

Minnesota MUFON Journal

Issue #77 May/June 1999

MINNESOTA MUFON IS NOW MEETING IN A NEW LOCATION!

Starting with the May 8, 1999 meeting, we will meet at the new location since the Science Museum computer center is changing its location. We will be meeting at the Roseville Community Center in the Parks and Rec. bldg. Parking is free and NOT in a ramp. This location will have easy access (NO cards, elevators, or special security issues). You can go outside to smoke or come and go anytime without having to bother anyone or wait till a certain time. This is our new and improved permanent location.

The location is convenient:

The address is 2800 Arona Street.

Take 35W to County Rd C2 exit. Head east on C2 past Snelling 1 1/2 blks on the right (south) side of C2 and Arona. The Centennial Methodist Church (big) is on the corner of C2 and Snelling. The Parks & Rec. bldg. is behind the church and its parking lot butts up against the church parking lot. If you are coming from Hwy 36, exit on Snelling and go north to County C2. Take a right 1 1/2 blks to Arona (its on the right (south) side of C2.

(See map on other side.)

The phone number is 651-415-2100 if you need to call for more specific directions.

We will have to pay \$8/hour rent for the room for the 1:30-5:00 p.m. meeting. This works out to \$1 per person, which we will have to charge at the door to pay for it (not part of speaker fund). Cheap, I'd say. The room will be larger and still have access to VCR, TV, and coffee.

There are all kinds of restaurants around -- Stuart Anderson's, Fuddrucker's, Mongolian Barbecue, Olive Garden, Joe's Crab Shack, Don Pablo's, Lido, etc. Byerly's is close, as of course, is Rosedale.

Minnesota Mufon Meetings

Sat., May 8th
&
Sat., June 12th

1:30-5:00pm

Roseville Community Center
2800 Arona Street
Roseville, MN
651-415-2100

Behind Centennial Methodist
Church on the corner of C2
and Arona.

PARK FREE!

The building is designated as
non-smoking.

See map on back cover

Note: This building has no special security or elevators, so you can come and go as you please and smoke outdoors, providing more freedom than the old location.

From the State Director:

In this issue we will conclude our series on the early days of UFOs as viewed by Donald Keyhoe. With his military background he was able to gain access to many events involving the military, such as a situation at Minot, North Dakota on March 5, 1967. A radar station was tracking an object moving toward a Minuteman grid. Air Force Strike Teams in armed trucks took chase and pointed their guns at it when it had descended to an altitude of 500 feet. Keyhoe claimed that they were under orders to capture it undamaged if it should land. Fighter pilots were aboard their aircraft in case an attack was ordered. After circling the launch control facility the object took off up and out of sight. Keyhoe seemed to be concerned with the idea that the Air Force was covering up the subject while supposedly trying to figure out how to prepare Americans for the news later. His choice of sightings included a few in which hostility was indicated.

One of these situations occurred at Fort Itaipu in Brazil on November 4, 1957. At 2:00 AM a UFO appeared over the Fort and emitted a kind of heat that caused one sentry to collapse, while the other tried to hide under a cannon to escape the heat. Another hostile encounter occurred at Beallsville, Ohio on March 14, 1968. A nine-year-old boy, Gregory Wells, was walking the short distance from his grandmother's home to his own. Suddenly, both his mother and grandmother heard him screaming. They ran out of their houses and saw Gregory rolling on the ground with his jacket on fire. The UFO had already been reported to the police as a low-flying slow-moving cylinder and the two women had not noticed it when they were helping Gregory. He explained that the object had hovered over nearby trees. A tube-like protrusion emerged from the bottom of the machine and rotated toward him. It then gave off a flash, or flame, and the boy's jacket instantly ignited. No ready explanation for this kind of behavior from UFOs was obvious.

Reports from airline pilots were abundant in Keyhoe's writings, such as a flight over Amarillo, which had to start diving in order to avoid what seemed like an imminent collision with an object racing at it from ahead. During the maneuver, unbelted passengers were thrown against the ceiling and then fell back into the aisles and onto other passengers. One elderly woman, bleeding from a head cut, lay in a clutter of hats and parcels. The Captain radioed Amarillo airport, declared an emergency landing, and asked for ambulances and doctors.

