the phenomenon? It looks like a lot of our effort of late goes to putting out fires of undetermined origin. The possibility must be acknowledged that a host of side issues of dubious merit have sprung up not only to divert researchers, but to divert public attention away from Corona and toward less credible UFO events.

Certainly the Walters/Gulf Breeze controversy and the Gerald Anderson morass arrived in time to overshadow the publication of the two most recent books on Corona, *Crash at Corona* by Friedman and Berliner, and *UFO Crash at Roswell*, by Randle and Schmitt, as well as the 1988 Berkley paperback release of Berlitz and Moore's dismal *The Roswell Incident*. The cover-up of the crash at Corona is ongoing, and organized ufology may be unwitting participants in its latest manifestations. It's worth considering.

– FAE

Close encounter leaves officer shaking and crying

By Fearon Hicks

Fearon L. Hicks is a MUFON field investigator and state section director for Polk and Osceola counties. The former Naval intelligence officer is a native Floridian who has lived in Polk County most of his life. He says he had two personal sightings as a child, and has been researching and investigating UFO sightings for more than twenty eight years.

Three police officers who rushed to the aid of a fellow officer in distress found him crying and shaking after a close encounter with a UFO, according to Haines City police reports and personal interviews with the officers involved.

The incident began at 3:52 a.m. on March 19, 1992. Haines City Patrolman Luis Delgado, 28, was driving his cruiser north on 30th Street when he noticed a green light in his rear view mirror. He called the dispatcher and asked whether there were any other units in the 30th Street area, but went on talking into his microphone without pausing for a reply. He said something was following him. Then his transmission stopped, and there was no response to the dispatcher's repeated attempts to contact him.

At 3:54 Patrolman Brian Rowles advised the dispatcher that he was going to Delgado's aid. In nearby Lake Hamilton, Patrolman David Higgins heard the conversation and also rushed to the aid of his fellow officer. Higgins arrived at Delgado's cruiser within sixty seconds. Rowles arrived only seconds later, followed by his and Delgado's supervisor, Sergeant L. Bartley. Bartley's "Suspicious Incident" report reads:

"When I arrived I found Delgado sitting in his police vehicle with the left door open and one foot on the ground and he could not talk at this time. Delgado was shaking and crying. I got him out of his vehicle. He was shaking so bad I had him get into his vehicle. I asked him was he able to drive to the police station. He said yes and I followed him to the station.

"Delgado made the following statement: He had turned off S.R. 544 onto 30th Street and about 1/8 mile he made transmission #1 and then transmission #2. He tried to make transmission #3 but no one could hear him. He then made transmissions #5 & #6.

"Delgado said he looked in the rear view mirror and saw a green light. Delgado said he thought it was a small plane that was going to crash. The next thing he saw the inside of his vehicle was bright green and whatever it was was on the right side of his vehicle and then in front and back to the right side. This took place two or three times."

What I saw was a domed object approximately fifteen feet wide and three and a half to four feet thick at the center.

When I learned of the incident, about fourteen hours later, I went to the police station and got a copy of Sergeant Bartley's report. I then contacted Luis Delgado and arranged to interview him the following evening at his home.

The following is his personal description of the encounter:

"After I turned onto 30th Street I noticed a green light in my rear view mirror. I thought it was a small plane about to crash so I picked up the mike and called dispatch, and asked if there were any other units in the area.

"The green light was approaching me from the right rear of the police cruiser. I was going about forty miles an hour and I turned and looked over my right shoulder. The green light was still coming toward me.

"I was still going north and the green light came up on the right side of the car. It was now really bright. The green color was all inside the cruiser. It turned the color of my dark blue uniform to a purplish color." I took my foot off the accelerator and the light moved to the front of me over the roadway. The green light was very bright. I had to squint in order to be able to see.

"What I saw was a domed object approximately fifteen feet wide and three and a half to four feet thick at the center. I was still slowing

when the object moved back to my right side. It then pulled back in front of me again, then back to the right side, then back in front of me again. This time the object was so close to the cruiser that I braked and pulled off onto the shoulder of the roadway and stopped.

"I was afraid that I was going to collide with the object, and I could just see myself trying to explain to the Chief that I hit a green object and it took off and left the scene. I don't think he would believe a story like that.

"As I sat there watching the object my motor, lights and radio ceased to function. It was hovering about twenty feet away at ten feet altitude. I attempted to contact dispatch but my radio would not work. After a few seconds a white light came from the top of the dome and lit up the inside of my patrol unit.

"I didn't know what to think. I got out of the car, keeping an eye on the object. I started backing away on foot, reached down to my belt to get my walkie talkie and again tried to contact dispatch, and found that the walkie talkie would not work.

"As I was talking into the hand held unit I noticed that my breath was fogging like it does on a cold morning, but it was sixty degrees outside

and I know your breath doesn't fog at such a high temperature.

"I stood there for a few more seconds and then the object shot out of sight at treetop level toward the northeast. As it left my clothes seemed to flutter like when the wind blows, and I also felt the wind on my face.

"I don't think I'll ever forget this. The green was a color I have never seen before, and the color seemed to flow over the surface of the object. I had never given UFOs much thought before. I was sort of on the fence about them, but now I have no doubt."

Later that morning Patrolman Delgado was taken to the police department's physician and to its psychologist. His physical examination was normal, and the psychologist concluded that there was nothing wrong with him; he simply had seen something that could not be explained. His superior and fellow officers agree that Delgado is a professional with no known problems and not given to pranks.

Indeed, no explanation of the event has been found. The Polk County Sheriff's office said it had no airborne units active at the time, and the Federal Aviation Administration said there were no known aircraft in the vicinity at the time.

