


SUNlite

Shedding some light on UFOlogy and UFOs



Sleep deprivation can produce some strange effects. So can sensory deprivation, and driving through the mountains at night is a pretty close to sensory deprivation. Do you remember those old "Night Driver" video games, where you had to use a steering wheel to keep centered between an endless line of approaching dots that shifted right and left across the screen? Driving Rt. 3 at night is like that.

James MacDonald September 19, 2007(Making light blog)

Volume 4 Number 2

MARCH - April 2012



Something in the air

The RB-47 newsletter produced some interesting e-mail responses. I have a section describing follow-up and potential avenues that could be explored in the future. Some of it includes new information that sheds a little more light on the subject.

In mid-February, I decided to cave-in and perform an interview. I had been asked a few times before but chose not to do so because I really saw no point in it. However, after a bit of gentle prodding by a few friends, I let down my guard. The interview bounced around on so many different cases, it sometimes was confusing as to what we were discussing. I know at one point I referred to the Fort Worth newspaper as the Dallas newspaper. Unfortunately, I did not bother to correct myself because of the pace of the interview. Despite this mea culpa, I thought it went pretty well.

The FE Warren AFB missile incident debate got into full swing after James Carlson and Tim Hebert presented their articles on the subject. Robert Hastings responded by denying he paid Reuters to get his stories published. Instead, he admits paying PRnewswire to publish his story and they got it onto the Reuters

newswire. You have to give Mr. Hastings credit for finding a way to spin things a certain way. I wonder if he sleeps well at night realizing that he ruined the careers and lives of two air force technicians (if this story is even true), who got caught leaking secrets to him through another party?

Roger Paquay provides another contribution in this issue regarding his observations about the November 29, 1989 Eupen UFO. Some of it may be new to readers of SUNlite and some it may be old information. It certainly presents information for readers to refer to and pursue if they desire.

I thought I would share my experiences recently with going up into the white mountains and looking at the Barney and Betty Hill case. This was inspired by a blog entry from James MacDonald. If you haven't read it, you should as he makes some interesting points. However, I question some of his conclusions in this issue. I hope the town of Lincoln does not become the next "Roswell" where there are Betty/Barney Hill festivals. They don't need to promote that sort of thing even though some of the local businesses are beginning to try and cash in on it.

Cover: The Betty and Barney Hill sign near Indian-head in North Lincoln, NH.

Left: Venus followed my airplane home in February. It was quite interesting watch it shift its position relative to the plane as the plane shifted its direction of travel..

It is now the fifteenth anniversary of the Arizona UFOs. I refer my readers to SUNlite 2-3, when examining the case. I am sure there will be plenty of hype in UFO blogs but it is a fact that a bulk of the NUFORC reports made in 1997 did not describe a massive V-shaped object and, instead, just described a formation of lights. Those that reported the massive object appear to have been fooled by Dr. Hartmann's airship and excitedness effects. It is their reports that populate most of the films and documentaries giving a misleading impression as to what was seen that night by a majority of the witnesses in the NUFORC database.

February was also the seventieth anniversary of the Battle of LA. I suggest readers review SUNlite 3-1 for a complete description of this event. The conclusion there is that it was just war nerves and not an alien spaceship.

A link that has nothing to do with UFOs but the scale of the universe is <http://htwins.net/scale2/>. Enjoy it.

Based on a previous suggestion, I am working on an index to SUNlite, which should be done by the next issue. It will be helpful to those trying to locate certain articles/subjects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Who's blogging UFOs.....	2-3
The Roswell Corner	4-5
Taking the Betty and Barney Hill Drive...	6-9
The dance of the planets.....	10
Hastings' hoax?.....	10
RB-47 follow-up.....	11-12
Anecdotal evidence and Science.....	13
Testimonies of 29 November 1989: Eupen, Gileppe by Roger Paquay.....	14-20
Geometric logic.....	21
UFOs on the tube.....	22
Buy it, borrow it, bin it.....	22


The White house petition bandwagon brings out all kinds of individuals looking for the limelight and ways to make a buck off people. According to a PR Newswire release (the same service paid for by Robert Hastings to put out his flawed research), "Doctor" Simeon Hein of the Mount Baldy Institute states that 98% of people in his poll (which was an on-line poll designed to get UFO proponents to participate) believe the White House is lying in their response to the recent UFO petition. This "Mount Baldy Institute" is not what I would consider a legitimate scientific organization. A group that "trains" people in "Human fusion" (undisclosed fee) and "Resonant viewing" (\$995) to unleash your "untapped potential", just sets off all sorts of alarm bells in my book. Can anybody take these claims seriously?

Jim Oberg pointed out a wonderful story about a science fiction based brothel opening up. After those long voyages between the stars, some aliens might make a visit. One would think that sailors are the same everywhere. I wonder if they will have any Orion slave girls?

The national UFO reporting center's Peter Davenport has made the pronouncement that UFO reports are increasing the first part of 2012! He had 206 reports for the first twelve days of 2012 but reading them indicates the quality of these reports are just not very good. For instance, one of his first reports at midnight was a witness seeing orange balls of light and shooting stars at midnight January 1st. The witness added that no fireworks were occurring at the time. Are we led to believe that there were NO fireworks at midnight when most of the rest of the world was celebrating? A significant amount of these reports appear to be caused by the infamous chinese lanterns. Even more interesting to note is that sixty of the 206 reports (up to January 12th) were on new years day. This computes to almost 30% of the reports come from the day that aerial fireworks are common. If one tosses out these 60, the number of reports equates to about 13 reports per day from January 2-12. Compare this to December's rate of over 15/day and November's rate of almost

Who's blogging UFOs?

Hot topics and varied opinions



14/day. It is almost like Davenport does not even pay attention to his own statistics. What this demonstrates is the only "spike" in UFO reports occurred on New Years day, which is not really that unexpected.

Robert Sheaffer presented some information about the Rex Heflin photographs. I have mentioned this in the past and there seem to be indications of a hoax. Now somebody named "Enkidu" has created a 3-D pair from two of the images. As noted by Sheaffer, in this image, the UFO appears to be small and close vice large and distant. Could this be the smoking gun of a hoax? I doubt it. I am sure somebody will proclaim the analysis is flawed and Heflin would never lie about this. Where have I heard this story before?

Bob would add a blog entry regarding an old and ugly rumor that had been revived and circulated on the internet about Phil Klass. The rumor is that Phil had offered \$10,000 to one of Travis Walton's work mates, Steve Pierce. In return for this payment, Pierce would proclaim the entire case was a hoax. Robert lays out how this same charge was made back in 1978 and Klass had pointed out that they were false. Pierce is now repeating the same story from long ago without any real evidence that it is true.

Since Phil is dead, it is easy to make up such tales.

Billy Cox once again repeats his claim that the main stream media is ignoring UFOs that are threatening the skies and the government. Cox parrots the UFO party line regarding Stephenville as his example. It is almost as if he doesn't even think and just has UFOlogists pulling his puppet strings. I guess one can call him UFOs "Howdy doody". Maybe he should start to perform some actual investigative reporting and stop repeating what he is told.

Cox would later praise the good works of the countries of South America, who are trying to resolve the UFO problem on their own. What Cox fails to recognize is

that these governments and their armed services are simply repeating what project Blue Book accomplished almost fifty years ago! It makes for great bedtime stories and headlines. However, it is not science and it has resolved nothing. He can praise them for wasting their time and money all he wants. Then again, the Air Force of Uruguay really has not much to do so chasing saucers might be a worthwhile effort after all. Maybe they will shoot one down. Until that happens, it is the stuff of tabloids, which seems to be the type of reporting that Cox is best at writing.

MUFON is moving on up....to Cincinnati, Ohio. Clifford Clift is stepping down as supreme ruler as well. This isn't a coup this time but Clift resigned for family issues and David MacDonald is relieving him of ultimate command. It appears that Mr. MacDonald plans on providing space for MUFON, which will include a MUFON store! Will the location be called MUFON World? Maybe they will have rides, a grey alien, and a host of other characters running about. Imagine the amount of money that could be made!

Richard Dolan took a jab at George Clooney for stating that he does not understand why more UFOs are not photographed by cell phone cameras. According to Dolan, Clooney should do

Who's blogging UFOs? (Cont'd)

his research like Dan Ackroyd before opining about UFOs. I find that funny because all I have seen is Dan Ackroyd parrot the UFO party line in interviews. In SUNlite 2-4, I provided a quote where he sounded like a raving lunatic. He stated there were 23 species of aliens and that they only landed in isolated places among many things. In SUNlite 3-1, I pointed out where Ackroyd stated the "missile contrail", which made headlines and turned out to be nothing more than an airplane, was an "orb" or "egg" shaped object. This was about a month later when identification had been positively made. Is this somebody who is informed? At least Clooney was stating an opinion. Ackroyd tries to pass off his distortions as facts. I guess Dolan would rather promote a raving loon instead of somebody, who asked a very inconvenient question that Dolan would rather ignore.

Dolan also had a list of twelve documents that treat UFOs "seriously". It looks like the standard "best case" list. Just some pointers for Mr. Dolan, who seems to be only a student of UFO history and not any other kind. The Twining memo was concerned about UFOs being an indicator of Soviet technology. It was only six years since Pearl Harbor. Twining and the AF was not going to ignore a possible indication that the Soviets got a technological jump on the US. This was pointed out in the memo and completely ignored by this UFO "historian". Dolan also adds things like the "Halt Memo" regarding the Rendlesham case, which has been thoroughly debunked. He attempts to recount the Malmstrom Echo/Oscar shutdown even though he gets his facts about what Salas states happened wrong (he states both Oscar and Echo shut down on the same day, which was Salas' original story before he changed the date). There are no documents to support the Oscar flight shut down and the Echo flight has an explanation that does not require UFOs. For some reason, Dolan ignores these facts! Finally, Dolan includes the F-16 chase with UFOs in Belgium. Missing from his "documents", are the subsequent studies done by Salmon-Gilmard and Meessen. Apparently, he does not want his readers to know about this information. What we see here is Mr. Dolan just pumping out select information to feed to the UFO masses, who blindly accept what he says. Real histori-

ans would evaluate all the evidence. Mr. Dolan, while he may be educated as a historian, can not seriously be considered anything more than a UFO proponent blinded by his believe in conspiracies and alien spaceships

Robert Hastings again makes all sorts of claims about his UFOs and Nukes dog and pony show. I was shocked to read that he claimed that Carlson never produced any e-mails from Figel even though those e-mails have been produced at Reality Uncovered and here in SUNlite several times (SUNlite 2-3 and 2-6). In both e-mails I published, Figel pointed out that he interpreted the UFO report that Hastings states is so important as somebody just kidding around. Hastings never mentions this and he does not mention to his readers that Figel stated that he doubts that Salas' version events at Oscar flight ever happened. Why does Hastings pretend these things do not exist and why does he REFUSE to admit that Figel told him these things to his readers?

Responding to Hastings diatribes was Tim Hebert, who could not understand why Hastings has yet to comment on his post about the Echo Flight shutdown having nothing to do with UFOs. When Hebert publicly asked him on the UFO Chronicles blog, Hastings said Hebert was incapable of OBJECTIVELY evaluating the evidence. I find that a hypocritical statement since Hastings has done nothing to evaluate the actual evidence. He puts faith in his interpretation of what the witnesses stated and ignores any technical evaluation of what might have occurred. The bottom line here is Hastings is afraid of confronting Hebert because he knows he doesn't have the knowledge that Hebert has. His silence is deafening.

