

of me telling my story. It was to be filmed at the Technical College on March 19, 1979.

My eyes were sore for about a week and I had to wear dark glasses. I have had to have some weeks away from work as I haven't felt well and the doctor advised me to have a rest. My jaws ached after staring with my mouth open with shock when I first saw the "beings."

I have never read books about UFOs. I only read the papers. I don't look at a lot of television, but like the *Crossroads* programmes and *Coronation Street*, and love stories.

Some people have made jokes about me, but people who know me believe me as they know I am truthful.

Some people have written to say that they think the visitors were elves or beings from the Fairy Kingdom, or even robots, but I don't know what to think. I know I shall never forget them if I live to be a hundred.

A few days later we tried the "tapes" that had been handled by the "beings." They were so distorted that

they were ruined. Before January the 4th they were quite normal.

Note

These are some of the people who will confirm that they went to the house and heard Mrs. Hingley's story:—

Oldbury Police.

West Bromwich Police.

UFO Studies Investigation Services. Phone: 021 427 6914.

Mr. & Mrs. Westwood,
71, Wentworth Way,
Harborne,
Birmingham B32 2UX.

West Bromwich College of Technology,
Woden Road South, West Bromwich, Birmingham.
(Mr. R. Wilkinson, TV Production Course)

[The report has also been investigated by Martin Keatman on behalf of UFOIN — EDITOR]

MAIL BAG

Correspondence is invited from our readers, but they are asked to keep their letters short. Unless letters give the sender's full name and address (not necessarily for publication) they cannot be considered. The Editor would like to remind correspondents that it is not always possible to acknowledge every letter personally, so he takes this opportunity of thanking all who write to him.

The "Black Monk" and other matters

Dear Mr. Bowen, — Allow me to express my deep gratitude to you for sending me your splendid journal. I enjoyed reading about recent UFO-cases happening in various parts of the world.

I should like to comment on the letter by A. B. Sidle published in FSR, 25/2 and concerning the observation of a flying humanoid by E. E. Loznaya (FSR, 24/4). Of course I have read the tale "Black Monk" by A. P. Chekhov but I do not believe the coincidence of the stories is very close. The "monk" had his face; the humanoid did not have one. It resembles some other similar observations (see, for example, FSR Special No. 4, p.53) which Mrs. Loznaya undoubtedly had not the possibility of getting acquainted with. Moreover after publishing this report in *Tekhnika-Molodyozhi*, 1976, No. 11, I have received several readers' letters containing similar information. I am planning to publish these reports in a future issue of "TM".

Incidentally I do not think there is (or was), in our country, a legend about the "black monk," for A. P. Chekhov had a dream about such a "monk" and later he used it for the tale.

Naturally the possibility of the fraud on the witness' part is not fully excluded — as in any report about humanoids, UFOs etc. However, when investigating this research field an investigator is

forced, to my mind, to share an important principle — "the principle of confidence." We may not trust or distrust the witnesses (for it is impossible to verify each report). Should we not assume that the report is a true one, and look where this assumption leads?

On the one hand, almost each separate UFO — or humanoid — sighting may be explained by an "unusual combination of usual causes." But the phenomenon as a whole? On the other hand, there is at present no hypothesis explaining the phenomenon more or less completely. Even the ET concept explains a separate sighting rather than the full complex of the sightings. From this point of view I note with interest the evolution of such an eminent ufologist as Dr. J. Vallée from *Anatomy of a Phenomenon* to *The Invisible College* (unfortunately I have not had the chance to read his two most recent books — *The Edge of Reality* and *Messengers of Deception*). The UFO-phenomenon may be "real" or "imaginative" but its influence on our civilisation is quite real.

When publishing the letter by Mrs. E. E. Loznaya in *Tekhnika-Molodyozhi* I had the intention only to demonstrate that there is in the UFO-phenomenon a sub-phenomenon: not flying objects in general, not flying saucers, but flying "men" or flying humanoids. The readers of FSR can also read about such observations in FSR, 19/2, p.29 and FSR

Case Histories, Suppl. 10, pp.14-16.

