



### IN THIS ISSUE


- Page #2- UFO report - DoD police report daylight sighting at Otis AFB, Cape Cod, MA.
- Page #4- Communiques and Bits n' pieces
- Page #5- Update/statement of position by Dr. Willy Smith
- Page #6- Introduction to Aerial Anomalies International Founded on June 26, 1989
- Page #7- Fireball reports, source: Scientific Event Alert Network Bulletin, V. 14, no. 2&3 Feb 28/Mar 31, 1989
- Page #9- Part 3 of the Nippon Television Network interview with Larry Fawcett and Barry Greenwood.  
\*\*\*\*\*

### RADIO/T.V. LOG

August 22, 1989: WFXT (Fox) 7:30 PM and 11:00 PM, CAUS member Larry Bryant was a guest on "Current Affair".

\*\*\*\*\*

Sighting At Otis AFB, Cape Cod, MA.  
(Preliminary investigation on page #2)



Bell Huey UH-1

UFO REPORT  
(Preliminary Investigation)

Location: Otis Air Force Base  
Cape Cod, MA.

Sighting Date: 28 May 89

Sighting Time: 1345 hrs - 1400 hrs

Sighting duration: 15 - 20 minutes

Number of witnesses: 2

Sighting account: While on routine patrol at the above time, date, and location Sgt. Trill (pseudonym), of the Department of Defense (DoD) police, noticed a vapor trail from a high flying aircraft. The aircraft was at approximately 35000 feet and, looking west, was headed north to south. It is quite common to see aircraft leaving vapor trails in the area but what Sgt. Trill found unusual with this vapor trail was an object, the size of a dot, directly beneath it heading in the opposite direction, south to north. Both the object and vapor trail were at 40/45 degrees above the horizon.

Sgt. Trill, in his cruiser, was exiting the base housing area where he first caught sight of the object, he then stopped and watched it. Anticipating where the object was headed he turned his cruiser around and started to follow it. The object now on a descent was coming closer and, according to Sgt. Trill, was headed on a straight deliberate course toward the main artery of the base. Sgt. Trill at this time was leaving Hospital Rd. and, keeping the object in sight, turned north onto Connery Ave. The object now appeared as a dark grey sphere, about the size of a tire, it had no wings, no lights, no windows, was noiseless, and descending quickly towards a field. Sgt. Trill pulled his cruiser onto the field where a Huey UH-1 was on maneuvers and hovering at 10 - 15 ft. He stepped out of his cruiser and stood approximately 120 ft. away from the Huey observing the object's approach. The dark sphere came to within 25 ft. behind the chopper then, with twice the speed of it's descent, made a sudden dive towards the ground and ascended 30 ft. up and disappeared. Sgt. Trill compared the maneuver made by the object to a "check mark" - (✓). At this time DoD patrolman Jones(pseudonym), in his cruiser, drove up to the sighting area and exclaimed, "Did you see that"! Sgt. Trill acknowledged that he did and approached a nearby tent manned by a maintenance crew, hoping some of the personnel in it saw the incident, but it was a futile attempt. He explained that the rear of the tent was facing the field rendering those inside oblivious to the sighting.

He called his third patrol, by radio, requesting the unit to cruise the area and then to rendezvous with him at the field. Upon arriving Sgt. Trill questioned the patrolman, however he reported nothing out of the ordinary. Still in an excited and baffled state the three patrol units remained at the field and,

being so preoccupied by the account, had to be reminded to return to the station; their shift was over over.

A call to Chatham weather service, at Cape Cod, confirmed on the sighting date winds were from the N/W at 22 mph with a peak gust at 29 mph. This would rule out a balloon as the object was traveling S/N. High temp. was 66 degrees with clear skies. A weather balloon was launched from Chatham at 7 a.m. Balloons used at Chatham are light-tan in appearance.

Due to wedding plans Patrolman Jones has not yet been interviewed but according to Sgt. Trill an interview at a future date seems promising.

After a number of telephone conversations Sgt. Trill and myself finally settled on a convenient date, 16 Aug. 89, for an interview. He resides in a densely populated area of the Cape and has a very pleasant young family. He is a Vietnam veteran and served with the 26th aviation unit at Otis AFB. He has no preconcieved thoughts on UFO phenomena. In fact, he admitted to me if Patrolman Jones had not observed the object he wouldn't have come forward. He wants no publicity nor is concerned with making any financial gain from the sighting.

