

## MUFON, CUFOS LEADERS MEET WITH BUDD HOPKINS' NEW "QUEEN-BEE ABDUCTEE" -- AND HER CRITICS:

Two of UFOlogy's influential spokesmen recently accepted UFO-abduction guru Budd Hopkins' invitation to meet and talk with the Manhattan housewife who claims that in late 1989 she was "beamed through" the plate glass window of her 12th floor apartment to a UFO hovering overhead, and that the incident was witnessed by United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar and two of his security guards. Hopkins has characterized it as the "MOST IMPORTANT" UFO-abduction case of the century. [For details, see SUN-17/Sept. 1992]

Walter Andrus, international director of the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON), and Jerome Clark, vice president of the Hynek Center for UFO Studies (CUFOS) and editor of its International UFO Reporter (IUR), attended the Oct. 3 talk-fest held at Hopkins' home in New York City. Linda Moulton Howe, a TV producer who first achieved fame for her documentary on "cattle mutilations" and who has more recently become active in the UFO-abduction field, was invited but did not attend. Other attendees included: David Jacobs, Hopkins' principal disciple in the UFO-abduction field; Penelope Franklin, editor of Hopkins' Intruders Foundation's periodic newsletter; and Antonio Huneus, UFO-writer and member of the board of advisors of Hopkins' Intruders Foundation. (Clark also is a member.)

"Abductee" Linda Napolitano was accompanied by her husband, their 16-year old son and his younger brother who allegedly was abducted shortly before his mother. (When Linda appeared and spoke briefly at the recent MUFON conference in Albuquerque, following Hopkins' first public report on the case, he introduced her as Linda Cortille--her "stage name" during her earlier years in "show biz." Her real name was revealed by James Moseley in his Saucer Smear newsletter.) Linda is the only person who claims to have met with the two "security agents" (Richard and Dan) who allegedly witnessed her abduction. Hopkins' only contact has been through letters and audio tape recordings he has received.

To Hopkins' credit, invited attendees included two pro-UFOlogists whose own investigations and experience made them extremely suspicious of Linda's tale: Joseph J. Stefula, MUFON's State Director for New Jersey, and his deputy, Richard Butler. [See SUN-17/Sept. 1992] In the first letter that Hopkins received from Richard/Dan, they claimed to be members of the New York Police Dept. But when Stefula's investigation challenged this claim, the next letter Hopkins received claimed the two men were security agents protecting Javier Perez de Cuellar during the (alleged) incident. But the terminology used in their letter prompted more Stefula and Butler suspicions because both men worked in law enforcement and V.I.P. security when they were in the military services. Stefula and Butler brought with them to the Oct. 3 meeting a "Mr. X"--an experienced V.I.P. security officer--who also challenged the claim that Richard and Dan were V.I.P. security officers. Also in attendance were pro-UFOlogists George Hansen and Don Johnson.

Linda was the principal speaker at the Oct. 3 meeting--especially after she had to correct her husband as to the time when Richard/Dan (allegedly) visited their apartment. (After he said it was about 3 a.m., Linda corrected him to say it was around 10 p.m.). Linda told UFOlogist George Hansen in an earlier telephone conversation that her husband had been born in the U.S., but during the Oct. 3 meeting her husband told Hansen he had immigrated to the U.S. at the age of 17. At the meeting, Linda claimed that she is a descendant of Joan of Arc, France's most famous heroine who was burned at the stake in 1431 at the age of 19. There is no evidence that Joan ever married but perhaps she had siblings who did.

Even more extraordinary than Linda's "Star Trek beam me up Scotty" UFO-abduction tale is her claim that she was abducted TWICE in broad daylight by Richard and Dan and that DAN THEN ATTEMPTED TO KILL HER! (Later, Linda supplied Hopkins with love letters allegedly received from Dan asking her to marry him if he managed to escape from a mental institution to which he said he had been committed.) At the Albuquerque conference, when Linda was asked if she had reported the actions by Richard and Dan to any law enforcement agency, she said she had not. Hopkins spoke up to say he had been "pushing Linda" to report the incident but she refused to do so. WHEN STEFULA AND HANSEN PROPOSED A SIMILAR IDEA AT THE OCT. 3 MEETING, "THE GRIT REALLY HIT THE FAN," according to one participant.

