



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



Our Bookstore is OPEN

Over 5000 new & used titles, competitively priced!

Topics: [UFOs](#) - [Paranormal](#) - [Area 51](#) - [Ghosts](#) - [Fortean](#) - [Conspiracy](#) - [History](#) - [Biography](#) - [Psychology](#) - [Religion](#) - [Crime](#) - [Health](#) - [Geography](#) - [Maps](#) - [Science](#) - [Money](#) - [Language](#) - [Recreation](#) - [Technology](#) - [Fiction](#) - [Other](#) - [New](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Location: [Mothership](#) -> [UFO](#) -> [Updates](#) -> [2000](#) -> [Sep](#) -> **Re: Orford Ness Lighthouse 'UFO' - Easton**

UFO UpDates Mailing List

Re: Orford Ness Lighthouse 'UFO' - Easton

From: James Easton <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 26 Sep 2000 03:46:44 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 26 Sep 2000 12:31:30 -0400
Subject: Re: Orford Ness Lighthouse 'UFO' - Easton

In response to some recent claims concerning the relative visibility of Orford Ness lighthouse and its beam, I trust the following information will be of assistance:

[Originally posted to UFORL]

From: "James Easton" <voyager@ufoworld.co.uk>
To: "UFO Research List" <UFORL@listbot.com>
Subject: Re: Rendlesham...
Date: 12 September 2000 01:58

In answer to a previous question, what colour was the Orford Ness beacon, we do of course have an apparent first hand confirmation. According to Ed Cabansag, "While we walked, each one of us could see the lights. Blue, red, white and yellow. The beacon light turned out to be the yellow light. We could see them periodically, but not in a specific pattern".

The following may help to further understand events, especially in their original perspective and relates to previously unpublished material from last year. Some concerning the lighthouse will be familiar, however, no harm in confirming a few facts.

1. Extracts from conversation with Bernard Edwards, the Lights List Officer, re Orford Ness lighthouse [my questions/responses are prefixed by 'JE:'] -

..it's light number 2258 if you want a future reference for it...

...let me just see what the characteristics are now... it's a flashing white light and there's also a fixed red and a fixed green... the red covers a certain arc and the green covers another certain arc.

JE: Which of the lights would be visible from inshore?

Well... the red sector goes from shore, clockwise round to 210 degrees true, there is another red sector from 038 degrees to 049 degrees, which is a nine degree arc and there's a green sector from 047 degrees to shore.

Now, any angle in-between those, it obviously doesn't shine over.

The white light... it doesn't tell me here, but I would imagine that's all round, but maybe it's blanked inshore a bit, because

lighthouses tend to upset local people.

Now, when you draw out those bearings, you must remember they are bearings as a mariner would see the lights from seaward, so it's no good putting a dot on the paper for the light and drawing a bearing down to the south-west of 210. It is the mariner looking from the north-east, down a bearing of 210 towards the south-west and there he sees the light.

JE: Is there any reason this white light, or the beam, might be described as yellow or yellowish-white, as opposed to just plain white?

A white light can look yellowish and a yellow light can look whitish.

JE: What might cause that, could it be the Fresnel lens?

I don't honestly know, it may be something to do with the atmospheric conditions at the time. Was it in the winter?

JE: Yes, this particular observation was in December.

You see, lights do alter if they get a bit of ice on the lens, you know, a bit of frosting. I'm not saying that was the reason... [End]

2. Extracts from conversation with Keith Seaman, responsible for maintenance of the automated Orford Ness lighthouse and who knows the UFO story well:

...when you get right into the forest, the beam actually traverses through the forest...

...you're getting well down [towards the coast] then, because as I pointed out at the time, the lighthouse beam does not go any further inland than the coast; the coast curves, it doesn't follow a dead straight line and you obviously get a little bit of overthrow from the beam.

I've looked after the lighthouse since 1994, I wasn't involved with it at the time [December 1980], but I'm fully aware of all the equipment that was in there and where the light shone and that hasn't been altered since 1914.

JE: Has the light which shines inland been dimmed or reduced in any way?

The range and possibly the intensity has been reduced since, that happened in 1990.

JE: Another possibility which came up was that the Shipwash lightship may have been a factor.

The Shipwash was certainly there at the time.

JE: It's been replaced since then by a buoy, hasn't it?

