

# MN MUFON Journal

## Issue #76

## March/April 1999

### THE DEAD FLIES MYSTERY

by Janet Ossebaard, The Netherlands

On July 17th of this year (1998), I discovered a strange side-phenomenon of the crop circles in the Cher Hill Formation (Wiltshire, England): Dead flies.

The small, black flies were attached to the seed heads in a strange fashion: stuck with their tongues/snouts as if glued to the plants. It seemed like they were consuming something at the moment the circle making energies struck. But not only that; they seemed to have died in shock. Their legs and wings were stretched out; all they were attached with were their snouts.

But there was more. I also found other variants. Some flies seemed to have been exploded: body and limbs scattered all over the seed heads. It reminded me of the blown nodes: the expulsion cavities that are created when the energies strike the plants shortly but fiercely. Were these 'blown flies'?

Other flies seemed to be in perfect shape, but when I took a closer look they too turned out to be dead. And there were variants somewhere in between: those who were attached to the plants, drugged as they seemed, but who flew away after I carefully freed them from the seed heads. They first needed about ten minutes to recover, after which they took off.

Nobody had ever seen this before, me neither. For a while, it looked like a new lead, a new hint so to speak. Something that would give us new insights. Were they flies killed in order to help us discover more? Quite necessary, I would say. After all, we don't get much further with our research, do we?

But then, a more perceptive 'croppy' - Ed Sherwood - told me he already saw dead flies on crop circles back in 1994; he just never reported them. So, nothing new after all. We had just never really looked well enough...

What a weird side-phenomenon: dead flies. I don't have a clue right now what to think of it. I sampled the entire formation (including of course the dead flies) and sent them to Dr. Levensgood in the USA and to a British lab. Dr. Levensgood is working on them right now, so hopefully we will get some answers at short notice.

But until then, some questions just won't leave my mind:

-If the crop circles are indeed characterized by kindness, friendship, love and light, as so many believe (and I am one of them), then how come animals die in them?

### Minnesota Mufon Meetings

Sat., March 13  
&  
Sat., April 10

1:30-5:00pm

Science Museum of MN

**Firstar Center**  
**5<sup>th</sup> & Minnesota Streets**  
**19<sup>th</sup> Floor**

See Map on Cover!

**PARK FREE!**  
**Ramp entrance is on**  
**Minnesota Street**  
**Proceed to 5<sup>th</sup> Level**

Because this is a secured building, **to gain entrance, you must be at the ramp door between 1:15-1:30pm**

Someone will be on hand to activate the elevator to take you to the meeting room.

**The next admittance time will be at the 3:00pm break.**

The building and ramp areas are designated as non-smoking.

-If the energies are so strong and powerful that they can drug and explode insects, to what extent is the phenomenon safe and peaceful?

-If the stuff that drugged the flies enters our food chain, should we get worried?

Sometimes I wonder when the phenomenon will give us some answers instead of more questions...

© Janet Ossebaard, 1998, Email: ossebaard@wxs.nl

**Donald Keyhoe's books on UFO's  
Continued Review (part 4)  
(circa mid 50's to early 60's)  
by Dick Moss - MN MUFON State Dir.**

In this issue we will continue with the UFO phenomenon as reported by Major Donald Keyhoe, an early director of the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena, or NICAP. As in previous writings, Keyhoe uses many airline encounters with UFOs and endless accounts of Air Force cover-up attempts to bolster his idea that UFOs are interplanetary. Here are few more of them.

Just prior to 1960, the Air Force had issued instructions to operations and training commands under the heading: UFO's SERIOUS BUSINESS. It stated that UFOs, sometimes treated lightly by the press, must be rapidly and accurately identified as serious USAF business. It also concluded that the public should be given realistic explanations. But obviously, their debunking policies have never changed.

In 1956 a Navy Super-Constellation was over the Atlantic heading for Newfoundland when a huge object headed towards them. Just avoiding collision, the object swung around and paced the airplane. It was estimated at up to 400 feet in diameter. Tilting upward, it was rapidly lost against the stars. At Newfoundland the crew was carefully questioned. After they reached their final destination in Maryland, the pilot had a phone call from a scientist in a high government agency. The next day they met and the scientist listened to the entire story. Then he opened a briefcase and took out some photographs. The pilot identified one of them as the type craft

they had seen. He said to the scientist, "Somebody must know the answers if you have photos of these things." The scientist closed his case and left.