In a four-page "White Paper" which Hansen wrote on Oct. 20 and circulated among UFOlogists, he sharply criticized the group's negative response to the proposal. "If federal agents have engaged in kidnapping and attempted murder, they should be brought to justice. At risk is not only the safety of Linda but also that of the general public," Hansen wrote.

In response to Hansen's paper, CUFOS's Jerry Clark issued a two page memo, dated Oct. 24, which harshly attacked Hansen and sought to clarify the rationale behind Clark's "let's wait for six months and see what happens" proposal which the majority agreed to adopt. Clark's memo said he "urged the critics to refrain, over the next six months, from pursuing the investigation...of knocking on the doors of government agencies looking for evidence of the elusive Richard and Dan. I stated that if this story is true, it is not just a UFO case but a 'politically sensitive' event because it supposedly involves a political figure of international stature and therefore has consequences far outside the tiny world of ufology. If that is indeed the case, we would never find Richard and Dan (if they exist as who they say they are) because banging on the wrong doors could alert the relevant agency that two of its agents were leaking a huge secret. [Clark forgets that Hopkins himself already has "alerted the relevant agency" via his Albuquerque MUFON conference talk and his report on the case published in the Sept. 1992 issue of the MUFON UFO Journal.] ...If, on the other hand, the story is a hoax...a six-month delay will have no effect on that fact, and the evidence will be just as retrievable then as now."

In Clark's memo he admitted that he has ambivalent feelings about the Linda case. "As I have told Budd and others, I have serious problems with the story...too many links in the chain of evidence are missing...some aspects of it seem to me to be impossible. At the same time I have problems with the charge that Linda hoaxed the entire event, an allegation that -- in view of the extraordinary complexity of this episode, not to mention what I observed of and learned about Linda's personality--strikes me as simplistic and unconvincing."

MUFON's Andrus took a similar "let's not rock the boat" attitude, according to one participant. Recalling that Andrus earlier endorsed the Ed Walters/Gulf Breeze UFO photo case as "one of the most important UFO cases in the past 40 years," his cautious approach to the Linda case may reflect the validity of the old adage: "Once bitten, twice shy."

There is a curious similarity between the Gulf Breeze and Linda cases. In Andrus's endorsement published in the Walters book, he speculated that "a successful businessman and civic citizen was probably selected [by ETs] for this ultimate disclosure so that the events and evidence would be...accepted by the scientific community as factual and not easily ignored as an obvious hoax." During Hopkins' report on the Linda case at the 1992 MUFON conference in Albuquerque, he said: "It seems to me that this was a deliberate production on the part of the UFO. They wanted to be seen because of the [prominent] man in the car. Every single thing points...to this being a kind of STAGED event." Hopkins earlier strongly endorsed the Gulf Breeze case in the introduction which he wrote for the Walters book in which he recalled "a wonderful remark of Mark Twain's: ALWAYS TELLING THE TRUTH MEANS NEVER HAVING TO REMEMBER ANYTHING." [SUN wonders if Linda ever read Mark Twain.]

In Hansen's White Paper, he reported that he had talked by telephone with Dr. John Mack, professor of psychiatry at Harvard who has recently become one of Hopkins' staunchest allies. Mack strongly endorsed Linda's credibility, according to Hansen. In Clark's Oct. 24 memo, he challenged Hansen's suspicions of Linda's veracity by noting that "two mental-health professionals (not counting John Mack) who know Linda far better than Hansen does concur, emphatically," i.e. endorse her credibility.

This endorsement of Linda's credibility by three "mental-health professionals" recalls the sage observation of Dr. Martin T. Orne, professor of psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania and one of the world's leading authorities on hypnosis. In a paper published in the Oct. 1979 issue of the International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, Orne noted that "psychologists and psychiatrists are not particularly adept at recognizing deception...As a rule, the average hotel credit manager is considerably more adept than we are. Not only does his livelihood depend upon limiting errors of judgment, but he is in a position to obtain feedback concerning those errors of judgment, whereas in most treatment contexts the therapist is neither affected by being deceived nor even likely to learn about the fact that he had been deceived at a later date."