IS IT TRUE
THAT YOU
FELLOWS ARE
ELVES?



MY, NO...
UM.. BY THE WAY,
YOU WOULDN'T HAPPEN
TO BE BIGFOOT, WOULD
YOU?



©1992
FA. KKR

Reflections on the lack of a reflection

Copyright © 1992 by Bruce Maccabee

On January 13, 1988, Ed Walters reported to the MUFON investigators that the previous evening he had been "zapped" by a UFO while driving his truck to a construction site. He claimed that he took a picture during the sighting. This was his nineteenth photo of the UFO. The whole story has been reported elsewhere (References 1 and 2). The photo is the subject of this discussion.

The photo shows the UFO apparently hovering over the road ahead. The UFO image indicates a very bright light at the bottom and a much dimmer light at the top. The photo shows the skyline made by the trees beyond the UFO and it shows the cloudy sky above. At the bottom of the photo is an image which is evidently the reflection of the sky in the hood of the truck.

The fact that the hood reflection image appears in the photo has recently caught the interest of skeptics because, according to theoretical and experimental expectations for a normal truck hood, if the UFO actually were ahead of the truck (i.e., if Ed's report were true), then there should be a reflection of the light from the UFO as well as the reflection of the sky. The lack of a UFO reflection has played an important role in the recent decision of a photo expert, Mr. William Hyzer (Reference 3), to claim, with a high degree of certainty, that *photo 19 must be a fake*. If the photo were a fake, created by a double exposure technique, for example, there would be no reflection in the hood.

Granted that the lack of a reflection could be evidence of a fake, the next question is this: *Is there any explanation for the lack of a reflection even if the photo is not a fake?* The answer is yes, and the answer relies upon information which I would have provided to Mr. Hyzer had he responded to my offer (Reference 4).

The explanation for why there is no reflection of the UFO lights in the hood relies on two basic facts, only one of which was considered by Mr. Hyzer. The first fact relates to the *reflection cutoff angle*, which is the angle with respect to horizontal (measured from the top of the truck's hood) *below which nothing is reflected in the hood*. A normal hood has a cutoff angle of some number of degrees *below* horizontal, the exact

number of degrees depending upon the shape of the hood.

However, the hood of Ed's truck had been bent in 1987 when a backhoe backed into the truck at a construction site. The bend caused the cutoff angle to be *above horizontal*. The effect of the bend was permanently recorded in photo 19 as an unusual reflection of the sky from the *front* of the truck hood where, normally, the ground ahead of the truck would be reflected. Mr. Hyzer was aware of this fact. The second fact, which he did not take into account, is that the truck was carrying a load in the rear which caused its hood to tilt upward.

Experiments were carried out in the summer of 1988 (and briefly reported in Reference 4) in order to prove that damage had affected the reflection cutoff angle and to estimate the angle. The experiments were done with the truck parked *near* the location of photo 19 and with the same camera held *close* to where it was at the time of photo 19. (We were not able to determine the exact - to within a foot - location of the truck, nor were we able to determine the exact - to within an inch - location of the camera in the truck.)

The experiments showed that the reflection cutoff angle was about 0.65 degrees *above horizontal* (referenced to the hood height, four feet) *under the conditions of the experiment*. The value of this angle depends upon the camera's exact location and upon the hood's angle of tilt. The angle of tilt, in turn, depends upon loading in the back of the truck, the degree of tire inflation and the truck's location on the shoulder of the road.

Each inch of height difference between the front and rear wheels changes the tilt of the hood by about 0.05 degrees. Consequently, each inch of height difference changes the cutoff reflection

angle by about 0.1 degrees. (If a mirror is turned - tilted - by an angle A, then the reflected light rays are turned by twice that amount, 2A.) Since the shoulder of the road slopes downward from the edge of the road and since it is not smooth (there are bumps and depressions) the tilt of the truck could vary 0.05 degrees or more as the truck is moved from place to place. Hence there could be a tenth of a degree or more variation in the cutoff angle just due to unevenness of the shoulder.

Similarly, a one inch change in camera height could change the reflection angle by a degree. Because of the uncertainties in the locations of the truck and camera, the experimentally determined cutoff angle can only be considered illustrative, not definitive. Had the truck been at a different location and had the camera position been different when photo 19 was taken, the cutoff angle could have been higher or lower by several tenths of a degree at least.

The second fact, not taken into account by Mr. Hyzer, can have a larger effect on the cutoff angle than variations in the truck location. Ed reported in 1988 that he had a number of cement blocks (perhaps as many as a dozen and a half, each weighing thirty pounds) and some packages of roof shingles in the back of the truck. The weight of these was enough to tilt the front of the truck upward.

Recent experiments on the same model truck, a Ford F150 (but not the same truck; Ed sold his truck several years ago), showed that blocks piled at the back of the truck could tilt it by about one third of a degree per hundred pounds. Hence a dozen blocks (360 pounds) could tilt it by 1.2 degrees, and this would cause the cutoff angle to tilt by 2.4 degrees *above the value obtained when the truck was unloaded*, i.e., to more than 3 degrees above horizontal.

Of course, the exact cutoff angle cannot be determined because of the uncertainties in the magnitude of the load, the distribution (whether the load was all at the tailgate or spread more evenly), the unevenness of the shoulder and the location of the camera. However, this calculation does show that the cutoff angle was probably several degrees above horizontal.