Another encounter involving an airliner occurred on February 24, 1959. An American Airlines plane had departed from Newark to Detroit.

Captain Peter Killian noticed three very bright lights high and to the south. One object left the formation, came toward the plane, slowed for a bit, then swiftly rejoined the group. A stewardess brought one frightened passenger to the cockpit and Killian reassured him that all was well. Then one of the objects moved closer again and paced them for a while. Killian put out a radio call asking if other airline pilots could see the UFOs. In the end two other American crews and three United crews reported back that they had also observed the formation.

The Air Force made a first attempt to discredit Killian by saying that he had seen stars through broken clouds. But Killian had been flying above the clouds. The American Airlines magazine "Flagship" published a full report of the incident and sent a copy to the Air Force. Also, a statement by Rear Admiral George Dufek advised the public not to discount the reality of flying saucers. Then, the Air Force offered a new explanation claiming the objects were nothing but B-47 bombers refueling in flight. Killian's hot reply was printed in New York newspapers. A Maryland congressman, Sam Friedel, wanted to get into the case by getting Senator Goldwater and others to listen to Killian's story. Then, Keyhoe learned that Killian had been muzzled by a demand relayed through American Airlines.

On March 9, 1957 a Pan American pilot off Florida had to put his DC-6 into a climb to avoid an imminent collision with an object at about 3:30 AM. Most passengers, belts unfastened, were thrown from their seats with baggage and parcels flying through the air. Some of them were hurt and the captain radioed San Juan to have ambulances ready. Other Pan Am pilots on the San Juan run also reported seeing a fiery rear section drop away from the main part of the object, falling like a flare.

On that same night a UFO was seen near Baudette, Minnesota. It was flying so low that its glow shined

on the snow and seemed to draw up loose snow as it passed by.

On July 22, 1956 an Air Force Convair C-131-D was at 16,000 feet over California. There was a sudden crashing impact and the plane went into a dive, but the pilot eventually regained control. After an emergency landing they found that the tail had been badly damaged by something apparently hitting it from above. It turned out that a flying saucer had been seen near Fresno a few hours before this incident and it became linked with the collision. The Air Force claimed that metal fatigue was responsible, but this explanation was dismissed by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In January of 1958, according to David Jacobs, Keyhoe and NICAP had pressured some congressmen to consider holding public hearings on the subject of UFOs. The Senate Subcommittee on Government Relations, chaired by Senator John McClellan, asked to meet with the Secretary of the Air Force Office of Legislative Liaison to discuss the possibility of holding open hearings on the Air Force's UFO program. The Air Force saw no reason for such hearings and eventually defused any inquiry into their UFO program.

In preparation for the expected inquiry, Keyhoe met with a Chief Investigator Healey in the Senate Office Building. He presented NICAP's case for charging that the Air Force was hiding UFO information. Their meeting lasted for over three hours with Keyhoe telling of many sightings, of repeated contradictory Air Force statements, and of the reliability of the witnesses. He also gave names of military people and airline pilots who were willing to testify. At one point Healey said he thought that most reports came from unreliable sources and untrained observers. Keyhoe handed him a list of witnesses that included officers, technicians, pilots, tower and radar operators, rocket experts, scientists, astronomers, doctors, lawyers and businessmen. Not one of those pilots had been grounded for reporting a UFO, airline pilots were still carrying passengers, and radar operators were still guiding airplanes into airports. These were the same people the Air Force had ridiculed because they reported flying saucers. As one of many examples of "explained sightings," Keyhoe told of two children reporting a UFO at low altitude over Hamel, Minnesota. The Air Force

included in its Project Grudge report the question, "Is it known whether children have normal vision?"