### CURIOUS BUSINESS:

*At the Albuquerque conference, Linda explained her reluctance to report the incidents because she feared that if she did so "they" (U.S. Government agents) would "chop me up in little pieces." But she never once expressed any fear of being abducted (again) by Richard and Dan or that they might try again to kill her. If some U.S. Government agency is eager to do away with Linda, it is surprising that she is still alive today. (Seemingly the Government is too dum-dum to hire the Mafia to do the job.) It seems surprising that Linda and her children have not moved out of Manhattan. Nor has Hopkins encouraged Linda to take such action--so far as is known.*

*If Linda's tale is true, why is she the only "abductee" among the many dozens who have appeared on radio and TV talk shows to (allegedly) be brutally victimized by government agents? (When Hopkins publishes his planned book on the Linda case, SUN predicts that other "abductees" will begin to tell tales of alleged abduction by Government agents.)*

*If Linda's tale is false, her reluctance to file formal charges and seek police protection is understandable. She would be required to testify under oath, subject to the penalties of perjury, and could end up in jail.*

### THE SPIRAL IMPLANT IN LINDA'S NOSE:

The first claim (to SUN's knowledge) that ETs implant "gadgets" in the nasal cavities and/or brains of UFO-abductees came from Whitley Strieber in his best-selling book "Communion" published in early 1987. Even Budd Hopkins' second book on UFO-abductions, "Intruders," which went to press before Strieber's book was published, contains no report of "alien implants." Since "Communion," there have been numerous claims of alien implants but in all such cases the ETs were smart enough to remove the (alleged) implant before the subjects decided to go public with their claim--thereby depriving "Abductionists" of physical evidence which could prove beyond all doubt that the incident had really occurred.

Linda not only claims that ETs inserted an alien implant in her nasal cavity when she was a child, but she provided Hopkins with two recently taken X-rays which show a spiral-shaped object in somebody's nasal cavity. Hopkins showed slides of the X-rays during his talk at the 1992 MUFON conference and provided a brief, somewhat disjointed account of Linda's (alleged) alien implant and the curious circumstances under which it disappeared.

Hopkins said that when Linda first contacted him in April 1989, after reading his book, she said she recalled some 13 years earlier when she noted "there was a spot beside her nose...It was a very small bump but for some reason, unconsciously, it was a very significant bump for her. So she went to the doctor and had it looked at. And the doctor said what kind of nasal surgery did you have. And she said, I've never had any. And he said, yes you have--you have a scar. And she said, well it can't be from surgery. I've never had any. He said this is a surgical scar." If this scenario sounds familiar, you probably saw the CBS-TV "Intruders" mini-series last May in which a doctor made similar statements after examining the nasal cavity of a female "abductee."

Hopkins said "this extraordinarily upset her. She went home and called her mother and said, Mom, when I was a little girl, did this ever happen to me...did I ever have an operation? And [she was told] no one had ever taken her to a doctor for an operation." Hopkins said he "decided to look into this because there was this potential for medical evidence" but he failed to consider how very cunning ETs are about removing all physical evidence.

It was not until 18 months later--in November 1991--that Linda got around to having an X-ray taken of her nose. Hopkins said the X-ray was taken by a "doctor closely connected with Linda." [SUN has learned that the doctor is Linda's cousin.] Hopkins said the doctor said to Linda "you always talk about that thing on your nose, let's take an X-ray and she said no, I don't want to. But the doctor insisted--and they're very close. The X-ray was taken and Linda went home. The X-ray was not developed right away." [Normally a doctor asks the patient to wait until the X-ray is developed and has been examined to assure that it shows what the doctor needs to see.]

"Two days later," Hopkins said, "she called me to say she had awakened in the morning and there was blood all over her hand and running out of her nostrils...She thought something had happened because there was blood on the top of her head." [Although Linda seemingly did not realize it at the time, the ETs somehow had learned of her recently taken X-rays, knew that they would soon be delivered to her and Hopkins and so they had returned to remove their implant from her nasal cavity.]