It has been replaced by a buoy, but at the time the Shipwash was there, but it was some miles further out and my understanding of that is that it was blanked off towards the land anyway, because it wasn't necessary to shine the light towards the land because you'd already got the lighthouse there.

The lighthouse is blanked off to a certain area, it's not a completely visible light all the way round the 360 degrees, it's blanked off towards the land. And that's when the light disappears, because it's screened off.

JE: So, the lightship at that time, would just have been a plain, white light as well?

Yes, but it had a very different flash sequence.

There were two lightships out there at the time, there was the Gabbit as well, which was a lot further out.

JE: I'm not aware of that one.

That was off Felixstowe. [End]

In view of the landscape and lighthouse alterations since December, 1980, a previously mentioned, 1997 public statement from Chris Arnold is perhaps worth considering again.

As noted, Arnold was the security policeman who, after the first incident, reported concerns of an air crash to the local Suffolk Constabulary. He wrote:

In any case here is some information regarding that wonderful goat rope outside the RAF Woodbridge East Gate that December morning. I was a member of the 81st Security Police Squadron on "B" Flight Law Enforcement. If I remember correctly (and you must forgive me for some memory lapse as you must realize that at the time this was not a significant event, consequently it really hasn't been burned into my mind, obviously had I seen flying saucers, and little green men I doubt I would have any problems retaining the information) those of us working were having some fun as we actually were playing music over one of the Police Frequencies. It was very quiet and since it was the holiday season, not much was happening. Things were pretty laid back. In any case, we were playing Music on the Security Frequency and the Law Enforcement freq was being used in case someone had an emergency or actual work related transmission to make.

After midnight, John Burroughs radioed the LE desk and reported he had seen strange lights in the outside the East Gate on RAF Woodbridge. I was actually on RAF Lakenheath hanging out at the Law Enforcement Desk at the time. Burroughs, who liked to draw attention to himself, often over-reacted to situations and was considered very unreliable, wanted to know if there were any reports of downed aircraft.

We called the Control Tower and I even called the local Constabulary (I can't remember the town the constabulary was in, but I do know it was outside of Ipswich and I think it used to be an air base during WWII, I believe the control tower was restored in the 80's)

In any case, after getting a negative reply from the British Cops, My flight chief asked me if I wanted to head out to Woodbridge to meet up with Burroughs and see what was up. I grabbed the back gate keys, and took the back way to RAF W/B. I met Burroughs at the East Gate of WB. We left our guns with the guy riding with Burroughs and drove to the end of the long access road. We left our vehicle and walked out there.

There was absolutely nothing in the woods. We could see lights in the distance and it appeared unusual as it was a sweeping light, (we did not know about the lighthouse on the coast at the time). We also saw some strange colored lights in the distance but were unable to determine what they were. [End]

Arnold is a vital witness and apparently one of only three security policemen, the others being Burroughs and Chandler, who directly participated in both night's events.

I've recently been discussing the case with him and hope to shortly be able to publish his more detailed account.

What's important and may not be generally appreciated, is how Arnold went back with Burroughs to the 'site' of that inaugural 'UFO' scare and it was from this vantage point he could see "lights in the distance and it appeared unusual as it was a sweeping light", plus, "some strange colored lights in the distance".

In recent correspondence, I asked:

EASTON: Significantly, in July 1997, you mentioned there were 'some strange lights' in the distance, whose origin could not be determined. Can you recall what those lights looked like - indeed, anything about them at all - colour, size, whether they were flashing or moved, etc.

ARMOLD: Yes, there were what we initially interpreted as 'strange lights' and in my opinion and contrary to what some people assert, at the time almost none of us knew there was a lighthouse at Orford Ness. Remember, the vast majority of folks

involved were young people, 19, 20, 25 years old. Consequently it wasn't something most of the troops were cognizant of. That's one reason the lights appeared interesting or out of the ordinary to some people.