In July of 1957 a friend of NICAP's office manager had written a letter to General Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and formerly Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and asked some pointed questions. The letter had been forwarded to the Air Technical Intelligence Command at Dayton. One part of the reply, written by Wallace W. Elwood, Assistant Adjutant, was an admission that Air Force pilots had fired on UFOs. Keyhoe then gave Elwood a phone call and asked him about this revelation quoting, "The pilots fired on flying objects they could not identify but which were later determined to be conventional objects." Then what were they? Why didn't the pilots recognize them before they fired? When Elwood protested, Keyhoe asked, "How does ATIC know the objects were conventional? Did the pilots shoot them down?" Elwood's response was that nothing had been shot down. Keyhoe went on, "If the objects got away the pilots must not have identified them. How do you know they were conventional?" Elwood stopped him and transferred his call to a Captain, who transferred to Theodore Hieatt, Deputy Chief of Intelligence. Keyhoe told Hieatt, "It's clear the pilots thought the objects were hostile. Elwood's letter stated that pilots are to fire on an object only if it commits an act which is hostile or menacing." Hieatt agreed. Keyhoe answered, "Then the pilots must have been convinced those UFOs were menacing them, or were a danger to this country. Otherwise, they wouldn't have fired." Hieatt didn't answer. Keyhoe continued, "To commit menacing acts, the objects would have to be guided, directly or by remote control. Who controlled them during these attacks?" Hieatt replied that he had not seen the letter and that he would call back.

We all know about pre-1947 UFO sightings, particularly the so-called Foo Fighters. NICAP received a report that on August 1, 1946 an Army Air Corps C-47 was flying near Tampa and the pilot saw a bright object with a fiery tail. Assuming it might be a meteor, he then figured it was racing toward them in a horizontal flight path. When it got to within about 1000 yards it veered and crossed their path. It was a cylindrical-shaped object about twice the size of a B-29 and had luminous portholes. Trailing from it was a stream of fire about half its

length. The crew thought that it traveled about 100 miles in 3 minutes before disappearing over the horizon. One might now wonder if rocket-like vehicles shooting out luminous exhaust in those days was a visualization or screen memory type of encounter in which the visitors wanted us to think they had primitive spaceships. A vehicle of this description would hardly seem to be on an abduction mission, or even a mission to make contact and help mankind "solve its problems."

An example of the strange contradictions an investigator must deal with was evident in AFR-200 instructions for handling UFO material. Despite Air Force claims that saucers are delusions and non-existent, Section 19 directs that physical evidence, photographic or material, should be promptly reported. Further, that each Air Force echelon receiving suspected or actual UFO material will safeguard it in a manner to prevent any defacing or alteration which might reduce its value for intelligence examination and analysis. Paragraph A-3 emphasized the need for details to aid in plotting and estimating distances, size and nature of the UFO, and probable velocity and movements. Information on camera settings and film type were also among the required details. It also directed that photos of radarscopes showing UFOs should be classified.

On April 8, 1956 an American Airlines flight left Albany en route to Syracuse at 10:20 PM. The pilot was Raymond Ryan. Into the flight a brilliant white light was seen approaching the plane. Ryan veered away and the object shot past the plane at about 900 mph. Thinking he might hit the object in the dark, Ryan turned on his landing lights. The object appeared, glowing orange, ahead of them. He reported the situation to Griffiss Air Force base and was told to turn off the lights. Griffiss said they could see the orange object near the plane. Oddly, their radar was turned off, but they said they would send up two jets. Although under Civil Aeronautics regulations there was no authority for military control of an airliner, the tower at Griffiss told Ryan to change his course and follow the UFO. The request seemed to have a sense of urgency and Ryan complied. The object was headed toward Canada over Lake Ontario and Ryan eventually returned to a course that would take him to Syracuse. Four months after the incident Ryan changed his story and said that he had not deviated from his course at any

time. The Civil Aeronautics Board agreed. For Keyhoe, this was proof of a desperate determination to hide what had happened.

It happened that a NICAP member had done an audio tape recording of Ryan and his First Officer during a TV interview on WBEN after the incident. Ryan said that he had changed course at the request of the tower at Griffiss and followed the UFO. He was told that the fighter jets were on their way, but he never saw them and didn't know what happened to them. Keyhoe speculated that the extreme coverup might be linked with the missing jets. CIA pressure on Federal agencies could have resulted in a falsified flight log possibly involving American Airlines.

