

the apro bulletin

VOL. 28, NO. 2

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN

AUGUST, 1979

UFO - PATROL CAR ENCOUNTER

OPEN LETTER

Genesis III Productions, Ltd.
3032 North 32nd St.
Phoenix, AZ 85017

Attn: Lee Elders, Tom Welch, et al.

Gentlemen:

Whether by design or through default my name appears in your *UFO Contact From The Pleiades* in a manner which allows the easy inference that I endorse the contents (or at least the conclusions) of that publication. I do not. My current inclination is (and always has been) that the case is an elaborate hoax. My statement, prepared for use in the book at Col. Steven's request, (but not used) describes the Meier photos as *art*. I still hold that position.

In my view any label of authenticity is entirely premature, based on the level and quality of investigation done thus far.

When I became involved in the promotion of the book, it was on the basis that it would be a fair presentation of the facts, allowing the reader to draw his own conclusions, and that proceeds of its sale would be used for further investigation. Obviously such plans are no longer operative (if they ever were).

A pertinent fact that was omitted is that Meier builds UFO models and that they have the appearance and proportions of some of those in photos claimed to be of authentic craft, and further, that Meier has been caught in at least one attempt to destroy evidence of the existence of such models.

Also omitted were Meier's pictures of the cosmonauts, who look remarkably like Nordic fashion models photographed out of a magazine.

Why not mention the exciting accounts that Meier gives of flying, not only to other planets, but into the past where he photographed a pterodactyl, and into the future where he photographed San Francisco in the process of being destroyed by earthquake?

Why do you neglect to mention that Meier claims extraterrestrial contact going back to the age of four? And that he went public concerning his contact claims in India, in 1964 — a year after he lost his hand in an accident? Why the implication that it all started in 1975?

Your brief mention of the UFO which flew around the tree does not do that incident justice. Why did you not include some of the photos? Would it be because

(See Letter—Page Three)

Marshall County, Minnesota Sheriff's Deputy Val Johnson, 35, had an unusual experience with an unidentified light source in the early morning hours of August 27, 1979 on a lonely road outside of Stephen, Minnesota. The following is a narrative of Johnson's experience, in his own words, as offered to the press and investigators just twenty-four hours after the incident.

"I was on my way home from Stephen, Minnesota and it was about 1:15 or 1:30 when I left there," he said. "I took County Road 5 west of Stephen and when I got to its junction with 220 I looked south and I saw a bright light in the distance about 2 1/2 miles away. It was very bright and white and about four feet off the ground.

"I proceeded in that direction because I was heading home anyway. I proceeded in that direction to investigate more fully - I didn't know what it was. I proceeded south on 220 a mile and three-tenths or so and all of a sudden the light intercepted my vehicle.

"One minute it was a mile and half distant and the next minute it was right on me. It struck my vehicle. Everything got extremely, painfully bright. My eyes hurt. There was no object I could see at all. I heard the sound of breaking glass. And that's the last I remember.

"It was determined afterwards that at the point of interception my headlight debris was lying on the highway. From that point, estimating my speed at 60 mph, I coasted an absolutely straight line for 850 feet. I do not recall this.

"At that point I was doing about 48 mph and the brakes engaged, leaving black marks."

(He said he doesn't remember engaging the brakes--Ed.)

"I woke up at 2:19 a.m. leaning on the steering wheel. The engine wasn't running. I called in 10-88 - officer needs assistance - and I gave the location.

"The dispatcher asked what was wrong and I said, 'I don't know. Something just hit my car.'"

The officer in Stephen came out and called for an ambulance.

"I started going into a mild case of shock when the ambulance got there," Johnson said. "I was bouncing up and down and shivering. My eyes hurt extremely bad. The ambulance took me to the Warren Hospital and X-rayed me to see if there was damage. I said my eyes hurt real bad. The doctor put salve in my eyes, put adhesive bandages over them and discharged me."