I am very glad of this opportunity to wish you personally, and your colleagues and readers a happy and successful 1980!

Sincerely yours,
Vladimir V. Rubstov,
Kharkov,
USSR.
20 December, 1979.

The "Dapple Gray Lane" experience

(The following is an extract from a letter on unrelated matters).

Dear Mr. Bowen, — . . . Here is something that may prove of value, if nobody else has pointed it out yet. It concerns the story told by "John Hodges" as related in FSR Vol. 25, No. 3. I thought there was something familiar about the alleged truth about the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and indeed there is. The idea that air dropped bombs do not work and that those two cities were flattened by earthquake, the "atomic effects" (blinding flash and radio activity) being produced by the USAF, appears as the plot to a novel called *The Jesus Factor* (Mayflower paperback 1972). The latter, as far as I am aware, is complete fiction.

I do not intend to suggest that "John Hodges" fabricated his story; just that the required information exists elsewhere and that it may have been dredged up from an unconscious source by the

experience he underwent. However, if he did not read that book we have a very interesting situation, to say the least.

Yours sincerely,

M. H. Martin,

London SE9.

11 November, 1979

That Michael Bentine let-down (one expects it from P. Moore)

Dear Sir, — I'd like to say a few things about BBC T.V.'s *Sky at Night* programme. I didn't see this myself but several people in my department as work came up to me and said "Did you see the programme etc., it was such a farce." Even people who don't take a very serious interest in the UFO subject felt that the attitude of Michael Bentine and Patrick Moore was childish and deliberately misleading. Perhaps other FSR readers have become used to the way the government and the media nearly always take the line that "... 2% of UFO sightings cannot be explained" — as if they can calm people into complacency by means of statistics — because I myself have come to expect this now. It's a pity that the general public are led to believe that Patrick Moore is an expert and it's an even greater pity that Moore has succumbed to selling himself to the Blankety-Blank entertainment world.

Still, if my co-workers, who aren't even very interested in UFOs, can see through him, and it makes them wonder if there's a cover-up, then perhaps this silly sort of mickey-take is going to do the opposite of what it was intended to do.

Yours faithfully,

Denise Langman,

243 The Fairway,

New Moston,

Manchester,

M10 0WS.

12 December, 1979.

Dr. Condon was not entirely wrong

Dear Mr. Bowen, — We all know that the Condon Report has been harshly criticized by ufologists ever since its publication in January 1969.

Virtually unknown, however, is the fact the late Dr. Edward U. Condon grasped the *paraphysical* (or *metaphysical*) nature of the UFO phenomenon, which takes ufology out of the realm of science and places it in that of philosophy. Hence his famous conclusion that enraged ufologists: "Further extensive study of UFOs probably cannot be justified in the expectation that science will be advanced thereby."

In fact, the overwhelming majority of scientists still refuse to deal with the UFO problem. But I don't blame them for this

negative attitude. After all, they are right in not wasting their precious time in ufological research (sterile for them). For *ufology is not within the province of science but that of philosophy, especially of metaphysics and ontology*. The well-known English science writer Arthur C. Clarke has also suggested that the answers to the UFO enigma are in the realm of *paraphysics*.

It is therefore up to the new generation of philosophers — clear-headed, objective and *free from all religious dogmas and taboos* — to tackle the UFO mystery. As a matter of fact, religious faith constitutes a major obstacle to the comprehension of the paraphysical phenomena.

Yours sincerely,

Julian H. Kaneko,

18, rue Le Corbusier,

CH-1208 Geneva,

Switzerland.

4 January, 1980.

That UFO "missile"

Dear Sir, — I am writing about the article "UFO 'missile' Scare" in Vol. 25, No. 1. According to the author, the witness said that she was driving at 3 a.m. when she noticed a "star" following her car. After 2-3 minutes this object, changing shape constantly, passed over the car and hit the ground with a thud, bounced and vanished. After stopping the car the witness said she could see another shape (apparently this was a UFO that had emitted the "missile"). She also felt a mild tingling sensation while the "missile" was overhead.