"The next day," Hopkins said, "the X-rays were delivered to her by the doctor who didn't even want to talk to her about it on the telephone [he was] so nervous. He [doctor] was a little nervous about having the X-rays brought over to me." Hopkins said he gave the X-rays to a friend "who has been a kind of consultant and he's a very strong neurosurgeon." After examining the X-rays, Hopkins' friend exclaimed: "Holy Cats!" ALAS, BY THIS TIME THE IMPLANT WAS GONE.

**IF ONLY LINDA'S DOCTOR HAD DEVELOPED AND EXAMINED THE X-RAYS BEFORE LINDA LEFT FOR HOME--WHILE THE ALIEN IMPLANT STILL WAS IN HER NASAL CAVITY--HOPKINS WOULD TODAY HAVE HIS LONG-SOUGHT PHYSICAL PROOF OF ET VISITORS AND ABDUCTIONS.** [Hopkins did not indicate whether he suspects that this inaction by Linda's doctor might be part of a Government coverup.]

Hopkins offered what he called "one last footnote on this. A few days ago, Linda's son, who is 15-years-old, had another friend over, a 16-year-old boy...About 4 o'clock in the morning, Linda woke up choking and gagging--liquid was running down her throat. She got out of bed and she was having a very severe nose-bleed on the right side--It was running down her throat. She ran into the living room to try to stop it and within two minutes her 15-year-old son, her nine-year-old son, the 16-year-old guest and her husband were also sitting up with nose-bleeds down the right side. We haven't done any studies of that yet, but we will."

Apparently the ETs completely forgot they had earlier removed Linda's implant. When they returned and couldn't find it in her nasal cavity, they assumed that they must have put the implant in the nose of her husband or one of her children and thought the house guest was her son.

## PLAINS OF SAN AGUSTIN "CRASHED SAUCER" CRASHES WITH STAN FRIEDMAN'S CREDIBILITY AS THE PRINCIPAL VICTIM:

While much of the UFO Movement's attention has been focused on the Linda/Manhattan UFO-abduction case since Budd Hopkins' first public report at the MUFON conference in early July, important developments recently have been taking place on the "crashed-saucer" front in the internecine battle between "crashed saucerites" Kevin Randle/Don Schmitt and Stanton Friedman/Don Berliner. Randle and Schmitt co-authored the book "UFO Crash at Roswell," published in mid-1991, a much more extensively researched version of the alleged incident first reported in the 1980 book "The Roswell Incident," co-authored by UFOlogist William L. Moore and Charles Berlitz (whose earlier book described the alleged dangers of the "Bermuda Triangle.") Friedman and Berliner co-authored the book "Crash at Corona," published in mid-1992 which covers the same subject. As predicted in SUN-11 (Sept. 1991), before publication of the Friedman/Berliner book, there are significant differences between the three books:

- \* Moore/Berlitz book claimed debris from a crashed saucer was discovered by Mac Brazel on a ranch near Corona, N.M., roughly 75 miles northwest of the Roswell Air Force Base, in mid-1947. No live or dead ETs were reported. Their book also recounted tale told to friends by "Barney" Barnett that he had discovered a crashed saucer with several ET bodies on the Plains of San Agustin, roughly 150 miles west of the Brazel ranch. Friends of the now deceased Barnett said he told them that while he was at the San Agustin site, he was joined by a group of archaeological students from the University of Pennsylvania.
- \* Randle/Schmitt book claimed that the crashed saucer with four ET bodies that Barnett reported finding was not on the Plains of San Agustin, but was really located on the Brazel ranch, not far from the "debris field."
- \* Friedman/Berliner book claims that two UFOs crashed (probably because of a mid-air collision), that one was recovered from the Brazel ranch along with four ET bodies, while the other landed on the Plains of San Agustin, where ONE LIVE ET plus three ET bodies were recovered. This "1+3" scenario is based on tale told by Gerald Anderson who claims that as a child of five, he and four other members of his family (all now deceased) discovered the crashed saucer on the Plains of San Agustin. Anderson first decided to go public with his remarkable experience after seeing the crashed-saucer incident graphically portrayed on the "Unsolved Mysteries" TV show in early 1990. [See SUN-8/Mar. 1991] (When SUN spoke with Anderson's wife, she said he had never mentioned the alleged incident.) When Anderson telephoned the TV show producer to say there were some errors in their scenario--that Anderson's family, not Barnett, had been the first to discover the San Agustin crashed saucer--his name and phone number were passed along to Randle and Friedman.

