

Minnesota MUFON Journal

Issue #96 July/Aug. 2002

Directors Report

By Bill McNeff, State Director, Minnesota MUFON

"YELLOW" JOURNALISM

Webster defines "yellow journalism" as "ordinary news sensationally distorted." All of us are familiar with the type of Western movie in which the hero says to the villain something like, "You skunk, you have a yellow streak up and down your back!" meaning the guy is a coward. Both of those ideas, plus the epithet of "disinformation", in my opinion, apply to the program on the History Channel on June 13 titled "Roswell: Final Declassification".

The program featured, among others, Jon Elliston, "National Security Historian", but gave none of his credentials - leaving me to wonder if he was employed by some college, or the U.S. government. Also featured was Karl Pflock, who promptly admitted there was a cover-up, but parroted the Air Force party line that it was of the Mogul project, which used a string of small balloons to loft a sensitive microphone to detect Soviet nuclear tests. It should be pretty clear to most researchers by now that Pflock, a former member of an intelligence agency, is a government apologist at the least and a disinformation specialist at the worst.

Although the program had statements by Walter Haut, Kevin Randle and Don Burleson, Ph.D., the short clips did not provide much in the way of arguments for the other side of the question, that the Roswell wreckage could have been an alien crash. Real balance was lacking.

The program did not make clear the nature of the Roswell logbooks found in the files. Are these the "traffic" records that the General Accounting Office discovered had been "destroyed"?

The program did rightfully bring out the problems with the story told by Glenn Dennis, the Roswell mortician. No one has found record of a nurse named "Naomi Self" according to the first account by Dennis. He later stated that he used a made-up name to avoid violating his promise to the nurse to not reveal her identity. He has also stated that he doesn't like UFO researchers in general. The program pointed out that the presence of a black sergeant in his story was not likely since the Air Force was not integrated in 1947. This may not invalidate this part of the story, since there were blacks in the Air Force in WWII.

Let's review what seem to be important facts about Roswell. First, the wreckage on the Foster ("Brazel") ranch covered an area about 3/4 of a mile long and a few hundred feet wide, as admitted on the program. The Mogul balloon string used about a dozen weather-type balloons and two or three foil radar targets. When this fell to earth, the chances of the foil being torn into pieces and scattered around were low. It has



Minnesota Mufon Meetings

Sat., July 13th

&

Sat., Aug. 10th

1:30-5pm

New Brighton Family
Service Center, 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: This building has no
special security or elevators,
so you can come and go as
you please and smoke
outdoors.

been shown that even if someone went to the trouble of tearing up the foil and scattering it around, it would be impossible to cover that large an area with large enough pieces to frighten the sheep, as Brazel described. Finally, there was an instrument box that would have been recognized as earthly manufacture, and a nameplate requesting the finder to notify New York University. Definitely not alien!

Also, Prof. Moore of NYU stated that “there never were any Project Mogul balloon trains launched from Alamogordo in 1947”. Several witnesses mentioned crumpling the foil, which promptly unfolded without a crease. And Maj. Marcel told how they laid a sheet of the “foil” as “thin as cigarette paper” on the ground, and hit it with a sledgehammer, which bounced off leaving no dent. Finally, there is the blowup of the Bond photos showing the “memo” in Gen. Ramey’s hand on which virtually everyone agrees the words “VICTIMS OF THE WRECK” can be read. Efforts to decipher the rest of the memo are continuing.

The piece-de-resistance of the show was a triangular box said to contain “an unidentified metal object.” When it was finally opened toward the end of the program, it was a typical weather balloon radar reflector, and appeared to be brand, spanking new. This piece of “evidence”, it seemed to be implied, was sent to the National Archives in about 1978 when Maj. Jesse Marcel went public with his recollections of Roswell.

This was also the time frame in which stories about Roswell began to capture the interest of UFO researchers and, ultimately, the public. This was certainly not the wrinkled, torn wreckage that reporter James Bond Johnson’s photos show in General Roger Ramey’s office. This wreckage was identified to Bond as a weather balloon. Gen. Thomas Dubose stated that an airman had been ordered to tear up a weather balloon and foil radar target and bring the remains to Ramey’s office, as part of a cover-up. It seems clear that the radar reflector in the Archives was either merely put there as an example of the type of reflector involved or else purposely to mislead. Finally, we need not believe that all of the Roswell material was sent to the National Archive.

