

tion of metrical properties.

There are other problems which could be put forward. It has been suggested that random distributions of points lead to a pattern of lines with a spiky appearance. Are the lines from saucer plots less spikey than one would expect? This would mean they tend to meet in fairly large angles. Of course sooner or later we would find something significant about any map. Any hypothesis must stand the test of time.

Jumping a little further ahead now, what conclusions could be drawn if sightings did tend to lie along narrow strips of land, or corridors? In each sighting there are two possibilities. Either the UFO is due to an objective or to a subjective cause. What some people claim is that orthoteny will show the cause to be objective. Can subjective causes tend to lie along corridors? Most sightings are located in towns.*. If the towns themselves showed a tendency to follow corridors then the cause of UFOs could be subjective and they would show the same tendency. Otherwise it seems

difficult to explain the UFOs as subjective. But even if the causes are objective why should such a tendency imply that they are intelligently controlled? What is strange is the indication of the improbable six or seven point "line" rather than a slight increase in the three and four point "lines". This suggests that, rather than a weak influence over all sightings there is a stronger influence over a few of them. Whether this influence, if shown to exist, is an alien race would still be a matter of conjecture.

In any problem one must go as far as one can without approximating, and I have tried to do this in the initial problem. It does bring out the mechanics of the problem and leads to a practical solution of a simpler nature than Vallée's. I feel sure a theoretical solution must be built on this foundation.

NOTE

*It is felt that many readers and researchers will disagree with this statement that most sightings are located in towns: the bulk of the evidence I have seen indicates otherwise. It could be that the author is confusing sightings with reports: more reports are likely to emanate from towns because that is where the greatest number of people congregate.—EDITOR.

The Prime Lever

By the Reverend Guy J. Cyr

IN the September/October 1964 issue of the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, while commenting on NICAP's report Waveney Girvan hopefully stated: "If NICAP's pressure can open the American door to the truth, then the British door will swing open too."

In my judgment, "NICAP's pressure" will never "open the American door to the truth," for the obvious reason that it is applying the pressure at the wrong place: too near the hinges. In other words, the leaders in this organization are appealing to the legislators of the nation with arguments which are too speculative and nebulous. On the other hand, Senators and Representatives are very practical people who are constantly aware of the wishes of the voters, and the taxpayers who elected them.

Now taxpayers generally evaluate items and events on the dollar-scale, and so the shortest route to their brain passes through their purse. The members of the Senate and House in Washington must be fully conscious of that, and one can easily assume that while going through *The UFO Evidence*, they looked for practical arguments along these lines. Something, in effect, which would amount to political hay or dynamite. True, they found plenty of dynamite: enough to blow the U.S. Air Force into the "neighbouring" galaxy. However, they found no "caps", and dynamite will

not explode usefully without these. In other words, it immediately became obvious to them that the NICAP leaders, today as ever, are perfectly harmless because they simply don't know how to use their ammunition.

NICAP argues this way: the UFOs could be mistaken for enemy missiles and thus accidentally trigger a nuclear war. Also, the unprepared public would probably panic when confronted with extraterrestrials and a threat to our way of life. Therefore, the U.S. Air Force should publish what it knows about the UFOs.

A different strategy

However, as a matter of fact these extraterrestrial spaceships and probes have been manoeuvring in our atmosphere for thousands of years and there is not a shred of evidence to show that they ever started a war accidentally or otherwise. On the contrary, since, as our scientists theorize, a nuclear war could bring about the complete destruction of Planet-3, and thus upset the equilibrium in the solar system, it seems logical to conclude that the ufonites, who would know that, would try to prevent or stop such a war. And this can be done more effectively if their presence here is kept an official secret.

As for panic brought on by a sudden confronta-

tion with Intelligences from another world, that at best, is nebulous speculation. Our way of life is far from being perfect, and who can prove that a new way of life offered to us by beings hundreds of years ahead of us in science would not be far better and gladly accepted?

