

MUFON Minnesota Journal

Issue #177 Jan./Feb. 2016

The CE4 Corner

January/February, 2016 -- A mystery within a mystery

©2015 by Craig R. Lang, MS CHt

www.explorewithhypnosis.com

In the last few weeks, an interesting mystery within an interesting mystery has increasingly come to our attention - why do different witnesses to the same event see the same thing but have wildly different perceptions?

In the December 2015 Minnesota MUFON meeting, we had an extensive discussion of the Rendlesham forest/Bentwaters/Woodbridge encounter in the UK, at Christmastime in 1980. In this case the military base was visited by a series of UFO encounters in which one or more UFOs landed in the woods a few miles from the east gate of the base. During the event, several of the airmen observed the UFO at very close range, at one point touching the object and at another point apparently taken inside of the object. Subsequently, the airmen described very different impressions of the object, and of their interactions with it.

Similarly, in our own case files, we have many cases in which the UFO seems to be in a place and time in which it could not possibly remain unseen, such as hovering over a busy freeway, over downtown, etc. Yet apparently few if any additional people notice it. Those who do often describe it very differently from each other.

Subsequent to the meeting, I received a question by e-mail asking how, in the Rendlesham Forest case (or any other close encounter experience), different people seem to perceive/experience very different things as part of the same event. I wish I knew the answer. I think we can only speculate on the reason perceptions (triggers, mechanisms, etc.) seem to vary between witnesses. But we've noted this repeatedly in high-strangeness UFO cases. I suspect an answer to this mystery would cut to the core of the close encounter phenomenon.

Different witnesses seem to have widely varying descriptions of the event, the UFO, and any entities that may have been present. In a lot of events of the fourth kind, there appears to be an interaction between the phenomenon and the consciousness of the experiencer. Perhaps this is some kind of metaphysical or parapsychological effect, a transformation of the experiencer's reality.

Alternatively, it could simply be selective human perception. In several classic case studies witnesses observing a crime (or some other event) have later given widely varying descriptions of what happened. Seeing a robber running from the bank, witnesses might have very different descriptions of what the robber was wearing, what his/her actions were, etc. Similarly, witnesses in multiple-witness UFO sightings tend to have widely varying perceptions, even though they all saw the same thing. Perhaps it just boils down to human interpretation of whatever

events they have witnessed.



Minnesota Mufon Meetings

**Sat., Jan. 9th & Sat., Feb. 13th
2pm - 5pm**

**New Brighton Family
Service Center
Room 224
400 - 10th St. NW
(located 1/4-mile S.W.
of Hwy 694 and 35W.)**

**PARK FREE! The building is
designated as non-smoking.**

See map on back cover
**(Note: The building has no
special security, so you can
come and go as you please
and smoke outdoors. There
is also an elevator.)**

In this Issue:

- *CE4 Corner - Page 1*
- *Will Clinton Reveal Truth?-Pg 2*
- *Estimate of Situation 2016-Pg 3*
- *Magnetic Wormhole - Page 4*
- *Kecksburg Hypothesis - Page 5*
- *Can we take Disclosure? - Page 8*
- *South of the Border - Page 10*
- *MN UFO Report - Page 11*
- *MNMUFON Info - Page 13*
- *Meeting Map - Page 14*

Another example that often amazes me. Every so often, I see a movie or television show that I had seen many years before, perhaps as a kid. When I see it again, the show looks very different from what I remember from so many years before. It almost seems like a different show, yet I know it is the in fact same one. To me, this just goes to show the plasticity in our memory and perception.

In the case of the Bentwaters encounter(s), it may be that the experiencers had different connections with the phenomenon. In the first event, one was knocked to the ground and may have been taken inside the object, while the other was outside looking closely at the glyphs on the exterior of the craft. If I recall correctly, Jim Penniston remembered the object as being black, triangular, with lettering/glyphs on the side. John Burroughs described the object as a large ball or mass of light, a very different description. In the second encounter, Penniston and another security crewman ran toward the object. Penniston disappeared into the light while the other airman apparently went to the ground - tripping or diving over a log on the forest floor. Again, the two men seemed to have very different descriptions of the object.

Since we don't understand the nature the CE4/AN4 phenomenon, it is nearly impossible to say what the actual triggers or mechanisms are for the difference in perceptions between one witness and another. Is this simply a matter of human selective perception, or is this the sign of a deeper phenomenon in human consciousness? To me this is one of those questions that peek into the core of the UFO/CE4 phenomenon.

Why do they look different? I wish I knew.

Hillary Clinton: I will reveal truth about UFOs if I become America's next President

By Jonathon Dillon, 3 Jan 2016

<http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/world-news/hillary-clinton-reveal-truth-ufos-7111722>

The Democratic candidate has vowed to "get to the bottom" of UFOs and what is really going on at the top secret Area 51 if she's elected.

The truth IS out there: Hillary Clinton has spoken openly about UFOs for first time.

Hillary Clinton has vowed to "get to the bottom" of UFOs if she becomes the next President of the United States. And the [Democratic presidential candidate](#) believes we may already have been visited by extraterrestrials.

Responding to a question about UFOs from a journalist while campaigning in New Hampshire, she reportedly said: "Yes, I'm going to get to the bottom of it."

Clinton, who could become America's first female president if elected in November, also said she would send a "task force" into Area 51 - a top secret base in Nevada where UFO enthusiasts believe alien technology is being back-engineered.