I was disappointed in Bruce Duensing's blog entry about NORAD being unable to defend the US against UFOs. His original blog entry made a production about the infamous "missile" west of Los Angeles back in November 2010. Apparently, Duensing was unaware it was solved long ago and it was just an airplane contrail. My comment on his blog resulted in him removing this section but he made some other mistakes that should be mentioned. He presented the 2004 Mexican

AF video, which was nothing more than oil well fires filmed by an infrared camera from a great distance. Duensing also use the Belgium UFO chase of March 30-31, 1990 as an example. My guess is he uses Leslie Kean as his source of information because, like the Mexican AF video and the California "missile", the Belgium F-16 chases have been reasonably explained. Salmon-Gilmard performed an analysis explaining many of the returns and Auguste Meessen also wrote a paper explaining many of the echoes recorded by the radar. I understand Mr. Duensing's point but his examples were poorly chosen.

Peter Davenport highlighted a UFO photograph that was interesting to say the least. The witness, who took the photograph implied he was piloting the plane, which was an Albatross (HU16b). However, the photograph was taken from a location on the plane that was in the passenger compartment. Even more damning is the EXIF data indicated there was a seven second difference (11:16:28 and 11:16:35) between the two images but the witness, who took the image with an I-Phone, stated it zipped by the planes as if it were a simple blur and that it was visible for just a split second (time listed as 0.5 seconds). Indeed the image of the UFO is blurry, which is more confusing because the entire wing (close to the photographer) and distant objects were all in sharp focus. The blur does not appear to be motion blur but, instead, appears to be due to the object being extremely close to the camera. Shooting at a shutter speed of 1/1800th a second, one would expect the object to be practically frozen unless it zipped by so fast, that it could not even had been seen. My guess is the UFO image involves something on the plane's window and may be a hoax.

Openminds TV's Jason McClellan should get his facts right before commenting that a UFO had crashed in South Carolina. He thought the sonic explosion made it unlike an ordinary fireball and indicated something else. Although bright meteors do not always produce sonic booms, it is not as rare as he thinks. The evidence is pretty convincing for a bright fireball.

The Roswell Corner

If you are not with us....

Anthony Bragalia continues to try and make something out of nothing. His latest article basically called two elderly gentlemen liars because they did not tell him what he wanted to hear.

Mr. Bragalia tried to interview two men who were supposedly in Roswell in 1947. However, one denied being stationed at Roswell even though he admitted to being a private in the Army Air Force in 1946 and some of 1947. The other mentioned being stationed there in 1946 but not 1947.

Tony Bragalia, as is his custom, implies that he could tell they were lying to him by the way they responded on the phone. According to Bragalia, the yearbook documents they were there and because they refuse to admit they were stationed there, they are being dishonorable.

Because he has a strong belief that there is a conspiracy and that these men will lie, cheat, or steal to hide their involvement, Bragalia has drawn his conclusion. However, he ignores possible reasons why they stated what they did. I can think of a few:

- They don't remember being there. This is quite plausible especially if they felt they left at a certain time of year or were never there. One item I found revealing was an article called, "Phantom flashbulbs: False recollections of hearing the news about Challenger" (Neisser and Harsh). The study had students write what had happened the day after the Challenger accident and then, two and a half years later, repeat the report. About a third of the memories were inaccurate even though some of those individuals felt the later memories were accurate! One witness even moved their location from the school to her parent's house. The lesson here being that one can not consider any of these old memories to be 100% accurate. When talking about a private, who spent just a few

years in the military over sixty years ago, it is not beyond the possibility that they would forget details or get them wrong from that time period.

- They weren't there in JULY of 1947 as they stated. As best I can tell, the yearbook was printed sometime in mid-1947. It shows events from 1946 as well as 1947 so it encompasses that time period and not just the summer of 1947. If somebody was stationed there in 1946 but not 1947, they would probably appear in the yearbook.
- There is the possibility that he got the wrong individual in the case of the person, who claimed they were never stationed at Roswell. Bragalia states the surname is extremely rare. I looked into the RAAF yearbook and discovered three "Robert E."s for the first Air Transport Unit. Two fit the description he gave (the other being a sergeant and having a very common last name). While I could not find any mention of one of them in the newspaper archive, I did discover that a Robert E. Walthour (who is listed as a pfc in the 1st ATU) from Greensburg, PA had exited the Army in October 1945 (Connellsville, PA daily courier - Oct 16, 1945). When I pointed this out to Bruce Hutchinson, he followed up by looking into the national archives and discovered that there were three Robert E. Walthours from Pennsylvania that served in the Army in the 1940s. Two of them enlisted in 1946 (in different locations and with different ages/backgrounds). Could Bragalia have gotten the wrong person (he did not respond to my two e-mail queries on this)? Even if it wasn't, it demonstrates that it is possible to get two people with the same rare surname, serving in the military at the same time.
- The person who denied being present at RAAF did purposefully lie to him but for reasons other than a UFO crash. Maybe he had military or personal reasons he did not want anyone to discover.
- Bragalia misinterpreted what these individuals told him. We have no recordings of what was actually stated so they can be verified. It is his interpretation of what they said in his article.

Bragalia would later tell me that he had talked to two individuals who were at Roswell in July of 1947 and they told him that both individuals were there during that month. Bragalia simply accepts this claim as factual. I find the ability for anyone to remember such specific details after sixty years to be somewhat suspect. In my opinion, calling these gentlemen "dishonorable" based on what they or others recall is just wrong and simply ignores all possibilities in favor of only one. Bragalia's motto is apparently, "If you aren't going to tell me what I want to hear, then you are lying and are part of the conspiracy." I find this approach to a very controversial subject, highly biased and lacking in objectivity. If Bragalia wants to prove if somebody was or was not present in Roswell in July 1947, I suggest he obtain RAAF records or the person's service record before calling that person a liar. What he has presented so far is speculative and subject to error.

As a side note, the interviewees did not recall the names of General Roger Ramey or Colonel Blanchard. I assume from Bragalia's implication is they were denying they had contact with them on purpose. Because Bragalia apparently has little or no military background, he misses the obvious reason why these individuals did not remember them. A private is the lowest man on the totem pole and would not normally associate with high ranking officers in a large command like the 509th bomb group. Unless Blanchard and Ramey were as famous and flamboyant as George Patton, it is unlikely that a buck private, who served in their command but rarely had any close contact with them, would even remember them. If this is an example of how the "dream team" is conducting its research, one can expect more of the usual wildly speculative conclusions and inaccurate research so common in the writings about Roswell.

Hitting the nail on the head

Nick Redfern's blog posting about the infamous missing files was on target. I can't count how many times I have seen various crash proponents make much out of this. It is nice to see that Mr. Redfern looked at it logically and was not blinded by an emotional tie to the case.

WEATHER

Partly cloudy this morning.
Mostly clear this afternoon,
night and Saturday. Slightly
warmer Saturday.

LONG BEACH INDEPENDENT

PHONE
6-9641

Long Beach 12, Calif., Friday Morning, March 10, 1950

VOL. 12
NO. 103

5c

HOME EDITION

ADMITS NEVER SEEING WEIRD FLYING SAUCER

More wild speculation

Tony Bragalia once again demonstrated his ability to twist logic in order to link just about anything to Roswell. In this instance, we have a March 10, 1950 letter written from Lt. Col. Robert Blount to a Dr. Robley Evans at MIT. Lt. Col. Blount discusses in the letter, an April 1949 report written by Dr. Paul Fitts concerning the psychological analysis of UFO reports. In the final paragraph of the letter, Blount writes:

It has been recently rumored that one of these so-called flying saucers crashed in Mexico; however, the details are somewhat bizarre at the moment. (my emphasis in bold and underlined).

Bragalia links this all to Roswell. He picks out the "bizarre" comment as meaning that it was "exotic". However, it could also be interpreted to mean that the details were outrageous and difficult to believe. There is reason to suspect this was the case.

Back in SUNlite 3-3, I pointed out to my readers a lecture on March 8, 1950 at Denver University, where the Aztec story was being discussed. That next day an article in the Greeley tribune mentioned the lecture but also noted that Ray L. Dimmick had recently reported that he had seen or heard about a flying saucer crash outside Mexico City. The Dimmick story appeared in national newspapers on March 9th and 10th. The March 10th Long Beach Independent made it a front

Flying Saucer And Tiny Pilot Reported Seen

LOS ANGELES, (AP)—A Los Angeles business executive told reporters yesterday he saw an ultra-streamlined flying saucer in Mexico last week, wrecked on a mountainside.

He was told, he said, that a man 23 inches tall died in the crash, and that his body has been embalmed for scientific study.

There was no confirmation of his account from any source in Mexico, and the air force in Washington said it hadn't heard of it.

Ray L. Dimmick, sales manager of the Apache Powder Co., described the metal in the ship as being of tremendous hardness. He said he was taken to the scene by business associates. The craft crashed about three months ago, he continued.

"The saucer was powered by two motors," said Dimmick, 53, widely known amateur golfer hereabouts and considered an expert on chemicals, explosives and metals.

"It was about 40 feet in diameter, built of a strange material resembling aluminum."

Dimmick declined further discussion, except to say that high Mexican officials believe the machine came from some other planet, and that top U.S. military officials have viewed it.

"I think the government ought to make its position clear," he continued. "If it doesn't want to disclose these things for security reasons, why not say so? If it feels it is unwise to make the information public for fear of panic there should be some way found to handle the situation diplomatically."

Reminded that the air force announced last December it was dropping its investigation of flying saucers because of a preponderance of evidence that they do not exist, Dimmick said:

"I'm big enough to take the consequences of what I've said and stand my ground."

Page 1 story in the Syracuse Post-Standard on March 10th, 1950.

page headline (The image of that headline and the first part of the story is displayed above and to the right here). Several newspapers in the east had the story on page one (see story to the left). All mentioned an AF investigation into the story.

Is it any surprise that on the same day the story made news across the nation, Lt. Col. Blount wrote about a recent rumor regarding a flying saucer crash in Mexico? It appears to be just more than a coincidence that Blount would make reference to a recent rumor of a spaceship crash that had the same location as the Dimmick story.

When Gilles Fernandez pointed this story out to Mr. Bragalia, he dismissed it because it was only a rumor and Lt. Col. Blount would have not found the story credible enough to discuss it in this official correspondence. Of course, Bragalia completely ignores the context of the statement made by Lt. Col. Blount. He declared it a recent (i.e. in the past few days/months) rumor that is was bizarre (i.e. outrageous), and described the flying saucers as "so-called". Since he was talking about UFOs in this letter, casually mentioning this news would not be out of the ordinary especially when he referred to it in the manner he appears to be describing.

In my opinion, Blount was referring to the Dimmick hoax and it had nothing to do with Roswell. As with many of Bragalia's sensationalist writings, his failure to see beyond the Roswell myth prevents him from looking at more logical explanations.

'A Friend Told Me About It'

(By International News Service)

A Los Angeles businessman who claimed he had "seen" wreckage of a flying saucer backed down Thursday night by saying he was told about the object by a friend in Mexico.

Officials and scientists had already cast doubt on the report.

Ray L. Dimmick's original account of the "saucer" also included a statement that he had been told "by officials" that the "plane" was piloted by a fantastic midget only 23 inches tall, possibly from another planet.

Mexican and United States authorities quickly and explicitly denied the story.