The estimated cutoff angle caused by the truck's tilt should be compared with the angular elevations, as measured from the camera position (about five inches above the hood), of the top light of the UFO and of the tree line (skyline) above the UFO. (Note that the bottom ring light was below the level of the hood, so it was automatically below the reflection cutoff angle.) The angular elevation of the UFO top light (as measured from the photo and assuming the camera was about 4.5 feet above the ground) was about 2.5 degrees above horizontal (this is independent of the assumed distance to the UFO, i.e., whether it was 185 feet away or about 370 feet away). The angular elevation of the tree line was about 4 degrees. Hence the lack of a reflection of the top light can be explained by assuming that the truck hood tilted enough to cause the cutoff reflection angle to be greater than 2.5 degrees. But, since the skyline was reflected, the cutoff angle was not as great as 4 degrees.

Mr. Hyzer is confident that the lack of a reflection of the top light proves that photo 19 is a fake. I have shown, however, that the lack of reflection could also be a result of the damage to the hood combined with the loading of the truck. Hence the lack of a reflection is not conclusive proof that the photo was a fake.

References:

1. Maccabee, B., "A History of the Gulf Breeze Sightings", 1988 *MUFON Symposium Proceedings*. A revised and updated version is available from the Fund for UFO Research, Box 277, Mt. Rainier, MD 21780.
2. Walters, Ed and Frances, *The Gulf Breeze Sightings*, William Morrow 1990.
3. Salisbury, Rex and Carol, "Expert says Walters photos probably faked", *St. Johns River MUFON UFO Newsletter*, Vol. 1, No. 2, June 1992.
4. Private correspondence, February 1992.
5. Maccabee, B., "The Scale Remains Unbalanced", *Mufon UFO Journal* No. 252, April 1989.

Editor's note: William G. Hyzer's full report appears in the current (No. 291, July 1992) Mufon UFO Journal.

Bizarre abduction highlights Symposium

By Anne Ecker

The 1992 MUFON Symposium, "UFOs: The Ultimate Mystery of the Millennia", was held July 10, 11, and 12 at the Doubletree Hotel in Albuquerque, NM. It was a pleasant setting and a reasonably pleasant conference. No blows were struck, though during the press conference Stanton Friedman and Kevin Randle exchanged steely looks and engaged in a display of teeth over the subject of Gerald Anderson's telephone bill, which Randle alleges with a good bit of solid documentation was altered to shave thirty minutes off his initial phone conversation with Anderson.

The list of speakers included Friedman, Clifford E. Stone, Linda Moulton Howe, Richard Haines, Jacques Vallee and Budd Hopkins. Although several thought provoking papers were presented, perhaps most especially Dr. Richard Neal's treatment of the missing embryo/fetus syndrome, Vallee and Hopkins were the show stealers.

Vallee, who has a penchant for taking ufology to task, decried those ufologists who substitute dogmatic belief for scientific investigation. He restated his conviction that the phenomenon lies within the purview of science and concluded by saying that the current state of organized ufology makes this "a very good time for any researcher with intellectual integrity to walk away and seek challenges elsewhere."

He did walk away, about fifty feet to the back of the hall where he sat and listened to Budd Hopkins's presentation, looking much like a witness to a traffic accident who wants to look away but can't.

Hopkins's talk - there was no published paper - quickly became the main event of the symposium. It dealt with the abduction of a young Manhattan woman from the twelfth floor of her apartment building, an abduction that was witnessed by an unidentified politico, his bodyguards, and several other passers by.

One of the alleged witnesses to the bizarre scene of a woman in nightdress floating toward a UFO with a group of small beings reportedly thought at the time that she was seeing a movie being made, possibly "Snow White and The Seven Dwarfs".

Hopkins presented the abductee to the audience and, amid the pop of flashbulbs in defiance of ban on cameras and recording equipment, she answered questions and made a prepared speech denouncing people who believe her abductors to be elves.

The overall strangeness of the entire abduction, the behavior of the witnesses before, during and after the abduction, and the manner in which it was claimed to have happened is so eccentric even in a field inured to eccentricity that Hopkins himself is drawn to conclude that the event seems to have been staged.

How, why and by whom, remain open questions. Maybe these questions will have been resolved by next year's symposium in Richmond.

The *FL MUFON NEWS* appears to have settled the question of Bob Oeschler's credibility. Reporting on a Pensacola MUFON meeting at which Oeschler was the guest speaker, editor Whit Wise tells us in the July issue that:

"Of concern to this writer was his apparent ability to reach high level officials in NASA, the CIA, etc., for candid interviews about highly sensitive information that they would never talk to the press about.

"Mr. Oeschler was questioned about the paradoxical situation exposing the government's coverup, while at the same time maintaining a sweetheart relationship with high level intelligence personnel. He explained that although he is not on the government's payroll, he is a part of the plan to spread the UFO word (his hypothesis). They are using him as a mouthpiece. He is not officially stamped by the government, so he is a safe voice."

Readers' Forum

Maccabee disputes report

Bruce Maccabee, Ph.D., is a research physicist at the Naval Surface Weapons Center in Silver Spring, Maryland. A long time UFO investigator, he was a member of NICAP until its demise, and has been a member of MUFON since 1975. Dr. Maccabee is chairman of the Fund for UFO Research (FUFOR) and a member of MUFON's advisory board of consultants (in photo analysis and laser physics). He has personally investigated many well known UFO cases and has published numerous articles and technical papers on the subject.

Editor:

According to Rex and Carol Salisbury, William Hyzer has concluded that the Walters' photos are probably fake. His conclusion is largely based on his "discovery" that there is no reflection of the upper light on the UFO ("top light") in the hood of Ed's truck. He has made use of some of my experimental data in arriving at his conclusion (the experiments done with a Ford 150 XLT truck by Salisbury were irrelevant; he used the wrong type of truck and the hood of that truck was undamaged). He accepts my conclusion that the hood of the truck had been bent by a collision, as I reported in the *Mufon UFO Journal*, No. 248, December 1988, page 12.