John Podesta, her campaign chairman, has previously called for the release of all [UFO](#) files as the "American people can handle the truth".

Last year he famously tweeted his biggest regret of 2014 was not securing the release of the UFO files before he retired.

He said: "Finally, my biggest failure of 2014: Once again not securing the #disclosure of the UFO files. #the truthisstilloutthere".

[Podesta](#) was also her husband Bill Clinton's chief of staff when he was in the White House and a top advisor to [President Barack Obama](#).

Hillary said: "He has made me personally pledge we are going to get the information out. One way or another. Maybe we could have a task force go to [Area 51](#)."

Last year Bill Clinton told US chat show host [Jimmy Kimmel](#) he wouldn't be surprised if alien life visited Earth but said he hoped it "wouldn't be like Independence Day".

He also said he had looked into Area 51 but added: "There are no aliens there."

When asked about her husband's comments, Hillary said: "I think we may have been (visited already). We don't know for sure."

In 1993, [Clinton](#), when he was president, was approached by billionaire Laurance Rockefeller to release all UFO files to the public.

The Clintons even met with the philanthropist and financier, part of the American banking dynasty, at his ranch in Wyoming in August, 1995, as part of the so-called "[Rockefeller Initiative](#)".

Retired detective constable Gary Heseltine, who has been researching UFOs for 40 years and edits [UFO Truth Magazine](#), said: "I am well aware of the Rockefeller initiative and that both the Clintons were heavily involved in it.

"It was inevitable that Hillary Clinton would be asked questions about her links to it and I am pleased that she has responded to them.

"She cannot run away from those links so she really has to embrace it in order to remain credible. It will be interesting to see how much of a political issue it will become in her presidential campaign."

AN ESTIMATE OF THE SITUATION JANUARY 2016

By William I. McNeff, MNMUFON ASD

2015 has been a remarkable year. In Minnesota MUFON we have received a close encounter account in which an alien reviewed a science fiction program, pronouncing it as "not bad"! There has been a case of healing by aliens; while not yet fully authenticated, which is probably next to impossible, the evidence is good. And there have been multiple reports of reproductive activity involving aliens.

Here on Earth, the DNA formula for a human is not grossly different from that of a mouse, for example; similar locations on the DNA chain give rise to spine, limbs, and the head. DNA scientists suspect that DNA may be by far the most frequent formula for life throughout the universe, if not the only formula, because of its exceptional stability. It is axiomatic that if, as most scientists now believe, there is life on "billions and billions" of other planets (as Carl Sagan said before his mysterious conversion to alien skepticism) then there are myriads of planets which have beings on them who are similar to humans, and in some cases, indistinguishable. Some of these beings will be able to produce offspring with humans. This could provide cures for genetic problems such as infertility for alien races. Exactly this has been illustrated by one of the close encounter cases investigated over the past year.

After over 60 years of studying the subject, including reading dozens of books and investigating and recording hundreds of first hand reports, photographs and other evidence, here is what I think is going on with UFOs: I believe that Earth is being studied scientifically and interacted with covertly by a large number of extraterrestrial races, about 80 by some accounts, or more. These races seem to be operating under what has come to be known as the "Star Trek Prime Directive", the rule under which the fictional space explorers operate in the television and film series *Star Trek*. Whenever the *Star Trek* crew visits a new planet, there is to be "No interference with the social development of said planet." The reason for this directive is that such interference could cause problems which the space explorers would then be morally responsible for fixing, and often fixing problems can be very difficult!

The contacts with ETs are generally covert rather than open. There are exceptions, like the Joe Simonton case. There are several possible good reasons for this covertness: It reduces the effects on human beings, and therefore minimizes interference with human social development. It minimizes the possibilities of human attacks on the ETs and their craft. However, there have been such attacks – see books such as one by Frank Freschino. Because these contacts have usually been covert, governments have been able to deny that contacts are taking place. But people are being "whipsawed" between government denials and growing awareness of the contacts. This has led to calls for government disclosure and/or confirmation by those who have studied UFOs.

A few thoughts about "Disclosure" are in order. Disclosure is defined as "bringing the facts about UFOs and ET aliens into public knowledge." "Confirmation" would be a statement by the U.S. and/or other governments that ET contact has taken place. About a year ago, I personally sent emails to our two Minnesota Senators and the Representative for my district. Here is the approximate text of these:

"As a constituent in xxx, Minnesota who has studied UFOs extensively and has discovered that there is massive evidence for the reality of this phenomenon, some of which is documented on a DVD set which you and your staff have received from the Paradigm Research Group, I am urging you, as a Senator/Congressman with a reputation for down-to-earth work in the Senate, to (1) review the record of the Citizen Hearing on Disclosure (2) meet with PRG's lobbyist Stephen


Bassett to discuss the CHD and (3) push for hearings immediately for the scores of military/agency/political witnesses ready to testify under oath to events and evidence confirming an extraterrestrial presence engaging the human race. Thank you for your attention to this!"

I received no meaningful replies to these emails. At this point in time, I'm not sure if I even received "form letter" replies. Depending on the attitudes of the staffers who opened those emails, they either joggled a few brain cells or were simply deleted. But they may have raised the consciousness of these staffers on the UFO/ET subject. By such drops of water, mountains are brought low. But it takes a while!