A couple of factors that seem to center on a psychological affect the sighting had on the witnesses should be mentioned here. Sgt. Trill explained that he now patrols the sighting area more frequently than other parts of the base. He also stated that he now "looks around" for anything unusual. Another factor, that seems to have affected the witnesses since the sighting, is the comfortable rapport shared between Sgt. Trill and Patrolman Jones has somehow dissipated. I asked him why this sudden change in their relationship? He explained that it is "strange" but he "doesn't know" and "maybe it could be due to second guessing each other".

As of this writing attempts are being made to locate the pilot and co-pilot of the Bell Huey H-1. According to Sgt. Trill, shortly after the sighting, the pilot and co-pilot appeared startled and left the area. It is not known if they observed the object or if the object had an affect on the choppers instruments.

**\*\* TRIVIA \*\***

Q: In 1952, US Air Force and Navy intelligence and the Royal Air Force documented sightings during what NATO maneuvers?

Answer:

(Operation Mainbrace)

## Communiques and Bits n' Pieces

Regarding the commentary, "Cover-up/Debunking Program," published in Orbiter (issue #5) I recieved an interesting letter from former Bluebook Chief Major Dewey J. Fournet Jr. USAFR. For the record, he states that he and Ed Ruppelt had never "concocted a plan to give the American public the facts about UFOs," and the article continues to add that "the CIA stepped in and killed the whole program". (Ed. note - the source of the quote was from Major Keyhoe's Aliens from Space... The Real Story of UFO's, P. # 83-85) . "The only roll the CIA played", Major Fournet adds, "was a briefing on the subject by myself which served to make them aware what was going on, especially the problems being encountered in the USAF UFO investigation.... I therefore categorically deny that, at least as of January 1953, there had been any official cover-up/debunking policy and in particular such a program was orchestrated by the CIA."

Ed. Comment - Could the statements, made by Keyhoe, in his book have been fabricated or is Major Fournet's denial only added emphasis that possibly Project Bluebook served as a smoke screen for a secret and more sophisticated Air Force/CIA operation?

\*\*\*\*\*

The lifeboats are filling fast. Another one jumped ship, Tom Benson, a friend and colleague, resigning as New Jersey State Director of MUFON over further whitewashing policies issued by the MUFON hierarchy. Welcome aboard Tom.

To add more ballast to a listing ship MUFON Director W. Andrus is quoted in the Examiner 7/18/89, "that Bigfoot could be experimental animals UFO aliens brought to Earth in order to test the environment before colonizing."

Ed. comment - So much for Mr. science!

\*\*\*\*\*

In response to Dr. Willy Smith's critique (Orbiter Issue #18) on "The Scale Remains Unbalance", by Bruce Maccabee, a letter has reached this editor from Gulf Breeze, FL. by none other than Ed Walters. In part, Walters writes that he is, "growing tired of attacks on his character" and addresses a statement made by Dr. Smith. Referring to Walters, Dr. Smith in his critique mentions that "even the Mayor and the Chief of Police didn't like him". Walters counters that comment with, "only recently I recieved a warm thank you letter from the Mayor advising me of my re-appointment by the Mayor and the City Council to the City Planning Board...."

In what he claims is classic debunking ridicule Walters adds, "W. Smith seems to relish in pointing to my police record.... I detailed this teenage incident to MUFON investigators over a year ago. All four of the joyriding (car theft) charges were dropped and I pled guilty to a \$350 bad check."

Ed. comment - I wrote to Walters asking for a copy of the "warm letter" sent to him from the Mayor. He only sent newspaper clippings of himself and the mayor, not the letter. Furthermore, one doesn't do jail time (source- Miami Herald GB article, 6 Aug. 89) for just "Joyriding", and the bad check, in actuality, was a forged check. It is my gut feeling, no matter how this all turns out, that alot of people on both sides of this issue are in for a big surprise. No evidence, just a gut feeling.

FROM: DR. Willy Smith  
UNICAT Project

DATE: Aug. 7, 1989

TO: UFO publications, electronic media  
Proponents of Gulf Breeze photographs

SUBJECT: Statement of Position

In mid-June, 1989, the UNICAT Project submitted several photographs for computer enhanced image analysis. The photos considered fall into two categories: i) portrait of a girl with an anomalous image above her right shoulder; and ii) photos of an alleged UFO obtained by Mr. Walters/Hanson of Gulf Breeze, FL starting in November, 1987.