During a general search, a hidden case was discovered that proved the military knew about UFOs prior to 1947. Major William Leet, a highly decorated pilot, met with Keyhoe and told of a mission over Austria during which a disc-shaped object paced their plane all the way to the Adriatic. He and his crew had also seen a large disc over Japan in 1952 that accelerated and disappeared in seconds. They thought it might have been 250 feet across. Leet also offered the opinion that SAC radar controllers can identify UFOs. He told of one instance when a large formation of UFOs approached the west coast. Various radars picked up on them, but General Thomas Power at the SAC Command Center in Nebraska had U.S. bombers sit tight. If he had thought they were Russian bombers, he would have launched a counter attack. Keyhoe seemed to always be in communication with someone. In a letter to General Nathan Twining he asked if communication had ever been established with a UFO. In response Twining's exec, Colonel John Sherrill, told Keyhoe that no effective means had been developed to communicate by radio or otherwise. He went on to say that the technical obstacles in such an endeavor must be obvious. To Keyhoe and others it sounded as if they had been working on it.

We are running out of space here, so will do one final installment on the early days from the viewpoint of Donald Keyhoe in the next issue. For the benefit of new members particularly, I believe that a perspective on the past has value and I will return to this theme fairly often.

### **Atwater, MN Lake Hole:**

On 1/17/99 a loud bang was heard and a hole in the ice of a local lake was discovered. The hole was small and had radiating elements around it. Divers found nothing of significance. Below is a Minnesota MUFON Field Investigator's theory on what caused the hole.

### **Atwater Incident Explained? By Casey Holt**

I was at the attempted recovery operation on Tadd Lake Saturday 1/23/99 when the divers searched for evidence of something breaking through the ice. Since then a theory came to me as a possible cause.

The reported appearance of the hole being melted instead of broken gave me the impression of a high energy plasma burst. This might sound odd but it was almost like it was hit by lightning. I didn't know if that would be possible so I looked through some books and they said that lightning does strike in winter occasionally.

I then looked at last Sunday's paper for the weather forecast on that day of the event 1/17/99. The prediction was for a band of heavy wet snow across the middle section of Minnesota with blustery winds and a high temp. of 30 degrees. The Saint Paul paper also predicted a few thunderstorms as far north as Des Moines, Iowa.

A nearby lightning strike (especially within 100 yards) does produce the effect of a sonic boom as the lady described and is more than enough to rattle some windows. I don't know what it would do if lightning hits some ice on a shallow lake but it might be enough to whack a hole through it. Lightning can do funny things.

One book said that a lightning bolt can produce 3 billion joules of energy and reach temperatures of 25,000 degrees C. That might explain the ice being melted or vaporized in the 2 foot by 3 foot hole that was found. It would be interesting to see if there has been any other known reports of lightning hitting a frozen lake and what were the results.

I noticed the aeration system about 100 yards from the unusual hole. I wonder if bubbles in the water could have built up a static charge on the ice to help attract lightning to that area. There was a large tree

on the shore close to the hole that might have helped too although I did not pay attention to see if it was damaged.

I am not saying this is what happened for sure but just that it might be possible. It would still be quite odd and possibly rare. Maybe you could run the idea past your weather people and see what they think. I wonder if more people would have thought of this explanation were it not for the distraction of the possible meteor theory and the impression of something falling from the sky to make that unusual hole. Its shape could have tricked us.



Alien Light Bulb

### **A LOOK AT THE CONDON REPORT / LOW MEMORANDUM**

I'm the coordinator of the NCAS volunteer group that put the Condon report on the web.

Posting the Condon Report on the web without providing historical context and commentary about important events that took place during its creation is, shall I say from the perspective of 1999, rather one-sided and that is being very, very charitable.

Understanding the Low Memorandum is crucial to understanding what Condon and Low set out to accomplish when they undertook the research project which was promoted to the public as being performed by "objective scientists". That they were not objective at all is revealed by the Low Memorandum.

Even the supposed sponsorship of the project by the Air Force was a deception, it would only be many years later after the Report was released that it would be documented and admitted publicly by the CIA that it was the true sponsor of the project. This involvement is discussed by the CIA's historian, Gerald Haines, in his paper "*CIA's Role in the Study of UFOs, 1947-90 (A Die Hard Issue)*" Studies in Intelligence Vol.1 No.1, 1997. Langley, Central Intelligence Agency, 1997.

