

Monte Maíz had telephoned the Electricity Plant to ask whether anything was wrong, and the Power men had replied that it looked as though one of the Plant's engines was about to break down.

A medical man was at once sent for. This was Dr. Francisco Guillermo Dabolos. He testified that he found the truck driver to be suffering from burns upon the face and hands, and described these burns as: "lesions produced by unknown causes". Douglas's blanket also showed signs of burning of the same type, and when his truck was inspected next day it was found that his wiring was burnt out. The doctor found Douglas perfectly sane.

A witness who later testified before the Police was the businessman Mateo Manocchio. He told them that at 3.30 a.m. he had been driving along the road in question, and had seen the changes in the street lamps and had seen Douglas rushing towards him, head muffled, and brandishing a revolver. This witness went on to say that he himself had felt an indescribable sensation, accompanied by a loss of memory which lasted for some hours. On recovering his memory he went to the Police and made his statement.

On the following day a number of local residents examined the spot where Douglas had met the entities. The heavy rain had erased most of the footprints, but they were able to make out some which were approximately 45-50 centimetres in length.

A twelve-page report on the Douglas case, together with the depositions of the numerous witnesses and the doctor's findings, was in due course forwarded by the Monte Maíz police station to the Administrative and Political Headquarters (Jefatura Política) of the Rural District of Unión, which is the nearest large town. Commenting on this, the newspaper *Córdoba* of November 19 observed that had statements been collected from every one of the people who had seen the strange changes in the lights and candles and had felt the asphyxiating gas, the report would have run to far more than twelve pages. The foregoing is taken partly from the Report for 1963 issued by CODOVNI (the Argentine Committee for the Study of Unidentified Flying Objects, Buenos Aires) and partly from numerous clippings, and I feel that no apology need be made for giving the case in such great detail, since it includes points of much significance, not the least of which is the fact that a witness claims to have suffered from amnesia as a result of the episode.

So far as I know, no official report or explanation has ever been offered on this case, which remains shrouded in mystery. I have seen no further reference to it anywhere in the Argentine press since the end of 1963.

[We have prepared a map to accompany this article: it will appear with Part II.—EDITOR.]

## More about UFOs and the Sea

By Antonio Ribera

WHEN, in my previous article on *UFOs and the Sea*, I wrote the words "the dossier on strange happenings in this area seems complete", I was quite wrong: as wrong as I should be if I were to say the same thing again. This dossier is still wide open, as are most of the intriguing problems posed by the UFOs. It was my own article in fact, which whetted my appetite to look further into the matter, and I followed a line of research which I invite anybody who has an interest in the question to follow.

First of all, I found several reports of strange happenings at sea in the REVIEW itself, of all places. In the *World Round-up* section of the March/April, 1964 issue, there are two interesting notices about "Mystery at sea" (page 22) and "UFO at sea" (page 23-4), the former from England and the latter from Portugal. Then, in the same section of the September/October issue of the same year, we read on page 24 of a "Mystery submarine" observed in Swedish waters. This strongly reminds the reader of the mystery submarine, such a big news item in the international press some time ago, which was detected off the Argentine coast and

taken as a Russian U-boat. Then there was W. S. Robertson's article *UFOs and the Scottish Seas* in the May/June issue. A careful search through all the past issues of the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, of which, unfortunately, I do not possess a complete collection, would almost certainly unearth more reports of sightings at sea.

### Cardiganshire Sightings

Then, in my friend Gavin Gibbons's book *The Coming of the Space Ships*<sup>2</sup>, I found some very interesting marine sightings, which gave ample food for thought. . . . I quote from page 114 of the book: "We move to Wales for our last example but one of the erratic behaviour of this strange object—to the coast of Cardiganshire, to be precise. It was at 7.15 p.m. that Mrs. Harding, a farmer's wife of Aberarth, was called outside by her young daughter, who was pointing excitedly at the evening sky. She gazed out over the sea in the direction that Rosalyn, her daughter, indicated. There, to the north-west of where they stood, and well out to sea, was a large orange ball giving out a black trail and zig-zagging downwards. They

remarked that it looked very like the sun except for the movement and the long, black, smoky trail that streamed out behind. As they watched, it exploded and, still in the shape of an orange ball, plunged into the sea. The strange thing was that they could still see it glowing *beneath the surface of the water* [italics mine—Author], and this continued for upwards of an hour after the object finally struck. The trail that it had left behind changed from black to grey before it dispersed: neither of the two watchers had heard any sound from the ball, either in the air or in the sea.

### Object off Merionethshire Coast

“It is due to the kindness of Mrs. Rhoda Harding that I managed to obtain the information I required concerning the last sighting of this ‘meteor’ series [strange meteor indeed!—Author]. She very kindly made a special journey to Roshlefain, a village near Towyn in Merionethshire, to interview for me the two witnesses concerned, and I should like to record my gratitude to her.