The results have been spectacular: the girl's photos were undoubtedly obtained by using double exposure, thus demonstrating the photographer's familiarity with the technique, while the UFO photos show a well defined supporting structure under the alleged spacecraft.

The reaction of the interested parties has been swift and predictable. Instead of addressing the main issue, i.e., why a real UFO needs to be supported, the proponents have flooded the mails with anonymous and world shaking communiques which can be described only as malicious gossiping, aimed at cushioning the negative impact of the information revealed by the computer analysis.

The releases follow the time-honored pattern that what counts in politics is not the truth, but what is believed to be the truth. In an attempt to provide a semblance of credibility, names and circumstances are provided, but no supporting evidence is offered. Authorship of the masterpieces of intrigue --I am told-- have been attributed to various sources, some of them luminaries on the UFO scene, such as Budd Hopkins and/or his associates, or Dr. Maccabee, or secondary characters in the play, as for instance Col. Robert (sic) Reid or "Ed-of-Gulf-Breeze" himself. Whatever the case may be, until such times a signed copy of the statements reaches me, I will not dignify them with a formal response.

The computer-enhanced material has not been released as yet, as some questions have been raised by the photographer regarding the copyright protection of the photos, an issue that has been complicated by the fact that the lawyer that initially contacted me has indicated that she does not represent Mr. Walters any longer. In the Meantime, information recieved from the copyright office in Washington has created some doubts with reference to the validity of the copyright for this specific instance, as well as disclosing interested possibilities based on the doctrine of "fair use".

Ed. comment - Dr. Smith promises more information, on these significant developments, which will be published in future issues of Orbiter.

# **Aerial Anomalies International**

P. O. BOX 66404, MOBILE, ALABAMA 36606, U.S.A.

## INTRODUCTION

Since prehistory, man has been observing unusual happenings in the sky. Those occurrences have been given various names to suit the trends of the times. However, in almost every instance, the identifying nomenclatures used were either inaccurate or misleading for the various forms of reported experiences.

Historically, we have used a variety of names such as angels, flying shields, mystery airships, phantom planes, ghost rockets, flying saucers and unidentified flying objects to describe aerial phenomena. But those terms are both restrictive and lacking in accuracy. The phenomena that we study ranges from micro specks in the sky to macro masses sometimes comparable to unnatural structures.

Observations by witnesses of truly enigmatic occurrences in the sky fall into two broad categories: (1) Natural aerial phenomena and/or (2) Unknown aerial phenomena (having an apparent intelligent source). Both categories deserve serious disciplined study. It is essential that we differentiate between the two categories and classify, when possible.

Because of this crucial need, we do not go beyond the point of referring to anomalous aerial phenomena by other names such as spaceships, flying saucers and UFOs. To do so would be equivalent to stating that we study spaceships, flying saucers and unidentified flying objects; none of which would be accurate. We use such terms only as historical and reported references; not as verified identifiable nomenclatures.

We oppose the use of misleading names which help to give the press, public and scientific community a totally false impression of actual aerial phenomena. In order to overcome the stigma attached to this subject, we need the help and support of the most experienced and knowledgeable people available.

Investigators, researchers and serious students of aerial phenomena are encouraged to share their works and findings with us. We endeavor to make as much factual information available as possible to both our associates and to the public at large. Should you wish to participate in our activities or have a work published and distributed, please contact us for details.

A NON-PROFIT ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF ANOMALOUS AERIAL PHENOMENA STUDIES

(Educational, Investigative, Research - founded on June 26, 1989)

## Fireball Reports

Texas, USA, 17 May 1988, 0332 GMT (16 May 2232 CDT).