This article is available on the Internet at: [www.odci.gov/csi/studies/97unclas/ufo.html](http://www.odci.gov/csi/studies/97unclas/ufo.html)

The following essay on the Low Memorandum was written a few years ago (1995) and sheds some crucial light on the significance of its discovery in the history of the Colorado Study.

Gary Alevy

### **James E. McDonald & The Low Memorandum**

**UFOSearch  
Val Germann  
Columbia, Missouri**

Here is a summary of the blow-up that occurred in 1968 over the leak to McDonald (by Donald Keyhoe) of the famous Condon Committee's internal missive.

Go back and look at McDonald's comments from '67, at how ready he was to believe Condon would really try to get at the truth. His anger knew few bounds when it finally dawned on him that his fellow "scientists" were just as much flacks and hacks as the vile politicians he was having to kow-tow to for future funding.

The following is excerpted from LOOK magazine in 1968.

Personages involved:

1) Dr. Edward U. Condon, physicist, former president of both the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Physical Society.

2) Major Donald Keyhoe, National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP).

3) Robert J. Low, project [i.e. Condon committee] coordinator.

4) Dr. James McDonald, senior physicist at the Institute of Atmospheric Physics and professor in the Department of Meteorology at the University of Arizona.

5) David Saunders, Condon committee staff member.

6) Dr. Norman Levine, investigator and member of the project.

7) Mrs. Mary Louise Armstrong, assistant to Robert J. Low.

The excerpt:

"A strange series of incidents in the University of Colorado Unidentified Flying Objects study has led to a near-mutiny by several of the staff scientists, the dismissal of two PHD's on the staff and the resignation of the project's administrative assistant."

"The study, announced as a totally objective scientific investigation of one of the most puzzling phenomena of modern times, has already cost the taxpayers over half a million dollars.

The committee is scheduled to release its report by the end of the year."

"The announcement by the Secretary of Defense in October, 1966, that the Air Force had selected Dr. Edward U. Condon and the University of Colorado for the UFO research contract was welcomed both by skeptical observers and those convinced of the existence of flying saucers."

"Maj. Donald Keyhoe and his National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena [NICAP], who were among the severest critics of the Air Force's study, publicly announced cautious support and offered NICAP's nation-wide UFO reporting system to the new research group."

"The project staff received a minor jolt early in October of 1966, when the Denver Post published a story: CU [Colorado University] AIDE SLAPS UFO STUDY. [Robert J.] Low was quoted as saying that the UFO project 'comes pretty close to the criteria of nonacceptability' as a university function."

This embarrassment did not delay the project, however. Dr. McDonald was called on to give an address to members of the Condon committee.

"McDonald had carried out an extensive investigation on his own. After examining the hundreds of well-documented reports of sightings by military and airline pilots, radar operators, police, technical observers, and articulate, rational laymen, McDonald rejected as highly unlikely such conventional explanations for UFO's as ball lightning (plasma), hallucinations, hoaxes and misinterpretations of natural phenomena. He concluded that 'only abysmally limited scientific competence has been brought to the study of UFOs within Air Force circles in the past 15 years. Unfortunately, during all this time, the scientific community and the public were repeatedly assured that substantial scientific talent was being used...'"

"The first major turbulence in the new project [occurred] in February, 1967... [On January 25, Dr. Condon] spoke before a chapter of Sigma Xi, the honorary scientific fraternity. The Elmira, N.Y., Star-Gazette reported:

"Unidentified flying objects" are not the business of the Air Force,"... Dr. Edward U. Condon said here Wednesday night... Dr. Condon left no doubt as to his personal sentiments on the matter: "It is my inclination right now to recommend that the Government get out of this business. My attitude right now is that there's nothing to it." With a smile, he added, "but I'm not supposed to reach a conclusion for another year..."

Major Keyhoe's reaction? "He bristled. He knew that Condon had not yet investigated any field cases personally, nor had any members of the staff completed any meaningful research. The project was only three months old. 'I have to admit, 'Keyhoe told David Saunders, a key staff member, 'that I'm

shocked by these statements. Is this a scientific investigation or isn't it?"