"About 5 a.m. I made a statement on tape at the
(See Patrol Car—Page Two)

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN
 Copyright © 1980 by the
 AERIAL PHENOMENA
 RESEARCH ORGANIZATION, INC.
 3910 E. Kleindale Road
 Tucson, Arizona 85712
 Phone: 602-793-1825 and 602-326-0059
 Coral E. Lorenzen, Editor
 Norman Duke, Richard Beal,
 Brian James, Lance P. Johnson,
 Robert Gonzales, Artists

A.P.R.O. STAFF

International Director.....L.J. Lorenzen
 Director of Research.....James A. Harder, Ph.D.
 Public Relations.....Hal Starr
 Secretary-Treasurer.....Coral E. Lorenzen
 Membership Secretary.....Madeleine H. Cooper
 Staff Librarian.....Allen Benz
 Office Manager.....Christine Panter

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN is the official copyrighted publication of the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc., (A.P.R.O.), 3910 E. Kleindale Rd., Tucson, Arizona 85712, and is issued every month to members and subscribers. The Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc., a non-profit corporation established under the laws of the State of Arizona and a federally recognized scientific and educational tax-exempt organization, is dedicated to the eventual solution of the phenomenon of unidentified flying objects. Inquiries pertaining to membership and subscription may be made to the above address.

A.P.R.O. MEMBERSHIP including BULLETIN:

United States.....\$12.00/yr.
 Canada & Mexico.....\$13.00/yr.
 (Canadian Currency will be accepted)
 All other countries.....\$15.00/yr.
 SUBSCRIPTION to BULLETIN only: SAME AS ABOVE

Newswires, newspapers, radio and television stations may quote up to 250 words from this publication, provided that the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc. (or A.P.R.O.), Tucson, Arizona, is given as the source. Written permission of the Editor must be obtained for quotes in excess of 250 words.

Patrol Car

(Continued from Page One)

sheriff's office. I was taken home and deposited in bed, got some sleep, and about 11 in the morning Sheriff Brekke picked me up and we went to the ophthalmologist. He took the bandages off and said I had irritation to the inner eye, which could be caused by seeing a bright light after dark. Basically, that's it."

Johnson said he did not have time to be afraid before he lost consciousness in his car. And when he woke up again, he said, he felt as if he were moving in slow motion.

"My first thought was concern for the car because it belongs to the county," he said. "I thought, I wonder if I'm in trouble for banging up a car."

When asked now what he thinks that light was, Johnson says, "I have no idea, absolutely no idea whatsoever."

"I have nothing to base an alien explanation on. It's an unidentified object, and who knows what level of technology our government or another government might have? We're close to the Grand Forks Air Force base. Perhaps they're testing something there."

But if it was an alien vessel, Johnson does not think he was being attacked by it.

"I feel I was neutralized," he said. "They didn't

mean me any harm. I could have rolled in the ditch but I went straight for 800 feet. If it was alien, I stumbled across something I probably wasn't supposed to see. That's as good an explanation as I've been able to come up with."

The incident has not made Johnson a believer in creatures from other worlds, but "anything is possible. I had an open mind prior to the occurrence and I still do. I read a couple books about the (UFOs) but I've read a couple of books on any number of subjects. I wasn't any more interested in that than anything else."

"I know it happened to me and the majority of the people in this area are understanding and supportive," he said. "They say, 'We believe you. We see the evidence. We have the doctor's reports. We have no reason to disbelieve you.'"

But what if they did not believe?

"I still know in my own mind what I saw and experienced," Johnson said. "That will never change."

The damage to the patrol car was not extensive but is nevertheless most impressive. One headlight was broken, the windshield was smashed, as was a red light on top of the car. A small round dent was found in the car's hood and two spring-mounted antennas which protruded above the top of the car were bent over at nearly 90 degree angles. The damage indicates the "attack" came from the front and that whatever the object was, it definitely made physical contact with the front of the car, causing the damage to the front and top of the vehicle.

The Scandia Reports

(Continued from the July Issue)

The object next flew over Kuno's Store situated at the intersection of County Rd. #15 and 192nd Street North (Manning Road) on the west side of Big Marine Lake. Here it again was sighted by Dan M. and as yet his sighting is unconfirmed. At this point, it is my belief that this object's flight path is no longer traceable and at this time a different style of craft appears 6 miles to the SE of Big Marine Lake, i.e. over Square Lake.

John and Nancy K. are our witnesses, the time is 21:20 to 21:30 hours, the location: County Road #7 on the south side of Square Lake. They were heading east when the object(s) were seen coming over the lake from the NE - dipping a bit over the lake, then leaving to the SW. Nancy describes the sound as a fine, low tone humming (fan type) noise. John and Nancy's description differ somewhat. John says there were 5 groups of 2 lights - one red and one orange. Nancy maintains 5 groups of 3 lights in a repeat pattern of white - white - yellow. The flight pattern was in a half chevron as depicted in Figure 5(c). She projects the
(See Scandia—Page Four)

Letter

(Continued from Page One)

the photos show the disc penetrating the tree limbs to the point that the rim apparently touches the trunk? A skeptical view might assume that we have here a small model tethered by the rim to the trunk of a miniature tree, and supported by the limbs, superimposed against normal landscape. And what about, as Paul Harvey might say, "the rest of the story"?