Sometimes a well-known citizen would be involved in a UFO sighting and could be quite vocal about it. Such was the case with Henry Ford II on April 16, 1968. He and some executives were on a company jet at 35,000 feet over Austin, Texas when the pilots sighted a huge object overhead and moving with them. They guessed its size at 600 feet in diameter, which would be the length of two football fields. Ford asked the pilot to radio the Air Force so that they could send up an interceptor, but the pilot feared ridicule and begged off the request.

On September 24, 1959, FAA personnel, who rushed a report to the Air Force, saw a large disc over Redmond, Oregon. A decision was made to try to capture the UFO. For a while the object was motionless after quickly diving out of the sky to a low altitude of 200 feet. It then climbed up past the Redmond Airport and stopped again. Jets were sent from Portland. Odd tongues of red, yellow, and green flames were seen extending and retracting from the rim of the craft, but when the jets arrived and dived at it, the tongues disappeared. A fiery exhaust was seen coming from the bottom of the disc before it shot up at a terrific acceleration almost in the path of the jets. One pilot had to bank in order to avoid a collision. An intelligence officer, Major Jeremiah Boggs, told Keyhoe those members of his squadron had been told to ram a UFO if they could first bail out without getting hurt. The Air Defense Command was determined to capture one.

There has always been speculation about UFO propulsion systems. None other than Dr. Hermann Oberth, co-designer of the V-2 rocket, explained to Keyhoe how a gravity system on a spacecraft might work. One consequence of gravity propulsion was that entities and objects within the craft would all be acted upon equally and would essentially feel nothing as the changing gravity accelerated the vehicle and made sharp turns. In 1965 there were 46 gravity projects confirmed to Keyhoe by the Scientific Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution. Most of these were controlled by the Air Force.

As was the case in earlier books, Keyhoe wrote about airplane disappearances that were connected with UFO events. In July of 1953 a Transoceanic Airlines DC-6 left Honolulu for Oakland at 7 AM. At 8:30 the captain radioed those conditions were normal. When the next scheduled report failed to come in, an emergency search was put into effect during which time some fast-moving objects with green lights were seen by pilots and ship crews. After several hours, the crew of the SS Bartlett picked up 25 bodies. From their condition it was clear that they had all died instantly. The plane was either torn apart in the air or from a violent impact into the ocean. Since there was no mayday call, the former was implied.

On the evening of September 29, 1959, a Braniff Airlines Electra was en route from Houston to New York. When over Buffalo, Texas, witnesses on the ground saw a fiery glow in the sky and then heard a violent explosion. Thousands of fragments fell from the sky. Braniff's chief of operations said he had never seen a plane so thoroughly demolished and the people so horribly mangled. The events occurred in reverse, however. At 15,000 feet it would take 15-20 seconds for the sound to reach earth. So, the plane exploded first and people looked up to see the blast. Several witnesses had seen a bright object flash across the sky, which resembled a small fireball. Keyhoe seemed

to imply that these objects were perhaps daytime versions of the green fireballs that had been seen over New Mexico a few years earlier.

Keyhoe claims the CIA took control of the Air Force investigation because of a report from Secretary of the Navy Dan Kimball. In April of 1952, Kimball was flying to Hawaii when two objects streaked toward his Navy executive plane and circled it. He had his report radioed to the Air Force. When he later asked the Air Force about it, he was told that it was against orders to discuss case analyses. Kimball was a man not easily pushed around. He ordered the Office of Naval Research to make a full investigation of all Navy and Marine reports from now on and keep it separate from the Air Force project. The Air Force knew that if Kimball bucked them that it could make headlines. He might even make his pacific encounter public. Then a movie of UFOs was taken by a Navy photographer and was being analyzed by the Navy Photo Interpretation Lab. The Air Force told him about the jurisdiction order and to send them the film. Kimball ordered the Navy people to continue the analysis and send the Air Force a copy. The film was the Tremonton, Utah 16mm movie made by Warrant Officer Delbert Newhouse. Aircraft, balloons, and birds were ruled out. Navy experts ruled that the unknown objects were under intelligent control. The details of what followed are lengthy and complex, but the end result was that the CIA took control of the Air Force investigation. For years, the CIA and Air Force together have shown an astonishing disregard for congressional authority, as we all know.