After it was discovered that a lighthouse was out there, the 'strangeness' of the lights evaporated. The lights were primarily white and were very small, far off in the distance. Occasionally one would see a shade of blue or red but I attribute that to refraction from stained glass windows in a local church in addition to the fog and weather at the time. The lights did not move in erratic fashions nor did they move towards us or act in any manner which violated the laws of known physics. [End]

So, of immense significance, according to Arnold some distant red and blue lights were still visible from the 'landing site'. However, according to Penniston, the red and blue lights encountered earlier were attached to a small craft which had, by that time, zoomed off into the night sky. [END]

[From Ian Ridpath and posted with Ian's full permission]

Sparks seems to think that the fact that the lighthouse dips below the horizon as one moves into the farmer's field somehow disproves that Col Halt (or anyone else) could have chased it for two miles. Au contraire: it simply confirms what Halt said on the tape, namely that he lost sight of it and then made sighting again "at the far side of the second farmer's field". From Halt's time markers on the tape, it seems there was quite an interval between passing the farmer's house and re-sighting the light. (Note, however, that he says: "We've passed the farmer's house and are crossing the next field" as though the two events were almost consecutive - no suggestion of a long walk along the lanes as proposed by Robert McLean).

He also tries to make a point about magnetic deviation, but simply ends up confirming the figures we already have. What he says is: "Contrary to erroneous skeptic information the magnetic declination or correction from magnetic to true bearings was -5.2 degs, not -10 degs, according to the NOAA Geomagnetic Synthesis program and Historical Declination database for Dec 28, 1980, at 52-05 N, 1-30 E, zero elevation. With these two 5-degree errors by skeptics -- in the bearing to Orfordness and in converting Halt's compass readings from magnetic to true -- skeptics have conveniently improved their case by a total of 10 degrees."

Now, we have to distinguish between true north and grid north, since most of us are working from OS maps and true north at that location is 2 degrees 50 minutes west of grid north. In addition, at the date of the sighting magnetic north was about 8 degrees west of grid north. Deduct 2*50 from 8 and you have a deviation of magnetic north from true north of -5.2 degs, as quoted by Sparks from NOAA info, confirming my info from the OS.

On the other hand, his own measurement of the azimuth of the lighthouse from East Gate as 85 degrees is clearly wrong. (Coincidentally, the azimuth is virtually identical from East Gate and from the alleged landing site). Where he gets the "5-degree errors by skeptics" from I don't know. My own value for the azimuth of the lighthouse (measured from the OS map) was 91 degrees from grid north, which converts to a magnetic bearing of 99 degrees, using the figures above.

As an amusing aside, had Sparks followed his own logic to its inevitable conclusion, he would have realized he had just proved that the lighthouse should have been some 30 degrees to the *left* of Halt's bearing to the UFO, rather than to the right where Halt claimed to have seen it. [END]

[Also from Ian and forwarded with permission]

I see from the latest postings to UFO Updates that David Rudiak has done some research and undergone a rather remarkable (and principled) change of view about the visibility of the Orford Ness lighthouse.

He posts a link:

<http://www.debenweb.co.uk/img/suff/orfd/orf10.jpg>

to a photo of the lighthouse.

It so happens that on my last trip to the area I took a photo of the lighthouse from almost exactly the same position as the one at the above URL. Hence I can state with confidence that this photo was taken from somewhere very near to (and most probably on) the jetty that sticks out into the River Ore from the riverfront at Orford. If you have the relevant Pathfinder map, you should see a dotted line marked 'Ferry V' crossing the River Ore at this point. In fact, it looks to me as though the line of sight of this photo is almost exactly along this dotted line.

A glance at a map will show that the position from which this photo was taken is to the NNW of the lighthouse. I do recall seeing the direct flash of the beam even from this position on the riverfront, but it is probably the very northerly limit of visibility. Perhaps Robert McLean could confirm this. In any case, it is clear from the photo that the lamp is not entirely blocked from view by shielding at this point. This makes sense, since direct visibility of the light would be valuable to boats in the River Ore.

Hence, Rudiak has neatly provided evidence for everyone on the UFO Updates list that the beam is indeed directly visible well to the north of west, and no southerly adjustment of the position of the presumed landing site is necessary. [END]

[Originally posted to UFORL]

From: "Robert McLean" <robert.mclean2@virgin.net>
To: "Rudiak, David" <DRudiak@aol.com>; "UFO Research List" <UFORL@listbot.com>
Subject: Rendlesham: Visibility of Orfordness Lighthouse
Date: 25 September 2000 22:37

(The contents of this message are non-confidential and can be re-posted.)