Questioned officially Thursday night in Los Angeles by Air Force Sgt. Richard Coleman, an orders from Washington, D. C., Dimmick said he was told about the saucer, but did not see it.

Dimmick's earlier story had stated that he inspected the wrecked "saucer" last week at a military installation near Mexico City, where it was under guard. Dimmick had stated that Mexican businessmen told him the "pilot" died in the crash.

The first secretary of the U. S. embassy in Mexico City said flatly:

"I can say definitely and officially that this report is not true. No embassy official has inspected, seen, or knows anything about this."

Col. Joseph Anderson, assistant U. S. military attache at the Mexican City embassy, said of Dimmick's story that "This is beyond me." He added:

"I have not heard of any such thing, nor seen it, and were it true I feel positively that I would have been informed by the Mexican defense ministry, since we are in closest touch with them."

Mexican air force spokesmen similarly insisted they knew nothing about the wrecked "saucer" or its mysterious, tiny pilot.

In Washington, air force headquarters insisted it had heard nothing about the Mexico City flying saucer.

Maj. Jess Stay, air force public information officer, told International News Service:

"The air force has no knowledge of the incident and we are sure that if any U. S. military man of

(Continued on Page 2)


In 2009, Kentaro Mori posted a link on his blog to an article by Science Fiction writer James MacDonald concerning the Barney and Betty Hill incident. The article was over a year and a half old and I was surprised that I had not heard of it until then. James lives in New Hampshire and is quite familiar with the trip Betty and Barney took that night. To be honest, I was more than willing to accept the idea they confused something astronomical as the UFO and then dreamed the rest of the story up under hypnosis. MacDonald makes a case for why things transpired the way they did and explains the "missing time". After reading his article, I was intrigued by his argument. Some of the key

points that appeared to go unmentioned in the popular UFO literature was suddenly illuminated by MacDonald.

The Betty and Barney Hill event

I am not going to rehash the details about this event other than mention the basic outline:


- Betty and Barney Hill were returning to their home in Portsmouth, New Hampshire following a trip to Niagara Falls and Canada on September 19th, 1961.
- The trip home involved a very long drive along the minor two-lane roads through the mountains in northern New Hampshire.
- They left Colebrook, NH around 10 PM.
- As they drove south, around Lancaster, NH, they saw a bright light in the southern sky near the moon.
- The light continued to be there as they drove south but appeared to get bigger.
- They tried to convince themselves it was an airplane but, after examining with binoculars, thought it was an alien spaceship.



- As they drove south, they seemed to have lost track of the time. The next thing they knew they were on Interstate 93 heading towards Concord. They did not really recall much of what happened between Lincoln, NH and that point.
- When they arrived in Portsmouth, it was almost dawn. They had estimated they would return around 2 or 3 AM. It seems they had about 3 hours of "missing time".
- Later hypnosis revealed they were abducted by aliens. The details of the event are well known in the UFO community.

The elusive UFO

One part of the case that confuses me is the story about Betty and Barney driving for over 30 minutes watching this very bright UFO but nobody else driving in the area saw it. Just over twenty miles from Franconia Notch (about the same distance Lancaster is from the same location), is the Mount Washington Obser-



View from the top of Mount Washington towards the SW. Some of the peaks are over 30 miles away.

vatory. At an altitude of over 6,000 feet, it is the highest point in the White Mountains and one can see for dozens of miles from there (see the image I took below center which shows the view from the mountain top towards Lincoln, NH just south of the notch). The observers there make weather observations on a regular basis but the UFO seems to have been invisible to them. If Betty could see the UFO from ground level, why couldn't these observers see it from over 6,000 feet altitude?

Then we have the motives of the UFO occupants. Were they focused the entire time on Betty and Barney as they drove south? Why did they wait for Betty and Barney to come to them? If they were fascinated by the Hills, why didn't they simply go get them early on?

These are questions that appear to be ignored by the proponents of the Hill case. While, it is difficult to determine how aliens would actually act, the missing UFO reports from all of northern NH seems to indicate problems with the story as told.

Drowsy driving

A key point that James makes is that Betty and Barney were driving late at night trying to get home from a long trip to Canada. They had apparently run out of money and could not afford a hotel. As a result, they were going to drive through the night to get home.

Driving down two lane roads that twist about would make for a difficult trip during the day time. On my trip to Lancaster, which I had driven during the day and at night, I found the roads to be a bit tasking the farther north you drove. The trip to Twin Mountain from Lancaster was particularly difficult in the dark even today. Back in 1961, it would have been somewhat

lonely and, if one were not familiar with the road, tricky to navigate.

Add to these issues the mental and physical fatigue they must have felt and you have a recipe for confusion and mistakes. Is it any surprise that they could not remember exactly where they were or when they passed through a certain area?

While many UFO proponents state they should have gotten home by 3AM, MacDonald notes they were not familiar with the New Hampshire roads in 1961 and the trip would have taken much longer. This was confirmed by Peter Brookesmith, who drove the trip over a decade ago. He computed an arrival time in Portsmouth of around 5 AM. He also estimated that the trip from Colebrook to Indian Head took at least two and possibly three hours. All the multiple stops that Betty and Barney took that night could make up for the three or so hours that supposedly were "missing" from their trip.

Up on the mountain top

James MacDonald's big surprise was the source of the UFO. He had driven the trip with his family and attempted to locate some of the landmarks on his drive. At the time I first read the article, I was not aware of anyone trying this. I later learned that both Karl Pflock and Peter Brookesmith had documented their attempts at performing the drive in the book "Encounters at Indian Head". However, neither of them bothered to mention MacDonald's potential source of the UFO.

Just south of Lancaster, New Hampshire, is when Betty first noticed the UFO. James notes that this is where you just come up over a ridge and see the peak of Cannon Mountain for the first time. In 1959, a tower with an intense light had been placed on the top of Cannon mountain. It was MacDonald's suggestion that this light could have been the source of the UFO that intrigued me. So, I decided to make a trip to the White Mountains and see for myself.


North Lincoln, NH

I live in Manchester NH and first attempted this trip in April of 2009. While the

weather was clear in Manchester, low clouds hid the mountain tops. It was an informative trip but I was unable to accomplish my goal to see how the light appeared at night. Between my astronomy hobby and other obligations, I just never got to go up to the mountains at night for a few more years. I finally got that chance last fall.



Before I go into the drive, I really wanted to mention how the town of North Lincoln, NH is beginning to see a chance to make money off of the case. I stopped for gas and discovered the gas station had all sorts of alien references on the outside. The funniest thing was when I went to the rest room. The walls of the ONLY bathroom inside were coated with newspaper clippings, magazine articles, and other items referencing the Hills, Roswell, and just about anything else related to UFOs. Do they really expect people to read all of this while others wait to use the bathroom?



After gassing up, I chose to stop by the sign that has been erected commemorating the event. It is too bad that describes the incident as factual, which gives the event too much credence. Less skeptical

people would accept the story blindly. It really should have stated that it was an "alleged abduction". Of course, the protests would have come from Kathleen Marden, who apparently designed the sign and got it erected. I am surprised there was not a plug on the sign to read her book. Perhaps the state of NH would only allow so much.


After taking a few pictures of the Indian Head outcrop, I proceeded north through Franconia notch and the White Mountain forest towards Lancaster NH



Mount Prospect

When I arrived in Lancaster, NH, I could see what Mr. MacDonald had described. The view to the south is obscured by buildings and the surrounding hillsides. As one drives south through town, you begin to drive up a grade to the top of a ridge next to Mount Prospect where a view opens up to show the view to the south (see above).

As I watched the increasing twilight from the top of the hill at Mount Prospect, I began to have an uneasy feeling about the mountain light theory. The light on the mountain was not very noticeable to the naked eye, despite it being easy to see in binoculars and my telephoto lens (see below). At best it would appear no brighter than the average star (about +3) and maybe a bit fainter. It is possible, the light could have been much brighter in 1961. However, the tower, as it exists today, could not have grabbed Betty Hill's attention.





Driving south

While driving south along route 3, the light continued to be faint to me. I had seen Cannon Mountain as I had driven north during daylight and expected to see the light easily. This was not the case.

After passing through Twin Mountain, one drives into the edge of the White Mountain National Forest. There are plenty of trees as one drives in a west-southwest direction. They obscure just about anything to the south or southwest.

James MacDonald identified a picnic area in this region where the Hills reportedly stopped. This is the Mount Cleveland area and it is very small (see image above). According to the literature, they could see the UFO from this point but I do not see how if it was to the south or southwest. The trees and hills hide just about everything in that direction even where there is no foliage on the trees.

The light appears

As I approached within about five miles of the mountain the road turns towards the southwest. Suddenly a bright light, which I estimated was as bright as



Sirius, appeared to my right in the trees. It wasn't a star or planet because it was in a location where no bright stars or planets were positioned. It then moved to the left side of the road. I was pretty sure I was seeing the light on top of the mountain but the road was too dark and I could not see much.

After the road opened up with a wide view I was able to verify I was seeing the light on the mountain. There was a parking area on the eastern side of the road that allowed me to stop and take some pictures. Was this area accessible in 1961? Aerial photographs are not very clear and neither are the topographic maps I have. It seems that it would be a better argument for the stop that Betty and Barney made than the Mount Cleveland picnic area.



The mountain was visible and the light was quite prominent on the right side of the road. The telephoto shows how it would have appeared from this location using binoculars (see above). The moon was visible but under a darker sky, the light might appear to have been in the sky and not on the mountain top. As I

neared Cannon Mountain, the road shifted towards the southwest and the light then moved to the left side of the road. Looking at old maps of the road, it was not a very straight path like the present interstate and it had several changes in direction during this leg. Looking at the 1964 images compared to the lights location, we would see the following pattern relative to a car driving south (distances are approximate)

Approximate distance from 2011 parking area	Direction to the light relative to the road
0-0.4 mi	Right
0.4-0.7 mi	Center
0.7-0.9 mi	Right
0.9-1.7 mi	Left
1.8-1.9 mi	Center
Echo Lake	Right

I lost the light just before reaching exit 34C for Echo Lake about two miles from the mountain light. I then proceeded through Franconia Notch where the light was no longer visible.

...and reappears

Since I was by myself, I could not see out the right side of the car as I passed through the notch. However, at the Lafayette campground exit (the first on the southern part of the route as one exits the notch), I turned off the road and was able to see the light only about a mile southeast of its location.


The next exit I turned off at was about 4 miles from the light near the "Flume" parking area. The light was very obvious. Using a telephoto lens (see below), one can see how this "light" might appear to be an airborne craft.



As I continued to drive south, the light disappeared behind the trees shortly before reaching the road sign commemorating the event but reappeared a mile



The google earth image to the left shows the road as it is today. The Historical aerials image (<http://historicaerials.com/>) to the right shows the road leading to Franconia Notch in 1964. The road Betty and Barney took is now called SR18 or "Profile Road" (Marked by arrows on left image). The narrow nature of the road compared to the interstate demonstrates the twists and turns that would make the drive difficult and shift the position of the light relative to the road. The nature of the roads in 1961 is an important factor to consider when examining the case.



or so south of this location near the US-93 interchange. The light, over six miles away, was still quite prominent. In 1961, the light may have been more or less visible depending on the intervening terrain/trees.