There is so much more to say about the books written by Donald Keyhoe that the only way to get the whole story is to simply read them. They might be available through interlibrary loan. If they are ever re-printed and made available to the public, I would urge all of you to get copies. As you can tell from these past few summaries in our newsletter, the UFO situation in the 1950's and 1960's was very

different from what we read today. There were no stories of abductions, although encounters with alien creatures of varying sizes and shapes were reported. The UFO was scrutinized on the basis of its own behaviors with the assumption that a crew was ultimately responsible.

In the next issue this space will discuss Project Identification, in which meter readings and actual data on UFOs were collected by a college physics professor and his students.

Richard Moss
Minnesota MUFON State Director

SCIENCE NEWS

Controversial Findings Speak of Mars Life

Scientists have unveiled more evidence of "microfossils" in Martian meteorites, rekindling the debate over the existence of bacterial life on the Red Planet.

On Thursday, a five-member team led by David McKay at the Johnson Space Center revealed new images and chemical signatures from two Martian meteorites, called "Nakhla" and "Shergotty," that the team argues contain further evidence of bacterial life on Mars. The announcement came during the Lunar and Planetary Science Conference this week in Houston.

Co-author Everett Gibson of the Johnson Space Center explained that past studies have dated water-borne deposits to ancient periods on Mars. With ALH 84001, the meteorite that started the debate in 1996, the carbonate minerals containing worm-like shapes were shown to be 3.8 billion years old -- older than any natural rock on Earth. The rocks bearing the new fossils are much younger.

"With Nakhla, the age is 1.3 billion years. With Shergotty, it's between 300 and 165 million years," Gibson says. "This is more than evidence of life on early Mars -- it suggests a

continual chain of subsurface life in groundwater throughout the planet's history. The Mars of 165 million years ago was about like Mars today."

The new evidence includes electron microscope images of clumps of balls resembling bacteria and of a gooey substance called "biofilm."

Challenging the claim are new studies of the two meteorites, also presented at the conference, suggesting that both rocks have been colonized by Earthly microbes? Although neither of these studies examined the same parts of the meteorites as the McKay team, the team's critics take them as evidence that any fossils in the rocks probably came from Earth.

"Precisely because of the contamination threat, we looked only inside of clays (and mineral grains) that someone else had already proved formed on Mars," Gibson counters. "In every case, the structures we found were bound up inside the minerals -- they were part of the deposit. That's very different from the contaminant organisms found on the surface and in the cracks."

Days before the announcement, other scientists attending the conference had already begun to challenge the team's claims.

"The advance mood is one of extreme skepticism," Martian meteorite expert Allen Treiman said on Tuesday. "I'm not convinced by what they've put in the abstract. But maybe they've got some surprises to bring out in the talk itself. I know I'd like to be convinced." McKay's team plans to present additional evidence of Martian life in the two meteorites in a paper to be submitted to a scientific journal later this year.

By Michael Ray Taylor in Houston for Discovery Online News DISCOVERY ONLINE <http://www.discovery.com/news/briefs/brief1.html?ct=36f1d84a> Copyright © 1999 Discovery Communications Inc.

Announcement

Congratulations to Robert Bletchman, MUFON Director of Public Relations, and Larry Bryant, MUFON Director of Government Affairs, for successfully securing MUFON's formal national support for the State Ballot Initiative which could put the Open Congressional Hearing demand directly to the voters in 16 states.

And congratulations to MUFON for making an historic decision at a critical time which will significantly impact the process of disclosure.

This initiative has the potential to place binding Open Congressional Hearing (for government witnesses) language on 16 state ballots in the upcoming 2000 election.

All that is required is the grass roots collection of x amount of signatures for each state.

Much more, including formal national press releases to follow soon.

From the files of NICAP...

A statement from the director of NICAP (5-14-68)


After 17 months, NICAP has broken with the University of Colorado UFO Project. We join LOOK and John G. Fuller in disclosing the facts as a public service.

At first, NICAP was dubious about an AF-financed project. After Dr. Condon pledged a fair study, we briefed scientists, trained field teams, and loaned verified reports by pilots, aerospace engineers and other capable observers. Later, news stories quoted Condon as strongly biased, rejecting all evidence. When we found that barely one half of one percent of NICAP's cases were investigated (and none by Condon himself, we stopped transmitting. Administrator Low's disturbing

proposals and the firing of Drs. Saunders and Levine led to our final break.