The rest of the story is that there is no sign of a tree at the position that this one appears to be. How does Meier explain this troublesome fact? Why, the tree, damaged by radiation from the space ship, just pined (sorry!) away for a couple of weeks and then disappeared without a trace over a period of three days. Meier is supported in this statement by two witnesses from among his group of disciples, one of whom now claims that he was hypnotized into giving false testimony.

There are other problems with this incident. The changing cloud background suggests that the photos were taken over a much longer period than would be required for the circumnavigation of a tree by a technically advanced vehicle. Stevens counters this objection with the statement that clouds change quickly in that area, but no supporting documentation is furnished and apparently no one bothered to check the winds aloft for the time in question.

Sincerely,
L.J. (Jim) Lorenzen
International Director

Mr. Thomas K. Welch
Genesis III Productions, Ltd.
P.O. Box 32067
Phoenix, Arizona 85064

Dear Mr. Welch, et al:

Today we received our copy of *UFO — Contact From The Pleiades, Vol. 1*. In accordance with your money back guarantee within 30 days, I am requesting a refund of \$21.95 (\$19.95 + \$2.00 postage) which we sent you for this book. (I'm requesting the postage refund because we have to pay the return postage.) I am mailing the book back to you under separate cover in the same mail as this letter, which will go out on Monday, November 5.

Mr. Welch, we have been studying the UFO phenomenon for many years, both the scientific material and the lunatic fringe material. We try to keep an open mind about everything we read because we know that just because a story is unusual does not mean it is a hoax. We do believe UFOs are spaceships from other planets in other solar systems and we think it is logical that people from many planets have been visiting earth for centuries. We also think it is logical

to assume that some humanoids will resemble mankind as we know it and some will have entirely different forms. We have read many books, many scientific newsletters from various investigative organizations, heard many speakers and been to some conferences on the subject. We feel we are fairly well versed in the subject.

Because Jim Lorenzen endorsed your book, we ordered it. But when I read it and saw the photos, I wondered how he could have been taken in by this production which seems to have all the characteristics of a hoax and a money making scheme. I will mention just a few of the reasons I feel this way and if you wish to offer any explanations, I will be glad to have them.

First of all, this book provides very few hard facts about these supposed contactee experiences. Only a few quotes are given from the supposed space traveler. There is no information about his planet, solar system, way of life, his race of people, the present state of their development (except one or two vague statements), etc. There are only philosophical comments of a pseudo-religious nature, promoting belief in reincarnation and pantheism. Whenever contactee stories espouse philosophical, religious, or occult opinions, this discredits them totally as far as I am concerned. This is the kind of thing that has given the UFO field a bad name and has earned for it the term of "cult."

Second, the book devotes several pages to ancient myths and artifacts which we all have read in other books, with photos and drawings we have all seen in other books, especially von Daniken's. You even include Devil's Tower, Wyoming from the movie, "Close Encounters of the Third Kind." Really! All these things have little if anything to do with the story you are supposedly trying to convey except for a connection you are trying to build between ancient artifacts and the Pleiades.

Third, much of what is said and some of the terms used, like "mother ship" and "scout ship" read right out of Adamski's books. He was proven beyond any doubt to be a fraud, but one does not need proof: just reading his books makes it obvious he was a fraud.

Fourth, I wonder why the term "cosmonaut" — the Soviet word — was used for the space travelers and not the American term, "astronaut." If this book is a communist production, what it is trying to accomplish is suspect. It is obvious that the writing was done by a foreign national because of some of the mis-choice of words — using a certain word which conveys the opposite meaning from what, in context of the total sentence, was trying to be expressed. Also the punctuation is very bad — quotes with commas outside and apostrophes to denote plural words, for instance. Of course, punctuation mistakes could be attributed to a bad education as well as to one not totally familiar with the English language.

The writing style itself is very unprofessional and actually juvenile and sensationalized. Much of it is

innuendo with very little substantive information. Perhaps the most factual part of the book is the explanation of the photoanalysis.