I believe what I wrote in last year's Estimate of the Situation is still true: "Of course, disclosure is taking place, slowly and surely. More and more people are becoming aware of the evidence for UFOs/ETs. Besides disclosure, we need to, some time, have government confirmation of the existence of alien craft and extraterrestrials. There are big problems for government in providing confirmation. But it **will** happen; when it will happen, only time can tell."

Magnetic Wormhole Connecting 2 Regions Of Space Created For The First Time by Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 09/03/2015

<http://www.ecnmag.com/2015/09/magnetic-wormhole-connecting-2-regions-space-created-first-time?cupid=horizontalcontent>



3-D diagram of the magnetic wormhole shows how the magnetic field lines (in red) leaves a magnet on the right pass through the wormhole. Jordi Prat-Camps and Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

"Wormholes" are cosmic tunnels that can connect two distant regions of the universe, and have been popularized by the dissemination of theoretical physics and by works of science fiction like Stargate, Star Trek or, more recently, Interstellar. Using present-day technology it would be

impossible to create a gravitational wormhole, as the field would have to be manipulated with huge amounts of gravitational energy, which no-one yet knows how to generate. In electromagnetism, however, advances in meta-materials and invisibility have allowed researchers to put forward several designs to achieve this.

Scientists in the Department of Physics at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona have designed and created in the laboratory the first experimental wormhole that can connect two regions of space magnetically. This consists of a tunnel that transfers the magnetic field from one point to the other while keeping it undetectable - invisible - all the way.

The researchers used meta-materials and meta-surfaces to build the tunnel experimentally, so that the magnetic field from a source, such as a magnet or a an electromagnet, appears at the other end of the wormhole as an isolated magnetic monopole. This result is strange enough in itself, as magnetic monopoles - magnets with only one pole, whether north or south - do not exist in nature. The overall effect is that of a magnetic field that appears to travel from one point to another through a dimension that lies outside the conventional three dimensions.

The wormhole in this experiment is a sphere made of different layers: an external layer with a ferromagnetic surface, a second inner layer, made of superconducting material, and a ferromagnetic sheet rolled into a cylinder that crosses the sphere from one end to the other. The sphere is made in such a way as to be magnetically undetectable - invisible, in magnetic field terms - from the exterior.

The magnetic wormhole is an analogy of gravitational ones, as it "changes the topology of space, as if the inner region has been magnetically erased from space", explains Àlvar Sánchez, the lead researcher.

These same researchers had already built a magnetic fibre in 2014: a device capable of transporting the magnetic field from one end to the other. This fibre was, however, detectable magnetically. The wormhole developed now, though, is a completely three-dimensional device that is undetectable by any magnetic field.

This means a step forward towards possible applications in which magnetic fields are used: in medicine for example. This technology could, for example, increase patients' comfort by distancing them from the detectors when having MRI scans in hospital, or allow MRI images of different parts of the body to be obtained simultaneously.

This study, published in *Scientific Reports*, involved the UAB Department of Physics researchers Jordi Prat, Carles Navau and Àlvar Sánchez, who is also a lecturer at ICREA Academy.

Source: http://www.eurekaalert.org/pub_releases/2015-09/uadb-mwco90315.php

UFO RESEARCH AND UFO REPORTS (Exerpt from Vicente-Juan Ballester Olmos UFO FOTOCAT BLOG)

http://fotocat.blogspot.com.es/2015_12_18_archive.html

Kecksburg's New Hypothesis Dismissed

There is a UFO-genre story about the alleged fall and military recovery of an extraterrestrial spacecraft at Kecksburg, Pennsylvania, on the evening of December 9, 1965. Lately, it has been depicted as a sort of new Roswell. Much literature, both pro and against the UFO crash has been written, and it is not my purpose to review the merits and weaknesses of every proposed alternative. To be honest, I am rather inclined to agree with the assessment by which it was nothing but a non-event, that is, a UFO crash legend prompted by the coincidence of the apparition of a big fireball. In this regard, see Tim Printy's journal: http://home.comcast.net/~tprinty/UFO/SUNlite3_6.pdf

Recently a new theory has been published on the alleged crash: it was a space object launched by the United States that decayed over the site. I thought it was worthwhile to examine it and I requested recognized expert Ted Molczan to look at this. Ted has been kind enough to submit the following report that I hope it is totally clarifying in this regard.

No, the Kecksburg UFO was not a GE Mark 2 Re-entry Vehicle

Ted Molczan

I have read the paper by John Ventre and Owen Eichler, "Has a Top 5 UFO Case Been Solved? Was

the Kecksburg UFO a GE Mark 2 Reentry Vehicle?," in which they hypothesize that the UFO sightings from Kecksburg, Pennsylvania, on 1965 Dec 09 UTC could have been caused by a re-entry vehicle launched two days earlier from Johnston Island under USAF Program 437:

<http://www.futuretheater.com/assets/pdf/kecksburg-mark.pdf>

I have concluded that this is impossible, primarily because Kecksburg is beyond the range of the missile used by Program 437.

Program 437 was an ASAT (anti-satellite) weapon, launched from Johnston Island on the Thor IRBM (intermediate range ballistic missile). If it had been of the co-orbital type, i.e. one that entered an Earth orbit to approach its orbiting target, then it might have been possible for its payload to reach Kecksburg. However, reference 1 cited by Ventre and Eichler, "Program 437: The Air Force's First Antisatellite System," by Dr. Wayne R. Austerman, describes the Program 437 ASAT as a direct ascent type:

As a direct ascent interception weapon it could not be charged with constituting a violation of either the United Nations General Assembly Resolution of 1963, nor the subsequent 1967 treaty, for its nuclear warhead would never enter orbit. (See p.40, pdf 58).