Planetarium simulation

After scaling the image on page 8 with images from the Stellarium planetarium program, I decided to make some simulated images of how the stars and moon might appear to Betty and Barney Hill from the same location at different times. Below are images for times 2330 and 0030. I chose these times because this is the time period it is believed that Betty and Barney made it to Franconia Notch. The moon was still visible but was just off the right edge. It is important to

point out that this is the view they would have as they exited the forest/woods about 3 miles north of Cannon Mountain. As one drives closer to the mountain, the moon and planets would have shifted position relative to the ridgeline. They would have been pretty low and disappeared behind the mountains as they drove south through the notch.

Reflections

As I proceeded south on US-93, I felt I had seen enough. It was clear that the light was very prominent within a half-dozen miles of the mountain. Could it have played a role in the events that transpired that night in September 1961?

In my opinion, I felt the light, as it is today,

was not very bright from Mount Prospect in Lancaster. The drive south through Whitefield to Twin Mountain provides views of Cannon Mountain but I never noticed the light to be prominent. Only when I was within a half-dozen miles of Cannon Mountain did it become an item of interest. The conditions for my drive were pretty clear, so I doubt the issue had to do with intervening atmosphere. However, we don't know if the lights brilliance has changed in the past fifty years. A brighter bulb or a clearer casing might make the difference. I would consider it possible but not likely that the light on the mountain was what Betty first saw. It may have been that she first confused Jupiter or Saturn, which were near the moon and bright enough to be noticed.

Once they were within a few miles of Cannon Mountain, the light started to play a role in the events. Reading the narrative, the characteristics of the UFO appeared to mimic that of the light on the mountain top. One has to remember that at the time of the incident, both Barney and Betty were very fatigued and Betty had all sorts of wild ideas about what they were seeing. It would not take much for them to be confused and convinced they were seeing something other than the light on top of the mountain. Is it any surprise that as they drove further south, the UFO seems to have "disappeared" from the sky? It seems to be a significant coincidence that prior to passing through the notch, the UFO was in front of them but after they passed through the notch, it eventually "disappeared" from view.


Is this case solved with this explanation? I can't state that we can conclusively close the book here. However, these explanations appear to me to be more plausible than an alien spaceship that nobody else noticed that night.



The moon and planets for the night of September 19/20, 1961 at 2330 (L) and 0030 (R) as viewed from the rest area location where I took the photograph on page 8. In 1961, there would have been more trees and one descends into a valley after leaving this point.

The dance of the planets

March is probably going to be a banner month for UFO reports. The weather is going to warm up and people are going to be out in the evening to see the wonders of the night sky. You can also add the anniversary to the Arizona UFOs to alert some people to go out and look.



The first big event in March is the appearance of Mars in the east after sunset. Mars is at opposition and is brighter than all the night sky's stars but Sirius. It will be a bright orange beacon for those who are not sure what they are observing. It will be interesting to see how many reports will be traced to this IFO.

The second big astronomical event happens the evening of March 13th (see below image using Stellarium software). On that night the planets Venus and Jupiter will be very bright twins a few degrees apart in the west after sunset. They will be close together for the week before and after. In late February and March, the moon will pass by the two planets on successive nights (on the 25th and 26th of both months). The queen of UFOs and the king of the planets will put on quite a show for celestial observers. Will they also produce the lion's share of UFO reports during March?



Hastings' hoax?

Robert Hastings continues to push on everyone the idea that the FE Warren AFB missile incident was caused by UFOs. I really see no reason to go into the technical details as Tim Hebert has demolished most of what Hastings has presented. However, there are other details that he has been presenting that bear mentioning.

It appears that most of Hastings "inside information" has come from an individual that has connections with active duty personnel. He has been feeding Hastings all the information that Hastings has been announcing to the world. He also appears to be the source of the "blimp-like" UFO reports. His anonymity and close ties to Hastings indicate he is probably one of those aficionados interested in the UFOs and nukes story line and wants to become part of it. Since we don't know his name, I will refer to him by the code name "Wannabe".

Wannabe has told Hastings he has received information from two missile technicians attached to FE Warren AFB. These technicians have since been asked to "retire" and had their DD214s "flagged" so they can't pursue defense contract work in the future. This all has to do with the military discovering they had been leaking classified information about UFOs or missile technology to Wannabe.

The whole problem with this story is that the technicians sounded like junior enlisted personnel, who can't really "retire". Even if they were senior enlisted personnel/officers, they would not be allowed to "retire" with honors if their DD214s have been flagged. That indicates they were punished and would not be honorably discharged. If these enlisted men thought they were wronged by this punishment, they could ask for a court-martial. When I was in the Navy, we were always told to request one if you were truly innocent of any wrongdoing. The fact they chose not to ask for one indicates it is likely they were punished for violating security regulations regarding the activities on base and their departure has nothing to do with UFOs.

However, if their story was true, one can

imagine what kind of press coverage these individuals could generate if they were to proclaim they were forced out of the USAF because of UFOs! Legal action might be possible. At this point, the individuals have little to lose since they already have suffered punishment and were forced out of the service with dire consequences if you believe Wannabe. Hastings, who is great for threatening legal action against anybody who questions him, seems uninterested in the welfare of these two individuals or what he could potentially gain from the publicity. One wonders why? Is it possible because they don't even exist?

The two technicians story is based on some anonymous individuals who are contacting Mr. Wannabe. In turn, Mr. Wannabe talks to Hastings. This brings us into a possibility that some of these individuals may not even exist or are not who they claim to be. A security violation would be serious business and the military would make sure that everybody was aware of it. Looking about at the various military news sources, I could find no indication that any individuals were discharged because they violated security regulations at FE Warren. So either the USAF has kept it quiet or the stories about these individuals are not accurate.

While skeptics, like myself, can't prove anything as long as these individuals remain anonymous, there are the earmarks of a potential hoax here. The entire story or parts of it may have been fabricated for "effect". There is tendency for UFOlogists to be taken in by stories they want to believe and this could be the case again. Hoaxers/liars like Billy Meier, Ed Walters, Don Schmitt, Frank Kaufmann, Glenn Dennis, Phil Imbrogno, etc. are perfect examples of this sort of thing. It is up to Robert Hastings to exercise his "due diligence" in vetting his sources prior to making pronouncements. He has yet to demonstrate that his sources are reliable or even exist.



I have received a few comments about the RB-47 case and I felt it was necessary to go over some of the counter-arguments I received. I also wanted to add any details that I came across in looking at new information I received/discovered.

We don't do fractions?

One of the first arguments I received was the fact that it was positively known that the RB-47 came across the coast at the 89th meridian. This is supposed to be a proven fact because RB-47s always flew along round numbered Meridians and Latitudes. The purpose of using round numbers was that it made it easier for the analysts to determine the locations of radar sites from the data.

I found this argument rather odd. One could easily fly along any line of longitude/latitude (even ones that were not round numbers) and the data would be just as easy to analyze as long as the analysts could calculate using fractions. This implies the analysts and RB-47 crews were just not very smart or very good at their jobs. I could not agree with that conclusion. When I was in the navy, we practiced the motto to train the way we fight. If they flew that way during training, then they would fly that way during a mission. Such a predictable pattern would be recognized within a few missions. This means that, because the USAF did not want the analysts to calculate positions using fractions, they endangered the crews and their missions. Something was wrong with this methodology.

In an effort to resolve the issue, I contacted a navigator who had flown in RB-47s, and asked him about this among other things. The response I received was that he had no idea where the explanation for flying along lines of longitude and latitude originated. His experience was

that they did not purposefully fly along specific longitudes or latitudes for the sake of making the data "easier" to evaluate. He added that if they did fly along a specific line of latitude or longitude it was only by coincidence. The only time he could recall doing so was when they navigated up the prime meridian from England on their first leg of their trip to their operating area.

What this all means is that the theory they were navigating specific lines of longitude and latitude so the ECM operators could obtain valid data is not very plausible. The idea that they would restrict themselves to flying along only round numbered values of longitude/latitude seems even more absurd. As a result, one can not categorically state the plane positively flew up the 89th meridian. I would need to see the navigator's log to change my opinion on this and not wishful thinking.

We also have several reasons that they were not flying along the round number even if, contrary to what the navigator told me, this was standard procedure:

1. The pilot, Lewis Chase, stated that they did not perform any Raven mission until after the turn west from Meridian. There would be no reason for them to fly along a round numbered meridian at this point.
2. Both McCoid and McClure stated it was not a training flight. There was no reason to fly along a specific round numbered longitude.
3. If they were training analysts to calculate positions of radar sites, they would want to make it difficult for them to perform the calculations. Flying along 88.75 vice 89 degrees would introduce a twist for those

computations with known radar locations to see if they could do it under actual conditions where a round numbered line of longitude was not possible.

4. Assuming they were attempting to fly along the 89th meridian, what prevents them from having drifted eastward three to five miles? The CPS-6B at the Keesler annex was only about 2.5 miles to the east of the 89th meridian (at 88.95 degrees). If they were off course just a half-dozen miles, it would be possible for them to be on the east side of the Keesler radar and then potentially have an upscope signal with a broken relay/connection.

Call me stubborn but unless I can see actual documentation that the plane positively flew over the coast at 89.0000000000 degrees longitude, I still consider it very possible the plane flew east of the CPS-6B and that was the source of the upscope signal.

A supersonic radar plane?

I never examined the possibility that the up-scope signal was due to a plane with a radar on board. The Soviets had a radar that was similar to the CPS-6B in that it operated around 3GHZ. It was referred to as "Token". It was suggested that a large supersonic plane could have such a radar mounted on it and create a test for the RB-47 crew.

About the only plane that satisfies the need for being supersonic and large was the B-58 "Hustler". It was first flown in November 1956. The problem with this idea is that there are no records of such an aircraft or any such modification. The B-58 did not become operational at Carswell until 1960 because of a long test period so it seems unlikely that an untested bomber would have been used in this way. It is an interesting theory but, without some more convincing data (like a document describing this modification), I would not consider it plausible.

A forgotten radar site

One item that I had missed in my original map was the Perrin AFB training radar that existed in 1957. In 1955, there

Kevin Randle made a recent blog post-
King that basically repeats the same
old argument about anecdotal evidence
and how science will accept it for certain
sciences but not for UFOs. As expected,
Randle makes his case by drawing paral-
lels with the discovery that meteorites
came from falling out of the sky.

Were professors lying?

President Thomas Jefferson made the
mistake of suggesting that it was im-
possible for rocks to fall from the sky. He
would live to regret making the statement
when science eventually determined that
this was the case. If you listened to many
UFOlogists, it was the anecdotal testimo-
ny of the eyewitnesses that established
this. However, they also had the rocks
that fell, which demonstrated the story
the witnesses were telling were accurate.
So, it was not the anecdotal testimony
alone that established the fact that mete-
orites came from the sky.

Anecdotal meteor observations

As an amateur astronomer, I am fully
aware of how anecdotal testimony
has played a role in observations of as-
tronomical events. One of the fields I
first became involved with was meteor
observing. I spent hundreds of hours
in my backyard, counting meteors as a
teenager. Reflecting on my observations
back during that time period, I suspect
that some of my observations were not
that accurate. I just did not have the ex-
perience to differentiate between what I
thought might have been a meteor and
just tricks of the eye. I probably counted
these "tricks" (flickering lights/dark me-
teors) as meteors when they probably
weren't. What this demonstrates is that
one has to be careful at accepting such
observations at face value.