Which brings me to the photos, which cause many questions to arise in my mind. Your brochure advertises "more than a dozen color photographs. . ." I was surprised and puzzled to see several things about the photos. First, you wasted the better part of 6 pages with photos of the stars, over 2 pages of which were duplicates. Many of the photos of the UFOs were the same frame cropped differently. Why would you do this when you claim to have many hundreds of different shots of many kinds and designs of UFOs that were taken over several years of these encounters? Also, you mention that the reason the photos are fuzzy is because the contactee's camera focus was jammed at "near infinity." If he had 105 contacts over several years, why didn't he get it repaired or get a new camera? This doesn't make any sense.

Second, why did he not get any photos of the spaceships close up, inside, and why did he not get any photos of the space travelers themselves? Why have all the other alleged witnesses not taken close-up photos of the spaceships and travelers?

Which brings me to a couple of other points. If all these witnesses were involved with 105 sightings over a long period of time, how did this whole story escape the news media? Also, were there any tape recordings of conversations the contactee alleges to have taken place in his language? None are mentioned. You devote three pages to pictures of the witnesses and one column of copy about them, but you never say what they witnessed except the spaceships approaching and leaving the contact sites. How could so many people be content to just take pictures of such an amazing event without becoming involved in the actual contacts, 105 times? That doesn't make any sense.

In the final analysis, it seems to me that all the evidence you have, according to what is presented in this book, is the testimony of one person, which is a low-grade substantiation for any legitimate investigator, plus a number of photos of UFOs, the authenticity of which could be valid. Even if the photos are valid, that does not mean there was any actual contact made. The writer does allude to the "fact" that there was no way the contactee could have known some of the things he reported without information from a space traveler, but again, no explanation or details are given.

I don't know if you have been taken in by this contactee or if you are trying to perpetrate a fraud on the public. I cannot understand how any intelligent persons could believe all that is claimed about this story with so little substantiation. On the other hand, perhaps you have a lot of substantiation which does not appear in this book. To me, the biggest giveaway that this book is a fraud is the come-on on the last page regarding more "startling" information to come in Volume 2, which I assume will cost another \$19.95

or more. It is obvious that there will be a third, fourth, etc, ad infinitum, to milk the unsuspecting public as you divulge a little information (?) in each book. The whole scheme is very transparent.

I must say that this book is a real disappointment. After what was written about it in the APRO newsletter and in the mailed promotion pieces by Jim Lorenzen, we expected something extremely newsworthy and informative, both in copy and photos. This book does not say anything that has not been written elsewhere in some form and the photos are no better than many others that have been printed and shown on movie film from other sources.

Therefore, we will look for your refund check in the near future.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Edwin L. Neville

Dear Mr. Lorenzen:

I don't see that you've got much, if anything, to explain or apologize for in the case of the 'Pleiades' book.

If you changed the word "preponderance" in the sentence attributed to you to "abundance," it's as neat a statement of skepticism-cum-enthusiasm as could be made by anyone viewing the Genesis III book fairly.

After studying a copy (which I ordered at once on your assessment as published in their little folder), I ordered five more copies for friends.

Don't let them bug you!

If the book is a whole hoax, it will someday be celebrated for *that!* What pictures!

Yours Truly,

Paul Kiepe
APRO member

(Mr. Lorenzen agrees that the word *abundance* better expresses his meaning—Ed.)

Scandia

(Continued from Page Two)

grouping size at 1 - 1 1/2 ft. at her arm's length and the length of time to travel from the NE, over the lake, and recede to the SW as 3 - 4 minutes. It was flying just above the tree line.

Behind John and Nancy's car another lady is following and observing the UFO approach. She, however, has still another visual interpretation. She is Nancy W., who immediately drove home (also on the south end of Square Lake) and got her husband to catch a tail-end glimpse of the light group before it disappeared over the horizon. Nancy and John generally agreed that 16 lights, each the apparent size of a 50

cent piece, moved as a group about 10 - 20 MPH from NE to SW with no noticeable noise. Their descriptions are illustrated in Figure 6(a). The over-all pattern size was that of a basketball at arm's length and the lights - "4 times brighter than plane running lights" were steady bright red. It also appeared that adjacent lights "bobbed" up and down while flying at a constant height over the tree line. Their sighting lasted 5 minutes wherein they observed a clear atmosphere and the moon. The estimated time of this occurrence was between 21:00 and 21:30 hours.

The next set of sightings were to take place much further to the SSW in the St. Paul suburb of Oakdale and at Beaver Lake, 15 miles distant from Square Lake and about in line with the two Oakdale sightings.