<http://forum.nasaspaceflight.com/index.php?action=dlattach;topic=17046.0;attach=133523>

A direct ascent ASAT flies directly from the ground, on a sub-orbital trajectory, to intercept its orbiting target - conceptually similar to the sport of skeet-shooting, in which a shooter on the ground attempts to hit a target moving rapidly through the air. The shortest distance from Johnston Island to Kecksburg is 8835 km, far beyond the typical 2400 to 2800 km range of the Thor IRBM.

Ventre and Eichler concluded that the Kecksburg UFO sightings were of a General Electric Mark II re-entry vehicle, launched on a variant of Program 437, called 437AP (Alternate Payload), which replaced the ASAT warhead with a satellite inspector. However, 437AP launches were sub-orbital, just like the 437 ASAT, as stated in Austerman's paper:

In April, the SPO issued a complete development plan for Program 437AP, which outlined its objectives and the methods by which they were to be achieved. Its basic aim was to demonstrate the

'feasibility of obtaining technical intelligence photos of orbiting objects using a non-orbital inspection system.' (See p.54, pdf 72).

Nevertheless, Ventre and Eichler claim that a Program 437AP launch could explain Kecksburg: *On December 7, 1965 at 19:29 Military Standard Time (MST), the 10 ADS Air Force crew launched Thor missile Number J8-2299 skyward on an interception azimuth of 153. The target was SPADATS object Number 613; an expended Atlas Agena rocket body. Interception occurred 8:18 minutes after launching following normal lift-off, booster separation, flight path assumption, and payload operation. The camera-bearing capsule registered a miss of .56 nautical miles from the programmed standoff distance of 3.2 nautical miles. All payload functions were performed normally up to separation except for film cutting and sealing operations. The failure was academic; however since the ejected film capsule was stated as never recovered and was visible at 19:45 heading for the ocean. The outcome of this mission is a prime candidate for the Kecksburg UFO!*

Ventre and Eichler appear to have relied on the mission description found on p.57 (pdf 75) of Austerman's paper, but they omitted the conclusion of the experts that the flight ended with a destructive impact into the ocean, as reported by Austerman:

Contrails and smoke were sighted by both recovery aircraft and a helicopter at 1945 MST in an area some thirty miles north of the nominal impact point. It appeared that the recovery parachute had failed to deploy properly and the subsequent water impact destroyed the capsule.

The sighting of contrails at 1945 MST, 16 minutes after launch, is consistent with the typical 2400 to 2800 km range of the Thor IRBM, based on my experience analyzing the trajectory of several Jupiter IRBM launches with the same range. The number of contrails was not stated, but at least two would have been expected in this case: one due to the re-entry of the booster; the other due to the re-entry of the payload vehicle with recovery capsule still attached. There was zero possibility of anything ever reaching Kecksburg. The only difference from a normal 437AP mission was the failure of the recovery capsule to separate, which precluded recovery. Despite these facts, Ventre and Eichler falsely concluded that the Thor IRBM had placed the re-entry vehicle in orbit. This alone is fatal to their theory, but there are other problems with it.

Ventre and Eichler speculated that the re-entry vehicle generated electrical power using an RTG (Radioisotope Thermoelectric Generator). In reality, few RTGs have been launched into LEO (low Earth orbit), and re-entry vehicles would have been an unlikely application. In his paper, "A New Look at Nuclear Power Sources and Space Debris," author Nicholas L. Johnson reported that the U.S. launched five experimental RTGs in the 1960s (none on re-entry vehicles), and explained why they fell out of favour for LEO applications:

Although the NPS [nuclear power sources] of the 1960's proved the utility of these devices for generating electrical power in space, with one exception the systems rapidly fell out of favor for Earth orbital applications at the same time that they proved indispensable for deep space missions, particularly at and beyond the orbit of Mars. Improvements in solar cell technology provided reliable and cost-effective alternatives to the relatively low power RTGs in Earth orbit, and requirements for higher-powered nuclear reactors failed to emerge. Consequently, only one more RTG was inserted into LEO (a Transit-class spacecraft in 1972), and two were inserted into geosynchronous orbits in 1976 (the LES 8 and LES 9 spacecraft).

http://articles.adsabs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/nph-article_query?bibcode=2005ESASP.587..551J

One of the most common U.S. orbital re-entry vehicles of the 1960s was that of the Corona imagery intelligence satellite. Although re-entry vehicles were only active for the typically short time between separation from their parent spacecraft and landing, they needed to retain their battery charge for long periods in storage, both on Earth and during a month-long stay in orbit. In his book, CORONA Program History, Volume IV Recovery from Orbit, author Robert L. Perry revealed how this problem was solved with a conventional battery:

GE designed and developed a squib activated battery that could stay in storage for up to three years and be activated on-orbit before the recovery sequence. This battery was used throughout the J-3 Program without a failure.