My meteor observations had also got-
ten me involved with help researching
a potential meteor shower, called the
Upsilon Pegasids. It had been proposed
by Hal Povenmire in the 1970s and 80s
based on anecdotal reports from meteor
observers, who reported seeing mete-
ors coming from the constellation of
Pegasus. However, having some meteor
observers claiming they saw a few mete-
ors from a specific area of the sky is not
good enough to establish the shower's

Anecdotal evi- dence and science

existence. The maximum for the shower
was amid all the other summer showers
in early August so it would require pho-
tographs of point/near point meteors to
verify the shower's existence. I took many
photographs of the great square on the
dates in question but never was able to
record a single Upsilon Pegasid. At one
point, meteor observers began to doubt
the radiant even existed and it was jok-
ingly referred to by some as the "Halsieds".
I lost track of the research regarding the
Upsilon Pegasids over the past few de-
cades but I see that Mr. Povenmire has
written at least one paper on the subject
and seemed to be making some head-
way in getting the shower established.
The point of this is that Povenmire could
not rely on anecdotal evidence alone. He
needed calibrated photographic/video
evidence to support his theory. The me-
teors he has recorded may or may not be
simple sporadics and it is going to take
much more work to confirm the exis-
tence of this meteor shower.

A final type of anecdotal report associ-
ated with meteors are fireball reports.
In the past, before the advent of all sky
video cameras, it was mostly visual ob-
servations of these fireballs that were
used to look for meteorite falls. These
anecdotal reports can be valuable if they
are accurate. However, when the analysis
of the trajectory is based on just a few
observers, errors can produce inaccurate
conclusions. Only the discovery of me-
teorites will confirm which observations
are correct and those that are not.

Other astronomical reports

Amateur and early professional astron-
omers reported many events based
on their observations. Some of them
have been accurate and others have not.
The ones that haven't (like the Martian
canals or the planet Vulcan), have been
discarded but the others needed to be
confirmed. Recent amateur astronomer
recordings of bright flashes due to re-
flections on Mars and impacts on Jupiter
have confirmed some observations made
in the past. Before these recordings, they
were just anecdotal reports which may or
may not be correct until they were con-

firmed.

What this means is that anecdotal testi-
mony can play a role in scientific research
but one can't establish something as be-
ing factual/accurate without a lot more
evidence than anecdotal reports. The
more exotic the observation, the more
convincing the evidence has to be to sup-
port it.

When it comes to astronomical observa-
tions one has to remember that for every
Edward Barnard, there are a dozens of
Percival Lowells. Suspect images/videos/
observations need confirmation no mat-
ter how convinced the observer is that he
could not be mistaken.

UFOs and anecdotal evidence

Allan Hendry once stated that science
can be initiated by feelings but can
not be based on them. While anecdotal
evidence can be used to initiate research
into a new phenomenon, like UFOs, it is
usually inadequate by itself to convince
the scientific community to take it seri-
ously. Sure, people are reporting some-
thing they don't understand and it might
be significant. However, when one looks
at the reports and the fact that most
UFOlogists admit that 80-90% of them
are misperceptions of ordinary phenom-
ena, one has to wonder if the remaining
10-20% are also misperceived mundane
events that just have not been identified.

I have repeatedly pointed out In this
newsletter, methodologies/technology
for gathering data beyond the anecdotal
reports that UFOlogy relies upon to make
their case. As long as UFOlogists rely on
this anecdotal testimony as their prima-
ry source of "evidence" for UFOs being
an exotic phenomenon, their endeavor
to legitimize their research will result in
failure. It is time for UFOlogy's leading
minds to take the next step! What is stop-
ping them?

TESTIMONIES OF 29 NOVEMBER 1989 : EUPEN , GILEPPE.

Roger Paquay - Physicist

Editor note: I tried to keep Roger's article intact and made very few editorial corrections fearing I might edit out something important. I ask my readers bear with the syntax issues in order to understand Mr. Paquay's arguments as he presents them. One thing I think is important to note is that when Roger is discussing the apparent size of Venus, he is NOT describing the actual angular size. He is trying to point out that Venus appears much larger than a star to the casual observer.

Observations made by 2 gendarmes on Wednesday 29 November 1989 .

These testimonies were the starting point of what was called "The Belgian wave of ufos".

On 29 November in the evening, it freezes, the sun goes down on 16h45, the moon is absent from the sky, the stars and the planet Venus are particularly bright. The atmosphere is very transparent.

We will look at these testimonies without "a priori" and with an open mind.

The data we will use came from VOB1 and VOB2 and other sources.

Warning: We point out that we don't want to negate or invalidate the testimonies from the gendarmes nor doubt their good faith or sincerity. They have seen (observed) something they could not explain. Nevertheless, these testimonies contain information's that can be interpreted with different ways. These ways must be investigated and the different conclusions that can outcome may be presented. They don't constitute an attack against somebody. One observation was made but you must look to several possibilities. You must too keep a critical and open mind.

Observation 1: EUPEN:

Made by two gendarmes driving from Eupen in the direction of Eynatten.

At 17h20, from the car driving on the N68 street Eupen-Eynatten between Kettenis and Merols, the gendarmes see a bright spot on a grassland at the right side of

the street in the direction SEE. The centre of the bright spot is situated at 50 meters from the street and extent to 20 meters of the street. They drive slowly, window down when looking to the phenomenon. Nevertheless: "The others cars pass just like if there was nothing abnormal". (VOB1 p 17)

Looking in the air they see an engine, a big platform with three enormous lights forming a triangle and directed down. The circular lights emit down three cone-shaped beams of light that go to the ground like spotlights. One gendarme evaluates after the altitude of the engine at 120 meters by comparison with the height of the telecommunication tower at the Eupen gendarmerie. (height 74 meters), the seeing angle and the situation of the spot in the grassland. They deduce the elevation angle is 68° later by comparison with a tower..

They see distinctly, they say, the outlines from a big dark shape (mass) on the bottom of the twilight sky. (ref: A. Delmon: les cas solides) The lights are dazzling, the base looks perfectly plane. The base is horizontal and is forming an isosceles triangle with a wide base. The dimensions are estimated 30 to 35 meters for the length of the base from the triangle and at 25 meters for the height. The thickness is two meters. The corners at the base of the triangle are cut. The diameter of the lights is estimated to one meter. A red spotlight flashing one to two times per second is situated at the centre of the triangle. No noise seems outpass the noise of the car engine and the traffic noise. (VOB1 P 17). So you cannot say: "The engine was silent"

Nevertheless, in an article edited in the newspaper "Le Soir" from 1 December 1989, it appears they had declared to the journalist to have heard a weak noise coming from the engine, a weak humming like an electrical engine. The estimated altitude was 300 meters.

In the German edited newspaper "Grenz

Echo" from 1 December 1989 the altitude was between 300 to 400 meters.

Here under a translation of different part of this text:

...By 17.30, the gendarmerie patrol noticed an unknown flying object (Ufo), that approached the city of Eupen from the German border. The flying object had three strong spotlights that were directed toward the ground, the object itself remained hidden behind this light...(first paragraph).

The flying object travelled at an altitude of 300 to 400 metres, almost soundless. Only a buzzing sound, comparable to that of a strong electrical motor could be perceived. Now and then the object remained stationary in the sky, while further rays of light beamed to the surface. (second paragraph)

Platform

The officers from the Eupen brigade who watched the Ufo, described it as a kind of platform, that had two spotlights in the direction of travel, pointed toward the ground, while a third light shone at the back of the object. In between was an orange-coloured flashing light. (third paragraph)....

The Ufo moved steadily over Baelen in the direction of the Gileppe barrage. According to eyewitnesses, it stayed there for about 45 minutes, before it disappeared in the direction of Spa." (Fourth paragraph)

This translation is in contradiction with the assertion that "the object was flying at low altitude, without the characteristic noise of combustion engine.

The engine starts to move parallel to the street at a speed of 50 km/h, point forward in the same direction of move just like the gendarmes. Then the gendarmes stop on the little street between Merols and Raeren. They see an engine that seems to stop and go backwards in the direction of Eupen. It is now 17h 24.

Intrigued by this behavior who could suggest an answer to their attempt of interception, they drive immediately on the "Hochstrasse", a street that skirt round Kettenis and Eupen at the NW. So, they

Ufo gesichtet

Sonderbare Erscheinung am Himmel im Eupener Land

Eupen. — Rätselhafte Beobachtungen machten Mittwochabend eine Gendarmiestreife und verschiedene Bürger im Eupener Land. Die Gendarmiestreife flüchtete gegen 17.30 Uhr ein unbekanntes Flugobjekt (Ufo), das sich aus Richtung deutsche Grenze der Stadt Eupen näherte. Um was es sich dabei handelte war nicht genau auszumachen. Das Flugobjekt hatte drei starke Scheinwerfer auf den Enden gerichtet, hinter deren Licht der Flugkörper selbst verborgen blieb.

Das Flugobjekt bewegte sich in einer Höhe von 300 bis 400 Metern fast geräuschlos fort. Lediglich ein Brummen wie von einem starken Elektromotor war zu vernehmen. Ab und zu veränderte das Objekt seine Bewegungsrichtung und strahlte weitere Lichtstrahlen zur Erde aus.

Plattform

Die Gendarmiestreife der Brigade Eupen, die das Ufo beobachteten, beschrieben es als eine Art Plattform,

von der in Flugrichtung zwei Scheinwerfer auf den Boden gerichtet waren, während ein dritter am Heck des Objekts erstrahlte. Dazwischen habe sich eine orangefarbene Blinkleuchte befunden.

Das Ufo bewegte sich zielstrebig über Baalen in Richtung der Gileppe Tal-sperre. Hier veränderte es nach Augenzeugenberichten etwa 45 Minuten lang, ehe es in Richtung Spa verschwand. Dem Vernehmen nach wurde das Objekt auch über Spa beobachtet, wo es etwa 30 Minuten lang zu sehen war.

Zweites Objekt?

Doch nicht genug mit dem einen geheimnisvollen Flugkörper: Nachdem der erste verschwunden war, tauchte ein zweiter über dem Eupener Land auf (oder kehrte der erste zurück?) und flog in großen Schleifen zunächst längs der Autobahn, so als ob die Insassen etwas auf dem Boden suchen würden. Auch hier flog das Objekt wieder sehr tief und leuchtete mit starken Scheinwerfern den Boden ab. Von der Höhe

des Wallhorner Feldes waren diese Manöver des Ufos von den Augenzeugen gut zu beobachten. Schließlich entfernte sich der Flugkörper in Richtung Bleyberg und niederländische Grenze.

Die Gendarmiestreife teilte ihre Beobachtung unverzüglich dem Flughafen von Bierset mit, jedoch konnte man dort auf den Radarschirmen nichts feststellen, da offenbar die Flughöhe der Objekte für eine Erfassung durch Radarstrahlen zu gering war.

Inzwischen wird aus der Provinz Luxemburg eine ähnliche Beobachtung gemeldet. Dort sichtete ein Beamter der Flugsicherung von Bastogne ebenfalls einen mit drei Scheinwerfern ausgerüsteten Flugkörper in der Nähe von Longvilly, der sich längs der belgisch-luxemburgischen Grenze fortbewegte.

Spekulationen

Bleibt man bei diesem Flugobjekt gehandelt hat. Ein Flugzeug oder ein Hubschrauber kann es nicht ge-

wesen sein. Bleibt zu vermuten, daß es sich um ein Luftschiff gehandelt hat, wie sie zu Werbezwecken eingesetzt werden. Allerdings sind diese meist nur tagsüber im Einsatz. Es wäre jedoch möglich, daß die Besatzung eines solchen Luftschiffs einmal einen nächtlichen Ausflug unternommen hat, um den Anblick der beleuchteten belgischen Autobahnen und Landstraßen zu genießen.