All of the red herrings that appeared in the two Air Force reports on Roswell were again fished out of the garbage and displayed: the crash dummies, the injured airman, the crash of a KC-97 tanker at a

later date. It is a pity that the producers of this program did not have the courage or the moxy to point out that none of this proved that the Roswell crash was not of alien origin.

To summarize, the History channel show was an infamous example of how to sensationalize ordinary objects, slant the evidence, and dis-inform the viewer who does not have wide knowledge of Roswell. The History channel has done much better in the past, and we deserved better this time.

Grand Betrayal Of Science Principles
Originally posted to ‘Whispers’
by Ives Lewis Tuesday, 11 June 2002
<http://www.junjun.com/cgi-bin/boards/whispers/config.pl?read=32786>

Blinded by “Science”

Have you ever participated in a discussion and realized that there was a fundamental flaw in another’s position, but could not quite put your finger on it? Recent discussions with debunkers have me thinking about their positions on UFOs - particularly one post, not written by a debunker, that included the following statement:

“There are two avenues of scientific research, and both are necessary to gain any level of advancement in science. They are empirical and speculative. And, for some reason, the skeptics, as well as many believers, leave out the speculative end of research.”

It was an excellent point. Moreover, I realized something. Most of us here in the ‘believer’ category (I hate the label) have accepted and even valued much of the work of the debunkers, recognizing the contribution made by weeding out the weaker cases. On one level, it would appear that we all have the same goal of finding truth. Not to pick on Oberg, but in thinking back on his posts, I’ve yet to see him acknowledge any factors in any cases that would support the ETH. Where is the willingness to speculate based on the available evidence? One example of this curious absence is his response to the 1967 Malmstrom incident. I cannot quote him from memory. But to me, the substance of his response was rather impatient: ‘yes yes, an unexplained case that deserves to be investigated,’ and so on and so forth. No acknowledgement whatsoever of the behavioral aspects of the case which pointed away from some kind of random

prosaic event. No willingness to speculate on the basis of evidence that literally jumps from the case.

Why?

The best debaters concede points to their opponents when the point is won. The refusal on the part of Oberg and others to ever concede behavioral or observational characteristics that suggest anything other than a prosaic explanation is suspicious. Dictionary.com gives the following definition to the "scientific method":

"The principles and empirical processes of discovery and demonstration considered characteristic of or necessary for scientific investigation, generally involving the observation of phenomena, the formulation of a hypothesis concerning the phenomena, experimentation to demonstrate the truth or falseness of the hypothesis, and a conclusion that validates or modifies the hypothesis."

I see that the phrase "observation of phenomena" is included. The debunker viewpoint seems to put blinders on for the most obvious, intriguing behavioral aspects of incidents such as Malmstrom. It appears to be a deliberate effort not just to give such factors negligible importance, but to disregard them entirely. Instead, time is spent promoting unidentified prosaic explanations that offer nothing to the debate except dead weight. This is then masqueraded as a scientific approach, and those of us who question this are treated condescendingly.

If we contrast those actual practices to the ideals of the scientific method as defined, we find they are inconsistent in the most fundamental ways possible. The debunker method does not only involve observation of phenomena; it also involves disregarding factors inconsistent with a preconceived final position. It does not involve the formulation of a hypothesis concerning the phenomena; it instead involves the promotion of unidentified prosaic explanations consistent with the preconceived final position. And while the debunkers have shouted shrilly their criticism that experimentation is not possible to test the ETH hypothesis, their failure to even name their proposed prosaic explanations, exemplified by Oberg's failure to do so in Malmstrom, marks the ultimate hypocrisy. How can an unidentified theory be tested?

This can only be defined as a grand betrayal of the fundamental guiding principles of science.

Two issues which destroy the debunker's arguments. Posted By: Hutch Date: Wednesday, 12 June 2002

In Response To: Blinded by "Science" (Ives)

The first issue which eliminates the debunkers argument against some unidentified flying objects being extraterrestrial in origin, is that of human technological advancement. As the human race advances with its technology, whether it be propulsion, navigation, space, or whatever have you, we are actually demonstrating that there is a greater chance for the extraterrestrial hypothesis, because we are using technology which mimics, or will someday mimic, the very objects that have been reported, photographed, and videotaped over the past fifty-five years.

Let's take propulsion as an example. In the very beginning as we walked out of the cave, we used our own two feet to displace ourselves from one specific point to another. Eventually, that wasn't necessary, as we found other means, whether by horse, or animal-pulled cart with the wheel, which undoubtably was one of the most important early advances in human existence. Then came the bicycle, the automobile, the propeller driven aircraft, then the jet aircraft. Eventually we had to find something which would take us out into space, which meant that we needed a technology that would travel roughly seven miles per second, in order to break the gravitational boundary of Earth.