I offered to supply Mr. Hyzer with more information but he did not respond to my offer. Had he done so he would have known that the experiments I carried out to test the hood reflection theory were done with an *unloaded* truck, but that the truck actually had a number of cement blocks and roofing shingles in the back at the time of the sighting. This load tilted the front of the truck upwards. Of course, the exact amount of the load and therefore the exact tilt are unknown, but experiments showed that a reasonable estimate of the load tilted the truck sufficiently that *even the top light would not have been reflected. This result is independent of the assumed distance of the*

UFO. Hence the lack of a reflection does not positively prove, as Hyzer has evidently suggested, that the photo is a hoax.

Quite independently of this analysis, Jeffrey Sainio, a speaker at the 1992 MUFON Symposium, has analyzed the original photo 19 and found that the bright spot on the road below the UFO is inconsistent with the double exposure hoax hypothesis. Furthermore he has found a faint glow extending away from the bright spot which is consistent with an actual light source being over the road.

As far as the distance to the UFO is concerned, I did not claim that the UFO had to be 370 feet away in an earlier paper in the *Mufon UFO Journal*, merely that such a great distance is a possibility. The UFO could have been only about 200 feet away hovering over the road and creating a very skewed light pattern. (Note: an alternative explanation offered for the vertical extent of the glow below the object is that a vapor just above the road was illuminated by the light above creating a "pile of light".) A short paper supplied to the editor of this newsletter provides more details on the effect of the loading of the truck.

Regarding the year and a half series of sightings of red-white lights (RWL) and rings of light (ROL) in the Gulf Breeze area, anyone who accepts the trivial "flare on a balloon" hypothesis simply is unaware of the facts about most of the sightings.

We now have conclusive proof that structures of some substantial size are passing over populated areas. Numerous triangulated sightings of pairs of lights have provided information that shows spacings of many feet between the lights.

The editor of this newsletter has a technical analysis, which I wrote, of the May 18 video taken by a CBS news crew (KHOU TV from Houston, Texas) which shows that two red lights, between seven and eleven feet apart, moved over the Gulf Breeze area for four minutes in a coherent manner (they remained together) with no swaying

back and forth, such as would a weight under a balloon. Furthermore they traveled several miles, probably in a nearly straight line, starting over land and then passing over water, at an altitude of several thousand feet and at a rate of at least 20 mph into the prevailing breeze.

(Note: in some other sightings the paths of the objects have been totally over land; this obviates the "pull a balloon or kite with a boat" hypothesis.)

To keep the two lights together as they traveled into the breeze would require a structure between them and a propulsion device of some sort. (Editor's note: Not necessarily. Wind direction and speed changes with altitude. At "an altitude of several thousand feet" the lights could have been moving with the wind at that altitude, but apparently against the surface wind. To ascertain that the lights were moving against the wind we would have to know their altitude, and the wind direction and speed at that altitude.) To avoid oscillation there would have to be some sort of aerodynamic stabilization.

On several occasions they dropped some glowing material. (Note: pyrotechnic devices typically send off sparks, etc., continually.)

If this is a hoax that uses a pyrotechnic display of some considerable sophistication, then the perpetrators of this hoax have recklessly placed the Gulf Breeze populace in some jeopardy: suppose a pyrotechnic device were to fall and start a fire or injure someone directly. Moreover, the devices have endangered the airspace: if an airplane were to run into a structure of this size it could be damaged enough to crash.

If the over 170 light/objects that have been seen are pyrotechnic devices, then the local authorities (police, Coast Guard, FAA) are negligent and guilty of nonfeasance of duty in failing to pursue, arrest and prosecute the perpetrator on charges of reckless endangerment and illegally flying flares. If these are pyrotechnic devices (perhaps with some incandescent light devices "thrown in" occasionally), as has been claimed by the Coast Guard, then the authorities should be sued by the citizens of Gulf Breeze for allowing this hoax to persist.

— Bruce Maccabee

Flannigan fires a falseillade

Indiana native Charles D. Flannigan is a retired navy chief petty officer and a successful Pensacola realtor whose interest in UFOs dates from a personal daylight sighting in 1952. He was a member of APRO from 1960 to 1967, later became a MUFON field investigator. In 1988 he was appointed state section director for Escambia and Santa Rosa counties, and in 1990 replaced Donald Ware as Florida state director. He is also state director of Florida MUFON, Inc., a nonprofit corporation "independent of but subordinate to MUFON International", whatever that means.

Editor:

Untruths noted in your June 1992 newsletter are as follows:

UNTRUTH # 1. The spectacular rise and fall of Ed Walters is no stranger than, and directly related to, the fall and rise of Rex and Carol Salisbury, erstwhile state section co-directors whose bursting of the Walters bubble precipitated a revolt within the ranks of Pensacola/Gulf Breeze MUFON.

TRUTH. The Salisberrys haven't broken anyone's bubble. The membership revolted because of Salisberrys ineffective leadership. The majority of the members said, "We have had enough. We want an effective leader." The majority made their point very clear. That is when Art Hufford was voted in. This change had nothing to do with the Salisberrys' unauthorized version of the Walters case reopening.

Reply: We acknowledge your opinion but do not accept it as the "truth", and we stand by our story.

UNTRUTH # 2. The Salisberrys approached the Walters case reopening with their customary skill and diligence.

TRUTH. In my opinion, all cases that I had previously assigned the Salisberrys were investigated very thoroughly. Their timely submission and accuracy of these reports was outstanding. The Salisberrys deserved the July 1990 annual MUFON award. However, it was at this point, or perhaps 3-4 weeks prior to this time, that irregularities began to surface with their hidden agenda.