I believe that this case holds several factors of psychic phenomena. I will list them here: 1, The "missile" changed shape many times; 2, It was apparently travelling in a straight line for up to three minutes without gravity pulling it down until that period was up. This means that either the "missile" was not solid, it was emitted with a tremendous force to keep it in the air that long, or it was self-propelled; 3, After hitting the ground the "missile" vanished, which no physical object could do; 4, No markings were left on the ground — thus the "missile" could not have been solid, because the tremendous force (either from the UFO or the "missile" itself) needed to propel it for three minutes would have surely made it hit the ground with enough force to create a depression.

My opinion on this case is that the "missile" (and UFO) might be psychic phenomena, and the case needs further thought on that line.

Yours sincerely,

Kevin R. Berry,

48 Hope Street,

Shirley, Christchurch,

New Zealand.

6 November, 1979.

Soft soap?

Dear Sir, — In the 1979-80 number of "Pears Cyclopaedia" (No. 88) — see pp. L45, J21 ('Flying Saucers') — there appear such remarks on UFOs as would surely bear out the worst estimates that have been made of those official media in general stances regarding this question.

I quote from that of the L45 column:—
"... It is now believed that when not hallucinations, meteorological or cosmic-ray balloons, they are nothing more than atmospheric phenomena like mirages or mock suns caused by unusual atmospheric conditions. Described by Dr. Menzel, astrophysics professor at Harvard University, 'as real as rainbows are real, and no more dangerous.' It has been suggested that the study of some of the people who report the sighting of UFOs would be more rewarding than the investigation of what they saw! . . ."

I quote very briefly now from J21 column:

"... As long as empty churches testify to the (if perhaps but temporary) loss of contact between citizens and orthodox religions then one can expect such offbeat ideas as the cults surrounding flying saucers, and the science-fiction-like cult of scientology to expand, flourish . . ."

Sirs, I am yours, etc.,

Capt. G. A. Miles (Ret.),

Warren Road,

Liss Forest,

Hants GU33 7DD.

22 January, 1980

[*Fortunately we have never needed to consult "Pears Cyclopaedia" (Pears being specialists in all kinds of soap) as an authority on UFO reports, and our views on cultist activities around the fringe of the subject have been stated clearly enough — EDITOR*]

Illusions, or hallucinations?

Dear Sir,—Hilary Evans (Vol. 25, No. 4) with his wonted perceptiveness and clarity of exposition has put his finger on the right spot in stressing Vieroudy's "paradoxical duality." UFOs are indeed "autonomous entities"; but are they also "illusions"? Personally, I should prefer to talk of "hallucinations" in this context, for the following reason.

Illusions are false perceptions of physical stimuli. They are exceedingly common in this subject (A. Hendry, *The UFO Handbook*, Doubleday 1979), though apparently not so in *Psychical Research* (*Proc. of the S.P.R.*, Vol. X, Part XXVI, p.100). They apply to the IFOs rather than to UFOs properly so called. To illustrate my point, when I impatiently wait for a no.16 bus in the Kilburn High Road, that "illusionary" and evasive object turns out to be a 616. I am consequently in error, and there the matter rests as far as bus-spotting is concerned. (Illusions of "flying objects"

are, it is true, psychologically more revealing.) A hallucinatory no. 16 bus is a different kettle of fish with which I can claim no personal acquaintance: it could be either an apparition or a UFO, depending on the observer's predilection or other psychological factors.

M. Cassirer

(Formerly Chairman,
Physical Phenomena
Committee, S.P.R.)

Critics who speak from a background of ignorance

Dear Sir,—Having only now succeeded in getting round to reading Mr. D. Durand's letter "A Matter of Paranoia" (FSR Vol. 24, No. 4) I must confess that, like your correspondent, I am becoming more than a little irritated with the type of critic who suggests that "some scientists and researchers concerned with ufology are paranoid in their attitudes," when not infrequently that self-same critic would be utterly unable to distinguish an L.S.D. hallucination and a case of *folie à deux* psychosis.