“Angelo and Salvatore Tornabene are, as may be assumed by their names, Italians and they work on the land in this pleasant corner of Wales. They are not very sure of the time, but think it was about 8 p.m. when they saw the bright orange object zig-zagging down into the sea off Rhoslefain. (The date was March 24, 1955). They could not distinguish its shape or size, but confirm that it gave off a dark trail, like smoke, that became lighter in colour as it got lower. Suddenly the object stopped giving off smoke and substituted flame instead, before dropping straight into the sea. But it did not stay in the water for long. Almost at once *it shot up into the sky again*, this time leaving a grey trail behind it. It then shot northwards at great speed, leaving no trace in the water. . . . Of course this sighting may have been identical with that (at Aberarth) of Mrs. Harding.”

Gavin Gibbons quotes another witness of the events of this remarkable day. He is a Mr. Hughes of Montford, near Shrewsbury (see page 112), “a countryman possessed of a retentive memory and a remarkable accuracy of explanation.” We read that: “He was on his way . . . to his club at Shrawardine . . . when suddenly their attention (a lad was with him at the time) was drawn by a brilliant light in the sky, yellowy-white in colour, which was approaching from the direction of Shrewsbury. As it came nearer they were amazed to see a sort of disc of many different colours form around a central ball of light. This disc began to rotate at great speed round the golden centre piece, while the whole mass of the object continued to flash across the heavens. . . . It had made no sound at all and left a white trail which lasted about twenty minutes after it had disappeared.”

I have quoted this sighting at some length, because it is unmistakably a “saucer-type” sighting, and its connection with the marine sightings quoted above must be emphasized. As Mr. Gibbons writes (page 121): “No meteor has ever been observed to plunge into the sea and shoot out of it again to fly off out of sight. Then again, these objects repeatedly changed course and direction, a thing that is quite impossible for any meteor.”

Elsewhere in his text Mr. Gibbons referred to a fourth craft, which appeared on the scene half-an-hour later. Quite slow by comparison, it moved westwards, rather to the south of the others, to appear as an orange ball, before dropping into Cardigan Bay some 30 miles north of Fishguard, in a mass of dark smoke and flames. Like the object in the first report, *it glowed under the water*; it did not rise again.

Gavin Gibbons believes that there were four objects over that part of Great Britain (Staffordshire, Shropshire and North Wales) on the night in question, in addition to others reported from places as far apart as Cornwall, Newcastle and Glasgow. The first of these was a cigar-shaped object (mother-ship?) travelling north-east. I speculate that on this particular night a big reconnaissance operation took place, maybe of submarine bases off the coast of Scotland.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>“UFOs and the Sea”, in *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW*, November/December, 1964.

<sup>2</sup>Gavin Gibbons, “The Coming of the Space Ships”, Neville Spearman, London, Second Impression, January, 1958.

(continued from Page 13)

The production of gravitational fields by mass concentrations may be comparable to a static method. Now it is a well known fact that the gravitational forces are infinitely weak if compared for example with the electrostatic attraction. Could this not be an indication that mass concentrations are only a very inefficient method of producing G-fields, and that an energetic, dynamical process would be far more efficient?

<sup>3</sup>See: *Whidby Island Contact*, *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW*, November/December, 1964 (p. 13) and, *Down on the Farm*, in the issue of September/October, 1964 (p. 22).

<sup>4</sup>Compare the apparition at Verona, *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW*, March/April 1964, (p. 5).

<sup>5</sup>Richard Hall refers to such a case in his book (Maney and Hall: *The Challenge of Unidentified Flying Objects*, p. 126-127). I doubt, however, whether full justice is done to this problem if one sees the parallels between ghosts and UFOs only in the reaction of people to the reports. Sometimes one gets the impression that the “occult” aspects of the UFO-phenomenon are unconsciously ignored for fear that any research in this field would relegate the researcher to the lunatic fringe. (This, of course, should not be taken as a suggestion to explain a phenomenon of a very likely technological nature in terms of occultism, but rather vice versa!)

<sup>7</sup>For Angel’s Hair incidents see: Maney and Hall: *The Challenge of Unidentified Flying Objects*, pages 58-63, 41-43.

Menzel and Boyd: *The World of Flying Saucers*, p. 219.  
Michel: *The Truth about Flying Saucers* (Criterion Books), pages 145-150.  
NICAP: *The UFO Evidence*, pages 99-101 (particularly the case reported by Craig Phillips of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).  
Stringfield: *Inside Saucer Post . . .* 3-0 Blue, p. 49. *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW*, May/June, 1964, p. 14.

<sup>8</sup>It could be, that such a waste product is already known to the specialists of certain industries. But as a manufacturer could possibly be forced to provide costly filters to prevent waste material from escaping into the atmosphere, it would be clear why those who know about its origin would not be particularly eager to make a great fuss about it.

<sup>9</sup>Michel: *The Truth about Flying Saucers*, p. 207.  
<sup>10</sup>Even in this case a dematerialisation should be demonstrable by the specified experiment, provided that substance from the UFO’s space participates in the formation of angel’s hair at not too small a rate.