Rex Salisbury and I met with Walt Andrus on July 5, 1990 in Pensacola. One of the primary

reasons for this meeting was to ask Walt Andrus to be the only spokesman to the media concerning the final report in the Walters case. This was necessary because of the constant inquiries by the media, private investigators, MUFON investigators, and just curious people. Our investigation had been continuously hampered because of these many inquiries. Walt Andrus agreed that he would be the only spokesman for this case. Several weeks later the Salisberrys violated this agreement by releasing their own unauthorized version of the case at this point. The Salisberrys mailed copies of their unauthorized version to the media, individuals, etc.

As a result of this direct violation of our July 5, 1990 agreement, I recommended to Walt Andrus that the Salisberrys be removed from the case. Walt approved the recommendation and appointed Chief Field Investigator Gary Watson to complete the investigation. Gary later completed an exhaustive formal report, which was delivered to Walt Andrus in July 1991.

So you see, The Salisberrys' customary skill and diligence fell by the wayside, for some unknown reason(s).

Reply: Well, that's not the way Walt Andrus or the Salisberrys tell it.

Andrus: "In the event that Mr. Salisbury fails to submit a final report, a second investigation team under the leadership of Gary Watson, the Chief Investigator for Pensacola MUFON, was authorized and assigned the same task and will submit the results of their reopening of the Ed Walters case. Each of these reports may be very revealing and even contradictory. Stay tuned to what has developed into a very controversial subject in Ufology, both pro and con."

The Salisberrys say they have completed their final report and submitted it to MUFON. Until now, we've not heard anyone refer to it as an "unauthorized version". Will Gary Watson's report become known as the "Revised Standard Version"?

Walt Andrus does agree with you that Rex Salisbury released information to the public "in direct contradiction to the conditions under which he accepted the assignment", one of which was: "Mr. Salisbury accepted this responsibility with

one stipulation. He would accept the assignment only if Walt Andrus would be willing to accept the disclosure based upon Rex's investigation that the Ed Walters case could be a hoax."

The Salisberrys say they became frustrated with MUFON's secrecy about what was being revealed by their investigation. For our part, we don't understand this secrecy either, and we object to it. Aren't we the people who castigate the government for not telling us what it knows about UFO cases? Does it become us to practice what we condemn rather than what we preach?

Being hampered by inquiries won't wash, Charles. That goes with the territory.

UNTRUTH #3. Art Hufford drew a fairly accurate sketch of the Pensacola water tower, which doesn't look like the Walters UFO and is visible from the spot of Hufford's sighting.

TRUTH. What a joke! Do you pull this information from the air, or do you rely on inside sources?

Reply: No, Charles, we "pull" this information from the J. Allen Hynek Center for UFO Studies (CUFOS). Anyone who cares to look for himself can see the sketch along with a photograph of the Pensacola water tower in the current issue of CUFOS's International UFO Reporter - as was pointed out in our story. In fairness, the sketch doesn't prove anything either way, but we didn't make it up out of thin air.

UNTRUTH # 4. Less than a fifth of Florida's MUFON members have been willing to associate themselves with Florida MUFON, Inc., and the New Age nonsense coming out of Pensacola.

TRUTH. You are either short of marbles or short on UFO newsworthy stories in Palatka if you believe this comment. Florida MUFON has gained 17 new members in the last sixty days.

Reply: Well, we did believe that comment, Charles, because we got the numbers from you.

UNTRUTH # 5. Pensacola/Gulf Breeze members gather nightly to worship the road flares that seem to appear on demand over Santa Rosa Sound, ignored by the Navy, the Air Force, the FAA and the rest of the world, but dutifully photographed, videotaped, cheered on and breathlessly reported by a faithful few who dog-

gedly insist they are conducting a scientific investigation.

TRUTH. I will ask State Section Director Art Hufford to respond to this stupid remark.

Reply: Mr. Hufford's letter appears in this issue.

UNTRUTH # 6. Now MUFON seems to be stuck not only with the Pensacola New Agers, whose FL MUFON News regularly ridicules MUFON and its UFO Journal for unwarranted skepticism and use of big words.

TRUTH. My position has always been that New Age material, including channelling and psychic reports, may be researched privately for those interested, but these subjects should not be presented openly in newsletters, public gatherings, etc. We cannot build quality membership or retain current members by pushing this type of material on the public.

The statement of our editor, Whit Wise, regarding the content of Mufon UFO Journal was too strongly worded. Whit mailed an apologetic letter to Walt Andrus and later clarified that point in FL MUFON NEWS. Let's not beat a dead horse!

Reply: Yes, and then Wise went on to criticize the Journal again. That's fair enough; if you publish you take the flak, and if you don't get any flak you're probably not doing your job. But part of Wise's criticism was that the Journal prints criticism. Does Wise have a patent on the right to criticize? And this is the guy who, in the same issue, passes on the fascinating information that: "If one places a mental image of the three sided pyramid (tetrahedron), above one's head, this vision will create an energy column charged with positive electromagnetic ions that raise consciousness. When an individual does this often enough, the mind's limitations are slowly removed and replaced with an expanded consciousness that connects it with the unified field. The tetrahedron symbol makes it possible for any individual who choses to connect with its power."

Come on, Charles. You keep saying that you "hate New Age stuff", don't want it mentioned in public and won't allow it in your newsletter, but your New Agers keep drowning you out. You can stand on an alligator and yell to the world and the heavens that there are no alligators in Gulf Breeze because Gulf Breeze doesn't allow alligators. Your

yelling, and even your sincere belief in the "truth" of what you are yelling, won't change the fact that you're standing on an alligator. And your disclaiming won't change the fact that the most of the "news" we've seen coming out of Pensacola and Florida MUFON, Inc., is New Age nonsense.