Ken J., a reserve police officer with the Oakdale force, was waiting for his ride to work when he noticed 5 solid red lights coming out of the north and going approximately over Interstate Highway #694 to the south and then to the SW. The formation made a low humming noise similar to a washing machine and appeared to be going 30 - 50 MPH at an altitude of 200 feet. When Ken first saw the group 3 miles to the north, it had an apparent size of 2 inches at arm's length but while over I-694, the size grew to 5 inches at his reach. He interpreted the object's size at 80 to 200 ft. in diameter at the point of closest approach which he estimated as 1 mile. He also noted the time at 21:15 to 21:20 hours which was confirmed by his wife and daughter who also observed the lights; his wife was very frightened.

At 21:35 hours, two and a half miles due west of Ken's location, Keith L. and Jean P. watched a huge object cross the south end of Beaver Lake. It had orange and red lights on its circumference and lights that appeared to be suspended on rods beneath the bottom surface. The direction of travel was to the west and at times it would stop and "teeter", revealing the bottom lights. It passed in front of terrain and street lights which revealed the object's outline more clearly. The 2 minute sighting duration revealed that the larger side lights had a rapid pulsating or "flutter" effect to their appearance. Figure 6(b) is a sketch similar to Keith's in which he defines the apparent size as 1 1/4 inches in diameter by 3/4 inch high at his arm's reach when the object was 6 - 8 blocks distant.

Sequentially, Trudy G. and her family's sighting at 21:40 hours is next in time but is also in the same location as Ken J.'s Oakdale experience given previously. She describes 8 steady, very bright, red lights traveling in a straight line with somewhat of a "wave" motion. She and her family watched these objects travel over I-694, at about 75 - 100 feet above the ground, for 10 minutes. The formation was going north to south and turned to the SW at about the intersection of I-694 and Hwy. #12 (I-94). Trudy illustrated her impression in Figure 6(c).

The last sighting to the south end of the object's course was at Carver Lake in Woodbury Township some 4 miles to the SSW of Trudy's location. However, due to witness reluctance to be interviewed,

this last point remains an unconfirmed event in the flight path.

A complicating coincidence to the Scandia sightings involves a flight of 5 helicopters that followed a similar path as the UFO trajectory courses. These helicopters were on a vector extending from over Osceola, Wisconsin, *directly* to Holman Field in St. Paul. There is a temptation within many quarters to explain the sightings with this Army Reserve Flight and there are unconfirmed cases where a witness saw both the flight of helicopters *and* the UFO.

Figure 1 has a path traced out by the helicopters on their vector into Holman Field. I interviewed the lead pilots, Wayne Resemius and Dan Meyers and the supervisor of the Army Reserve Aviation Support Facility at Holman Field. Wayne related that he was flying the lead 'copter in a tight "V" formation at 90 knots/hour (103.6 MPH) airspeed. The craft were at a 2 rotor (80 ft.) spacing, running with their usual night lights which included one larger, steady red light. Adding Wayne's airspeed to the wind velocity, we get an approximate relative ground speed of 105 MPH. Working backwards from the landing pattern approach time of 21:20 hours would put the flight formation over Osceola (32 air miles away) at about 21:02 hours (9:02 P.M.) Also given was their altitude of 2500 ft. (above sea level) or about 1500 ft. off the ground which was approximately constant from Wisconsin.

Based on the above information, the wing of 'copters would be 1.5 miles SE of Scandia at 9:06 p.m. They would be 1.0 mile SE of Big Marine Lake at 9:08 p.m. At 9:15 p.m. the helicopters would be near the SE tip of White Bear Lake over Mahtomedi, and at 9:18 p.m. the "Jet Ranger" 'copters were 1 mile to the NW of Beaver Lake in St. Paul. At 9:20 p.m. the flight would be within sight of Holman Field; approaching from the NE. The supervisor gave me 9:30 (21:30 hours) as the touch down time of the group of helicopters. This time was given earlier to the papers as 9:35 p.m., a five minute discrepancy with my personal information.