Randle interviewed Anderson by telephone on Feb. 4 and they talked for nearly an hour. Randle found sufficient discrepancies in Anderson's tale to raise his suspicions. Friedman interviewed Anderson on Feb. 16, and found his tale convincing. Despite the fact that Anderson was only five at the time of the alleged incident, he "remembered" that the head of the archaeological group was a Dr. Buskirk. With the aid of techniques used by law enforcement agencies to reconstruct the appearance of a criminal suspect, Anderson was able to come up with a sketch of Dr. Buskirk's appearance--ALTHOUGH ANDERSON CLAIMED HE HAD NOT SEEN DR. BUSKIRK SINCE 1947.

Thomas J. Carey, a pro-UFOlogist who lives in the vicinity of the University of Pennsylvania, offered to assist Friedman in trying to locate Dr. Buskirk. After much effort and a bit of luck, Carey succeeded--TO FRIEDMAN'S GREAT EMBARRASSMENT. [See SUN-14 | March 1992.]

When Carey managed to locate Dr. Buskirk, he learned that he was trained as an anthropologist and had formerly lived in New Mexico. However, Buskirk supplied convincing hard evidence that he could not possibly have been involved in the (alleged) Plains of San Agustin incident because he had spent the entire summer of 1947 at Fort Apache Reservation in Arizona on a research project. Furthermore, he had never been affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania, as Carey reported in an article published in the Nov./Dec. 1991 issue of International UFO Reporter (IUR). Yet Anderson's sketch of the "Plains of San Agustin Dr. Buskirk" showed a remarkable resemblance to a photo of Buskirk taken in 1958 when he was a teacher at the Albuquerque High School. BY A CURIOUS COINCIDENCE, IN 1958 GERALD ANDERSON WAS A STUDENT IN THE SAME HIGH SCHOOL WHERE BUSKIRK TAUGHT A COURSE IN ANTHROPOLOGY.

Carey's query prompted Buskirk to ask friends at the Albuquerque High School to check Anderson's student records and he subsequently informed Carey that they showed that Anderson "was enrolled for a semester of Anthropology. This was a course that I [Buskirk] taught..." When Anderson learned that Randle was trying to obtain a photocopy of Anderson's student record, he informed school officials that they should not be released to anyone but himself. Later, Anderson supplied what he claimed to be a photocopy of his high school records to Friedman and to John Carpenter, a hypnotherapist who is MUFON's Director of Abduction Research and who earlier had strongly endorsed Anderson's tale. The photocopy which Anderson provided seemed to show that he had taken a course in Sociology, NOT Anthropology. This prompted suspicions that the student record photocopy that Anderson supplied to Friedman and Carpenter was a "doctored" version:

Useful insights into the question of whether Anderson is the sort of person who might "doctor" his high school transcript were provided by a seemingly inconsequential disagreement between Anderson and Randle over the duration of their first (and only) telephone interview. Randle says the interview lasted for nearly an hour, while Anderson claims it lasted only 26 minutes. Randle tape-recorded their interview and his tape runs for approximately 51 minutes, with a brief interruption when he flipped the tape over to the other side. Yet Anderson supplied Friedman and Carpenter with what he claimed to be a photocopy of his telephone bill (to which he charged the call) which shows that the call lasted only 26 minutes.

After considerable effort, Randle managed to obtain from Anderson's telephone company (Southwestern Bell), an official photocopy of the telephone bill. It showed that the telephone call had lasted for 54 minutes as Randle claimed. This proved beyond any doubt that the purported copy which Anderson had supplied to Carpenter and Friedman was bogus. (A more detailed account, including photocopies of the telephone bills, can be found in an article by Randle and Schmitt entitled "Missing Time," published in the July/August 1992 issue of IUR which was mailed in mid-September.)