The fact that I am able to refer to them myself is simply because I am in the process of reading a quite excellent book on the subject entitled *UFO Phenomena and the Behavioral Scientist*, edited by Dr. Richard F. Haines, and published by the Scarecrow Press Inc., Metuchen, New Jersey, U.S.A.

The relevancy of the "paranoid" accusation lies, I feel, in Chapter 6, in an article by Dr. Berthold Eric Schwarz, in which he contends that "... the media have attributed UFO events to hallucinations, illusions and delusions. **But these statements were not made by psychiatrists.**" (My emphasis — R.J.P.)

In other words, if you wish to criticise, be very sure that you know all about the subject you are endeavouring to criticise.

Yours sincerely,

R. Jones Pugh, M.R.C.V.S.,

Parkland Place,
St. Brides View,
Roch,

Haverfordwest,
Pembrokeshire.

March 7, 1980.

Another cat flap analogy

Dear Mr. Bowen — In your review of the book *UFOs: a British Viewpoint*, you ask "Do some people have the special attributes needed to see UFOs?" And in my opinion, the answer, probably, is *yes*.

Consider our pet cat. Only once in several years has he shown any interest in the television set. The other night, baboons were shown sitting on a rock, howling. The noise awoke the cat, who jumped off the settee and, with tail wagging, slowly approached the TV. To my surprise he ignored the TV completely, sprang through the legs of the stand, and attacked the bookcase behind the set.

If our cat could express his thoughts to other cats, the conversations would be interesting. Other cats may have identified the source of the howling, but how to explain this to our cat? To describe a box with bright lights and moving figures would be both beyond the power of cats both to describe or to understand. A human seeing a UFO in any location, on the ground or in the air, has difficulty in describing what he or she has seen. So, many of the peculiar effects and experiences that have been recorded may come from our inability to comprehend what we actually do see. People may see the same type of UFOs, but their individual brains may interpret the object in a way peculiar to that particular person. Our cat would say the howling came from the bookcase, other cats would quote whatever their home had behind the TV, whilst perhaps a few, very few, would quote the brightly coloured box.

On the same theme, what do the goldfish in our garden pond make of my hand when it appears over the pond to drop food into it. My hand is beyond their comprehension, let alone the rest of my body.

I look forward to FSR very much.

Yours truly,

J. Clamp

188 Beckhampton Road,
Bestwood Park Estate,
Nottingham NG5 5NE
February 21, 1980.

The Scully controversy

Dear Mr. Bowen,—I have just received and read the latest FSR, Vol. 25, No. 4, and found the articles by Mr. Stringfield and Mr. Creighton very interesting.

In the book *Flying Saucers Farewell* George Adamski wrote the following:

"In *Behind The Flying Saucers* Frank Scully mentioned that in the first crashed spacecraft examined by our scientists some twelve to fifteen years ago, all measurements were found to be divisible by nine. Thus he gave the first clue to Cosmic mathematics used in construction of the spacecraft.

"Although one of the first books written on this subject of spacecraft, and bitterly denied by the opposition who feared the acceptance of such facts even in those days, this book stands as one that has never been disproved. Of the hundreds of books written regarding space visitors and their ships, this remains one of the comparatively few authentic treatments of the subject."

That was 20 years ago, now in 1980 we have Mr. Stringfield and Mr. Creighton suggesting that the Scully exposure may have been contrived, and that there might now be a mad rush to get Scully's book. Well it is a pity that we didn't take more notice of Frank Scully's book in the

first place and also what George Adamski had to say about it.

Over the years there has been a lot of talk about cover-ups and official secrecy etc.

We have had the USAF cover-ups, the Condon whitewash, official de-bunking by various governmental bodies. May I suggest that soon we will become aware of another cover-up, and it will be known as the great NASA cover-up!