The course of my investigation revealed a number of other sightings in the same general area of Scandia and Taylor's Falls both before and after the major sighting just discussed. Mary Beth Ostrand was traveling east on Highway 97 with two other friends when she noticed some strange lights above the St. Croix River near the intersection of Highways 95 and 97. The time was about 22:30 hours on 7 June 1978. She described the object as:

"... Very large and had bright red, blue, and blue grey lights which appeared to rotate. The lights did not blink, they seemed to become brighter and darker. There was no noise. Then we could see a shadowy mass above and below. (The lights were located on the equator of the object)...Its shape was like an Ellipse. All of a sudden it darted very quickly in a NE direction - and it was gone. (At her arm's extension, a 5 inch diameter area would cover the object)."

Other sightings near Bone Lake, Chisago Lake, and

Taylor's Falls had occurred some weeks both before and after the major sightings at Scandia. The area is generally a rolling, hilly, forested recreational area with numerous lakes, parks and campgrounds. Stillwater to the SE has a very large electrical generating facility with many high voltage transmission lines crossing the area. The highest frequency of confirmed sighting times occurred at 21:15 hours. At least six (6) separate reports, ranging from Shafer to Oakdale and along a line approximately 35 miles long, simultaneously described grossly different object shapes, lights, courses and speeds.

Therefore, one can easily conclude that a minimum of 5 or 6 units were involved in the Scandia sightings just in Minnesota, to say nothing of the Cumberland, Wisconsin UFO also seen at 21:15 hours.

If any reader has information on the 22 March 1978 sightings in Eastern Minnesota which he or she feels would further this investigation or any other sighting data, that person may forward his data or request for an interview to:

Robert E. Engberg, P.E.
P.O. Box 80143
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Any assistance which would complete the Scandia sightings would be very much appreciated and interview details and names will be held in strictest confidence if so requested.

UFOs — THE GROWING BELIEF

By P. Wayne LaPorte
APRO Field Investigator

According to a May, 1978 poll conducted by George Gallup, a clear majority of Americans now believe in UFOs. Furthermore, a comparison with two earlier Gallup Polls on UFOs discovered there is a growing belief in UFOs. In the 1966 poll, only 46% said they were believers. By 1973, this figure had risen to 54%. According to the May '78 poll, 57% of Americans now believe in the reality of UFOs.

This same comparison revealed some other interesting trends. The percentage figure for those who definitely disbelieve has fallen. In 1966, this figure was 29%. It climbed to 30% in 1973, but dropped to 27% in the '78 poll. And the percentage for those uncertain about UFO reality has also fallen. It dropped from 25% in 1966 to 16% in '73 and remained at this figure in the '78 poll.

Another significant find is the growing belief in UFOs among our youth. A comparison of the '73 and '78 polls found an increase in "believers" — from 65 to 70 percent for those under 30, and from 57 to 63 percent for those 30 to 49. In contrast, there was a decline in "believers" 50 and over — from 44 to 40

percent. However, in this age group the "skeptics" remained at a constant 38%, but the "uncertains" increased from 18 to 22 percent.

The implications of this is enormous. Unless something causes a reversal in the trend, there may be a large majority belief in UFOs by the turn of the century. For by then, most of the skeptical senior citizens will have been replaced by the believing youth of today.

Of course, this is only speculation based on the current trend. But, the latest Gallup Poll on UFOs clearly indicates that the majority of Americans believe there are strangers in our skies.

If you think you've seen one of these strangers — you're not alone. This same '78 poll also found as many as one in nine, or a projected 13 million Americans believe they've seen a UFO.

LETTERS

Reply to Vincent R. White's Book Review of "Messengers of Deception", by Jacques Vallee (Berkeley, Ca.: AND/OR Press, 1979) [*The APRO Bulletin*, Vol 27, No. 12, p. 3]

I have been a student of UFOs for 14 years. I have known, Jacques Vallee (and other reputable UFO researchers who know and respect him) for a slightly shorter period of time.

I do not find "Messengers of Deception" to be paranoid. To me it states a possibility: that some humans are simulating the UFO phenomenon for their own purpose. As I understand the author's reasoning, there is both a "real" and a "fake" UFO phenomenon. How can we tell the difference? An interesting question.

I find Vallee's research and investigations original and significant. It won't do a bit of harm to ask yourself, after reading yet another tedious, personal and Freudian abduction report, "Could this have been engineered (either physically, mentally, or a combination of both) by humans?" What about UMMO, declared a hoax by Dr. Claude Poher? A lengthy, expensive and serious hoax. Why? What about the Meier case, not yet accepted by researchers? Don't these arouse your suspicions? They do mine.

A fresh point of view should not be attacked emotionally, but kept in mind as one more clue to the murky UFO mystery.