The same issue of IUR carried an editorial by Jerome Clark which began: "It is hard to believe that Gerald Anderson's fibs remain a subject of anything but rueful humor. Nonetheless here we are, with a new book [by Friedman/Berliner] which preserves them, as what the authors want us to believe is testimony to a real event...all of us can be fooled some of the time. In Anderson's case, however, the doubts emerged almost from the outset, and troubling elements multiplied as the investigation proceeded. Yet the worse things got for Anderson, the more fervently Friedman defended him..." (Emphasis added.)

Approximately a month before this issue of IUR was received, SUN's editor sent Friedman a proposed Memorandum of Agreement which began: "Both Klass and Friedman, being desirous of determining whether Gerald F. Anderson, Springfield, Mo., is being truthful about events that (allegedly) occurred on or about July 5, 1947, especially his meeting with an archaeological party headed by a Dr. Buskirk--a man whom Anderson claims he never saw again. Dr. Buskirk was a teacher at Albuquerque high school which Anderson attended in the 1950s. Anderson has publicly stated that he did not take a course in Anthropology under Dr. Buskirk. [Continued on p. 7]

"This critical issue can be quickly resolved if Anderson will request and authorize the present Principal of the Albuquerque High School, or the Superintendent of Schools, to carefully examine the transcript of Anderson's high school records and issue a public statement that Anderson did, or did not, take a course in Anthropology.

"Klass agrees to pay Friedman the sum of One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000) if, within 30 days of signing this agreement, Anderson provides Klass with a notarized statement which requests the Principal or Superintendent to examine his transcript and issue a public statement as to whether Anderson did, or did not, take a course in Anthropology. Friedman agrees to pay Klass the sum of One Hundred Dollars (\$100) if Anderson fails to carry out actions described above within 30 days of the signing of this agreement."

ON AUG. 8, 1992, I SIGNED TWO COPIES AND PROMPTLY MAILED THEM TO FRIEDMAN FOR HIS SIGNATURE. THREE MONTHS HAVE NOW ELAPSED AND I'VE HEARD NOTHING FROM FRIEDMAN. Yet publicly, Friedman--who is MUFON's Director of Special Investigations--continues to proclaim his high confidence in Anderson's tale.

Friedman's actions recall the sage observation of French philosopher Charles Peguy: "HE WHO DOES NOT BELLOW THE TRUTH WHEN HE KNOWS THE TRUTH MAKES HIMSELF THE ACCOMPLICE OF LIARS AND FORGERS."

### Schmitt/Randle: No Credible Evidence of San Agustin Crashed Saucer:

Beyond discrediting Anderson, whose colorful tale is the most notable feature of the Friedman/Berliner book, Schmitt and Randle have recently recanted their earlier acceptance of Barney Barnett's crashed saucer tale. In an article titled "Second Thoughts on the Barney Barnett Story," published in the May/June issue of IUR, they report that despite their numerous interviews with old-timers in the San Agustin area, "no firsthand witnesses confirm the [Barnett] report...With no corroboration, we are forced to reject the story." They note that "while [Mac] Brazel's neighbors knew something had happened, the ranchers on the Plains [of San Agustin] insist no crash occurred in their area in July 1947."

Schmitt/Randle report that "while researching our book, we became convinced of the single-craft/single-event interpretation." That is, that only one UFO with ET bodies had been discovered and recovered--rather than two as Friedman/Berliner believe. IF ET bodies had been recovered from San Agustin, they would have been taken to Kirtland AF Base which was much closer than Roswell. So when Schmitt/Randle heard reports of ET bodies being brought to the Roswell AF Base, they concluded that the ET bodies must have been found on or near the Brazel ranch. This prompted them to conclude that Barnett had visited the Brazel ranch in the course of his work in soil conservation for the U.S. Agriculture Dept. But in their book they admitted that during early July 1947, when the UFO (allegedly) crashed, entries in Mrs. Barnett's diary indicated that her husband was working 300 miles west of the Brazel ranch. To get around this obstacle, Randle/Schmitt speculated that perhaps Barney had lied to his wife. Now they reject Barnett's claim as simply a tall-tale told by a respected citizen.