Now, what are we actually doing with all of the mentioned technology? We are physically accomplishing two things. The first is very well observed and discussed - we are displacing ourselves a longer distance than what we were able to do with the given technology previous to the one being discussed. An example being that the jet aircraft extended the range of human displacement over the propeller driven aircraft.

The second accomplishment with all of the given technology, is that we are displacing ourselves from one point to the next at a faster rate. And, to use the same example, the jet engine replacing the propeller driven engine, not only moved us a greater distance, but it did so at a faster rate of time.

Now, if we look at the technological advances in mobilizing the human being over the past few thousand years, and continue into the future with the same avenue of progress, isn't it safe to speculate, that there will eventually come a point in the future of the human race, that we will have some form of machine that will move us from one point to the next, at a rate that resembles what is being reported as unidentified flying objects?

The second issue that deflates the debunker's arguments is what we have discussed previous - that is of the scientific method. And, this is also one of the answers to the question raised, of why the debunkers don't use speculative research, and limit themselves to empirical data. If we use the scientific method with only the avenue of empirical research, then we have a limitation to the scientific method - namely that of time. History and present day work wonders when we attempt empirical research, but when we even think about using the word 'future' in our investigation, and limit ourselves to the empirical method, the scientific method falls flat on its face. This has to be one of the main reasons, if not the only reason, that UFO debunkers avoid speculative research. For if they didn't, and they included well-founded scientific speculation, they would be forced to admit, that scientifically there is evidence of a non-human intelligence controlling some unidentified flying objects.

If we haven't been controlling these machines over the past fifty-five years, then somebody else has!!! And, I don't think there's a person alive that would argue, that the human race is completely responsible for all the machine sightings since Kenneth Arnold.

It only emphasizes my point of how necessary it is for us to include well-founded speculative research in questioning the possibility of non-human intelligence behind UFOs.

And, as for the technology utilized in the UFO displacement, there is the greatest evidence of all - our own human technological advancement!

The Illegitimacy of CSICOP by Wendy Connors < FadedDiscs@comcast.net >

One of the most bogus scientific organizations in existence is the Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal. Known

by its acronym, CSICOP. It is not a scientific organization, nor does it engage in accepted scientific methodologies in its findings or claims.

Rather, it is a cult of individuals whose commonality and goal is to use any method under a twisted guise of science to force a belief system that science is damaged by investigation of paranormal avenues and that people who engage in such research are inherently dangerous to society.

Thus, CSICOP by its very nature, is a Cult that attempts to prevent people from studying areas not approved by CSICOP's view of what constitutes a formal scientific group. The only thing wrong with this approach is that it borders on fanaticism and is a danger to inherent individual freedom.

CSICOP, as a fanatical cult with a hidden agenda to prevent acquisition of new knowledge by investigation, is provable. Robert Shaeffer, a CSICOP Committee Member demonstrates though his own words, that CSICOP is not a scientific organization. That it does not engage in scientific methodologies and uses nefarious methods in an attempt to control the public's right to free thought and opinion. That any person who engages in research into areas science has failed to investigate are misguided and a danger to society and science in general.

This is Part One of the proof of CSICOP's bogus claims to be a legitimate and scientific organization. It is presented through Robert Shaeffer's own words, which are in direct quotes and my comments, which follow each quoted passage:

From the Collective Mind of the CSICOP Cult:

"Our group is not what you would call a front line organization. We don't receive reports directly from the general public. We do not attempt to get a specific number of cases. Because we concentrate only on those cases that the other organizations have put out to be unexplainable."

In other words CSICOP doesn't do first hand investigations. They only deal in personal opinion. CSICOP proclaims to be a scientific organization, but doesn't engage in actual science. CSICOP defaults on its own legitimacy.

"Because these groups will admit, ummm, the believers groups if you will, they will admit that at least 95% of the reports that come into their files

are nonsense. But, people who cannot identify Venus or an airplane, prank balloons and so on. They say, however, that there is about a 5% residue of unexplainable cases or sometimes they say 2% or 10%...always that small residue according to the UFO believer.”

In other words, anyone who engages in free thought is branded status as a believer, with nefarious connotations attached by CSICOP. As if a person's belief in something that does not conform to CSICOP parameters of what is appropriate to believe, is suspect. Which it is not, except to the fanatical CSICOP cult. CSICOP defaults on its own legitimacy.