UNTRUTH # 7. And the Salisberrys are still in demand as speakers in spite of their lack of standing within MUFON. For example, they are scheduled to speak before the Panama City group which has broken away from Florida MUFON but continues operating on its own.

TRUTH. Debunkers are only demand until the truth prevails! Our MUFON Panama City group is small in size and has not broken away as you would like to believe. It is true that we do not currently have a State Section Director for this area. It is sometimes difficult to find qualified SSD's who are willing to accept responsibility for this very important position. Occasionally, SSD's are not willing to be accountable for their leadership position. **DO YOU RELATE TO WHAT I AM SAYING?**

Reply: Yes, we do, Charles. You're calling the Salisberrys debunkers, which is a false and malicious accusation, and you're threatening to fire us as state section co-directors unless we toe the party line and accept the vicious slander of people we believe to be honest, sincere, and very hard working in the UFO field. Coming on the heels of your calling us liars, stupid and short of marbles, somehow it doesn't seem like much of an ultimatum. Anyway, we reject it out of hand, and accept the consequences.

UNTRUTH # 8. MUFON is also stuck with the Salisberrys' final report on the Walters case, and must decide whether to publish it.

TRUTH. The Salisberrys do not have the final report. As previously mentioned, Gary Watson completed the final re-investigative report of Case 15. Walt Andrus will have the final word on whether the Salisberrys' unauthorized version, or a summary thereof, will be printed in the Mufon UFO Journal. I would personally not print any part of the Salisberry version because of their violation previously mentioned in UNTRUTH #2.

Reply: And as replied before, that's not the way Walt Andrus or the Salisberrys tell it. And we've never heard anyone else refer to the Salisbury report as an "unauthorized version". It was, after all, commissioned by MUFON.

UNTRUTH # 9. Meanwhile, back in Gulf Breeze, Patti Weatherford tells us in the current issue of the FL MUFON NEWS that "as we sometimes became bored with the same type sighting, the UFO would display some new behavior, as if to maintain our interest".

Truth. You could make this same statement by simply spending a few evenings with an exceptionally dedicated group. However, this would require that you get up from your "armchair."

Reply: So now you're even calling Patti Weatherford a liar? We quoted her verbatim, and you label the quote UNTRUTH #9?

As for getting up from our armchairs, we have made several trips to Gulf Breeze - even visited you, in case you've forgotten - and spent nights staking out Shore Line Park and the foot of the bridge. Of course, being stupid and short of marbles, we didn't announce our presence or gather a crowd, and the UFO never showed up. That doesn't prove anything, of course. And we don't doubt that the UFO shows up when there is a crowd there to see it. That doesn't prove anything either. It just makes MUFON the laughing stock of the tabloid press.

UNTRUTH #10. Expert says Walters photos probably faked.

TRUTH. Talk is cheap! Where is the meat? Where are the duplicated photos and videotape utilizing the same photographic equipment? Shouldn't we allow the "experts" to duplicate what they claim to be fakes? Assuming the "experts" complete this task, let them submit their finished product to other professionals for analytical review.

Reply: And now you're calling William Hyzer a liar? Our headline said merely (and truthfully) that an expert says the Walters photos are probably fake, and the "meat" is in the article by Rex and Carol Salisbury printed under that headline. Exactly whom are you calling liar here - the expert for giving his professional opinion, or just us and the Salisberrys for reporting his opinion?

In closing, I would say that I am very disappointed that you would "slam" so many people publicly. I know that you are a freelance writer, but try not to be so frustrated with people & ufology. This mysterious phenomenon requires patience and a lot of understanding from all sides.

I am willing to try harder, and it is my hope that you are, too. Shall we start over instead of finding sides to camp on?

— Charles D. Flannigan

Reply from Terry:

Charles, I am not frustrated with people or with ufology. I am embarrassed by Pensacola MUFON, which appears to be identical with Florida MUFON, Inc., and I am disgusted by the organized character assassination campaign that has been directed at the Salisberrys. Is it mere coincidence that when their diligent work started turning up evidence of fakery their characters and honesty came under attack, that vicious and ludicrously transparent lies about them were told not only within MUFON but spread around the world via computer networks? I'm accustomed to and not bothered by the disagreements, in-fighting and even occasional mud slinging that goes on among ufologists, but I've never seen anything like the organized hatred that your group has displayed. And we couldn't avoid noticing in Albuquerque that the Gulf Breeze Guns are now trained upon us.

In summary, we stand by the story as published.

Summary reply from Anne:

You are right about one thing: the heart of this issue is accountability. As a journalist, my accountability is my bond. I must call them as I see them, even when I don't like what I see. And I don't like some of the things I see in Florida MUFON.

I joined MUFON because I want to know what's playing games with our airspace, our lives and our culture. Whether the answer is ET, government psyops, hallucinations, all of the above or none of the above, I want to know. I suspect a lot of other people do, too.

It is my understanding that MUFON is an investigative and reporting body, not a church or a service club seeking to expand its membership rolls. But when those quality members you mention hear the Eastern U.S. Director of MUFON say to mem-

bers of the press, as he did in Pensacola in 1990, that acceptance of reincarnation is essential to understanding the UFO mystery, the only cheer they can take is that it is proof positive that the organization permits public dissent.

Hufford doesn't like it, either

Arthur D. (Art) Hufford II is a chemical engineer and process technology supervisor with Monsanto Company in Pensacola, Florida, his hometown. He says a personal sighting in 1987 kindled his interest in UFOs. He joined MUFON in 1988, became a field investigator in 1989 and was elected president of Pensacola/Gulf Breeze MUFON in 1990. In 1992 he was appointed state section director for Escambia and Santa Rosa counties. His writings have appeared in the Mufon UFO Journal, the International UFO Reporter and UFO Magazine.