Observer: Cary Hannsz  
 Location: Near Haskell (33.15°N, 99.75°W)  
 1st sighting: R.A. 13<sup>h</sup> 30<sup>m</sup>, dec. 15° N  
 End sighting: R.A. 12<sup>h</sup> 20<sup>m</sup>, dec. 30° S  
 Magnitude: - 10  
 Color: White  
 Termination: Vanished above horizon

Oklahoma, USA, 10 December 1988, 0230 GMT (9 December, 2030 CST)

Observer: Cindy Frankenfield  
 Location: Oklahoma City (35.28°N, 97.78°W)  
 1st sighting: Zenith  
 End sighting: Azim. 0°, alt. 65-70°  
 Duration: 6 seconds  
 Apparent Velocity: Medium  
 Magnitude: Bright as the full moon  
 Color: Reddish-orange with yellow fringe  
 Trail: Luminous, yellow, about 15° long  
 Termination: Vanished above the horizon

Australia, 13 January, 1988, 1329 GMT (14 January, 0029 local time)

Observer: P. Camullen  
 Location: Cobram East, Victoria (35. 87°S, 140.67°E)  
 1st sighting: R.A. 228°, dec. -58°  
 End sighting: R.A. 111°, dec. -55°  
 Apparent velocity: Medium  
 Magnitude: -8  
 Color: Bright green  
 Termination: Vanished above horizon

North Sea, 31 January, 1988, 1824 GMT

Observers:

F.O. Lufthansa flt. 1648 (Stuttgart- London)	Cpt. Guenther & F.O. Martin, Lufthansa flt. 1775 (Nice-Frankfurt)	Flight crew, Lufthansa flt. 1355 (Copenhagen Frankfurt)
--	---	---

Aircraft Location:

51.5°N, 2.42°E alt., 11 km	46.87°N, 9.27°E alt., 10.5 km	54.25°N, 11.0°E alt., 8 km
-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

1st sighting: Azim. 340°, alt. 20°	Azim. 337°, alt. 10°	Azim. 230°, alt. 40°
End sighting: Azim. 335°, alt. 20°	Azim. 322°, alt. 0°	Azim. 235°, alt. 10°
Brightness: Fullmoon	Landing lights	
Duration: 5 seconds	5 seconds	5 seconds
Color: White	White, changing to blue-green	White to Green
Termination: Fragmented; disappeared above the horizon	Disappeared above the horizon	Disappeared above the horizon

Oregon, USA, 8 February, 1988, 0328 GMT (7 February, 1928 PST)  
Observer: Joy Hayhurst  
Location: Salem, Marion County (44.8°N, 123.07°W)  
1st sighting: Azim. 280°, alt. 45°  
End sighting: Azim. 315°, alt ?  
Duration: 2 seconds

W. Pacific Ocean, 8 March, 1988, 1428 GMT (9 March, 0028 LOCAL TIME)  
Observers: Capt. J. Krom and F.O. D. Ross; Quantas flight 70 (Tokyo-Perth)  
Aircraft Location: 13.17°N, 137.69°E (650 km SSE of Tokyo)  
1st sighting: Azim. 227°, alt. 30°  
End sighting: Azim. 232°, alt. 15°  
Duration: 4 seconds  
Color: Yellow, changing to white, red, then yellow  
Trail: Long, thin  
Termination: Fragmented into 2 pieces and vanished above the horizon

<u>Oklahoma/Texas, USA, 13 March, 1988, 0300 GMT (12 March, 2100 CST).</u>		
Observer: Jill Devenport	Kent Taylor	Herbert Schulz and Bruno Viertel
Location: Near Noble, OK 35.53°N, 91.48°W	Edmond, OK 35.57°N, 97.44°W	Near Cranfills Gap, TX 31.77°N, 97.82°W
1st sighting: Azim. 225°, alt. 80°	Azim. 200°, alt. 50°	
End sighting: Azim. 270°, alt. 10°	Azim. 225°, alt. 15°	
Path:		E-W in the NNW sky, down at a 45° angle
Duration: 5-10seconds	5-6 seconds	3-4 seconds
Magnitude: Bright as a full moon	Bright as a full moon	
Color: Green	Green	Bright white
Trail: Orange	Light-green with sparks and smoke; lasted 2 second	
Term- -ination: Vanished behind hill	Vanished over horizon	Vanished below horizon

Pennsylvania, USA, 8 April 88,  
0430 EDT (0830 GMT)  
Observer: Tom Reiland  
Location: Pittsburgh  
(40.43°N, 80.00°W)  
1st sighting: R.A. 275°, dec. 75°N  
End sighting: R.A. 315°, dec. 65°N  
Magnitude; Brighter than full moon;  
cast shadows  
Trail: lasted 20 seconds  
Termination: Flashed and  
vanished above horizon