I agree with Mr. Stringfield, it will be a great shock for human-kind on this planet when the truth finally is out — even to most UFO researchers!

Sincerely,

C. Poole,

94 Kelbrook Court,
Offerton,
Stockport,
Cheshire, SK2 5NT.
February 21, 1980.

Retrieval difficulties

Dear Sir,—I find "Retrievals of the Third Kind" (FSR Vol. 25, No. 4) an interesting article, but here are a few points to ponder:

Abstract 1: Did the USA get permission from the Mexican government to retrieve the UFO? If, yes, can this be checked with the Mexicans? Was the UFO cut-up or dismantled for transportation? In either case it must have taken considerable time, whereas the article indicates otherwise.

Abstract 2: Again, was the 50ft. diameter UFO cut-up to put on to *one* lo-boy?

The points I am trying to make are: (a) why cut-up an alien craft if you want to fly it? (Would they be able to put it together again?) (b) If it is dismantled (a process that must take a very long time considering it has not been done before) where do they start, what dangers are there from the power plant etc? Every part would have to be labelled and catalogued (do "they" use real nuts and bolts?).

Finally, these craft have been in the hangers for a long time and yet the USA appears not to have any new metals or power systems after nearly 30 years. I would have thought that no expense would have been spared to get a UFO into the air, or space.

Yours sincerely,

John Ledner,

50 Seymour Road,
Ringwood,
Hants.

March 5, 1980.

What the "Retrievals" could mean — if true

Dear Sirs, — The "Retrievals" articles in FSR Vol. 25 No. 4 by Messrs Creighton and Stringfield are very intriguing, and if the subject matter were to prove factual, the implications would

be more far-reaching, and enormous, than most ufologists have so far supposed.

If the authorities have, as suggested, retrieved not merely pieces of UFO hardware, but complete UFOs along with dead crewmen (and possibly survivors of a UFO crash-landing?), then the whole UFO cover-up takes on far more sinister and alarming proportions. It means that for about 30 years the U.S. and probably other governments have been in full possession of all the facts and concrete evidence necessary to identify UFOs, but it also means contact must certainly have been made with these aliens (the retrieved craft presumably had some kind of communications system, some of which must have worked or been repairable). It also means scientists have had three decades to study the design and mechanics of the retrieved UFOs, and so the government agencies concerned must have developed a UFO-type propulsion system of their own years ago.

This would mean the whole NASA and Soviet space programmes must be seen as a complete fraud — a joint Soviet-American charade to hoodwink the public, and the truth would come pretty close to the allegations made in the TV play "Alternative 3" which was put on as a straight documentary a few years ago, then denounced as a hoax: government agencies must have been secretly in contact with and visiting civilisations on other planets for about 20-odd years. This would mean many of the UFOs seen in recent years would be of Earth-origin, and there must be some hideous secret conspiracy too terrible to reveal to the world at large.

Now I find all this extremely hard to believe, but I do not see how one can avoid these implications if we accept the "Retrievals" as factual. In view of this, and of the flimsy nature of the evidence, I feel we must be very cautious and realise that such retrieval reports may well be grossly exaggerated if not complete fabrications. That the various governments have pieces of charred, twisted metal from crashed UFOs I have no doubt, but that they have complete craft with occupants I find very hard to swallow. If they had, hard evidence would surely have come out by now. The financial incentive for some individual in the Military or Intelligence services to secretly photograph a saucer or dead crewman and sell the picture and story to the press would be irresistible. Unless, that is, those in charge of the conspiracy of silence are so completely powerful and so utterly ruthless that no-one can defy them and survive.

Yours faithfully,
A. J. Papard,
65 Jay Court, Austin Road,
London SW11 5JN
February 18, 1980.