Sollte es sich bei der Erscheinung nicht um ein irdisches Objekt gehandelt haben, bleibt noch die Möglichkeit eines Besuchs aus dem All. Vielleicht sind die Hilferufe des zotteligen Alf inzwischen von seinen Freunden im Weltall gehört worden, und die suchen ihn nun im Eupener Land.

Neben den Behörden, die sich intensiv mit dem unbekannten Flugkörper befassen, nimmt auch unsere Redaktion gerne Informationen über Beobachtungen in Zusammenhang mit dem Flugobjekt entgegen.

hego

After 20 minutes they quit the casern and the light follow them in direction of SW, anew a change in the opposite direction.

They go away immediately, but it seems they stayed 20 minutes; they drive on the Hochstrasse and go in the direction of Membach. They see again the Ufo who is moving in the direction of the barrage of La Gileppe.

Analysis:

The car from the witnesses is driving, so it is very difficult to evaluate the stationary or the displacement of an air moving engine. Why did they not stop the car to see the phenomenon more close? This would have given more precise data that the data you can obtain when driving on this street with other vehicles at this hour, 17h 24. The gendarmes himself spoke over the noise of the traffic. N 68 is indeed the an important street between Eupen and Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle). This street is quasi-parallel with the Hochstrasse, the street followed by the gendarmes to return to Eupen.

- The evaluation of distances, altitude, speed is impossible in the dark and in the day too without measure instruments like laser telemeters and Doppler radar. Here, no measure was done, they were driving.
- The evaluation of the altitude 120 m was made a posteriori. This type of determination is always affected a very big uncertainty, the angles were not measured. In the sky there are no landmarks. You must remember in the first declarations, they situated the altitude between 300 to 400 m, this differ from 120 m in VOB1. So the angle of 68° estimated is in fact a very subjective data with great uncertainty.

The evaluation of the distance is also impossible. The only interesting data to know was the apparent diameter, angle of vision of the engine, but he was not measured while driving the car.

The gendarmes speak over lights that lighted the ground. This was surely not very bright because the other cars drivers don't stop and don't see anything abnormal. The lack of audible noise, but is this really the case, indicate an under estimation of the distance. The noise of a car with open window cannot drown the noise of an engine flying at low altitude and at the distance estimated by the witnesses. A light vroom was indicated in the first declaration to the reporters. Later, in the second interview from 1997, they say the lights were more luminous (brighter) than the lights of a football lawn and that 140000 w lights. If it was the case, the other car drivers would surely have stopped to see a so powerful light on a lawn. It is very difficult to estimate the luminosity of a light. If the light were so bright and more brighter than those of a football lawn, they would have been dazzled. They never say that it was so. You cannot look light spots on a football lawn without being dazzled.

- When they stop the car on the Merols street for a better observation they see the engine goes in a different direction and is going in the opposite direction towards Eupen. They immediately interpret this change in the direction like a manoeuvre to escape to their observation. Why an engine would be more interested by one car on a street when they are many other cars with different behavior on this street? This is not objective observation but oriented interpretation.
- A very curious thing is the fact that the other drivers on the same street seem see nothing and don't stop, just as if there was nothing abnormal. We can ask why they are the only persons to see something abnormal and why the other doesn't see something.
- They estimated the diameter of the

can see continuously the engine when pursuing it discreetly. The engine flight slowly in the direction of Eupen along the N 68. When the gendarmes come on the street from Herbestal, they see the engine flying over the town of Eupen. The lights directed down permit to follow it easily.

They enter the casern situated on the street of Herbestal at the beginning of Eupen. They receive an answer from Elsenborn where they say there are no military exercises and an answer from Bierset saying there was no AWACS in the air, but don't speak from the flying Mirage planes.

They say that from a window situated at the first floor they can see the stopped engine through the branches of a tree. It is then 18h.

In "Inforespace 95, in the text: "Etude approfondie et discussion de certaines observations du 29 novembre 1989" Meessen say that, at 18 h the engine was seen from the casern at the azimuth 166. The azimuth 166 is in direction of NE in direction of Germany. So the engine had first fled in the same direction east that the gendarmes then turned in direction of Eupen and above Eupen. At 18 H it is now seen flying in the opposite direction above the Hertogenwald in direction of Germany (anew southeast direction).

lights to 1 m; and the altitude at 120 m. this give an apparent diameter of 0,0083 radians, what is equivalent to ½ degree .This is the same apparent diameter like the moon. The lights had on the sky the same dimension as the moon. The gendarmes did not this remark. Later they did a greater estimation of 2 m (Inforespace 95). This had given to the lights a diameter twice the diameter of the moon.

- The frequency of the flickering was one to two times in one second. This correspond to the flickering of the anticrash lights of planes and helicopters.

It seems likely the gendarmes observed one helicopter, the three lights in triangle, the adjustable beams in direction of the ground and the central red flickering with a frequency of one to two flickering per second are very typical.

After having stopped, they see it again turning in the direction of Eupen. But a helicopter must have been far away and at a distance upper than 500 m to be inaudible. But was it really the case? They follow it and see the engine flying above Eupen.

Then they enter the casern. They don't see the engine for twenty minutes. Then they go away and follow something in the direction of La Gileppe. They see the Ufo again they say. But as they did not see it for many minutes, 20 probably, they cannot assert it is the same observation.

This second observation from the same gendarmes will be considered as a different observation.

Observation 2: The spectacle above La Gileppe.

The same gendarmes , after their stop at the casern were they are said there is no AWACS in the air, continued their journey in the direction of Membach.

They see the Ufo again at 18 h20. He is displacing in the direction of the dam of La Gileppe.

The gendarmes stop at 18h 30 on a height called Kortenbach. : latitude 50°

37' 27,33" N and 5° 59' 58,72"E, altitude about 280 m.

.The ufo stop above la Gileppe (first interview from Hubert von Montigny). In 1997, eight years after, in a second interview, he declares the ufo stop above the lighted tower, with a very bright luminosity, 50 m upper than the tower. The tower is situated at 4,6 km. (following A Meessen). Latitude of the tower:50° 35' 06" N, longitude, 5°58'03" E, altitude 323 m. As the tower is 77 m height , the top of the tower is situated at about 400 m.

At this time, with naked eyes, the angular resolution is so small they see only one motionless bright white ball, this ball was quasi punctual.

They will stay motionless during one hour (VOB 1 p 23) until 19 h 23.

the engine stayed motionless above the Gileppe until 19h23 (L'engin est resté stationnaire au-dessus de la Gileppe jusque 19 h 23.) Then he moved to disappear in the direction of SPA (VOB 1, p 24).

Note that the azimuth of Spa seen from Kortenbach is 217° compared to the 205°, azimuth of the tower seen from the same point.

For Spa, latitude 50° 29' 01"N, longitude 5° 52' 00", given by Google earth.

The gendarmes then describe what they are observing and notice red light beams coming from the ball, horizontally in two opposite direction with a high speed they say and getting away so far as one km. In the first interview they indicate a distance of 5 to 6 km.

How explain this phenomenon?

The sky was clear. It was freezing and the "engine" was above a lake. Thus there must be a bit water vapor not visible. This vapor could maybe (hypothesis) disperse light in a horizontal way.

Another hypothesis , because one gendarme stayed in the car, that mist on the window could have product this phenomenon. The gendarme said the window was open.

Personally I did observe horizontal rays

through the window of my car covered of a tiny mist . I had no camera with me. I had informed WVU . Two years later he could observe the same phenomenon through the window of his bathroom. He took pictures showing these horizontal rays due to the tiny mist on the window.

Could this be an explanation? I don't know.

Always in the second interview, Mr Montigny when he goes up to the first stage of the casern say:

From the window, we could see the motionless object (azimuth indicated by A. Meessen: 166°) above the Hertogenwald. Then we go away with our car and in he Hochstrasse, we could see continuously the object. Then the object moved again slowly in the direction of Garnstock and Roereke.

This is not the direction of the tower that lies south but the West direction that is followed by the gendarmes at this moment. The bright light is displacing parallel to the gendarmes and at the same speed. They turn in direction of Membach and Kortenbach. Then they see the bright point going in direction of the Gileppe tower. So the engine makes the same moves as the gendarmes. They stop near a chapel at Kortenbach and then the bright light stop too.

In the same interview, after being questioned by Mr Meessen , he said:

...the object we were observing followed the valley. The object was moving at a constant distance from the ground, because it was hidden by the pine trees. It reappeared. It continued in a straight line in direction of the panoramic tower.

Note that the tower is only visible from Kortenbach and two or three other points but is not visible while riding in the area. Indeed if you go from Eupen to Kortenbach you are surprised to find this road is very narrow with houses and trees blocking the view most of the time. Apart from the chapel at Kortenbach you have just one spot near the boundary post 182 that permit to see clearly the sky and have a panoramic view of the landscape.

In the second interview in 1997 by A

Meessen from gendarme Nicoll we can read:

A= answer by gendarme, Q = question by A Meessen.

A: *the object is displacing slowly;*

Q: *In straight line?*

A: *Yes, as if it had an object if and as if it was piloted. Seen from the casern this moved slowly from the Ville haute in direction of the Hertogenwald or Membach or Spa.*

Remark: The Hertogenwald is situated at an azimuth between 150 and 170°, south east side of Eupen, Meessen indicate 166°. Spa is situated at an azimuth 217° to 220° south west side of Eupen. This is 50° difference in the direction. This makes this localization of the direction followed by the "engine" very subjective.

Again, in the second interview from gendarme Nicoll by Mr Meessen in 1997, we can read the following text that is the better proof the light above the panoramic tower could not be something other than Venus. Venus the gendarmes say they did not see it:

The gendarme Nicoll said:

...the sky was starry, but the stars are higher and I stayed in the car because it was cold weather. Normal stars, nothing special.

Meessen question then:

Was the light we are speaking brighter then the stars?

Nicoll:

This light was very bright and the stars are so far away. They cannot bright so much. It was like giant lights. It was not comparable to stars. I cannot explain that.

He added:

...it was like the big lights of a football stadium....We were at a certain distance, (4,6 km), and it combined a bit, but there were several lights. We had see them close

They add the light was brighter than spots lights from 140000 W.

These latest assertions seem to be acquired data. We will explain why in another paragraph below.

This assertion is in contradiction with the first declaration where they declared they see **a bright light ball quasi punctual**. A drawing made by the gendarme can be found in the latest upgrading from his text in 2008 by A Meessen and shows a ball the same apparent diameter as the tower.

The gendarme specifies the engine finally goes away in the direction of Spa **in their line of sight and disappear at the horizon**.


Note the azimuth of the tower is 205° following Meessen and the azimuth of SPA is 217° to 220°. So, the line of sight is not in direction of the tower.

The engine did not go to the left or to the right in relation with the tower but behind the tower. (and not at 25° right side of the tower say the gendarme)

We will notice this remark is one acquired characteristic by the witness and not one initial data. The gendarmes said indeed they never had seen Venus.

NB: the second interview from the gendarmes by Mr Meessen took place after Paul Vanbrabant and Wim van Utrecht proposed the Venus hypothesis. It is why Meessen contacted the gendarmes again. It then appeared nobody before had looked to the astronomical data in the study of this case.