Hawaii, USA, 17 April, 1988,  
0737 HST (1737 GMT)  
Observer: Lydia Alvarez  
Location: Honolulu  
(21.27°N, 157.85°W)  
1st sighting: Azim. 300°, alt. 65°  
End sighting: Azim. 300°, alt. 35°  
Duration: 3-4 seconds  
Apparent velocity: Slow  
Magnitude: Too bright to look at  
Color: Yellow  
Trail: Sparks  
Termination: Vanished above horizon

**\*\* THE NIPPON T.V. INTERVIEW \*\* (part three)**

CL: Charles Lee (Interviewer-Nippon T.V.), BG: Barry Greenwood  
LF: Larry Fawcett

CL: Why is that ?

BG: Because the material was classified top-secret and we weren't cleared for that security level.

CL: So your lawyer Mr. Gersten he was allowed to see this ?

BG: No he wasn't.

CL: Then who prepared the affidavit ?

LF: Eugene Yates, The Attorney General for the U.S.

BG: We never saw one word of this document through the whole proceedings.

CL: Let me get myself cleared. When a plaintiff sues the defendant, bring them to court, they have to file a court paper.

LF: We did that. Based on prior releases that we obtained from the CIA suit.

CL: You don't have that court paper ?

LF: No, we don't.

BG: There was nothing really spectacular in it.

CL: On which grounds were have you sued ?

LF: Well the CIA suit was for documents.

CL: Yes - O.K.

BG: We maintained that UFOs were no threat to national security by the government's own words. They declared in at least three government-funded studies that UFOs were not a threat. Therefore we felt that that was not a legitimate exemption to withhold UFO material from us. So we filed a law suit.

CL: Can you clear, ah, can you explain to us what the affidavit contained ?

BG: The original affidavit contained all the reasons.

CL: Well, give us the reasons ?

BG: Well, those we don't know (laughs) because I'll show you right here. These are the reasons (BG presents heavily censored documents) why they withheld UFO material. And considering that they regarded the matter as a top-secret matter, we cannot have access to any of the reasons, any of the cases, or evidence.

CL: So virtually you had a court case and the judge came to conclusion and boom you lost this case. And you wanted to know the reason why you lost this case. And they cannot tell you the reason and years later you finally got the paper stating the reason why such reports were not granted to you. Then the affidavit came to you in writing but it was all censored out.

LF: Yeah, that convinced us but that's got to tell you something and that's a message that being brought out in these documents. If there are no UFOs then why all the secrecy.

CL: To us it's big news because they're saying ,there admitting that they're hiding something. They're withholding some information and they're are indirectly admitting that UFOs exist.

BG: One thing that CAUS has been able to do, an old controversy ? We haven't been able to provide hard final proof of UFOs because for that we have to have a UFO or whoever runs them. But we have hard evidence, indisputable black and white evidence, that the government has misinformed the public about the subject and has understated the importance of it. It's much bigger then they implied through all the years of giving pronouncements on UFOs. It's a very important subject and we have proof of that.

CL: To us, to our level of thinking this is big news. Why not the public. Ah, I don't know how I should explain the situation but knowing and getting the affidavit and the NSA. The public should be in such a state, shocked, wondering if NSA is hiding such documents then UFOs exist the public should be outraged ?

LF: Well, the problem with a suit like this is it should have been well publicized at the time but the media just didn't pick up on it. When I go around the country or Barry goes around lecturing we show this document and people are astounded by it when they see it. O.K. yet it didn't make the splash we wanted it to do to start a movement.

CL: The reason that the public is not outraged or stunned by this affidavit is that they do not know ?

LF: Well, they do know because now other events out of the UFO field through the years have occurred, Watergate and other things, so that they know there are dirty tricks played. So we're seasoned to this, if you will, where other people in other countries are not.

CL: This affidavit, the movement by the government, I believe it is equivilent to the Watergate case. I see it that way.

BG: Well, legally because the problem is getting the public to react, getting the media to present this information to the people to let them know what is happening. That's been very difficult because much of the media has an old view of UFO phenomenon, 1950s flying saucer films, aliens shooting humans, eating them for food and it seems to be a very hard idea to get out of the media's head. They continue to report the subject in that context, we can't get it to be taken seriously enough by very important media, to get it over to the people. And we continue to unearth very interesting evidence, we tell our sources about it in the media, it gets out somewhat but just not enough to make a difference and that's very frustrating.