Then, a staff member searching through project files (under the heading "Air Force Contract and Background") to obtain material for a speech came across a startling memorandum. "The staff member found most of the material... rather dull going, but one memo, written by [Robert J.] Low to university officials on August 9, 1966, contained [the following:]"

-- The Low Memorandum --

...Our study would be conducted almost exclusively by non-believers who, although they couldn't possibly \*prove\* a negative result, could and probably would add an impressive body of evidence that there is no reality to the observations. The trick would be, I think, to describe the project so that, to the public, it would appear a totally objective study, but to the scientific community, would present the image of a group of non-believers trying their best to be objective, but having an almost zero expectation of finding a saucer.

One way to do this would be to stress investigation, not of the physical phenomena, but rather of the people who do the observing -- the psychology and sociology of persons and groups who report seeing UFOs. If the emphasis were put here, rather than on examination of the old question of the physical reality of the saucer, I think the scientific community would quickly get the message... I'm inclined to feel at this early stage that, if we set up the thing right and take pains to get the proper people involved and have success in presenting the image we want to present to the scientific community, we could carry the job off to our benefit...

On September 18, 1967, Condon, Low and Saunders met for the first time in many weeks. As a result of reading the [Low] memo, Saunders was deeply concerned... [At the meeting] Saunders was led to believe that if by chance the Extra Terrestrial Intelligence (ETI) hypothesis was substantiated, the announcement would be sent by Condon directly to the Air Force and the President, and never be allowed to go to the public."

Around this same time, word got out that Dr. Condon had made another embarrassing speech. "A

report of the new Condon speech had already reached Dr. McDonald in a letter from a colleague at the University of Arizona, William S. Bickel, assistant professor of physics on the campus. '...Dr. Condon's speech was funny and entertaining,' Bickel wrote. 'But to me, it was also disappointing and surprising.'

Dr. Condon emphasized mostly funny things. He told of an offer made to him by a contactee, who, for a sizable sum deposited in the right bank, would introduce him to a UFO crew... He told how he tracked the case down and concluded that it was very likely a hoax... "My feelings about UFOs are similar to those of many people - I don't know what they are, I believe people are seeing real things, and I believe a scientific attack on the problem will solve the mystery - whatever they are..." The net effect of Dr. Condon's talk was zero, if not negative...

"In reply to Bickel, McDonald wrote, '...The crackpots are so immediately recognizable that one need not waste any time at all on them... I fail to understand why a scientific group should be given an address by any member of the Colorado team on the topic of the crackpot fringe...'"

"On September 27, the Rocky Mountain News (Denver, Colo.) published this headline: *UFO REASERCH AT CU DISENCHANTED*. Condon was quoted as saying: 'I'm almost inclined to think such studies ought to be discontinued unless someone comes up with a new idea on how to approach the problem... The 21st century may die laughing when it looks back on many things we have done. This [the UFO study] may be one.'"

"The majority of the staff began exploring several proposals, including the possibility of the entire staff resigning en masse or issuing a press release or a minority report. Another proposal was the establishment of an independent scientific group to explore the rational sighting reports and eliminate the crackpot-fringe static. There was general agreement that an objective study of the UFO problem should be made and that accurate and unbiased findings should reach the National Academy of Sciences, the public and the Air Force... Several members of the staff told of their concern that the content and form of the final report would reflect what they now felt was Condon's and Low's prejudice and would be unjustifiably negative."

In a January, 1968 telephone conversation with Low, McDonald indicated to Low his alarm that "negative findings were already being clearly expressed by both Low and Condon." When Low hung up in anger, McDonald wrote him a long letter in which he reviewed his [McDonald's] complaints. Low did not get around to reading the letter until February 6, 1968.

"On Wednesday, February 7, Saunders was summoned to Condon's office. Low and Condon were present. The questioning focussed on the [Low] memo. Did Saunders know of it and know where it was kept? Saunders said that the memo was only part of the whole problem... The broader issues of scientific integrity were at stake. Condon, furious that he had not immediately been informed that McDonald knew of the [Low] memo, told Saunders, 'For an act like that, you ought to be ruined professionally.'"

"Saunders countered by saying that Condon and Low seemed to be treating the symptoms rather than the disease. He reminded them of the efforts of the entire staff to get Low and Condon to modify their intractable stance. He reviewed the long sequence of events and reminded Low that he had blocked the investigation of one particularly startling UFO case."