On the other hand, if our governments were to admit publicly that thousands of spaceships and probes from other worlds are manoeuvring in our atmosphere, in the same breath they would be conceding their complete inability to stop them. There, you certainly would have cause for concern and panic.

Hence, it is no wonder that NICAP and other organizations who have approached their governments with the "war and panic" argument, have failed every time. And there is no reason to think that it will succeed in the near future. So, why not try a different strategy . . . something which can be evaluated on the monetary scale? Arguments in that area are easily grasped and can be very convincing when well presented.

Dr. Greenacre's observations

Briefly, I suggest that we join in a concerted effort to convince the legislators in Washington that a group of scientists who are not in any way involved in the space programme, therefore not prejudiced, should undertake seriously the thorough study of the question: Are there Intelligences on the Moon? If they come out with an affirmative answer, then our efforts to land on it, and then to colonize it are presently, at least, USELESS and WASTEFUL.

But, are there any good arguments? Indeed, there are, and quite a variety too. The most cogent that I know is the one based on the recent Greenacre sightings.

A few years ago a selenographer, Dr. James C. Greenacre, and others, were hired by the U.S. Air Force to study the surface of the Moon for the purpose of finding a suitable place for the landing of astronauts. He used the facilities at the Lowell Observatory, Flagstaff, Arizona. In view of what we are now about to say, it is as well to note that Dr. John S. Hall, Director of that observatory, described Greenacre as a "very cautious observer" who "had long been sceptical of reported changes on the lunar surface."

However, on October 29, 1963, Dr. Greenacre had to abandon this attitude completely with regard to changes on the Moon, for he, plus at least four other astronomers clearly observed that night, and a month later, 31 gigantic spaceships on or near the lunar surface. Of course, they were called "spots", "coloured areas" and the like. He

consulted the co-witnesses and the Air Force at length unveiled, a few details at a time, the stupendous facts. These 31 ships were gigantic, ranging from around 1,000 feet to 3 miles wide. Yet, from the observers' remarks and from their sketches it is clear that at least some of these craft were moving while they were under close observation. How else can you explain, for example, that one formation made up of seven "spots" was said to be an oval (5 miles x 1.5 miles) and was sketched as a circle? The "spots" were symmetrical and of various colours, which at times sparkled. These circular, cylindrical, diamond-shaped or U-shaped ships were grouped into five different geometric formations: one oval, two circles and two double-test-tube patterns, one of which lasted 1 hour and 15 minutes.

A few more details

When I first read accounts of these sightings in the newspapers and magazines, I wondered why Dr. Greenacre said the terrain ("lurain") beneath was hidden by these "spots": in the sketches they were very far apart. Now I know, for, on May 17th the doctor himself was permitted to reveal a few more details. Between these "spots" there were "tiny dots" . . . tiny to the eye, but actually they had to be at least 500 feet wide more or less depending on contrast, observing conditions, etc., otherwise he could not have seen them. They were white and "ran along" the larger objects which at times were ruby.

In effect, he said that the whole display reminded him of one of our own *MAN-MADE* devices: a set of electrical lights switching on and off according to an *INTELLIGENTLY* controlled rhythm. Yes, trampling down under foot his adamant scepticism as regards changes on the lunar surface, Dr. Greenacre had enough honesty and courage to acknowledge that this spectacular show or series thereof brought to his mind a neon sign made up of red and white lights "chasing each other" across it.

With the apparent purpose of exploding to smithereens all the ridiculous theories propounded by the so-called "experts" who gave natural "explanations" for these sightings, he stated emphatically that these "spots", "dots" and "streaks" were not clouds of any kind. Furthermore, he told the world, implicitly, it's true, but nevertheless very clearly what he saw. His first impression was that the Russians were already on the Moon.

I defy any scientist, or group thereof, to give a *reasonable* explanation of these 31 objects with the accompanying events in terms of purely abiotic and non-intelligent activities.

