

JOURNAL FÜR UFO-FORSCHUNG, No. 199, 1/2012

ENGLISH SUMMARY

UFO observations (pp. 2-10)

The classification of the case 20090517 B, 4040, from Linz, Austria, as a Good UFO led to much discussion within research circles, with many believing (and expressing so in long reports) that this was a clear case of hoax. It was no hoax, however, but also no good UFO. Further research by Hans-Werner Peiniger revealed that, at the very time the witness took his photos, an art installation called “Air Plug”, by Markus Wilfing, consisting of a balloon in the form of an oversized sink plug, freed itself from its lines and drifted away. This is what the witness saw and interpreted as an anomalous sky phenomenon.

Additional reports / part 6 (pp. 11-18)

The GEP again received a number of photos of unusual things in the sky. Again, the photographers generally noticed their “UFO” only after viewing the images. A picture from Vent, Austria, from 22 August 2011, showing an “orb”, certainly is just a dust particle or insect in front of the lens. The quite surreal image on a photo taken at 11 December 2011, at Eisenberg, was thought by the photographer to be an energy spaceship, however, it was just a lens flare. A trace on a picture from Kiel, taken on 5 November 2011, was Jupiter (transformed into a trace by camera movement). The picture from Regensburg, taken on 6 July 2008, was a bird or an insect in front of the lens, as was the UFO on a photo from Bayreuth, taken on 1 April 2011. A sighting of a bright point source of light observed over Veitshöheim, on 3 September 2010, was identified as the star Capella or planet Jupiter.

A UFO over Hamburg in 1665? (pp. 19-20)

A UFO in form of two shoe soles, observed and drawn in Hamburg in 1665, is revealed to be nothing else than an observation of a well-known comet appearance that was widely reported at the time.

Classification and Evaluation of CE-IV cases – A proposal (pp. 21-29)

André Kramer suggests a new classification of abduction cases which refers to the amount of strangeness or explicability of the case – from single missing time and bedroom visitations, which may be conventionally explained, to complex case history which are being produced with or without hypnosis. Therefore, a CE 4.1 would mean no concrete memories, simple belief; CE 4.2 memories of minimal complexity (bedroom visitor); CE 4.3 complex memories produced under hypnosis; and CE 4.4 complex memories without the use of hypnosis.