"Dr. Levine was summoned while Saunders was still in Condon's office. Saunders offered to stay. Low rose from his chair and physically ushered him out the door. Levine was unnerved by the forcible ejection of Saunders. Again, the questioning went straight to the [Low] memo... Condon asked why Levine had not brought the [Low] memo to him, and Levine said that Condon's public and private statements had indicated that there was little likelihood of effective communication. He told Condon that Low had slammed the door in his face when he brought up the handling by Low of an Edwards Air Force Base case."

Mrs. Armstrong, Low's administrative assistant, "had joined the project at its inception with no convictions whatever about UFOs. By February, 1967, she was convinced that the study was being gravely misdirected."

"She talked to Condon on February 22, 1968, at his office. She told him frankly that there appeared to be



an almost unanimous lack of confidence in the project coordinator and his scientific direction of the project... She said that her long, close association with Low gave strong evidence that he was trying very hard to say as little as possible in the final report, and to say that in the most negative way possible."

"The others who left the project also felt they had an obligation to speak out, and when Condon failed to respond positively to his outspoken letter of criticism, McDonald brought the matter before the executive officers of the National Academy of Sciences in a vigorous written protest."

"The hope that the establishment of the Colorado study brought with it has dimmed. All that seems to be left is the \$500,000 [price tag]."

\*\* End Excerpt \*\*

(Note how the price, which started at \$300,000 and by this time had inflated to \$500,000, would eventually reach \$600,000 – this amount equal to at least \$3,000,000 today.)

End

Gary Alevy < [galevy@pipeline.com](mailto:galevy@pipeline.com) >

### **Field Investigator's Report, March 1999 By Craig R. Lang - FI Coordinator**

The last two months have been relatively quiet in the skies of Minnesota, but extremely eventful on the investigation front. A quick check of our website will find three new reports online, the results from long-standing investigations. Two of these are the results of the investigations into the 1992 Elk River and 1986 St. Francis sightings, which were described in the last Field Investigator Update. The third report is from our investigations into a sighting in south Minneapolis during a power outage on a warm, pleasant evening in October of 1995.

The witness had been watching television in her apartment when the power went out. She lit a candle and went out into the hall. She noticed a couple of her neighbors chatting while they awaited the return

of the electric power. She went to the front landing of her apartment building (about 20 feet away) to look out of the window onto the street below. The weather was nice, and the lights were out - a great excuse to socialize with the neighbors - and many people had congregated on the sidewalks and lawns in the neighborhood. Suddenly her attention was drawn to a large object that seemed to be hovering over the block of two-story buildings just across the street from her. She observed this for several seconds, with increasing puzzlement. After mentally eliminating mundane possibilities such as clouds, etc., she attempted to bring the object to the attention of her neighbors, who were still in the hall, nearby. To her surprise and annoyance, she was unable to get their attention. In frustration, she turned back around to the object, to see if it was still there. But by that time (seconds, by her perception), the object was gone. A few minutes later, the power came back on, and the witness returned to her apartment and watched the 9:00 news.

There are several interesting anomalies suggested in this account:

- 1) The timing of this event, with respect to the events in the power failure, suggests that approximately 20 minutes of time might be missing from the witness's perception.
- 2) There were a number of people on the street, sidewalk and lawns outside, as well as in a store immediately below the object, who should have noticed the object, or possible effects associated with it, but apparently did not.
- 3) The witness was unable to get the attention of her neighbors, who were only 20 feet away from her. The neighbors subsequently indicated that they were unaware of her attempts to hail them.

Each of these anomalies represents an interesting piece of the mystery, which we will discuss in future "Field Investigator Updates". In addition, the intriguing suggestion has been made that within one of the buildings over which the object was hovering, someone might have been experiencing a close encounter of the fourth kind. This, along with possibility of additional sighting witnesses, could potentially enhance this already fascinating case.

If you know of anyone who might be able to shed additional light on this or any other sightings, please contact:

Craig Lang  
phone:612-560-1532,  
e-mail: [crlang@mm.com](mailto:crlang@mm.com)).

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 investigators 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...