Editor:

Like Charles Flannigan, I too was disappointed that persons in your position of responsibility within MUFON would report a story without getting all the facts. It would appear to me that you have borrowed lines from the Debunker manual; that is, if you do not have facts, just make them up and throw in a few labels, such as New Agers, Flare Worshipers and the like to reinforce your basic ignorance of what is going on in Gulf Breeze.

I would like to add a few additional facts to those supplied by Charles Flannigan in his June 30 letter to you:

The Water Tower Ruse

I assure you I am quite capable of distinguishing water towers from the UFO my wife and I saw in November 1987. Contrary to what you have been led to believe, there are no water towers visible anywhere close to the area where we had our UFO sighting. (If you are ever in this area, I would be glad to take you to the area where we had our UFO sighting and show you that no water towers are visible.) Not only that, none of the water towers in this area come equipped with a white lighted dome on top, nor do they have a flat base which glows bright white; maybe water towers in your area come equipped

that way, but none in Pensacola come that way. Also, I have never seen a water tower that could hover in the sky without any obvious means of support. However, the UFOs photographed by Ed Walters in November 1987 do come equipped that way and what I saw convinced me that Ed's photographs were real. I am sorry I am not a better artist when it comes to sketches, for the sketch I made when my sighting was investigated was primarily to illustrate the lighted portions of the craft, since I had not noticed any windows or portholes during my brief sighting.

Road Flare Worship

The debunkers would like for you to believe that we are seeing road flares. In this respect, let me share a few results from our investigations. Although many of our 150+ sightings over the last 1.5 years are bright, cherry red lights, many are not. We have seen and photographed/video-taped rings of eight red or amber colored lights, red elliptical shapes with rows of small red lights above the base, balls of white light with rings of white encircling them, and lights circling around a main red light. We have seen and identified several low altitude flares, with smoke trailing behind; no one has ever seen any smoke trailing behind what we are classifying as UFOs. Based on azimuth and elevation measurements from multiple locations, we have been able to calculate UFO locations, elevations, and directions of movement. From such calculations, we have determined the vast majority of sightings to typically be from 1 to 6+ miles away, at elevations from 1,000 to 7,000 feet. They travel independent of wind direction, and often travel directly into the wind. (Editor's note: To our knowledge that "fact" has not been established, and cannot be established by ground observation.) We have been running from 30 to 120 people a night on these skywatches; these witnesses include many pilots (both military and civilian), several air traffic controllers, scientists, and engineers. We do not know what we are seeing, but we all agree they are not flares.

Editor's note: The Houston, Texas, CBS TV crew that filmed the UFO says that what appear

on its film are flares, and the U.S. Coast Guard has produced identical "UFOs" with flares.

As we have moved to better lens and film, we have documented additional items. For example, I am now using a 2,000mm focal length lens combination on my 35mm camera. Some of these red lights are pulsing at 40-45 pulses per second. Furthermore, I have measured some of the lights are oscillating up and down at 15-20 cycles per second. Some of these red lights have been determined to be 1.5-2.0 feet in diameter; others are much larger. None of these characteristics easily fit into the debunkers' flare theory; but no matter, they just ignore what does not fit.

We have actually tested road flares and compared their color spectra to that of the red UFOs. The road flares we tested had a strong green color band, in addition to the red (apparently due to magnesium, a common ingredient in flares and which has a strong green color spectra). The red UFOs lacked the green color band; rather, they had a strong blue band, in addition to the red. Two photo analysts, Bruce Maccabee and Jeff Sainio, have also arrived at this same conclusion.

New Agers

I am really amused and disappointed in this last label. Charles Flannigan and I have worked very hard to separate MUFON activities from channeling and psychic phenomena. At our monthly meetings of Pensacola/Gulf Breeze MUFON, our programs run through subjects such as crop circles, abductions, government cover-ups, and sighting reports; we have deliberately avoided such "new age" subjects, leaving them to individuals to explore if they are so inclined. Our local MUFON organization seems to be doing well with this format. We currently have 49 members, including 17 field investigators. Our monthly meetings are open to the public and run attendances from 60 to 130 people each month. We have a monthly radio talk show. Our speakers bureau is in steady demand, making 15-20 talks a year.

Closing Remarks

In closing, I do not know if your mind is open to any new information, but I hope the time I took on this letter was not totally wasted. Realizing people from out of town have no way to gauge

one's credibility, I have also attached a resume I give to program chairmen when I make public presentations. I would hope you can recognize some indications on this sheet of the personal integrity and respect I enjoy within my community, church, and occupation.

—Art Hufford

Editor's note: Mr. Hufford's resume indicates that he is a fifty year old graduate of Georgia Tech in chemical engineering, a supervisor with Monsanto Company, a U.S. Army veteran, a family man of thirty years standing, an elder in his church and a member of several civic, fraternal and social organizations.

Roswell UFO museum planned

A former army officer and a mortician who were involved in the July 1947 UFO crash near Roswell, New Mexico, are working with a Roswell real estate man to establish a UFO museum there, according to the Associated Press.

A July 7 AP story in the *El Paso Times* said Walter Haut, Glenn Dennis and Max Littell were seeking a location for the museum. The story quoted Haut: "It's part of New Mexico's history. The UFO crash is of significant historical value."

As a young army lieutenant in 1947, Haut was the public information officer at what was then Roswell Army Air Field, the world's only atomic bomber base. Acting on orders from the base intelligence officer, Major Jesse Marcel, Haut issued the press release stating that: "The many rumors regarding the flying discs became a reality yesterday."