<http://www.nro.gov/foia/CAL-Records/Cabinet2/DrawerA/2%20A%200091.pdf>

A Corona recovery battery is in the collection of the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum:

This silver-zinc battery, made by General Electric, was the only power source for the Corona satellite's film return capsule. It provided power to


fire spin and despin rockets, deploy the parachute, and operate a RF tracking beacon and flashing strobe light to help in recovery of the capsule. Corona was a highly-classified joint Air Force/Central Intelligence Agency program that successfully launched over 120 photoreconnaissance satellites from 1960-1972.

http://airandspace.si.edu/collections/artifact.cfm?object=nasm_A19980278000

Another unfounded claim is that the copper heat shield would have glowed green during re-entry. Apparently, this was based on the belief that it would have burned, but that would only have been true of an ablative heat shield - the kind that gradually melt/burn away. The GE Mk II shield was of the heat-sink type, which did not burn, but instead absorbed heat. It was designed to remain below the melting point, and it had a protective outer covering.

In the following discussion on the Thor IRBM, message #17, item 4, includes the simplified schematic drawing of the re-entry vehicle shown below.

<http://www.airfieldinformationexchange.org/community/showthread.php?6138-Thor-missile-details/page2>



Thor IRBM Reentry Vehicle

Thor IRBM re-entry vehicle. It depicts the "copper alloy heat sink, below a "highly polished protective layer."

I wanted to know more about the protective cover. The December 5, 1958 issue of Flight magazine described the protective cover of the earlier GE Mk1 vehicle as having been made of steel. I believe the Mk1 was similar to the Mk2. The relevant passage is:

Thor at present uses the G.E. Mk 1 cone, which has an included angle of about 105 deg, a tip radius of about 12in, and a base diameter at the transition ring of about 60in. The forward-facing surface of the cone is believed to be manufactured from a special steel, and the heavy gauge employed is

revealed by the fact that a 4,000,000-lb press is required by Lukens Steel to form part of the structure. The external surface is ground and polished to a very high finish.

<https://www.flightglobal.com/pdfarchive/view/1958/1958-1-%20-%200860.html>

The following April 1958 ad by Lukens Steel tends to support Flight magazine's report (Flight could conceivably have based its article on it), but it does not specifically state the material of construction.

...the nose cone blanks for the Air Force's Atlas and Thor ballistic missiles are being formed by Lukens Steel Company on one of the most unusual facilities in the steel industry—a mammoth four-post hydraulic press capable of exerting a force of up to 4 million pounds. Lukens is performing this work for General Electric Company's Missile and Ordnance Systems Department, prime contractor for the ballistic nose cone.

<http://arc.aiaa.org/doi/abs/10.2514/8.7282?journalCode=jjp>

A restored GE Mk2 re-entry vehicle is on display in the history center of the Air Force Space and Missile Museum at Cape Canaveral, FL. The silvery coloured exterior of the nose cone clearly is not copper.



Image of GE Mk2 re-entry vehicle borrowed from:

<http://afspacemuseum.org/displays/HeatsinkNoseCone/>

I contacted Museum Director, Ms. Emily Perry, in hope of learning the material of construction of the protective cover. The museum had no information on the material, so I proposed a simple, informal experiment: bring a strong magnet into close proximity with the protective cover, and note whether any attraction can be felt. Ms. Perry reported that a museum volunteer conducted the experiment using a "very strong magnet," and

found that the shiny silver "dome" on top was "only slightly" attracted to the magnet; "no other areas (round ring at center or cone underneath)" were attracted. That tends to confirm that the protective cover is steel.

Given that the copper heat shield was designed not to melt (let alone vaporize), and the considerable effort made to protect it with steel, it is highly implausible that it could have burned. Had it accidentally ruptured, then the copper could have become exposed to the heat of re-entry, but Ventre and Eichler claim that the fireball was seen to manoeuvre before making a "semi controlled landing" in Kecksburg. For this to have been a GE Mk2 re-entry vehicle, its heat shield must have remained intact through the intense heat of re-entry.

In conclusion, none of the key claims of Ventre and Eichler withstand scrutiny. The Program 437AP launch in question was sub-orbital and Kecksburg was far beyond the range of the Thor IRBM. That alone is fatal for their theory. There is no reason to believe that re-entry vehicles of the day were powered by RTGs; indeed the most common type are known to have used conventional batteries. The copper heat shield was designed not to burn, and was protected from the heat of re-entry by a steel cover.

Disclosure may be Imminent. But can We Take It?

Whitley Streiber, January 4, 2016

<http://www.unknowncountry.com/journal/disclosure-may-be-imminent-can-we-take-it>

Hillary Clinton has told a questioner that she will "get to the bottom" of the UFO controversy. Her friend and adviser John Podesta said in a tweet last February that it was not only time for disclosure, but that "it's the law." In September, George H.W. Bush said that "Americans can't handle the truth." In 1988, when questioned about the matter, he commented that he was "very careful in public when dealing with classified information."

The question is always asked, "why can't we handle the truth?" If we were told that there were aliens here studying us, we could handle that. But that cannot be the whole truth, not from all that I have experienced and observed, and it might not be part of the truth in any way. Colonel Philip Corso, the

author of "The Day After Roswell" told me that he'd had a direct encounter during which he had asked the question "what's in this for us?" The answer was "a new world, if you can take it."

How Colonel Corso came by that answer I cannot say, but it certainly resonated with me. My experience of the beings I call "visitors" is that their responses are multi-layered. To me, this response would mean both if we can bear it and if we can wrest it from them. Should we ever decide to face them, then, we will need to work hard to understand what is actually on offer. We should not expect anybody to be handed blueprints for a starship, in other words, or for them to open up interstellar trade routes or whatever.