**Daimonic Reality –  
Understanding Otherworld Encounters  
By Patrick Harpur  
(Review by Dean DeHarpPorte)**

The exasperating elusiveness of conclusive proof of the existence of UFOs or aliens - their here for a moment and gone with barely a trace behavior - has spawned a blossoming school of ufology that, in desperation as it were, attributes the source of these phenomena to "another dimension". Such attribution - without any basis in logic or hypothesis to say nothing of any evidence - is really only another way of saying "we don't know where they come from", which makes the advocate for such a position sound at best unfocused and at worst plain silly.

"Daimonic Reality" is the first, actually the only, attempt I have come across that actually attempts to comprehend and define this "other dimension" or "otherworld" as Harpur calls it. The framework for this world is Carl Jung's "collective unconscious", that mysterious repository of Jung's archetypes and Joseph Campbell's myths, which ultimately describe

and define the kaleidoscopic human interpretation of reality.

The collective unconscious is a realm antithetical to our everyday world of physical reality but, Harpur claims, it is just as real. Its inhabitants, or daimons, include just about every paranormal entity imaginable: fairies, discarnate beings, ghosts, extraterrestrials, leprechauns, the Blessed Virgin Mary, angels? you name it.

These daimons function as intermediaries between physical reality and the realm of the source of good and evil, perhaps God itself. In Christianity there is only one such intermediary, Jesus; hence all other daimons have been reduced to demons. Daimons, like the fairies of folklore, are tricksters who entice us to join them in their dance in the moonlight, only to vanish without a trace as soon as they begin to cross the threshold of reality (note the similarity to UFOs and aliens). They are both real and not real, but always meaningful as inhabitants of that otherworld which our single minded pursuit of physical reality has blinded us to.

Harpur views Daimons as the characters in Greek, Roman, and Germanic mythology. Since these mythologies are concrete expressions of Jung's archetypes, daimons, as mythological entities, are the quasi-literal embodiments of the human drive to comprehend and react to good, evil, and all of the other fundamental concepts that control human fate.


Harpur, along with the "primitives", believes the function of shamans (from native American to Australian to Siberian and African cultures) is to propitiate the daimons, lest they visit harm upon our physical reality. More importantly, the process of becoming a shaman involves a voyage into the otherworld where daimons bond our ego of physical reality -often involving great fright and psychic pain - with daimonic reality. Once thus prepared, the function of the shaman is to initiate tribal members into this bonding process with the assistance of otherworld daimons.

Daimons, since they are the otherworldly mirror of our physical selves, are capable of emotion and action. Feeling neglected during this era of super rationality, they increasingly project themselves into our physical reality in the form of "aliens" arriving in

"spacecraft" and subject us to frightening procedures which are sure to get our attention. Ghosts, the old hag, and the fairies of old did the same thing, but they were less intrusive because primitive man was much closer to the otherworld than we are today. Most obvious of the daimon's efforts to force themselves into our reality, says Harpur, are the crop circles, most frequently created (coincidentally?) in southern England, arguably the origin and still an important nexus of reason and "enlightenment."

After all of this are we really any closer to defining the nature of the otherworld than before, or are Harpur's ideas no more than a lot of mumbo jumbo with no basis in "physical reality"? Perhaps, but John Mack, the eminent Harvard psychologist who studies abduction phenomena, takes Harpur seriously (Mack's site led me to the book). It is true that Jung's archetypes are an exceedingly profound and incisive interpretation of the surprising consistency of cross cultural mythology. And UFOs and their occupants, if nothing else, have consistently defied the best efforts of rational analysis; they practically reek of the supernatural.

**WANTED**  
 For interstate flight, kidnapping,  
 possible abductions.



Do not approach.  
 Call  
**MUFON of Ohio**  
 (614)  
**486-5877 or 548-6634**

NOTE: Minnesota MUFON monthly meetings will be changing location to the Roseville Parks and Rec. Community Center room starting with the May 8, 1999 meeting. Location is 1 ½ blocks east of Snelling Ave. on County Rd. C2 (north side) behind a large church. Parking is outside and free. This location allows people to come and go as they please without the security and elevator and ramp problems we had at the Firststar Bank bldg location. We will have to pay rent (\$8/ hr), which means we will be asking for a buck at the door to pay for it. More details will be forthcoming in the next issue and also check out the website where it will be updated regularly. This is a good change and we have been searching for a long time and now we finally have found the right place. Meetings will still be at the old location through april.

**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](mailto: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](http://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).

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.