NICAP will submit plans to the President and Congress for a new official investigation, free of military or civilian agencies, with majority vote controls, frequent public reports and other safeguards. We welcome suggestions (confidential, if desired) from scientists and other citizens seeking a full, open evaluation. Meantime, to offset the Colorado failure, our investigations will be intensified. NICAP is the world's largest UFO fact-finding organization, with over 300 scientific and technical advisers, trained investigators and thousands of nationwide members. To help increase factual evidence, we urge that all verified sightings be reported to us. Names will be kept confidential, if requested.

Maj. Donald E. Keyhoe, USMC, Ret., Director
National Investigations Committee on Aerial
Phenomena
1536 Connecticut Avenue, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20036



Ancient Alien BioTechnology

CARL JUNG & UFO REALITY
By William McNeff (MN MUFON Assist.
State Dir.)

Many have assumed that the famous psychologist Carl Jung had only psychological explanations for UFO reports. On the contrary, even in the 1950s he began to have suspicions that there was a physical reality behind some UFO reports.

In his book "Flying Saucers: A Modern Myth.." (1958) he states (Para. 781): "...we could be satisfied with the psychological explanation and let it rest at that. Unfortunately, however, there are good reasons why the UFOs cannot be disposed of in this simple manner. So far as I know it remains an established fact, supported by numerous observations, that UFOs have not only been seen visually but have also been picked up on the radar screen and have left traces on the photographic plate. I base myself here not only on the comprehensive reports by Ruppelt and Keyhoe, which leave no room for doubt in this regard, but also on the fact that the astrophysicist, Professor Menzel, has not succeeded, despite all his efforts, in offering a satisfying scientific explanation of even one authentic UFO report. It boils down to nothing less than this: that either psychic projections throw back a radar echo, or else the appearance of real objects affords an opportunity for mythological projections."

Ruppelt (Edward J.) was of course the head of the Air Force's UFO investigative body known as Project Blue Book, and had access to reports made to and within the Air Force. Keyhoe (Donald E.) was a retired Marine Corp Major who carried out his own investigations and received help from individuals he knew in the military. Both of them unquestionably knew what they were talking about and documented it in books. Menzel (Donald V.), an excellent scientist and engineer, wrote a couple of books purporting to debunk UFOs, but his explanations were termed unscientific by no one less than the Air Force's chief scientific consultant on UFOs, the late Dr. J.

Allen Hynek. Many, including myself, suspect that Menzel was asked by the government to do a "hatchet job" on UFOs, and he complied. Hynek pointed out that whenever Menzel could not explain the facts, he changed them in his recounting of UFO cases. This fairly shouts "put up job".

Jung really did his homework on UFOs. He continues (Para.785): "The only thing we know with tolerable certainty about UFOs is that they possess a surface which can be seen by the eye and at the same time throws back a radar echo. Everything else is so uncertain that it must remain for the time being an unproven conjecture...We do not know, either, whether they are manned machines or a species of living creature...It is not likely that they are meteoric phenomena, since their behavior does not give the impression of a process that could be interpreted in [natural] terms. Their movements indicate volition and psychic relatedness, e.g., evasion and flight, perhaps even aggression and defense. Their progression in space is not in a straight line and of constant velocity like a meteor, but erratic like the flight of an insect and of varying velocity, from zero to several thousand miles per hour... (Para. 787) If these things are real - and by all human standards it hardly seems possible to doubt

this any longer - then we are left with only two hypotheses: that of their weightlessness on the one hand and of their psychic nature on the other. This is a question that I for one cannot decide...The discussion of [their psychic nature], as I have tried to show, leads to psychological problems which involve just as fantastic possibilities or impossibilities as the approach from the physical side."