But what would be so difficult that we couldn't handle it? Comments such as Podesta's and Bush's have left the coverup in tatters. The only places where it is still supported with denial is in old media venues with long-standing connections to the intelligence community. For the most part, the media has accepted that something strange is going on, but not drawn any conclusions about what it is. Nor should they. It is not at all clear what the visitors are or what they are doing here, or if they are even "visitors" at all, or something separate from us.

One reason--I think the primary reason--that disclosure has been so long in coming is the abduction phenomenon. Ask most conventional UFO researchers about it, and they'll say as little as possible. Many won't deal with it at all, and those who do seem to come very quickly to conclusions that cannot be supported without ignoring one type of evidence or another. I've had it explained to me by conventional researchers that the abduction phenomenon mustn't be mentioned because it's "too controversial." I've even heard it said that disclosure should come in "stages," first with an acknowledgement by NASA that there may be objects in the sky being flown by unknown parties, then that they might be intelligently guided by non-humans, etc.

They must be dreaming. If any sort of unknown presence is acknowledged in any way at any official level, it will be no more than a few days before the media is demanding answers about the abduction phenomenon. Millions of people who have had the experience will be intensely energized to find out what has happened to them and their families. For,

after all, it isn't only adults who are involved, it's children, too.

I think that the hidden truth is that the abduction phenomenon is just as commonplace as it seems, that at official levels it is not well understood, and that nothing whatsoever can be done about it. I also think that the thesis of Super Natural is correct, that we are embedded in a much larger reality that we are just beginning to awaken to. It isn't that the visitors have just come here, but rather that we have just begun to notice what is actually a very ancient presence in our world and our lives. How that presence relates to reality I cannot certainly say, but I do know that it is not as we now believe, and not has we have been taught in the past.

Many things have blocked our progress in the past. Among them is official fear of admitting that the situation is going to be very disturbing to the public and that it cannot be controlled. Another is the intellectual arrogance of scientists and educated people, who cannot face the fact that an intelligence greater than theirs might be present here in some way, but hiding itself from them. A third block is that there is abundant evidence that, when the truth becomes known, it is going to overturn so much of our understanding of the world that it will literally overwhelm us with a flood tide of the new.

What is most likely to come to the forefront, and very quickly, is the issue of the soul. The idea of the soul has been more-or-less completely rejected by western science and the western intellectual community. We are assumed to be automata with no relevance outside of physical reality.

That is, quite simply, not my experience. Not at all. On the contrary, judging from the thirty years I have now spent living with and thinking about the visitors, I can say with conviction that the soul is of absolutely central importance--that, in fact, the physical world is embedded in a much larger, more ancient nonphysical reality that is far more alive--indeed, more conscious--than we physical beings are or can be. And it is this reality and the issues, requirements and needs associated with it, that are the primary driving force behind the actions of the presence that we have discovered among us.

I have tried to address this presence as honestly and directly as I could, indeed, to surrender myself to it. I didn't do this because it was pleasant. It was not pleasant. But I had been offered access to a "new world," and no matter the cost, I determined

that I would take up that offer. The cost has been high, both in terms of my life in this world and my new life that extends beyond it. Just yesterday an old friend who is entirely innocent of any of this, spent some time casually mocking me. If I wasn't indifferent to that sort of thing by now, I wouldn't be much good at fulfilling the mission I have set myself, but his innocent teasing yet again reminded me of the gulf between our vision of reality and the extraordinary truth of the world in which we actually live.

As I write this, a dog lies at my feet. I reflect on the fact that he has absolutely no idea where he is or what he is. He cannot know what a table is, a carpet, an automobile, any of that. He doesn't know the meaning of the world in which we live. Nor do we, but there is a great difference. We can know. We can know far more than we do. We can achieve, if not a complete understanding of the presence that embraces us, a much more accurate understanding of the reason for that embrace.

We run from the soul. The reason we do this is deep instinct. We don't want to face the fact that our transitory lives have permanent consequences in our own personal connection to the greater consciousness. We want to live by instinct and desire, but we must find our way to the much harder path of love and compassion if we are to do what we are capable of, which is to become craftsmen of our souls. Our lives make us light and beautiful or they do not, and it is very hard to fact the fact that small choices may have such very large consequences, especially as we have so little real self knowledge.

This may seem a digression from the issue of disclosure, but it isn't. On the first day, there will be an admission of some sort of "alien presence." The next day will bring the questions about the abductions. Then will come the third day, which will last for the rest of the time human being is expressed into the physical world. On that day we will ask who are we, why are we here, and where are we?

We will wrestle for many generations with these questions, but in a new and more useful way. The question of whether or not the soul exists will be in the past, and with it the childhood of man. We will be facing both in ourselves and in the cosmos in which we live, a truly new world--if we can take it.

This is what contact is really about, and why it has been so long in coming. Over the next weeks and months, I will be discussing this in the context of my own experiences in the "special interviews" section of this website, which runs in conjunction with Dreamland. As best I can, I have accepted the challenge of this new world. I have experienced both wonders and terrors in the first few steps I've managed to take, and I am sure that more of both will be forthcoming.

Fine. I say bring it on. I can take it--and so can you.

Meanwhile, south of the border ...