“What our group does is we concentrate on that residue. We concentrate only on the ones which supposedly been pronounced unexplainable. For example the National Enquirer has a blue ribbon panel of Ph.D. scientists, all of whom are active in the UFO field that are in some sense of the word, UFO believers.”

A CSICOP ploy to manipulate the truth. The existence of a ‘blue ribbon panel’ is bogus. It does not exist. CSICOP consistently uses this approach to attempt to degrade or character assassinate anyone that disagrees with the cults position or engages in research defaulted upon by mainstream science. CSICOP defaults on its own legitimacy.

“And once a year they meet to choose what is considered to be the best UFO cases of the year. These are the ones that our group will go after, because you know, these well known people have said it has no explanation and we find that after a much more careful investigation, we think one which is more willing to consider negative evidence as well as just the case for that particular incident, that all of these instances are explainable.”

A perfect example of CSICOPs proclaimed scientific level of competence and clarity of thought. None of these people are ever named by the CSICOP cult because this blue ribbon panel does not exist. CSICOP defaults on its own legitimacy.

“As far as whether there are any genuine unexplainable cases... obviously nobody has time to look at all the UFO reports that have ever been made. There are just thousands of them and if anyone says they have investigated all of them, obviously they are way off base.”

By Shaeffer's own admission the CSICOPs cult doesn't do field investigation of cases. They only opine and call it science. This is not a basic tenant of a legitimate scientific organization that would consider all data, raw and formal. CSICOP defaults on its own legitimacy.

“But, we've looked at what has been pronounced, not by ourselves but the UFO believers, to be the cream of the crop and we haven't found anything in the supposed cream of the crop, that causes us to be wrong that there is something unexplainable here.”

Notice the complete lack of data or documentation to back this CSICOP scientific assessment? An opinion is not science, no matter how fervently CSICOP desires it to be. CSICOP's mission is stated to be scientific, but without scientific integrity in their claims. CSICOP defaults on its own legitimacy.

“Every one that we've had the opportunity and inclination to go into, we've been able to come up with a prosaic explanation. We are not seeing raw, unfiltered reports, we're seeing only the ones which are supposedly unexplainable. Consequently, we are finding a substantially higher percentage of hoaxes than you would find in the basis of raw reports.

Based upon what data other than the opinion of the CSICOP Committee? Again a perfect example of CSICOP's failure to use applied scientific methodologies for their claims. CSICOP defaults on its own legitimacy.

“I would say that probably 95% of all raw, unsorted reports are simply authentic and honest misperceptions of an everyday object. Possibly even more than 98% and that you'll find that probably the largest single factor that generates UFO reports is the planet Venus. I doubt if there is any one object that has generated as many UFO reports as that planet has.”

If CSICOP, by Shaeffer's own admission, does not investigate or keep databases of UFO reports for analysis, then this statement is completely erroneous and not based upon scientific factuality. In other words, CSICOP does not have any hard data to back up this claim. Using trumped up data, that 98% of people are fooled by viewing the planet Venus, is highly questionable and shows CSICOP uses the same tactics which they proclaim is

unscientific, by researchers who look at the paranormal venues.

Therefore, CSICOPs claim is bogus. Further, failure to look at the raw data is unscientific and CSICOP defaults on its own legitimacy.

“Other objects that will frequently give rise to UFO reports are such things as airplanes, especially airplanes testing new equipment or doing unusual things, advertising airplanes, balloons. Prank balloons in some cases... you know, kids take a bag like you get from the dry cleaner and put candles on the bottom and the thing will rise not very high, but it will be high enough to be spotted by many people and generally things of that nature are misperceived. They’re perceived to be much larger than they actually are, so they’ll go down as if, you know, they were some sort unidentified craft.”

In keeping with CSICOP’s mission, Shaeffer fails to be honest in that the cases they take issue with are not cases involving pranks, advertising planes, balloons, etc., which are already dismissed as misperceptions, etc. by the very researchers who did the field investigations and which CSICOP takes issue. By not being forthright, CSICOP defaults on its own legitimacy.

“But I would say by and large, people are being quite sincere when they say they are seeing something. But, if you separate out all the readily identifiable ones and concentrate only on those which are more difficult to solve and which require more time and effort, hence the believers group do not achieve solutions, then you’ll find the percentage of hoaxes is substantially higher. You’ll find that, for example, that just about any kid with an Instamatic camera and hubcap can produce a UFO photograph that will be accepted by many.”