The lead story in the July 8, 1947, Roswell Daily Record began: "The intelligence office of the 509th Bombardment group at Roswell Army Air Field announced at noon today that the field has come into possession of a flying saucer." Within hours the army claimed that it had only captured a crashed weather balloon.

Dennis, a Roswell funeral director at the time, says he was consulted by military officers at the base about the availability of small caskets and the preparation of small bodies that had been exposed to the elements.

Littell is a real estate man.

One crash or two?

New book refuels Roswell crash controversy

Crash at Corona

by Stanton Friedman and Don Berliner

Paragon House, 1992, 217 pages, \$19.95

Reviewed by Anne Ecker

In *Crash at Corona*, longtime UFO researcher Stanton Friedman and aviation writer Don Berliner explore the possibility that products of an off-earth technology fell on New Mexico in July 1947. The book is well written, well organized, pleasant, persuasive and easy to read.

Few ufologists doubt that something extraordinary fell onto the Foster ranch that July, and that the government went to extraordinary lengths to remove the evidence and silence the witnesses. Over the past dozen years several researchers, notably the team of Kevin Randle and Don Schmitt, in addition to Friedman and his associates, Bill Moore, Jamie Shandera and Don Berliner, have established a powerful and convincing case for a UFO crash on the Foster ranch. While the proof is not absolute, the preponderance of evidence clearly favors this view.

It is because of Stanton Friedman that the Roswell/Corona story has come to light. In 1978, acting on a tip he could as easily have ignored, he located and interviewed Major Jesse Marcel, the first military man at the crash scene. If this case turns out to be ufology's mother lode, Friedman deserves to be recognized as the fellow who turned up the first nugget. We owe him. None of this is to say we don't have misgivings about the book. We do, and some of them are large.

Crash at Corona does an admirable job of taking the reader through the events surrounding the discovery and recovery of the downed object and its nonhuman crew. Trouble arises, though, when this likely world-historical event is fleshed out with side trips into disputed and, in some cases, largely unsubstantiated material such as the MJ-12 documents and Gerald Anderson and the alleged San Agustin crash. The jury is still out on these issues and, in the case of Anderson, may have dispersed, muttering to itself.

Corona seems to be an extremely defensible case, and it seems a shame to give comparatively shaky cases equal status in a forum designed for a mass audience.

In the last chapter, Berliner says "If the public and/or the press ever decide the government has been dishonest in its handling of the UFO question, then all is lost. Nothing the president says will be believed..."

How true. In this field credibility is everything. To that end, it would have behooved the authors to have borrowed that big black felt tipped marker from NSA and excised some text.

San Agustin crash is disputed

Did something unearthly happen in the plains of San Agustin in July 1947? Stanton Friedman and Don Berliner say it did. Not on your life, say Kevin Randle and Don Schmitt. Last February these four researchers, along with Thomas J. Carey, Fred Whiting and Mark Rodeghier met in Chicago to present papers supporting their points of view. The conference was chaired by Dr. Michael Swords, editor of CUFOS's *Journal of UFO Studies*.

A summary report of this conference, *The Plains of San Agustin Controversy, July 1947* (The J. Allen Hynek Center for UFO Studies, 2457 W. Peterson, Chicago, IL 60659) is required reading for anyone hoping to untangle the skein of allegations and counter-allegations about what, if anything, happened on the plains that summer.

Arguments for a San Agustin crash hinge on three witnesses: Gerald Anderson, a security officer and student who claims to have been on the scene of the crash as a six year old child; Robert Drake, an archaeologist who says he saw "heavy equipment" on the plains that summer and who also says local people talked about a flying saucer crash that had taken place there; and soil conservation engineer Barney Barnett, now dead, who told friends he witnessed the aftermath of a UFO crash on the plains.

Anderson, who surfaced after an *Unsolved Mysteries* dramatization of the Corona crash, brings with him a diary written in post 1974 ink, allegedly by a now dead uncle, and an alleged co-witness to the crash who says he wasn't there but who later taught an anthropology course Anderson may or may not have taken. (Anderson has refused to allow his high school transcript to be obtained and just to add to the general good cheer has threatened anyone attempting to obtain such a transcript with legal action.)

Add to this a cloistered cousin who cannot be reached for comment, and assorted other side issues and we have a witness whose presence brings more heat than light to the issue. As if all this were not enough, he was sent a package of information about the case, including liberal references to the Berlitz/Moore book *The Roswell Incident*, before he was interviewed by anyone, thus severely compromising his value as a witness.

There seems to be no independent support for Drake's stories. This, combined with the fact that he, too, had been sent information about Anderson's claims makes him an unsatisfying witness.

Barney Barnett's whereabouts are gleaned from his wife's diary. The diary does not mention a UFO crash. Barnett is dead, and his story comes second hand through the memories of his friends, who may have gotten some of the details wrong. Moderator Swords finds the Barnett story "extremely soft" from an evidential viewpoint.

Michael Swords' cogent, no nonsense summation and comments on protocols are alone worth the price of the report.

In mentioning protocols, it is worth noting that the parties agreed to exchange papers, tapes and related documentation prior to the conference. According to Swords, Friedman failed to provide his part of this material, something that does not speak well for his attention to detail in this case.

The contrast with the Corona crash is marked. There, as new material and witnesses emerged, the points of agreement in their stories outweighed the differences until the story became a coherent whole.

With the alleged plains of San Agustin crash one has the feeling of looking into a kaleidoscope: interesting, colorful stuff, ever shifting and largely meaningless.

—Anne Ecker