By Billy Cox, Herald-Trib, Dec. 22, 2015

<http://devoid.blogs.heraldtribune.com/15430/meanwhile-south-of-the-border>

Wonder how Argentina's air force (FAA) would respond if a UFO were on track to bust the no-fly zone over the home of its president, as [happened in the United States in 2008](#)? Or if a UFO briefly parked over one of its busiest civilian airports – like [in 2006, at Chicago O'Hare](#)-- and left behind recorded chatter between air traffic control and a freaked-out airline supervisor? What if one of Argentina's federal agencies videotaped UFO activity over a civilian airport that created a flight delay, similar to [what happened over Aguadilla, Puerto Rico](#) in 2013?

These parallels are unavoidable in the wake of the FAA's release of its first official report on UFOs since Argentina established a commission to check this stuff out in 2011. Spoiler alert: Argentina didn't have much to work with. The good news: the report is too short and sketchy to put you to sleep.

Widely distributed online last week by Scott Corrales at [Inexplicata: The Journal of Hispanic Ufology](#) and Google-translated by Alejandro Rojas at [OpenMinds](#), Argentina's Commission for the Investigation of Aerospace Phenomena (CEFAe) apparently resolved every one of the dozen cases it contemplated in 2014-15. All were individual incidents based on testimony, video and still photos, and not a single one made a compelling argument for a true unknown. None involved radar. Explanations were at least "consistent with" a star, the moon, airplane and helicopter running lights, a satellite, a tossed ball, and Jupiter. One of the UFO candidates was discovered to be "a couple of lights Red stop antenna." Oh, and some of the translations were a little rough.

Argentina's presumed glasnost toward The Great Taboo is part of a wave of South American nations – Chile, Uruguay, Peru, Ecuador, Brazil – whose governments have either established investigative bodies or made a show of transparency for private researchers. However, in a note to De Void, Inexplicata's Corrales says there's a reason Argentina's inaugural report is so thin and arid:

"The South American air forces have been clear about this – the purpose of their 'UFO' research organizations is to insure safety of the airways, not to promote a frame of reference." By that, Corrales means a hypothesis. "If anyone's expecting this government interest and/or disclosure of files will further that frame of reference ... they're in for a surprise."

Well, nobody with half a brain in an official capacity wants to get stuck with trying to prove what legitimate UFOs *are*. Still, the incidents CEFAe investigated were so pedestrian, it begs the question of how the Commission might manage more problematic encounters. CEFAe's dispensing with a dozen yawners invites comparisons to the rigorous and meticulously detailed studies performed by the [National Aviation Reporting Center on Anomalous Phenomena \(NARCAP\)](#), the nonprofit that receives zero U.S. government support. Like CEFAe, NARCAP's primary concern is air-traffic safety, which explains why Uncle Sam wants nothing to do with The Great Taboo. How would staging a we-don't-know press conference about the Aguadilla enigma work to the Pentagon's advantage? And, given its recent lurch to the right, maybe Argentina's commitment to open analyses of UFOs will go the way of Project Blue Book.

"What I wonder," Corrales wrote to De Void, "is whether the newly elected Argentinean government (Mauricio Macri) is going to be as inclined to promoting any release of military intelligence as his predecessor, who even accepted a petition from CEFORA, one of the UFO research organizations."


Well, yeah, lefties are notorious for wanting to give away the farm. But what would happen if, before that window closes, the boss hog of Argentina's military stepped up to the podium one day with a vetted Aguadilla-type UFO video and announced to the international media something like: *Folks, this bogey made a joke of our restricted air space, averaged 80 mph after it entered the water, split into two separate objects before flying away, and we have no idea WTF it is ...* Here's one prediction: The U.S. mainstream media will ignore it.

Minnesota UFO Reports 2016-01-02 Prior Lake, MN UFO Bill McNeff

On Dec. 13th, one of my friends sent me an email telling about a UFO sighting that he and his lady friend had. Since he wanted himself and his friend to remain anonymous, I'll call him "Witness A" and I'll call his friend "Witness B". On Tuesday Dec. 15, MUFON Field Investigator Dean DeHarpporte and I had lunch with Witness A. After lunch, we visited his friend's home, a condo on the west side of a marshy area called and gathered details of the sighting.

After discussing it, they believe that it happened in late October; shortly after their sighting, there was an article about recent UFO reports in the Prior Lake American, the local newspaper. Anyway, about 7:30 on the evening in question, they were sitting in the sun room of her condo in Prior Lake watching television, when a bright red-orange round object over the swampy area east of the condos attracted their attention. The object is estimated to have been about 400 ft away. "It was not quite as bright as the full harvest moon", Witness A said. This object, about five feet or six feet in diameter, emitted two similar but smaller objects, perhaps 1.5 ft in diameter, and the three flew off together and out of sight.

After gathering all the details from the two witnesses, Dean and I began investigating the physical facts of the sighting. We measured the width of the east side of the sun room. It is 11 feet wide, and also about 11 feet long. It has two double windows, making four windows each a little over two feet wide. A sketch was made showing the sun room and the location of the witnesses during the sighting:




The four windows were numbered 1 to 4 starting at the left. At the time of the sighting, Witness A was reclining on a sofa on pillows; Witness B was in a recliner chair. She said she initially saw the object through window #3. She called it to Witness A's attention.

He had to partially get up to see the object, because his view was initially blocked by a lamp shade blocking the view through the lower part of window #4. It moved up and to the left at an angle he estimated as 45 degrees. Witness B soon lost sight of the object, probably because her view was blocked by the wall between Windows 2 and 3, and possibly because it grew too small in the distance for her eyes to pick up again. She didn't see the two smaller spheres come out of the first sphere. She didn't get up from the recliner during the sighting, probably because it was over quickly. Witness A estimated he had the object in view for 14 seconds. The objects left a bit of a "trail" behind them.