CSICOP deliberately clouds the issue by attempting to put investigators of UFO cases in with a group of researchers who prepare UFO cases for analysis and review, with those of people who are not investigators. A typical ploy by the CSICOP cult to discredit, at any cost, including being honest about their own non-existent data to back up their position that researchers in ufology are incapable of detecting a hoax. CSICOP defaults on its legitimacy.

End of Part One. Copyright (c) 2002 by Wendy Connors. All Rights Reserved.

Newton’s cherished constant may not be by UPI Science Correspondent

Mike Martin, 5/6/02

<http://www.upi.com/view.cfm?StoryID=04052002-101439-3089r>

CAMBRIDGE, Mass., May 6 (UPI) -- A Russian physicist at Massachusetts Institute of Technology has announced experimental data that may topple one of science’s most cherished dogmas - that Newton’s gravitational constant, famously symbolized by a large “G,” remains constant wherever, whenever and however it is measured.

“My colleagues and I have successfully experimentally demonstrated that the force of gravitation between two test bodies varies with their orientation in space, relative to a system of distant stars,” Mikhail Gershteyn, a visiting scientist at the MIT Plasma Science and Fusion Center, told United Press International from Cambridge, Mass..

Isaac Newton first described G in 1687 as a fundamental component of his universal law of gravity. Two masses, Newton wrote, attract each other with a force proportional to their mass that falls off rapidly as the bodies move farther and farther apart. Albert Einstein later used G in his own field equations that fine-tuned Newton’s original laws. In Einstein’s universe, gravity is the effect on bodies moving through space that is curved or warped by the presence of matter.

The constant G describes gravity’s attractive force precisely and appears in equations for any gravitational field, whether the field is between planets, stars, galaxies, microscopic particles or rays of light. Centuries of measurement have firmly fixed the value of G as the complex formula 6.673 times 10 to the minus 11th power, times meters traveled per second times the number of kilograms, squared. Gravity is a relatively very weak force, yet it is strong enough to hold planets in orbit and to mash great gobs of matter into incredibly dense, infinitesimally small black holes.

If G varies under any circumstances, scientists would have to rewrite virtually every physical law, including a long-accepted feature of the universe - isotropy, or the condition that a body’s physical properties are independent of its orientation in space. The idea that forces on bodies may vary relative to the orientation of distant stars has a

powerful historical precedent in “Mach’s Principle,” a term Einstein coined in 1918 for the theory that eventually led him to his biggest breakthrough - general relativity.

Swing a bucket of water at the end of rope and centrifugal forces pull it up and away. These forces result from the combined gravitational pull of all the distant stars and planets, Austrian physicist Ernst Mach wrote. Therefore any change in the orientation of heavenly bodies would affect forces on matter everywhere, so powerful is their combined effect. The idea that Newton’s G may change relative to the rest of the universe is an example of Mach’s adage - matter out there affects forces right here.

Gershteyn said his experiments show Newton’s G “changes with the orientation of test masses by at least 0.054 percent.” This remarkable and unprecedented finding has landed his paper on the subject in the June issue of the international journal Gravitation and Cosmology.

“The fact that G varies depending on orientation of the two gravitating bodies relative to a system of fixed stars is a direct challenge to Newton’s Universal Law of Gravitation,” Gershteyn told UPI. “The existence of such an effect requires a radically new theory of gravitation, because the magnitude of this effect dwarfs any of Einstein’s corrections to Newtonian gravity.”

“Gershteyn and his coworkers lay an extraordinary and very interesting claim which - if proven true - would change our view of the universe,” Lev Tsimring, a research physicist with the Institute for Nonlinear Science at the University of California San Diego, told UPI. “In a well-controlled experiment, the authors proposed to measure the gravitational force between two bodies with respect to the orientation of the experimental setup to distant stars,” Tsimring explained. The experiment, he said, would seek to detect gravitational anisotropy - the condition that the attractive force between bodies would vary with respect to their spatial orientation, not their separating distance.

“The latest paper by the authors - in collaboration with an experimentalist who is a well-respected specialist in precisely that kind of measurement - provides strong evidence in favor of the validity of the author’s original claim,” Tsimring said. Gravitation and Cosmology Editor Kirill Bronnikov agreed.

“The evident merit of the paper by Mikhail Gershteyn et. al. is the information of a possible new effect, discovered experimentally - the effect of anisotropy related to Newton’s constant G,” Bronnikov told UPI from Moscow. “So far the possibility of such an effect has only been discussed theoretically.”