There was some discussion a few weeks ago on UFO UpDates about the visibility of the Orfordness Lighthouse from the "accepted landing site", and how this could be possible, given that the rear, or landward, face of the lighthouse is blacked-out with a "shield". See for example:

<http://personal.riverusers.com/~tanseyj/orford.jpg>

and

<http://www.debenweb.co.uk/img/suff/orfd/orf10.jpg>

On 23/09/00 I went over to Orfordness for the afternoon. The site is run by the National Trust, and you get there by taking a small boat that leaves from the Orford pier, exactly where the debenweb photo was taken.

The Orfordness Lighthouse is, of course, visible from the "accepted landing site" in Rendlesham forest, the location of which on Ordnance Survey maps is at grid ref TM364490 - I've seen it there and so have lots of others. (N.B. Please ignore the circular logic: - The "accepted landing site" is believed to be at grid ref TM364490 mainly because the lighthouse is visible from there!)

In August I walked along the coastal path north from Orford. Simply out of curiosity, I used my binoculars to find the point along the path where I appeared to be directly "behind" the lighthouse, i.e. centered on the shield. It is possible to do this, because the shield follows the diamond pattern of the window panes. When you are directly in line facing the shield, you can see two small triangles of glass at the left and right sides of the lantern.

The point on the path from where these triangles of glass looked to be equal was at grid ref TM436499, which is about 1750 m inland of the lighthouse. The lighthouse is at grid ref TM450488« (you measure to the base of the lighthouse symbol on the OS map)

and so the centre of the shadow cast by the shield is at an angle of 308° grid north, or 310.4° true north. This line passes no closer than 750 m NE from the centre of Orford. The centre of this shadowed area is not centered on Orford, but very nearly bisects the angle formed by the change in direction of the coastline at the lighthouse. If it wasn't for this change in the direction of the coastline, the Orfordness lighthouse would not be visible inland the way it is.

The difference in angle between the centre of the shield and the line to the accepted landing site is 37° . (The error on this number will be low, probably within $\pm 2^\circ$, because it is possible to compare accurately the size of the triangles of glass as mentioned above.)

When I was at Orfordness, I walked around the lighthouse. There are 16 of the diamond-shaped panes of glass around the circumference of the lantern, and only 3 of these are blacked out around the mid-vertical circumference of the shield. The shield therefore extends a minimum of $\approx 33.75^\circ$ from the centre of the shadow cast by the shield, which is $37^\circ - 33.75^\circ = 3.25^\circ$ short of the angle to the accepted landing site.

There are three similar Fresnel lenses inside the lantern arranged as an equilateral triangle which rotates fully in 15 seconds, giving one flash every 5 seconds. Each of the lenses is quite large, with a diameter maybe one-half of the lantern. The lighthouse beam therefore fades gradually as it turns across the edge of the shield.

To work out the rate at which the beam fades, and the percentage of light visible at the accepted landing site, you'd have to know the cross-sectional intensity profile of the beam, and well as the angle formed by the diamond panes at the edge of the shield. The beam is probably most intense at its centre. The diamond pattern is "tall". So a good estimate would be that the beam intensity at the accepted landing site is about one-half what it would be out to sea.

The range of lighthouse at sea is stated by Trinity House to be 19 nautical miles. Since the accepted landing site is 8.5 km from the lighthouse, it is easy to see why the flash of the lighthouse is still bright at the accepted landing site at night, even when half of it has been obscured by the shield.

Robert McLean
[END]

To reiterate; when Burroughs, Cabansag and Penniston originally pursued some unidentified lights, in the early hours of 26th December, 1980, we know that the following occurred:

"Once we reached the farmer's house we could see a beacon going around so we went towards it. We followed it for about 2 miles before we could see it was coming from a lighthouse" - Burroughs.

"We figured the lights were coming from past the forest, since nothing was visible as we passed through the woody forest. We could see a glowing near the beacon light, but as we got closer we found it to be a lit-up farmhouse. After we had passed through the forest, we thought it had to be an aircraft accident. So did CSC [Central Security Control] as well. But we ran and walked a good 2 miles past our vehicle, until we got to a vantage point where we could determine that what we were chasing was only a beacon light off in the distance. Our route through the forest and field was a direct one, straight towards the light.

We informed CSC that the light beacon was further than we thought, so CSC terminated our investigation" - Cabansag.

On the night of 27th December, Halt was investigating a report that the 'UFO was back' and was at the 'landing sight' when it's recorded on his microcassette:

HALT: You just saw a light? Where? [Unclear] Slow down. Where?