I sketched the lines of sight which the witnesses had at the time that they both had the object in sight (see sketch). The condo is placed 15 degrees CW from the cardinal directions, measured on the map with a protractor. The sun room thus faces 15 degrees south of east, a bearing of 105 degrees. Constructing an approximate line of sight from Witness B to Window 3 gives an angle of approx. 20 degrees, measured with a protractor. Adding this to the condo angle of 15 degrees gives the angle of the line of sight of Witness B to the object of 35 degrees CW from due east, which is a bearing of 125 degrees, or approx. southeast. The line of sight of Witness A differs from that of Witness B by a very small amount of approx. half a degree, equivalent to about 4 ft divergence at 400 ft. The line of sight for Witness B had to be such that Witness A would have a view not obstructed by the wall to the right of Window 4. The estimated lines of sight on the sketch fulfill that requirement, confirming that they are approximately correct.

The map (File "73...map02") shows the location of the UFO as reconstructed:



Note that it is roughly in the middle of the marsh, over standing water full of thick cattails and virtually inaccessible to a human, so it is unlikely that the UFO was a device launched by human beings. Possible exceptions are a drone or a “Chinese lantern”. Neither of these is capable of “emitting” two smaller lighted spheres.

The objects were partially obscured by the trunks of trees which grow on the slope to the swamp, but Witness A did not notice these trees during the sighting. It seems that the mind can ignore such minor obscuration when something interesting happens. The tree trunks were mostly bare of branches, which helped with the view. As the object moved to the left, the wall between the two pairs of windows blocked Witness B’s view of the object, and it was apparently out of her sight when it emitted the two smaller objects. She did not regain sight of the object after it went out of her field of view; why that was so is not clear. Witness B estimated the diameter of the object as 6 ft. Further discussion established that the sighting had perhaps taken place in late October, because when the local paper the Prior Lake American had come out, it described a sighting of an object or objects by others in the area in the same time frame, but ascribed this to the lights at Mystic Lake Casino, a few miles to the west. This casino projects a pattern of a dozen spotlights which, when the sky is cloudy, generally form a circle on the clouds above the building. However, our witnesses were looking toward the southeast and the casino is due west.

After the discussion, Witness A, Dean and I went out and walked partway along the black-top path which goes along the west side of the wildlife area. We looked for disturbance in the cattails which cover most of the surface of the swamp, which includes a pool of open water about 40 ft wide near the western side in which is a sign which reads

“Blackbird Lake”. We saw coming in from the north what was probably a wildlife trail, possibly deer, etc. which may be used to get to the water, and some possibly suspicious bent-over cattails, which were probably bent by wildlife or wind. Otherwise, we saw nothing suspicious.

A check of the Prior Lake American website revealed an article titled “Close Encounters of the Eerie Kind” datelined Friday, Oct. 30, 2015, “in the spirit of Halloween” which included a ghost story, an article about a “dirt geyser” on a farm near Jordan, MN, and a story about a UFO report in Prior Lake that was caused by the Mystic Lake Casino lights. But that UFO report was for Aug. 29, 2015, and was already documented by MUFON and shortly thereafter explained by the reporting witness, saving us some work. (MUFON has several UFO cases that turned out to be the Mystic Lake lights.) Witness A and Witness B had the impression that this report had been at the same time as theirs, an easy mistake to make.

To conclude, Witness A is a personal friend whom I have known for at least 25 years. I have known Witness B for at least ten years. Both of the witnesses are in my opinion honest, intelligent, and credible people. These objects they reported could not be identified, and so must be considered “Unidentified Flying Objects”. Since they were apparently under intelligent control, they could also be termed “Unidentified Aerial Vehicles”. Many similar reports of glowing reddish or orange spheres are in MUFON’s files, and have been called “Red Balls of Light” (RBOL) or “Orange Balls of Light” (OBOL) or “Orbs”, although the latter term is not as descriptive and has been used to describe other spherical UFOs.

For up to date information on MUFON Minnesota meetings and agendas, including special speakers, visit: <http://www.mnmufon.org/agenda.htm> or <http://www.mnmufon.org/event.htm>

MUFON Minnesota

State Director: Craig Lang (763) 560-1532
Assist. State Dir.: Bill McNeff (952) 890-1390
Field Invest. Coord.: Bill McNeff
Journal Editor: Joel Henry
(952) 431-2426 E-Mail: mmj@mnmufon.org

MN MUFON WEB PAGE

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

MUFONET: 3.9777 Mhz Mon. at 7:00pm CST,
Bob Shultz, Net Control


National MUFON Hotline

To report UFO news, sightings, etc. call (888) 817-2220

The Minnesota MUFON Journal (MMJ) is a FREE publication available by internet only as a .PDF document. If you send an e-mail request to: mmj@mnmufon.org and I will add you to my e-mail notification list. Or you can just go to: www.mnmufon.org/mmjpdf.htm where you can check for new issues from time to time.

If you know someone who would like the MMJ, but does not have e-mail or internet access, you may print out a copy of the MMJ and give to them as long as you do not charge for it. If you have news or editorial contributions you wish to submit for inclusion 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).



Minnesota MUFON Journal
Joel Henry, Editor