In this observation, the engine they follow till Kortenbach and stay motionless above the Gileppe tower is a white bright ball quasi punctual. By comparison it is very interesting to see the apparent diameter from the top of the tower. The dimension is of the order of 16 m. at a distance of 4,6 km, it look on the sky an angular diameter of 0,003478 radians or an angle of 12 arc minutes; By comparison the angular diameter of the moon is 30 arc minutes. So, the top of the tower has on the sky one third the size of the moon. This was also the apparent dimension of the bright ball. Indeed, in a mail



from A. Meessen on 8 December 2006, he writes: "I have two drawings, made by the gendarme von Montigny showing the dimension of the light was quasi identical to the size of the tower". This size does not match with the assertion of "quasi punctual", but Meessen had said it was not negligible.

Drawing from H V Montigny, (ref: Meessen: "Etude approfondie et discussion de certaines observations du 29 novembre 1989" in inforespace 95 and on www.meessen.net)

Between 17 h30 and 19h30 in this direction was visible the star of the night, the brightest planet in the sky, the planet VENUS with a magnitude of (- 4,6). The planet Venus was not punctual but **his apparent diameter for seeing was 3/10 or one third the diameter of the moon**, so Venus had the same apparent dimension that these of the tower and the drawing from the gendarme. Remark that the apparent diameter for seeing with naked eye differ strongly from the diameter you can calculate with his dimension and distance. The picture Vantuyne shows that clearly that the apparent diameter of Venus is the same size the tower (see page 18).

On a picture taken by Mr P. Vantuyne 12 days after, on the 9 December 1989, at the sundown, picture you can see on his web site www.tridi.be, see PRO-SEETI, you can see clearly the planet VENUS. Venus occupied on the sky the same apparent dimension as the tower. This match with the assertion of the gendarmes that "the dimension of the light was quasi the same as the dimension of the tower". This coincidence is very remarkable and is a supplementary argument for the VENUS

hypothesis.

We evidently remark that when this picture was taken Venus was no more at the same place in the sky that at the 29 November. But this picture allows having a correct idea of the aspect of Venus when the gendarmes did their observation.

On the picture below, at the right of the tower you can see another bright light. On this picture the tower is lighted. But **"Was the tower lighted on 29 November?"**


This is very important because the tower was unoccupied; we were out of the touristic period and logically only one flickering light on the top of the tower was justified for aerial traffic.. But twelve days later, on 9 December the tower was lighted as can be seen on the picture. Has someone ask to light the tower on this day were they returned with journalist at Kortenbach or was the tower permanently lighted?

In the first interview from H von Montigny in December 1989, questions by A Meessen and answer by HVM, we can read:

Q: It stayed motionless above the Gileppe how many time?

A: A half hour;

Q: And at what place?



Photograph of Venus and the tower on December 9, 1989 by Mr. Patrick Ventuyne (used with permission from his web site - <http://tridi.weebly.com/>)

A: Above the panoramic tower;

Q: Was the tower lighted?

*A: **The tower was lighted.***

So maybe the tower was lighted but did the interview took place after 9 December where the tower was lighted?

We will also remark that **the apparent visual diameter of Venus** differ strongly from the angular diameter you can calculate with his dimension and distance. This can clearly be seen on the picture from P. Vantuyne. Venus disappears between 19h 23 and 19h 30 according to Meessen. **But is this the reality?**

Indeed, the astronomical data indicate a Venus down for 19h23. But the astronomical data give the elevation of Venus by reference to the sea level. So you have to take in account the altitude of Kortenbach, the altitude of the top of the tower, 400 m, and the fact that the top of the hill behind the tower is at the altitude of 385 m. If we look the diagram with the elevation of Venus, we must replace the line of reference for Kortenbach, the top of the tower and the top of the hill. See Diagram in Meessen text "Analyse et implication The line level for Kortenbach must be placed at $2,73^\circ$, the level of the top of the tower at $4,97^\circ$ and the top of the hill at $4,72^\circ$. This result was verified by a skilled astronomer.

Then on the diagram place these level: **You can see that planet Venus disappear behind the hill at about 19 h quasi in the direction of Spa at the azimuth 222° and not at 19h23.**

Following the sky map for 29 November 1989 at 18 h 45 local hour (17 h 45, UT), the height of Venus at 18 h 45 was $4,8^\circ$ height by reference to the sea level. This place Venus at the same height the top of the tower, height corrected for atmospheric refraction following the program SKYMAP.

Moreover, in the first interview from 1989 the gendarme HVM said the observation at Kortenbach lasted for **one half hour. As they arrive at Kortenbach at 18h30, one half hour of observation situate the end of the observation at 19 h (and not 19h23). It is just the hour Venus disappear behind the hill.**

This half hour is also confirmed in the rapport of gendarme Creutz on adelson.free.fr Vague belge. The gendarme Creutz who stayed in the casern and took the radio communications with the gendarmes at Kortenbach says: the engine disappeared at 18h 50.

One fact seems to confirm the hypothesis Venus: when the gendarmes drive after their passage at the casern, the object is displacing parallel to them and at the same speed, when they stop, the object stop.

Note that the immobility is asserted by Mr Meessen in "Analyse et implication physique de deux photos de la vague belge publiée dans Infoespace n° 100, p 5-40. One can read:

... he flyed over the town of Eupen and stopped above a lighted tower at the dam La Gileppe. He stayed motionless for one hour...

Nevertheless, the assertion the engine is going far away and disappears in the direction of Spa refute the location at the left or above the tower. Indeed the tower is situated at the azimuth 205° . But the azimuth of Spa center is 217° clearly at the right of the tower. This is closer to the situation of Venus that disappear at 19 hat azimuth 222° close to the direction of Spa.

Venus, the brighter object in the sky and who looks like a ball of light non punctual. Moreover the gendarmes say they did not saw Venus, the brighter light in the sky, and they saw only ONE bright light in the sky. If they saw only one bright light in the sky, this light is necessarily VENUS. Otherwise they had to see two bright lights in the sky in this direction.

What the gendarmes have observed after their passage at the casern is effectively one planet, Venus clearly visible in this direction. **Venus is the most frequent confusion with ufos.**

The hypothesis for a confusion with Venus is rejected by Mr. Meessen but stay plausible and even the most probable.

About the red rays who seems to go away and to return to the light ball, I must say I cannot agree with the assertion edited in VOB1 p 24 saying to be visible this rays must have fantastic energy:

... if it were laser beams in visible light, the source must have an extraordinary power to permit the visibility at 4.6 km.

This assertion is not logical when you know that a car light of 21 watt in ordinary light is visible at more then ten km.

Remarks about the observations: Eupen and Gileppe.

In "Inforespace 100", Mr Meessen say the observations of the gendarmes von Montigny and Nicoll between 17h20 and 19h30 are only one observation. But as they stopped at the casern and stayed there between 15 to 30 minutes they are two distinct observations. Nothing indicate they observe the same object as they say. Indeed , in the first case a triangular engine of 30 m with three lights and in the second case a bright ball quasi punctual as confirmed by the drawing of the gendarme.

The dimension of the lights was 1 m in VOB 1 and became two meters in "Etude approfondie et discussion de certaines observations du 29 novembre 1989, inforespace 95"

Another difference in VOB1 the engine is observed to the left of the tower and in

inforespace 100 he is situated above the tower.

Strangely in the second interview in 1997, the unique light described in VOB1 become "*several lights, maybe 10 or 15, ... very bright, intense white*". It is strange because in "Etude approfondie et discussion de certaines observations du 29 novembre 1989" we can read "*the light observed above the lake is **quasi -punctual***".

In the second interview from Heinrich Nicoll , on 20 January 1997, we can read one astonishing phrase:

*This light was very intense and the stars are far away. This cannot bright so much. ... We were at a distance of 4.6 km and this was merging a bit, but there was several lights. **We had seen them from a close distance.***

This indicate they think they observe the same engine despite the great difference between an engine of 30 m and a ball quasi punctual.

How can we explain the significant difference between the observations on the evening from 29 November 1989 by the gendarmes von Montigny and Nicoll in VOB 1 and the later data?

1. May we reasonably consider that two distinct observations separate in time by a visit to the block, duration 15 to 30 minutes, do represent the same engine? Remember the first observation did concern a luminous spot very intense on a lawn and the observation of a triangular object with a triangular shape and dimensions close to 30 to 35 m with three circular lights one meter diameter situated at an altitude of 120 m. The second observation did concern a quasi-punctual light at the left or above the tower of the dam La Gileppe. This light stayed motionless, but is it really the case, during one hour (one half hour according to HVM in the first interview) and disappears at the horizon in direction of Spa between 19h 25 and 19h 30, at the same time the planet Venus according to Meessen data. Remember Venus down is at 19 h and not 19h

23.

2. In the article Etude approfondie et discussion de certaines observations du 29 novembre 1989", professor Meessen, Inforespace 95, we can read about the end of the observation: **...and the ufo goes away at 19h 23 without moving left or right**". This disappearing with a progressive removal is typical for the disappearance of a star or a planet at the horizon. Remember Spa is not in the direction of the tower.
3. During the last third of 1991, one TV team from the American TV NBC came in Belgium to film for the emission "Unsolved Mysteries" one reconstitution of the events from 29 November 1989 and also the events of the evening from 30 March 1990, the F16 fly. For the events from 29 November, powerful spots, 140000 watt, were used. The gendarmes say what they observed was more brighter. The evaluation from luminosity with naked eye and without instrument is very subjective after two years. This value, 140000 W, appear in the second interview of the gendarmes. It is an acquired data due to this reconstitution in 1991.

The gendarmes played their own role. Many sequences were filmed several times. We can ask the question: Did this reconstruction, with a big material and the restitution of events many times influence the memories of the witnesses and have influenced the 1997 declarations. Hope it is not the case.

But when the gendarme says:

*This light was very intense and the stars are far away. This cannot bright so much. ... We were at a distance of 4.6 km and this was merging a bit, **but there was several lights. We had seen them from a close distance.***

We cannot doubt there was influence of the episode "Unsolved Mysteries".

Don't forget the initial data spoke for a white ball quasi-punctual.

A strange element is the description of a red ray going out the engine and moving

away so far as 1 km each side of the engine. This correspond to an angular move of 12.26° each side. It is a very great angle. This angle is very important because, in the Meessen data we found that at 19 h Venus was 10° at the right of the tower. If the red filament were extending so far the gendarmes must inevitably see Venus who then was situated between the tower and the end of the red filaments. Or, apparently they don't see Venus the bright object in the sky .

Curious thing, this evening, without moon and with clear sky because it is freezing, Venus is exactly in the field of view from the gendarmes. Venus is very bright, his magnitude is “-4.6” **thus far more bright then the other stars in the sky** (see explanation on magnitude below). His apparent angular diameter on the sky was the same dimension that the tower. A drawing made by the gendarmes concerning the observation show a bright ball the same dimension than the tower. At what time correspond this drawing?

The apparent visual diameter give to Venus the aspect of a white bright ball, non punctual and seeming very close. The stars close to the horizon look greater then at a higher elevation. In the case of clear sky and freeze, the brighter planets seem to be very close, so close you could think it is possible to touch them. This fact is well known by astronomers

This very bright planet that disappears at the same time the observation seems not to have been seen by the gendarmes. Why? **Maybe because the ufo was Venus?** Indeed **they saw only ONE bright light in the sky**. If they saw only one bright light in the sky, this light is necessarily VENUS. Otherwise they had to see two bright lights in the sky in this direction.