VOICE: Right on this position here. Straight ahead, in between the trees - there it is again. Watch - straight ahead, off my flashlight there, sir. There it is.

HALT: I see it, too. What is it?

VOICE: We don't know, sir.

VOICE: Can I just have a...

HALT: It's a strange, small red light, looks to be maybe a quarter to a half mile, maybe further out. I'm gonna switch off.

HALT: The light is gone now. It was approximately 120 degrees from the site...

VOICE: It's back again.

HALT: Is it back again?

VOICE: Yes, sir.

HALT: Well douse flashlights then. Let's go back to the edge of the clearing so we can get a better look at it. See if you can get the Starscope on it. The light's still there and all the barnyard animals have gone quiet now.

[...]

HALT: There is no doubt about it - there is some type of strange flashing red light ahead.

VOICE: There! It's yellow.

HALT: I saw a yellow tinge in it, too. Weird! It appears to be maybe moving a little bit this way? It's brighter than it has been. It's coming this way. It is definitely coming this way. Pieces of it are shooting off. There is no doubt about it. This is weird!

[...]

HALT: OK, we're looking at the thing, we're probably about two to three hundred yards away. It looks like an eye winking at you. Still moving from side to side. And when you put the Starscope on it, it sorta has a hollow center, a dark center, it's like a pupil of an eye looking at you, winking.

And it flashes so bright to the Starscope that it almost burns your eye.

HALT: We've passed the farmer's house and are crossing the next field and now we have multiple sightings of up to five lights with a similar shape and all but they seem to be steady now rather than a pulsating or glow with a red flash.

[...]

HALT: 2:44. We're at the far side of the second farmer's field and made sighting again about 110 degrees. This looks like it's clear off to the coast. It's right on the horizon. Moves about a bit and flashes from time to time. Still steady or red in color.

[...]

HALT: 3:05. We see strange strobe-like flashes to the... rather sporadic, but there's definitely something there. Some kind of phenomenon.

[END]

Incidentally, thanks to Robert McLean, we now know what the 'strobe-like phenomenon' almost certainly was - it's still visible from the same vantage point, 'at the far side of the second farmer's field'. I'll leave that aside for now though, I'm not sure Robert wants to disclose this outwith UFORL at present.

As previously noted, Halt's publicised recollection is how the initial red [yellow] light observed then exploded into five white lights and was never seen again. That's evidently not what happened - as I'm sure Halt will now acknowledge - the white lights were a separate sighting (again, we now know what they almost certainly were) and the 'red' light was in fact seen once more, this time unmistakable "clear off to the coast" and still flashing.

In 'Rendlesham Unravalled', I wrote:

Science writer Ian Ridpath proposed a more mundane explanation, that Halt had been deceived by the nearby Orford Ness lighthouse and Shipwash lightship and these were responsible for the 'phenomena' witnessed.

Halt's tape recording also noted the 'eye' had a dark centre, only visible when using the 'starlight scope', an image intensifier. Using the intensifier to view a bright object may have produced this 'burn out' effect.

Subsequent comparisons between the timing of the 'flashing red light' from Halt's recording and the Orford Ness beacon, indicated the lighthouse was indeed an obvious source.

Jenny Randles, one of Britain's foremost authors on the 'unexplained', has written extensively about the case and was one of the first to investigate the rumours, long before Halt's memo surfaced.

In her latest book, 'UFO Crash Landing?', she writes:

"Once the men entered the woods on foot and headed towards the clearing, the option that they saw the lighthouse certainly increases in strength. I have stood and watched it several times at night".

"Being inside a forest several miles inland, a lighthouse beacon would not be the first thought to explain a low-level pulsing glow. Because of the way the land slopes, the lighthouse sits on the horizon and appears almost on the ground - just as described on the Halt tape".

"At the site, the lighthouse does pulse like a winking eye, just as Halt explains on the tape. The pulses can even be timed as the beacon rotates (taking about five seconds) and there is a comparison with part of the tape where the men notice that the light briefly disappears and then shout, 'There it is again', as it reappears. This match is quite striking if you judge film of the lighthouse alongside the audio of the tape. Finally, the bearing given by the men for the location of the UFO as they walk toward the coast closely mirrors that of the Orford lighthouse as seen from the landing site.