Jung then goes back to the questions raised by the silent hovering and sudden accelerations displayed by UFOs. "The question of anti-gravity is one which I must leave to the physicists, who alone can inform us what chances of success such an hypothesis has." Today in 1999, physicists tell us that science is closing in on theoretical ways to achieve artificial

gravity. "The ... hypothesis that UFOs are something psychic that is endowed with certain physical properties seems even less probable, for where should such a thing come from? If weightlessness is a hard proposition to swallow, then the notion of a materialized psychism opens a bottomless void under our feet." I have heard that in private letters that Jung went even further in supporting the reality of UFOs. At the moment I have not found such, and I would like to see documentation of this. But it is plain that Jung leaned strongly toward the reality hypothesis from what is written above, and from other statements he made in print. Finally there is Jung's statement about the government's policy (letter to Keyhoe, 1958): "If it is true that the AAF or the Government withholds telltale facts, then one can only say that this is the most unpsychological and stupid policy one could invent. Nothing helps rumors and panics more than ignorance. It is self-evident that the public ought to be told the truth, because ultimately it will nevertheless come to the light of day." I believe Jung had realized that the government was almost certainly covering up the facts, and that his anger about this shows through here.

Carl Jung was certainly one of the keenest minds of this century. I believe he came very close to the truth about UFOs.

William McNeff

WEB SITES TO VISIT

NIDS (National Institute for Discovery Science) Animal Pathology Research (Cattle Mutilation research):

<http://www.accessnv.com/nids/page4.shtml>

NICAP on the web:

<http://www.evansville.net/~slk/nicap.html>

More on the Condon Report "Fiasco"- LOOK Magazine report of 5/14/68:

<http://www.evansville.net/~slk/fiasco.htm>

CORRECTIONS:

The last issue (#76) was incorrectly labeled Jan./Feb., 1999. It should have been the March/April, 1999 issue. (BIG OOPS!) We'll be more careful next time.

Also, in the article titled "A LOOK AT THE CONDON REPORT / LOW MEMORANDUM", the 1st couple of paragraphs should have been attributed to:

(From: Jim Giglio <jgiglio@nova.umuc.edu>) who is actually responsible for putting the Condon Report on the web. We are sorry for the accidental deletion of his name from the top of the article where it should have been.

If anyone should spot any other mistakes in any issue, please let us know so the responsible party can be horse whipped (just kidding) - so we can print corrections and apologies. We look over the journal before it goes to print, but sometimes things just get missed. Sorry.

The Editor

Field Investigator Update: May 1999 By Craig R. Lang - FI Coordinator

In the last few months, the national UFO scene has again been punctuated by many sightings of triangular UFOs. Reports and speculations about these have filled many of the e-mail forums within the UFO community. Many suggest that they may have a secret military origin. Others suggest that these are yet another "make and model" of the "garden variety" UFO. Whatever they are, the triangle mystery would appear to be no more understood than any other aspect of the UFO phenomenon. But the triangle sightings appear to be a very coherent subset worthy of study in their own right.

In another twist on the "triangle scene", the organization known as the Committee Against UFO Secrecy (CAUS) has actively been seeking triangle sighting witnesses as part of a legal campaign to force the government to release any information about this aspect of the presumed cover-up. CAUS appears to be using accounts of triangular craft as legal evidence that real, physical, anomalous craft are plying our skies, and that our government knows about them. Given this interest in triangular UFOs, the Field Investigator Update for this issue of the newsletter will focus on triangle sightings right on our doorstep.

A number of triangle sighting cases have been reported to Minnesota MUFON. MN MUFON members have investigated a substantial number of these cases, and many have turned out to be of very high quality. The following is a very brief snapshot of some documented recent triangle sighting cases in Minnesota, which were taken from our own case files:

- 1) New Brighton, MN 8 Aug, 1996 - Multiple Witness - Fishermen on southern shore of Long Lake see a large triangular object. The object moved slowly and silently, from North to South over Long Lake. The object was dark and had three lights, red, orange and white in color. As the witnesses watched, the object passed overhead and was lost to view in the tree line as it passed to the south in the direction of Minneapolis. This case was investigated by Casey Holt, and has been logged as unexplained.
- 2) Anoka County, MN 04 June, 1996 - Two witnesses in a car-traveling north on Hwy 65 observed a triangular shaped object moving in varying directions. The witnesses watched the object for several minutes as it approached their location and passed over the road a few hundred feet from their car. They described the object as being dark, with red green and white lighting (note: similar to aircraft lighting?), but appeared to have a distinctly triangular shape - not resembling an aircraft. The

object appeared to move very slowly, and at times appeared to be hovering. Craig Lang is currently investigating this case.