— — — Barbara Mathey

PLEASE!
Send NEW and OLD
Zip Codes
with Address Changes

Models of UFO Evidence

R. Leo Sprinkle
University of Wyoming
Laramie, WY USA

(Presented at the British UFO Association Conference,
London, August 25 - 26, 1979.)

INTRODUCTION

The UFO experience (Hynek, 1972) continues; the UFO display (Salisbury, 1974) continues; the UFO controversy (Jacobs, 1974) continues; however, the beliefs about UFO phenomena (Vallee, 1975, 1979) are changing.

Scoffers (e.g., Klass, 1974; Menzel and Taves, 1977) sometimes take the position that there is not enough evidence to support the view that UFO phenomena are unusual events; however, I am of the opinion that there is "too much" evidence: any investigator can find evidence to support any hypothesis about the significance of UFO reports.

For example, if one wishes to find evidence of a "conspiracy" about suppressing UFO reports, then one can find evidence to support that hypothesis. The efforts of CAUS have resulted in the release of approximately 900 pages of UFO materials from CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) files and the return of approximately 200 additional documents to the "originating agencies" for clearance procedures. A lawsuit was filed in September 1977, by the Ground Saucer Watch, through the US Freedom of Information Act (CAUS, 1979, p. 1). However, I have doubts about the significance of these materials in resolving the long-standing UFO mystery.

In this paper, I hope to offer some views about the various theories or models of UFO evidence. My task is to present the range of models; then, I shall conclude with a statement on my biases or hypotheses about UFO activity.

I am somewhat diffident in describing these views; I do not wish to be viewed as offensive or flippant in my treatment of this serious problem. However, I believe that an investigator can be serious about his or her work without being grim about his or her role in UFO investigations. Thus, these comments are presented in the spirit of Don Juan's "controlled folly" (Castenada, 1971) or Greenwald's "concentrated play" (Greenwald, 1967). Those listeners who wish to hear a serious scientific paper shall forgive me, I hope, for any perceived insult to traditional science; I favor the analysis by Kuhn (1962) on "new" and "old" science, and I believe that "old" science - for the sake of science - must temporarily defer to the "new" science. And those listeners who like to hear statements about the equality of women and men shall forgive me, I hope, for any perceived insult to the dignity of specific persons. Please keep in mind that a model is a representation or a map; the map is not necessarily an

account or complete description of the territory.

I prefer a model of consciousness which shows four levels of reality: Matter, Life, Thought, and Spirit. (See sketch.) For example, a college campus may be seen as a time-space event which is composed of Buildings (Matter), which are inhabited by Students and Faculty (Life), who meet in classes and conferences (Thought), which are dedicated to the pursuit of truth (Spirit). Any model of a college, or any model of human personality, which does not contain all of these levels of consciousness is, in my opinion, an incomplete model of the "real world."

PROBLEM

The problem is to present the range of models of UFO evidence without being so inclusive that this paper becomes a boring list, and without being so exclusive that a useful model is slighted or ignored.

Thus, I shall ask for your assistance: I request that you follow my bias, temporarily at least, and consider each model as an individual structure, and as a unit within a larger system. I am asking you to pretend that you are attending a fashion show; each fashion model displays his or her garments as an individual person *and* as a member of the team of fashion models, so that many garish garments and outlandish outfits can be displayed.

PHYSICAL MODELS

In many ways, the physical models of UFO evidence are the most appealing - or seductive, if you please. First of all, the prospects of obtaining physical evidence are exciting because of the prestige of the physical sciences in modern society, and because contemporary concepts of "proof" often are based upon tangible evidence.

Thus, there are models who display, "birds," "bugs," "ice crystals," "Venus," "moon," "sun," "Venus," "temperature inversions," "sun dogs," and "Venus." (Venus is so disarming, if you'll pardon the pun, that no one should object to her being displayed more often than the others.) These models are well-received by those who are attracted to UFO evidence as "natural phenomena."

Similar models are those of manufactured objects. (For a variety of reasons, I am dissuaded from saying "man made.") Some of the displays are: "airplanes," "balloons," "helicopters," "hubcaps," "missiles," "satellites," "search lights," and "secret devices." These models appeal to those investigators who are assured that human technology and ingenuity are paramount. The display of evidence is familiar and conventional.