Schmitt/Randle acknowledge that the Barnett tale was important to earlier investigators like Moore and Friedman because they "could find no other story that spoke of the recovery of an alien flight crew." In their IUR article, Randle and Schmitt report they had better luck in finding persons who claim to have heard of recovered ET bodies. One is a former mortician named Glenn Dennis, another is a former airman named Robert A. Slusher, and another is the daughter of a deceased airman named Melvin Brown. In their IUR article, Schmitt and Randle wrote: "They convinced us that the [ET] bodies had been found somewhere between the debris field on the Brazel ranch and Roswell."

*Randle/Schmitt were so eager to be convinced that they failed to spot a very significant discrepancy between the stories told by Slusher and Brown's daughter and the one told by mortician Dennis. They accept all of them despite their inconsistencies. On April 5, 1992, I wrote Randle and Schmitt to detail these serious contradictions and I invited their comments. Having received no reply by April 29, I sent them another copy of my April 5 letter. SEVEN MONTHS LATER--NO RESPONSE HAS BEEN RECEIVED FROM RANDLE OR SCHMITT.*

Schmitt reported some recent crashed saucer developments on Oct. 19 at the CSICOP (Committee for Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal) conference in Dallas where he was invited to speak. Schmitt said: "Now, for the first time, we have seven firsthand witnesses to the second [Brazel ranch] site where the object was actually recovered. Six are [former] military." Later, during the question and answer period, Schmitt said "Each one [of the seven] is telling us they're still sworn to secrecy, they cannot go public." Schmitt added that he and Randle "have discussed this with three members of Congress" in the hope that the witnesses "may be willing to testify" if given immunity. However, Schmitt was not optimistic that Congress was really interested in uncovering what Stanton Friedman has called the "Cosmic Watergate." Will the new Congress will be more receptive? SUN doubts it.

### A Little Paranoia Is Good For You:

Budd Hopkins is convinced that the Linda Napolitano abduction case "establishes the physical reality of the UFO abduction experience," according to his highlight/summary article on the case published in the September issue of the MUFON UFO Journal. Hopkins warns that "this case will be severely attacked by the professional debunkers who will see it for what [it] is--the strongest evidence yet for the reality of UFOs, their occupants, and their program of systematic abduction of human beings. This they cannot tolerate. And if rumors are true and there are officially sanctioned intelligence agents within the various UFO investigative networks, these people will also be mobilized to subvert the case from the inside...The stakes are that high." (Emphasis added.) SUN has it on good authority that at least two of the eight-member board of advisors of Hopkins' Intruder Foundation have privately told Hopkins that they disagree with his appraisal of the Linda case. Is it possible that they are covert intelligence agents who have penetrated Hopkins' inner circle?

If the U.S. Government is covertly interested in UFOs, who does it employ to investigate UFO sightings by civilians? Prior to late 1969, when the USAF closed down its Project Blue Book office, UFO sightings often were investigated by uniformed USAF personnel from nearby bases. But since late 1969, if the U.S. government is covertly interested in UFOs, it can no longer use uniformed investigators lest this reveal its secret interest. The obvious solution would be to strike a secret deal with the head of an existing civil UFO organization which has a large network of field investigators who can quickly reach the scene of a sighting. The Top Secret code name for this operation might be CUFON (CIA UFO Network). To avoid any suspicion by the UFO organization's members that they were working for the U.S. Government, its director would be told he should repeatedly criticize the Government and accuse it of "UFO coverup." Carrying this "logic" a bit further, one should not rule out the possibility that the current director of CUFON might be Walt Andrus or even Jerry Clark.

-----  
 NOTE: Opinions expressed in SUN are those of its Editor, unless otherwise noted, and do not necessarily represent the views of any organizations with which he is affiliated--or his spouse. Thanks to Dr. Gary Posner for help in proofreading.  
 -----

SKEPTICS UFO NEWSLETTER (SUN) IS PUBLISHED BIMONTHLY. SUBSCRIPTION RATE (SIX ISSUES) IS \$15 FOR U.S./CANADA. OVERSEAS RATE (AIRMAIL) IS \$20/YEAR. (Please make check/money order payable to Phillip J. Klass.)