The hypothesis for a confusion with Venus is rejected by Mr. Meessen but stay plausible and even the most probable.

A supplementary reason is found in “Etude approfondie et discussion de certaines observations du 29 novembre”, in inforespace 95 from October 1997/

In the second interview from 20 January 1997, mr Von Montigny goes up to the first stage of the casern and say: “From

the window we could see the motionless object. We then go out with the car and, on the Hochstrasse we could see all the time the object. He did start up again and move forward slowly in the direction of Garnstock and Roereke”. This is not the direction of la Gileppe but the direction of the car at this moment. It is only when they go to Membach and Kortenbach the object seem to go in direction of la Gileppe, direction of driving .

This displacement, parallel to the moving car is typical of the observation of a star or a planet.

Mr von Montigny, questioned by Mr Meessen say: “the object we were observing followed the valley. The object stayed at the same distance from the ground, because it was hidden a few instant by the pine trees. It reappeared. It continued to go in the direction of the panoramic tower”.

So we can see that the object starts to move when the gendarmes start to move. Then the object follows the profile of the ground and stop when the gendarmes stop at Kortenbach. What the gendarmes describe is a “**mimetism of move**”. This description is characteristic of the observation of a star.

Thus the gendarmes did observe different things at different moments, first a big engine with lights, then a bright planet after their passage at the casern. This is explainable because they first saw something they cannot explain and they cannot see during the twenty minutes they stayed at the block; going in direction of Kortenbach, they say to see it again and to stop above the panoramic tower, but what they see then is a bright ball not punctual.

We have a mix of different observations they consider as one unique observation. Then this gives impossibility to understand.

Remark about the magnitude

A difference of five magnitudes correspond to a ratio of 100 for the luminosity. A difference of one magnitude corresponds to a ratio of 2.512 for the luminosity. Most of the visible stars with naked eye have a magnitude between 2

and 6. The planet Venus had a magnitude of “- 4,6”. This means Venus was 100 time more luminous that Betelgeuse in the constellation Orion, magnitude 0,4 and 10000 times more luminous that the limit of visibility with naked eye.

Conclusion

Curious things have been noticed, lights, moves or motionless objects, very few or no noise, imprecise shapes because the moon is not in the sky. What is clearly seen is the position of the lights.

Hypothesis I present don't negate the testimonies and the bona fide from the witnesses. They aims at drawing attention to the difficulty to observe one phenomenon when driving and that searching for a parking don't permit to see it continuously. The same difficulty occurs with the interruption caused by entering the casern for a few minutes.

The distances, except the distance between Kortenbach and the tower we can measure on a map, are not a viable data.

The helicopter hypothesis can match with the Eupen observation,, lights and conic rays in direction of the ground.

Venus matches perfectly for the second observation.

Ref:

1. VOB1 p 16-23
2. Inforespace 95
3. “Etude approfondie et discussion de certaines observations du 29 novembre”, in Inforespace 95 from October 1997 and on www.meessen.net.
4. Inforespace 100
5. picture taken by P Vantuyne , on www.tridi.be, see Pro-Seeti
6. A; Delmon “ les cas solides” Vague belge on adelmon.free.fr
7. Copy of the Grenz-Echo from 1 December 1989

I was watching, "The Caine Mutiny" one night and was struck by Humphrey Bogart's role as Captain Queeg. I noticed that one can draw an analogy between his behavior and the attitude of some UFOlogists and their research.



In one scene, Captain Queeg has gathered all his officers together late at night to reveal a catastrophe had befallen the officer's of the USS Caine. They had ice cream and strawberries at dinner and the Captain wanted to have more as a late night snack. Unfortunately, all the strawberries had been eaten. After careful calculation, Captain Queeg had determined that there should have been about a quart of strawberries left. He directed his officers to discover where the missing strawberries had gone. Because the only people who had access to the icebox were the officers and mess personnel, the officers interviewed all the mess attendants and cook but could not get any of them to admit that they had eaten the strawberries.

The next morning, the officers reported to the Captain that they could not discover where the strawberries went:

LT. Maryk: We kept the messboys and the cook most of the night. They may be lying but it's a dead end.

LT. Keefer: We couldn't keep covering the same ground endlessly sir.

Capt. Queeg: Gentlemen, you spent the entire night and accomplished nothing, while I have thought the whole thing out very clearly. Did it ever occur to you that some "bright boy" might have made a duplicate key to the wardroom ice box?

Geometric logic?

LT. Maryk: Sir...there is no indication.....

Capt. Queeg: There are some things we must assume Mr. Maryk in order to become a good officer...



The Captain then devised an ambitious plan to discover the sailor. The ship was basically turned upside down in an effort to locate the key. The key was never found but something did turn up from elsewhere. An officer had to return to the states but, before he left, he told Captain Queeg that the mess attendants had told him they had eaten the strawberries. Despite this information, Captain Queeg continued his search for the mythical key.

The officers had lost faith in their Captain and, in the middle of a Typhoon, relieved him of his command because he appeared to be lost in operating the ship safely. A court-martial occurred and the two officers, who were involved in the relieving Captain Queeg of his command, stood trial. Things looked bad for them until Captain Queeg took the stand. Once the defense lawyer got to the Captain and asked about various events (including the strawberries), Queeg began to rant about how his officers betrayed him at every turn. The most memorable section of the movie is this:

Ahh, but the strawberries that's... that's where I had them. They laughed at me and made jokes but I proved beyond the shadow of a doubt and with... geometric logic... that a duplicate key to the ward-

room icebox DID exist, and I'd have produced that key if they hadn't of pulled the Caine out of action. I, I, I know now they were only trying to protect some fellow officers...



So how does this apply to UFOs? Well, one can see how Captain Queeg decided to accept the least likely scenario for the missing strawberries mystery rather than the more obvious one. He "assumed" that this was the case because it was what he wanted to believe. Even when faced with evidence that demonstrated his solution was even less likely, he rejected it. When asked why he had done this, he went into a rant about how people scoffed at his theory even though he was able to demonstrate, through "geometric logic", that his solution was correct. He had convinced himself that his solution was the only correct one.

So let's rewrite that rant with a few words substituted:

Ahh, but (insert favorite UFO case here) that's... that's where I had them. They laughed at me and made jokes but I proved beyond the shadow of a doubt and with... geometric logic... that UNKNOWN INTELLIGENTLY CONTROLLED CRAFT DID produce the events described in this case, and I'd have proved it to everyone's satisfaction if "debunkers" and the Air Force did not step in. I, I, I know now they were involved in a conspiracy to hide the truth about UFOs...

Perhaps, before creating a UFO conspiracy, UFOlogists might try looking at more likely possibilities instead of making "assumptions" to explain these cases as "intelligently controlled vehicles of unknown origin" (but not ours).

UFOs on the tube

The Truth Behind UFOs

This UFO program presented on the National Geographic channel was a mixed bag of some good and some bad.

The "bad" was the UFO hunters from Las Vegas, which the show referred to as "Las Vegas' finest". I found that label an exaggeration. Alex Podovich was the leader and he just did not impress me. He thought the "dome of the rock" UFOs were real, when they have been shown to be hoax long ago. It gave the impression he did not approach the subject critically. When they camped out for a nightly UFO watch near the Area 51 mailbox, he proclaimed that they were all probably being watched by the government. Maybe they were or maybe they weren't. I think these kinds of people exaggerate a bit on the amount of surveillance they are under when they drive out there. Until, they cross the line in the secure area (or approach it), they probably are ignored for the most part.

The UFO watch was something of a joke. I saw a few telescopes and cameras. I am not sure what purpose the small celestron reflector served. The same goes for the cassegrain telephoto. Under low light conditions, that would be essentially worthless unless you had a bright UFO disc nearby.

The low light cameras did not record much more than a few lights coming on and off. The technical expert, Rey Acevedo, was astonished by what he saw but I think the motion he saw may have had more to do with the equipment. We never saw an analysis of the tape. My guess is they were looking at planes or, possibly, car lights in the distant hills.

More of the bad involved John Lear, who came across as a "woo". He made statements that implied just about everything from the transistor to fiber optics is the product of reverse engineering alien spaceships! Can UFOlogists really be taking him seriously?

A sort of "so-so" part of the show involved Paul Moller, who has engineered a "sky car" that works similar to the AVROCAR. It

was pretty cool but it really had little to do with UFOs.

As all UFO shows go, they eventually get to Roswell. Nick Redfern did most of the talking here but Dave Thomas got some air time. Dave gave the a pretty convincing project MOGUL argument in the few minutes they gave him. Redfern did not promote his theory but did make the point that people love a mystery. I was amused to hear the narrator imply that the Roswell event was the genesis of a modern mythology.

One of the "good" parts, was Peter Merlin making his arguments of how military flares produce some of the UFO reports around Area 51 and other military operating areas. He also demonstrated how the idea of a secret crash area being "sanitized" and all evidence being removed is just not possible.

Another good part of the program was Marc D'Antonio demonstrating how he analyzed UFO photographs. Apparently, this part was filmed some time ago. He promoted the infamous Petit-Rechain photograph as having passed all the best scientific analysis. In July of last year, the photographer came forward and admitted it was all a hoax. One has to wonder why all these scientific analyses failed to discover the hoax? I will give D'Antonio a pass here but this demonstrates that just because UFOlogists declare a photograph has not been proven to be a hoax, does not mean it wasn't. D'Antonio's shining moment was when he showed how easy it was to fool people with a toy UFO he flew over Winstead, Ct.

Another good interview came from Colorado MUFON's Doug Wilson. He came across as a knowledgeable individual, who was careful in his investigations. His behavior sharply contrasted with the Las Vegas UFO hunters. However, he still believes that UFOs can possibly be alien spaceships. His final statement struck me as telling. *"It is kind of like people's belief in God. You can't prove it but you'll be damned if you deny it in total."* Did he compare UFOlogy to a religion? It certainly sounded that way.

Book Reviews

Buy it! (No UFO library should do without it)

UFO abductions - Susan Clancy

This book actually comes across as a work that needs to be read by those interested in UFO abductions. Clancy's objective examination of her subject's abduction stories is refreshing compared to the efforts of Mack, Hopkins, and others. Her conclusion hits home when she notes that, despite the trauma they suffer, there are abductees that consider themselves special and that their experience is akin to a religious one.

Borrow it. (Worth checking out of library or borrowing from a friend)

The Abduction Enigma - Kevin Randle, Russ Estes, and William Cone

I became disenchanted when the book made some errors that were obvious as I began reading it. The loss of the 1/5 Norfolk Regiment at Gallipoli is described as an abduction incident. The truth is the story they quoted is a complete fabrication. Another item that caught my eye was stating that Betty and Barney Hill lived in Concord, NH, when it was Portsmouth over forty miles away. I also felt there was no need to bring up the occasional mention of Roswell as if it were a sales pitch. The book takes far too long to make its points about abduction research and really could have cut down on some of this extraneous information.

Bin it! (Not worth the paper it is written upon - send to recycle bin)

Abduction: Human Encounters with Aliens - John Mack

Dr. Mack's book is not a very objective look at the abduction phenomena. I could go on for some time but I think his observation that abductees are more spiritual because of their abductions is very similar to what Susan Clancy noted. However, he fails to make the link that these people might be telling their stories so they can feel special. The book is too long (about 3x as long as Clancy's book) and is not very convincing unless you want to believe in alien abductions.