LF: I think when our book "Clear Intent" came out and we were promoting the book in Washington D.C. in front of the Pentagon, to make the media move I had to put a challenge up. And there was forty or fifty reporters even two reporters from Russia were there from Tass.

And I had to put a challenge up, in saying to them, "listen we done the ground work, the ground work is here, all we are asking you to do is an investigative type reporting". Take any case you want in the book, we won't pick it, you pick it. If you find that case to be fact, and that the government did withhold that information from us, then I want you to put it on the air. If you find that that story is false then we'll put that in front of the camera. Well, out of 48 or 49 reporters one picked it up, Ted Turner from Cable News Network. He did a six month study on one of the cases, he picked the case, which was a case that occurred in England in 1980. They did a six month investigation, they did a week's show on television, and they proved our case that there was a cover-up of the case. Which made our case, but that didn't make big revelations either. How do you make the media move ?

BG: It's interesting that when one television network picks up a story like that, the other networks don't want to deal with the story unless it is a very large national issue. They almost view it as if it's a competing story to what the other networks are putting on the air therefore let's not touch it, let's not mention it, ignore it. And Ted Turner is considered to be a maverick in the television field so it was no surprise that the story did not get a large amount of coverage.

CL: Larry as you have told me you're a policeman. You have been policeman for how long ?

LF: Twenty years.

CL: And you know how the evidence in court cases must be viewed or perceived. I would like to hear your comments. They haven't shown the two hundred and ten or fifteen pages of documents to the judge, the judge has ruled only by seeing the 21 page affidavit. Will you tell us about that ?

LF: Yes, how can you rule on evidence if you're not seeing the evidence, you must see the evidence to make a ruling on it. In this case we're talking about UFO documents or incidents. The judge didn't see that. What he saw was the 21 page affidavit showing CAUS why they couldn't tell us this and he ruled on it. So we called foul.

CL: Is that common though ?

LF: Oh sure. That's common in everyday law.

CL: The judge without seeing the evidence he can rule it out.

LF: Yes, in this case he did. He ruled without seeing the two hundred ten or fifteen documents that they claim they had. So our attorney claimed foul, how can you do that, and that's why we eventually went up to the Supreme Court. But they concurred with the lower court's decision.

CL: So in everyday court case it's the judge who really sees all the evidence.

LF: Oh sure, and a jury has to see it.

CL: The foul you were talking about, is that common ?  
LF: Oh sure, in presenting evidence in court. If you brought a case into court and you said well I have this, this and this. The court must see this, this and this. So you can document it as evidence.

CL: Is this type of judgment popular in everyday court ?  
LF: This type of judgment ?

CL: Yes, the judge without seeing all the evidence, just reading the affidavit.

BG: It's not common but it happens.

LF: They had to show the judge positive proof in this document that they couldn't release this information because it would harm national security.

CL: How can a judge trust this 21 page affidavit without seeing the rest of the evidence ?

LF: We see it everyday when the government goes into court. All they have to do is go to a judge and say, "Your honor we can't present this evidence in court because it pertains to national security".

CL: What I'm saying is how can the judge trust that it's national security reasons ?

LF: Because he's being told that.

CL: That's political ?

LF: Sure

BG: He's a federal official as well.

LF: He's being paid by the federal government so he has to abide by certain lines. If the government is telling him that we can't tell the public because there is some national security implications here. Maybe the Russians are doing something or who knows what's in the documents ? So the judge has to listen to his side and rule on it because he didn't hear our side, he didn't allow our attorney to go in and view this and to give his opinions of this. So it was a one sided argument.

CL: It seems like it, it's too political.

CL: A few words on MJ-12. Majestic 12. Tell us the problems you found on Majestic 12.

LF: I'll start first then you can talk to Barry. When we first got the documents I was very excited about them. Here was the whole thing we were looking for. But once we started to scrutinize the documents, specifically Barry who did alot of work on the documents he picked out alot of the problems, we began finding faults with them. And then when we began checking deeper and deeper it became quagmire. Barry would you like to add to that ?

(CONTINUED NEXT ISSUE)