“The authors of this paper make some extraordinary claims in a legitimate journal,” George Spagna, chairman of the physics department at Randolph-Macon College, told UPI from Ashland, Va. “But they do not provide enough of their data or theoretical justification. They must provide much more information to be convincing.”

Other scientists will need to provide “more detailed and independent experiments to confirm and elaborate the experimental results obtained in Gershteyn’s paper,” Lev Tsimring told UPI. “I cannot exclude that there might be other ways of explaining this anisotropy within conventional theory, but I believe that Gershteyn’s results are convincing.” © 2002 UPI

Abductees and Implants by Dick Moss, MN MUFON Assist. Dir.

Dr. Roger Leir, a podiatry surgeon for thirty-five years, began research into the existence of alien implants in August of 1995 with removed specimens being analyzed at facilities such as the Los Alamos National Labs, New Mexico Tech, and the University of California.

Leir made a presentation at the 2001 MUFON Symposium in Irvine, California regarding his findings and possible implications. He is considered to be an important leader in physical evidence research involving UFOs. Prior to his Irvine appearance he and his surgical team had removed ten implants from nine abductees. Some tests on the materials showed isotopic ratios not found in elements on planet earth.

Dr. Leir has been on a number of television programs and has authored two books, *The Aliens* and *The Scalpel and Case Book: Alien Implants*. His MUFON Symposium presentation was entitled *Alien Abduction - Alien Implants - Why?*

One of the ten objects turned out to be a piece of glass. Both metallic and non-metallic compositions were found among the remaining nine. The non-

metallic implants were small BB-sized spheres and were attached to lesions commonly referred to as “scoop marks.” Body tissue adjacent to the objects showed no evidence of inflammation. When placed in a serum solution the objects displayed the unusual behavior of changing into a gelatinous state. Then, when the serum was removed and the implants were exposed to air, they returned back to the solid state.

One colleague, a dermatologist, thought that the lesions were a calcifying epithelioma and was shocked to learn that there was no calcium in an implant which contained 21 elements. These elements were earthly enough, but were put together in a strange way. How they are able to change state is not understood.

Of the six metallic objects, four were identical and shaped like small cantaloupe seeds. Another was T-shaped and the sixth was triangular. A dark membrane covered each.

The belief is that this membrane was connected to the lack of inflammation. It was composed of a protein, hemosiderin granules and keratin. These substances are known to exist in the body, but never in combination as observed here.

Dr. Leir described a case in which a man had contacted him with a belief that he had been abducted many years earlier. He was thinking that there might be an implant in his wrist. Prior to removing it they were able to use instruments which indicated that the implant was both receiving and sending signals. A Trimeter indicated a mid-band reading on the combination electric and magnetic scale.

This object was one of the small cantaloupe-seed-shaped devices. Under a microscope there was an appearance of bubbles, eggs or small sacs which contained an oily liquid. The implant was made of magnetic amorphous iron. We can make amorphous iron, but not samples that are magnetic. At this point Dr. Leir shifted into a discussion as to “why” abductions are occurring. Believing that we have been subjected to genetic manipulations for centuries, possibly the implants monitor the progress of ongoing genetic changes in about 15% of abductees.

He believes that children today are very different from those of fifty years ago and are a new race of humans. His studies indicate that during the past

forty years certain childhood developmental traits have progressed far out of proportion to an evolutionary timetable. He illustrated with fifteen examples, five of which are given below. These data compare children in 1987 with children in 1947.

In 1947 children could turn their heads 45 degrees by 6 months. In 1987 it occurred in 2 months.

In 1947 it took 24 months to respond to “No.” In 1987 it took only 8 months.

In 1947 simple sentences could be repeated at 3 years. In 1987 it occurred at 2 years.

In 1947 children could maintain a raised head at 6 months. In 1987 it only took 3 months.

In 1947 children would babble at 12 months. In 1987 they would babble at 5 months.

Dr. Leir ended his presentation with the question, “Are our children a different human species?”

As always, these accounts are very condensed summaries of the original presentation.

There is not room in a couple of columns here to go into great detail. If the reader wishes to know more about the research carried out by all of the Symposium speakers, you are encouraged to obtain a copy of the Symposium Proceedings from: MUFON, P0 Box 369, Morrison CO 80465-0369. The cost, with shipping, is \$27.50.

Field Investigator Update: June 2002 - There's More Happening Than We Think By Craig Lang - MN MUFON FI Coord.