Teleportations

By Gordon Creighton

ON the morning of 25th October 1593, a Spanish soldier suddenly appeared on the Plaza Mayor (the principal Square) of Mexico City. He was wearing the insignia of the regiment which at that moment was guarding the walled city of Manila, in the Philippine Islands, more than 9,000 miles away on the other side of the Pacific Ocean. How did this soldier come to be in Mexico City? The truth is that he had no idea. All he knew was that he had suddenly found himself, no longer in Manila, but in Mexico. But there was something else that he said he *DID* know. He said that His Excellency Don Gómez Pérez Dasmariñas, Governor of the Philippines, was dead. A preposterous rumour of course. But one that spread through the Mexican capital like wildfire.

Although puzzled as to how precisely the soldier could have travelled so far without so much as losing his uniform, the Spanish authorities in Mexico jailed him as a deserter from the Manila garrison. An awkward Fortean "damned fact" was thus safely swept under the carpet, and no doubt folk breathed again with relief.

And so the weeks passed, while our soldier languished in the brig; the long slow weeks necessary for news to travel by galleon along the regular sailing route from Spain, which run via Manila to Acapulco, the port on the west coast of Mexico. From Acapulco the news would pass by messenger up across the great sierras and into the sky-girt Valley of Mexico.

And then suddenly Mexico City was full of the news. His Excellency Don Gómez Pérez Dasmariñas, Governor of the Philippines for King Philip II, *WAS* dead—murdered by a mutinous Chinese crew off Punta de Azufre just as he was setting sail on a military expedition against the Molucca Islands! And, moreover, he had been murdered on the very day that the mysterious soldier from the Manila garrison had appeared on the Plaza Mayor of Mexico City.

The Most Holy Tribunal of the Inquisition, always alert for signs of witchcraft and "diablería", took charge of the case. But still the soldier could not tell them how he had travelled from Manila to Mexico. All he could tell them was that it had been "in less time than it takes a cock to crow".

The Inquisition ordered that the man be returned to Manila for further investigation of the matter, and on his arrival there it was established

beyond question, on the word of not a few witnesses, that the soldier had indeed been there on duty in the city of Manila on the night of 24th October 1593, just as it was proven beyond any peradventure that on the following morning he had been apprehended on the Plaza Mayor in Mexico City, over 9,000 miles away.

There are reliable records of this episode¹. It is no fabrication. And the best term with which we can label it, is one already familiar to us from the annals of Psychic Research: teleportation.

We possess records of numerous disappearances, apparent abductions, apparent teleportations. In the *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW* for July/August 1963 I reported the case of the Swedish student Olaf Nielsen who claims that he was swept up and carried off by a saucer near Halmstad, Sweden, on the afternoon of 25th August 1960, and taken to a secret base. I suggest that the Manila/Mexico case and many others are all *UFO phenomena*. And I shall give some further recent examples.

In his book *The Case for the UFO*, the late M. K. Jessup (and, by the way, his death was just one of many mysterious deaths) dealt with a number of classic cases, including this one of the Manila soldier and some of the more extraordinary disappearances, such as that of Oliver Lerch in 1890 and that of the R.A.F. officers Day and Stewart whose footprints came to a sudden end in the sands of Irak one day in July 1924. Space does not permit me to deal here with the fantastic problem of disappearances and abductions. My purpose in the present article is only to examine some of the evidence for *teleportation*, that is to say, evidence of cases in which a UFO may have picked a person up in one place and set him down again elsewhere. (Perhaps this is how our peripatetic pumas get here?)

I shall of course be told immediately that the Manila Soldier Story—if indeed it ever happened—is almost four centuries old; that they were capable of cooking up all sorts of tales in those days; that there has never been a whit of evidence since that pointed to a repetition. I regret that I cannot agree, and for the record here are two more cases which I have selected.

The Buenos-Aires Businessman

One day in 1959, an important Argentine businessman² was driving back to the South of that country after a visit to Buenos Aires. He stopped