More on Retrievals, and a note on Dyfed

Dear Sir, — I was interested to read "Retrievals of the Third Kind," as I am reading a book called *Wheels within Wheels and Points Beyond* by Willard L. Wannall. It is a fascinating book and in Chapter 9, entitled "Flying Saucers and Military Life" the author describes how he met a civilian employee of the Army. He had formerly held a position with the American Air Force, and had been present at the site in New Mexico where several Flying Saucers had crashed due to a magnetic fault in that area, which served to rob the craft of their means of magnetic propulsion. This civilian stated that efforts to break the objects into smaller parts were unsuccessful and it was necessary to transport them intact to a certain installation nearly 2000 miles distant! The bodies were taken to a special laboratory engaged in medical research.

After reading *The Uninvited* by Clive Harold I wrote to Mr. Coombes as I know the area. He kindly phoned me and although he and his family have moved from the farm, they still see the UFOs but are not frightened any more! I also enjoyed Peter Paget's *The Welsh Triangle*.

May I say how much I enjoy reading FSR.

Yours sincerely,
Elizabeth Cole,
9 Ray Lea Close,
Maidenhead,
Berks SL6 8QN.
February 18, 1980.

Mysterious sizes at arm's length

Dear Mr. Bowen,—In a recent issue of FSR, a contributor made the following statement: "Apparent size was that of a ten pence piece at arm's length . . ." I recall in an earlier issue, another British writer described the apparent size of an object by comparing it with the size of another denomination of British coin. I also remember an American writer referring to a UFO's apparent size by stating that it looked to be as big as a nickel, a five-cent piece.

Now, I know how big a nickel is (21.2mm), but I wouldn't know a ten pence piece if one jumped up and bit me. The chances are that most British readers can say the same thing about any given type of American coin.

It would be helpful if contributors would keep in mind that FSR is an international journal, and that terms and comparisons which make perfect sense to them may be meaningless to readers in other countries.

Sincerely,
J. M. Buehring,
12451 Barryknoll,
Houston, Tex. 77024.
March 11, 1980.

[Contributors take note! For the benefit of American and other overseas readers I will record that the approximate sizes (no way can I get down to 21.2mm!) are as follows: 10 pence — 28mm; 5p — 23mm; 2p — 26mm; 1p — 20mm; while the near useless ½p is 17mm — ED.]

SOME HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NEXT ISSUE OF FLYING SAUCER REVIEW. . .

ITALIAN NIGHT-WATCHMAN KIDNAPPED BY UFO. . . Lucian Boccone

A RE-VIEWING OF THE GREAT NOCTURNAL LIGHT: UFO fallout over
New Zealand, December 1978. . . W. C. Chalker
A revealing interview with the participants in the famous film incident

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF "RETRIEVALS" Gordon Creighton

PHYSICAL ASSAULT BY UNIDENTIFIED OBJECTS AT LIVINGSTON —
Pt. 2 M. Keatman & A. Collins

MINI-DISC OVER BLACKBUSHE Omar Fowler

Tell your friends about

FLYING SAUCER REVIEW

The magazine with 25 years' experience

World round-up

*of news and comment
about recent sightings*

People' Republic of China

Basin-like object over Hupei and other reports

A report from Hong Kong, repeated in *The Sunday Standard*, Bombay, of September 23, 1979, quoted the *Kwong Ming* daily of (presumably) September 21 as follows:—

"A Peking newspaper has belatedly reported sightings of Unidentified Flying Objects over China, China's domestic news agency reports.

"The report, quoting yesterday's issue of *Kwong Ming* daily, said the first sighting was reported by a high school student over Hupei Province in Central China one evening in 1977.

"The report, seen in Hong Kong today, said the student reported the sighting to anthropologist Yuen Zhanxin who was working in the province.

"Mr. Yuen, according to the report, told the daily that the student and other witnesses described the object as a basin-size round object, beaming with yellow and white lights and moving slowly in a circular route. He said the witnesses said the object remained in view for about one minute.

"The report said sightings of UFO had also been reported 'collectively' by troops in Hopei province in north China and inner Mongolia.

"It did not mention the dates but described the object over Hopei as a 'moon-like ball surrounded by fog-like gases.'