The last two month have seen a relatively low level of new sighting reports come in to Minnesota MUFON. At the same time a significant number of sighting reports tend to be described through larger scale UFO forums such as Filers Files, the National UFO Reporting Center, etc. I have recently wondered about the significance of this. Is this sighting minimum simply a random statistical fluctuation? Or is the volume of sightings much higher than the volume of reports reaching Minnesota MUFON?

Over the years that Minnesota MUFON has been active in investigation work; there have been both quiet periods, and bursts of activity. If one were to

look at the level of sighting reports on a graph, one might find them distributed almost at random. So I tend to guess that while some locations are having heavy sighting activity, this is not Minnesota's moment. Yet, I also hear through the informal grapevine of many sightings that continue to happen. Perhaps the present-day's current events, or even our harried daily lives, take our focus away from those things that don't expressly affect our daily survival. Or perhaps sighting reports are now so common that people simply take them for granted - just another light in the sky. The events of the last MUFON meeting would suggest that the latter might be the case.

Going into the last Minnesota MUFON meeting, there were relatively few new sighting reports to discuss. So I anticipated a short field investigator report at the meeting. The only new report was by our investigator in the Duluth area, who gave a report on a triangle sighting in that location - a classic dark boomerang shaped UFO, with numerous lights on it's edges (stay tuned to this column and the MN MUFON website for updates on this and other sightings).

Following the Duluth sighting report, we tried the slightly different format of holding an "open mike" session for people to describe their own sightings. As a result, what I had imagined as a short meeting segment turned into a lengthy forum as witness after witness came forward to describe their sightings. Many of the sightings described have at one time or another, been reported to MUFON - so these were not new sightings. Still, I was amazed at the number of people in the room who had seen or experienced the UFO phenomenon.

The first witness to speak was a man who had observed a distant daylight disk last month. He observed this object as he and a friend were driving north out of Minneapolis on I-35W. The witness was in the passenger seat, and was looking out at the sky to the east-southeast. As he noticed this unusual object, he observed that it seemed to be stationary, hovering amongst slowly moving, puffy cumulus clouds. He described the object as cigar shaped, and quite distant. Over the few seconds of the sighting, he noted the object's apparent color change - its surface becoming darker then lighter again. The witness noted it, then looked away to talk to his friend, then back to the object. When he did, the color change was very noticeable. Then, he looked back toward his friend once more to say

something. When he looked back, the object had vanished.

The second witness described to our group, a spectacular object which she and another person had seen a few months before. She described how they had observed this object at relatively close range, hovering just above the tree line. The object was a classic disk seen approximately edge-on with an apparently-rotating rotating rim. Lights on the rim seemed to move across it in a marquis-like fashion.

Several other people described UFO encounters at various times as they were driving through the area just south of the Twin Cities - approximately between Minneapolis and Rochester. One event was another sighting of a triangular object, somewhat resembling the boomerang shaped objects so common in the present-day's UFOlogical literature. Another person gave a second hand description of a winter encounter with a small ball of light which shot past the witness's car, only feet over the hood. A layer of ice which had accumulated on the hood was partially melted immediately below the flight path of the object.

While each person had described these sightings before, this confluence of reports in one meeting was, to me, very striking. It gave one the distinct impression that there is far more going on than we see on the surface. This idea is reinforced by with statistics such as the Roper Poll of unusual experiences [see the Roper Poll of Unusual Personal Experiences: 1991 and 1998 - http://www.nidsci.org/news/roper_surveys.html which estimates that approximately one percent of the population fits the criterion of being an experiencer, while about seven percent have had a UFO sighting of some kind. Applying these numbers to the population of the Twin Cities (approximately two million) suggests that there are about twenty thousand experiencers, and one hundred-forty thousand sighting witnesses. Clearly more is happening than we think.

If you have any further updates on events discussed in this column, or know of any information that might bring to light other sightings or encounters, please contact Craig Lang: (phone: 763-560-1532, www.craigrlang.com, crlang@craigrlang.com), or contact Minnesota MUFON through our website: www.mnmufon.org. Also, stay tuned to this column in each newsletter as we discuss more local and regional sighting cases.

With each event, the opportunity to become involved in UFO studies continues to expand. For those wishing to become a field investigator themselves, classes are conducted as sufficient interest is indicated. We try to hold classes approximately three times per year, and hope to hold the next one this summer or fall. 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 enigma. For those who decide to pursue the study of this strange phenomenon, mystery will never be in short supply.