BIOLOGICAL MODELS

The biological models of UFO evidence are limited in appeal. Few investigators are willing to consider UFOs as living creatures or "space critters." The model of "space critter" is distasteful or unappetizing to most

UFO investigators; we tend to view space critters as we view fashion models: interesting to look at, but we wouldn't want to feed them - especially if we were the feedees!

The biological model has appeal in connection with the physical model: if UFOs are space craft, the craft may be piloted or controlled by biological beings. Biological beings may be interested in Earth people for purposes of eating and/or the purposes of breeding. However, the variety and number of "close encounters" are factors which lead most investigators to favor other models.

PSYCHO-SOCIAL MODELS

The psycho-social models of UFO evidence are very appealing to most UFO investigators, because they are so adaptable and flexible. These models can display almost every scrap of evidence, and they also can display "no evidence." The evidence for "delusion," "dream," "fantasy," "hallucination," "hysteria," "hoax," "illusion," "lie," "neurosis," and "psychosis" may be sparse; however, the unsophisticated investigator may prefer to use these models to explain individual UFO experiences. A related model to explain multiple UFO observations: "collusion," "conspiracy," "conditioning," "collective craziness," "hysterical contagion," or "mass hysteria."

Recently, the parapsychological model, or psychic phenomena model, has become more popular. The UFO display can be interpreted as "doppelgangers," "out of the body experiences," "poltergeists," "projection of individual psyche," "projection of collective unconsciousness," and "telepathic communication with other persons." Nowadays, these hypotheses are almost respectable! These models have one definite advantage: they keep the UFO display "in the family." In other words, the UFO display is viewed as a manifestation of our own human subconscious urges; now, the only task is to conquer and subdue these silly urges!

Related models which display UFO evidence are those which carry the labels of "Bankers," "Capitalists," "College Students," "CIA Agents," "Communists," "Cultists," "Hippies," "Jews," "Nazis," and "US Air Force." These models are the human programmers who go around in silent helicopters, mutilating animals, abducting hysterical men and women, and subjecting the public to silly and bizarre emotional experiences. Ostensibly, the purpose of these UFO displays would be to frighten people, who choose "one world" rather than the prospects of being invaded by the "Martians."

SPIRITUAL MODELS

The spiritual models of UFO evidence are not appealing to the traditional scientific investigator. A few hundred years ago, the path of Rational Knowledge was directed away from the stultifying beliefs of Church Dogma; now, the high priests of Science do not appreciate being told by "uneducated" persons

that the concepts of experimental design are ritualized and dogmatic. The evidence for "angels," "demons," "devils," "etheric beings," "goblins," "ghosts," "fairies," "leprechauns," and "spirits," is usually unexamined by contemporary persons of science. However, experienced UFO investigators are aware that UFO experiences include bizarre events which can be interpreted as para-physical, para-biological, para-psychological, and para-spiritual. Of course, some UFO investigators prefer to dismiss any "spiritual" hypothesis for UFO activity; however, if one accepts evidence for physical models, or biological models, or psycho-social models, then one already has opened the door for other models to join the parade.

COMBINATIONS OF MODELS

Of course, there are combinations of all of these models. The "human programmer" model can account for many aspects of the UFO display. However, the model has certain limitations in explaining the variety of UFO contacts. For instance, this model would not provide a satisfactory answer to the following question: which society has an army of Hollywood technicians, who are trained in anthropology and mythology, who are able to fly around the world every night in silent helicopters, and who conduct an intensive program of conditioning ordinary citizens into believing that Earth is being contacted by alien beings from outer space?

This model would have to account for some very unusual experiences. For example, I recently talked with two persons who had traveled to Laramie, Wyoming, to talk with a rancher who has experienced cattle mutilations on his ranch, and who has observed many unusual aerial phenomena. These two persons watched the night sky for several nights; as they were planning to leave the area, they mentally requested a "sign" or a display. The persons claimed that the following events occurred: their attention was drawn to three "stars" or "lights," which were arranged in a triangular pattern; then a "light"¹ moved across the sky toward the three "lights" until it was in line with two of the other lights; then it stopped;² suddenly, the "light" at the top of the "triangle"³ accelerated and moved out of view!⁴ When I discussed the event with these two persons, I asked them about the personal significance of the display; they had no immediate reply, except to describe their excitement and puzzlement about the unexplained aerial display. As I questioned them further about any personal significance of the event, they both gasped as they recalled their initial meeting in a room where a wall decoration showed three UFOs in the same triangle configuration and in the same relative position.

*TO BE CONCLUDED
IN THE NEXT ISSUE*