"The report said the object 'spurting jets of gases rose high in the sky for a few seconds. It rose higher spurting jets of gases again and disappeared after a few seconds.' — AP."

[*Encouraging evidence that UFOs are also being reported in China — and corroboration, in a small way, of what a contact once conveyed to us, that the country was "running alive with them"* — EDITOR]

Credit: **Jal N. D. Tata** of Colaba, Bombay, India.

Spain

Madrid object

The following item is taken from the London national newspaper *Daily Telegraph* of November 29, 1979:—

"Hundreds of people in Madrid yesterday watched an unidentified flying object hovering high for several hours. Two late night radio shows devoted

almost their entire programmes to the mystery object.

"The Spanish Air Force has begun an investigation into the phenomenon. Earlier this month an experienced airline captain made an emergency landing at Valencia after his Caravelle was followed by two UFOs."

(The story of the *Caravelle* appeared in the last issue of FSR.)

Credit: **John M. Lade** and others.

Poland

Three reports

The following brief reports are taken from an article entitled "Kronika UFO" which appeared in the Polish weekly *Fakty* 79 dated August 8, 1979. The article took the form of a summary of items which had appeared in the Polish press during the first six months of 1979, and we have extracted the items which relate to reports in Poland itself (the remaining cases itemised were from South American countries):—

"During the day, for a period of two minutes a red luminous trail which split up into two was observed in the area of Kwidzynia. With great speed one half of the trail flew upwards, whilst the other went sideways. There were three witnesses. (*Kurier Polski* dated January 6, 1979)."

"Between 7.30 a.m. and 8.00 a.m. a luminous object travelling from East to West appeared over Szczecin. The object suddenly changed direction southwards and disappeared. There was one witness. (*Kurier Szczecinski* dated January 28, 1979)."

"At about 7.15 p.m. a spherical object was observed between Dubieck and Sliwnica. It illuminated the surrounding area with a pulsating bright light. Another object was also observed flying from the direction of Bachórcza at a height of 25 metres, and it seemed to extinguish itself over the head of the witnesses. There were many witnesses of these events. (*Zycie Przemysla* dated February 18, 1979)."

[*Small items in all conscience, but indicative of the fact that reports are being made regularly in*

Poland. We are hoping to obtain more, in greater detail — EDITOR]

Credit: **H. Kubala** of Huddersfield who, with Mrs. Kubala kindly provided the translation.

France

Comment on the Cergy Pontoise CEIII

We hope to bring our readers further full details of the Cergy-Pontoise abduction story in the next issue of FSR (although we know that some French researchers are far from happy about the case — now that M. Fontaine has returned to the realms of ordinary mortals). The following comments appeared in the third editorial of the *Daily Telegraph* of November 29, 1979,—

"Every UFO fanatic knows that flying saucers come in waves. A fortnight ago a reputed hard-nut Capt. Tejada, was forced to land his Caravelle jet in a hurry after being 'buzzed' by a saucer. Subsequently there have been 'sightings' in Glasgow, Kuwait and Sweden, some by others also of unimpeachable seriousness of mind. Three days ago a Frenchman, M. Franck Fontaine, disappeared into thin air — or so two of his friends aver. The three of them were minding their own business at 4 a.m., as is a Frenchman's wont, when a bright light descended from the heavens. In the ensuing melee the unfortunate M. Fontaine was somehow spirited away by the saucer. He has not been heard of since.

"Now our own inclination, taking into account the vastness of the universe, is somewhat in favour of the existence of some flying saucers. Sceptics may view this incident differently. One of them, our French television critic, points out that a programme on UFOs was televised the evening before M. Fontaine rose so dramatically into the stratosphere. It could be that he is — was, perhaps — an unduly impressionable man. The French, remember, are romantic as well as rational. Some are not prepared to let the matter rest. Reason must have its day. For our own part, we do not for a moment believe that we are having our legs pulled. We should be very surprised to learn that M. Fontaine is enjoying himself on the French Riviera. Much more likely, he is cruising on the limits of the known universe."