- 3) Northfield, MN 23 March, 1997 - Multiple Witness sighting in which motorists on southbound Hwy 3 observed two approximately house-sized [My own words, CL] triangular shaped objects. The witnesses pulled to the side of the road and watched for several minutes. They eventually lost sight of the objects when their view of them was obscured by the tree line. This case was investigated by Joel Henry and is presently listed as unexplained.
- 4) Cloquet, MN 09 Dec, 1997 ~7:30 AM CST - The witness was on her way to work when she observed a large black triangular (V shaped) object passing to the south of Cloquet - moving from east to west. The back end of the triangle, or V, opened to E. She described the object as Huge, filling the windshield. There was sound. She observed that there were squarish shaped lights on the on legs of triangle. She also indicated that, rather than the moving into and out of her field of vision, the object appeared into, "wink" into [CL Note: my own words] and moments later, disappear from, field of vision. There did not appear to be an exiting motion. This case is currently being investigated by Investigated by Steven Hero, of Duluth, MN.
- 5) 15 Aug, 1998 11:30PM CDT - Two brothers' report sighting a triangular object between Hutchinson and Dassel. Due to extenuating circumstances, this case has not been investigated, but the report appears to be of high quality.

The above are a smattering of the triangular object sightings which have been described in our locale in the last few years. These were found just by an evening's perusal through my own files. Other investigators, databases, and diaries undoubtedly contain a wealth of

information yet to be tapped. If you know of any information that might be able to shed additional light on these or any other sightings, please contact Craig Lang (ph: 612-560-1532, e-mail: crlang@mm.com, or contact MN MUFON through our webpage at: <http://www.visi.com/~jhenry/index.html>).

For those wishing to become a field investigator themselves, classes are conducted approximately three times a year, as sufficient interest is indicated. If you are interested, and feel that you have the necessary time, energy, and objectivity to be a UFO investigator, please contact Craig Lang. If you have not already done so, you also will need to join MUFON as a field investigator trainee and purchase the MUFON field investigator manual.

We always need more investigators in our effort to better understand the UFO and CE4 phenomenon. For those who seriously take up the study of UFO events, challenge and mystery will never be in short supply.

Happy investigating...

PROPAGANDA DETECTION TECHNIQUES

101

Version 1.75

1. BEWARE of information coming from a source that tells and re-tells the same story on a semi-daily basis without any flexibility as to the true nature of their experience when others raise questions and offer other possibilities.

The old broken-record diatribe.

2. BEWARE of information coming from a source that ignores posts that competently refutes their claims with facts.

3. BEWARE of information coming from a source that displays a mindset that their story is not subject to any other interpretation than

the one they offer regardless of compelling logic and reasoning to the contrary.

4. BEWARE of information coming from a source that ignores questions that it would rather not answer because the answer will contradict the story that they are putting out.

5. BEWARE of information coming from "list lurkers" that defend the propagandists and suggest moderation or sanctions against those who have opposed the propagandist. It is most likely the very same propagandist using an alias for the purpose of creating the appearance of support from innocent anonymous persons while not directly suggesting the moderation and sanctions themselves making them appear innocent.

6. BEWARE of information coming from "list lurkers" who support or corroborate the propagandists tales using the exact same writing styles, catch phrases, punctuation, sentence construction, etc. It is probably another alias of the original propagandist who uses the alias to make it appear that their views are widely experienced and accepted as valid. They use this technique to increase the credibility of their stories through apparently independent corroboration.

7. BEWARE of information coming from a source that seems to spend an inordinate amount of time on many different UFO newsgroup lists using more than one ISP, and using many different aliases to put out their story. This is probably indicative of a full-time job.

8. BEWARE of information coming from a source that uses ridicule or scorn as a response in a discussion instead of logic and reasoning. When one can't compete in a legitimate discussion and they resort to ridicule and scorn rather than acknowledge their argument is untenable then you are dealing with a propagandist.

9. BEWARE of information coming from a source that follows certain prominent

researchers from list to list and harasses them without any substance in their messages other than ridicule.

10. BEWARE of information coming from a source that considers a well-thought-out-and-well-written rebuttal of their UFO dogma a personal attack. Further, BEWARE of this source when they label this rebuttal or different point-of-view a personal attack and then call for moderation and sanctions against the fictional "personal attack." BEWARE of this source further when they use this falsely labeled accusation as an excuse to launch their own personal attack veiled as a defensive response. Phew!!! The Mental Martial Arts of Counter-Intelligence!!!!