Frankly, the first time I saw the lighthouse at night I was 80 per cent convinced that this was the explanation. When I first heard the Halt tape this conviction rose to 90 per cent. It only plummeted after talking to eye-witnesses like John Burroughs who were actually out there, although I did have some concern because the lighthouse appears as nothing more than a tiny pulsing light, not a massive red object throwing down beams towards the ground".

Although Halt has repeatedly stated the lighthouse was also visible and not the source of the pulsating red light with a "yellow tinge" - exactly like the lighthouse beacon - Ian Ridpath reiterated to me his belief that Halt was deceived by the beacon from the adjacent Shipwash lightship and mistook this to be the recognisable lighthouse.
[END]

As Jenny only subsequently appreciated, Burroughs had been involved in that abortive two mile pursuit of a 'lighthouse' - a fact he had never revealed.

Also, as Halt confirmed in a later interview with Salley Rayl, the light he observed was indeed a tiny, pulsating light:

RAYL: Now, I know it's hard to tell because it was dark that night, but any idea what size the initial red object was? Any idea?

HALT: Nah. I would just have to guess. My guess would be probably two to three feet, maybe a little less.

RAYL: Two to three feet?

HALT: From the distance, in diameter.

RAYL: In diameter. So, it's a very small object?

HALT: It was a very small object, but it was very bright.

RAYL: But not a craft that could hold a human being, for example?

HALT: No. It couldn't have been. But it appeared to [be] under some kind of intelligent control.
[END]

On the question of whether it could have been the lighthouse he observed - I highlighted this in 'Resolving Rendlesham':

Halt was asked [by Salley Rayl] about the assertion he had been deceived by the Orford Ness lighthouse and replied:

"First, the lighthouse was visible the whole time. It was readily apparent, and it was 30 to 40 degrees off to our right. If you were standing in the forest where we stood, at the supposed landing site or whatever you want to call it, you could see the farmer's house directly in front of us. The lighthouse was 30 to 35 degrees off to the right, and the object was close to the farmer's house and moving from there to the left, through the trees".

Here, as never before, Halt provides specific details of the perspective he believed to be accurate. When he states, "If you were standing in the forest where we stood, at the supposed landing site or whatever you want to call it, you could see the farmer's house directly in front of us", that's correct and the Orford Ness lighthouse is in a direct line of sight, east, towards the coast.

However, when he claims, "The lighthouse was 30 to 35 degrees off to the right." that seems to be consequentially incorrect; the Shipwash lightship was "off to the right", the lighthouse was straight ahead, where Halt observed the 'unidentified light' to be.

His comment that "the object was close to the farmer's house", again places the light source in the line of sight to Orford Ness lighthouse, whereas he believed the lighthouse to be much further south.

Jenny has provided me with a detailed sketch of the location, based on her visits and setting out where the lighthouse, lightship and the then prominent blue lights from the NSA building at Orford Ness all lay in relation to the 'clearing' and farmer's house. etc.

From the clearing which is supposedly the 'landing site', the lighthouse is shown by Jenny to be directly in line with the farmer's house, with the lightship distinctly further to the south-east.

This early familiarity with the site is important as a number of factors have changed since then, the lighthouse isn't now so noticeable inland, the NSA facility is no longer operational and the lightship has been replaced by a buoy.
[END]

I hope this all proves to be a definitive explanation of the factors to be considered regarding these events, which are, of course, cited as pivotal evidence why scientists and the media should pay serious attention to claims of encounters with extraterrestrial civilisations.

James Easton.
E-mail: voyager@ufoworld.co.uk
www.ufoworld.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[[This Month's Index](#) | [UFO UpDates Main Index](#) | [MUFON Ontario](#)]

UFO UpDates - Toronto - updates@globalserve.net

Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp - ++ 416-696-0304

A Hand-Operated E-Mail Subscription Service for the Study of UFO Related Phenomena.
To subscribe please send your first and last name to updates@globalserve.net
Message submissions should be sent to the same address.

[[UFO Topics](#) | [People](#) | [Ufomind What's New](#) | [Ufomind Top Level](#)]

To find this message again in the future...
Link it to the appropriate [Ufologist](#) or [UFO Topic](#) page.

Archived as a public service by [Area 51 Research Center](#) which is not responsible for content.
Software by Glenn Campbell. Technical contact: webmaster@ufomind.com

Financial support for this web server is provided by the [Research Center Catalog](#).