Quantum wormholes could carry people by Charles Choi, 22 May 02

<http://www.newscientist.com/exc/enews.jsp?id=ns99992312>

All around us are tiny doors that lead to the rest of the Universe. Predicted by Einstein's equations, these quantum wormholes offer a faster-than-light short cut to the rest of the cosmos - at least in principle. Now physicists believe they could open these doors wide enough to allow someone to travel through.

Quantum wormholes are thought to be much smaller than even protons and electrons, and until now no one has modeled what happens when something passes through one. So Sean Hayward at Ewha Womans University in Korea and Hisa-aki Shinkai at the Riken Institute of Physical and Chemical Research in Japan decided to do the sums.

They have found that any matter traveling through adds positive energy to the wormhole. That unexpectedly collapses it into a black hole, a super-massive region with a gravitational pull so strong not even light can escape.

But there's a way to stop any would-be traveler being crushed into oblivion. And it lies with a strange energy field nicknamed "ghost radiation". Predicted by quantum theory, ghost radiation is a negative energy field that dampens normal positive energy. Similar effects have been shown experimentally to exist.

Delicate balance

Ghost radiation could therefore be used to offset the positive energy of the traveling matter, the researchers have found. Add just the right amount and it should be possible to prevent the wormhole collapsing - a lot more and the wormhole could be widened just enough for someone to pass through. It would be a delicate operation, however. Add too much negative energy, the scientists discovered, and the wormhole will briefly explode into a new universe that expands at the speed of light, much as astrophysicists say ours did immediately after the big bang.

For now, such space travel remains in the realm of thought experiments. The CERN Large Hadron Collider in Switzerland is expected to generate one mini-black hole per second, a potential source of wormholes through which physicists could try to send quantum-sized particles.

But sending a person would be another thing. To keep the wormhole open wide enough would take a negative field equivalent to the energy that would be liberated by converting the mass of Jupiter.

Connecticut researcher, 21, receives doctorate degree - Nowinski gains Ph.D. in parapsychology, becomes MUFON consultant by Nick Roesler, Wisconsin MUFON State Dir.

WESTPORT, CT - Under normal circumstances, it takes years of study and fieldwork before someone attains a doctorate degree. Most people never do. Jon Nowinski of Westport, Connecticut is not most people.

At 21 years old, Nowinski holds a doctorate degree in parapsychology, and is looking to apply it to his field of study by submitting his resume and a membership application for a Consultant position to MUFON International Director John Schuessler at the 2002 MUFON Symposium in Rochester, New York.

The founder and Director of the Smoking Gun Research Agency, specializing in all things paranormal, Nowinski has been at the helm of the SGRA since its inception some five years ago.

Additionally, Jon's quest for knowledge shows no signs of abating, as he is currently double majoring in Criminal Justice and Journalism. As if that weren't enough, Jon counts among his contacts one of the most influential members of the US Senate, Senator Joseph Lieberman, (D-CT) who nearly became Vice President of the United States when he teamed with former Vice President Al Gore on the 2000 Democratic presidential ticket.

His doctorate degree, which also included the title of Adjunct Professor, has opened the doors for Nowinski to begin a teaching career where many, if not all of his students would be older than their professor.

Looking to provide assistance to the Mutual UFO Network's year-old Outreach Project, Jon has offered to personally take UFO cases that are considered strong cases, such as the 1997 Phoenix Lights case, to Capitol Hill and press for serious government inquiry into the UFO subject, as has been done in other countries, such as France, Great Britain, and Germany.

For further information on Jon and the work of the Smoking Gun Research Agency, visit the group's website at the address provided below.

Dr. Jon Nowinski heads the Connecticut-based Smoking Gun Research Agency. You may contact Jon and the SGRA at: 24 Oakview Circle, Westport, CT 06880-4171, Phone: (203) 247-0310, e-mail: sgrahq@att.net, website: <http://www.sgrahq.com>.

International MUFON Symposium 2002 Announcement

The 2002 International MUFON Symposium is being held in Rochester, NY on July 5-7. Full details can be found on the: www.mufon.com website including registration information.

Minnesota MUFON

State Dir.: Richard Moss (320) 732-3205
Assist. State Dir.: Bill McNeff (952) 890-1390
Journal Editor: Joel Henry, PO Box 240631
Apple Valley, MN 55124
(952) 431-2426 E-Mail: mmj@mnmufo.org

MN MUFON WEB PAGE

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

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

National MUFON Hotline

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

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

**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.