11. BEWARE of information coming from a source that does not provide detailed personal information about themselves in their signature info and signs off with a single name or alias. Anyone wishing to establish true credibility will provide verifiable information about themselves to prove "a priori" that they are not hiding behind false identities, playing games, or seeking to mislead based on the fact that they are willing to be visible and upfront about their identity. This is not to say that the majority of those who do not fully disclose their identity or uses incomplete personal information such as a single name or alias intends to be misleading or play games... Most, no doubt, do not have bad intentions... BUT if one doesn't disclose verifiable personal information then it will always cast some doubt on the sincerity of the source. BEWARE...

12. BEWARE of information coming from a source who's writing style does not appear to be consistent with one personality over time conveying the possibility that you are reading the collective writings of a team of people rather than an individual. Or a person with a multiple personality disorder. Also, messages that appear to be out of character of the claimed identity of the poster. For example, a female appears to actually be a male when reading what they have written. This is an advanced detection technique that can only be

invoked over time in prolonged exposure to the poster and, although it is valid as a guideline, it is a nebulous tool at best. All personalities have some inconsistencies and sorting them out is difficult from just the posted ranting on the Internet list group. Professional behaviorists can use this guideline more effectively than the laymen can. There has been some evidence to suggest that military-Intel operatives sometimes chose the identity of a woman because they are less likely to be argued with by men and people in general do not associate a "housewife" or woman in general with the propaganda purveyors. In a further schism, there seems to be a higher than normal incidence of transvestitism in these mil-Intel agents due in part to their cover but also in reality of their personal development as seen in the most prominent case of J. Edgar Hoover. When encountering this quirk of personality be advised that there is a possibility of involvement by a male mil-Intel agent with a closet full of dresses... (thanks to Rich Boylan for this guideline suggestion)

13. BEWARE of information coming from a source that projects guilt feelings to distract from the discussion at hand. Injecting emotions into an argument that cannot be supported by either logic or evidence is a red flag. (Thanks to KD'C for that guideline suggestion)

Steve Lazarus
ln2wshnMan@aol.com

Minnesota MUFON

State Dir.: Richard Moss (320) 732-3205
Assist. State Dir.: Bill McNeff (952) 890-1390
Field Invest. Coord.: Craig Lang (763) 560-1532
Journal Editor: Joel Henry, PO Box 240631
Apple Valley, MN 55124
(952) 431-2426 E-Mail: mmj@mnmufon.org

MN MUFON WEB PAGE

<http://www.mnmufon.org> - Joel Henry, Webmaster

MUFONET: 7.237mhz Sat. at 7:00am CST,
Bob Shultz, Net Control

National MUFON Hotline

To report UFO news, sightings, etc. call 1-800-836-2166

Go to: www.mnmufon.org/mmj.htm for back issues of the Minnesota MUFON Journal.

Your news or editorial contributions to this journal are welcomed and appreciated. Please direct your articles or inquiries to the Editor.

NOTE: Copyrights for the articles in this issue are property of the originator(s) and/or their assignee(s). Articles are reprinted here with permission or are believed to be in the public domain. Permission to use or reprint must be obtained from the original articles' author(s).

Dr. Richard Haines NASA Scientist Request

Date: Sat, 06 Mar 1999

I have a favor to ask of you. Am embarking on a new study of certain UFO evidence which deals only with cases in which the aerial phenomenon seen was highly asymmetric, unusual, strange-appearing. I am not interested in disc, saucers, etc. But each case must contain a lot of eyewitness details about the phenomenon (for example, flight trajectory, speed(s), acceleration(s), lighting pattern(s), rays, radiation, lading, sounds, EM interference, and such. A second requirement is that the eyewitness must have made one or more drawings of the phenomenon that are also available. Artistic ability is not important, but labeled details on and around the object/phenomenon are valuable.

Mail material to:

Dr. Richard F. Haines
325 Langton Avenue
Los Altos, CA 94022
Dhaines@mail.arc.nasa.gov

Note: Anyone interested in participating in Dr. Haines study can also obtain forms from Minnesota MUFON investigators.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.