

as Unknown. Saucer fans classify it as proof that flying saucers exist." It is a pity that the authors concentrate on America. They would have found many much more remarkable incidents in Great Britain, Brazil, Argentina, Papua and Australia. These are largely ignored. None of Dr. Menzel's explanations, for instance, fit the Father Gill sighting in Papua in 1959.

3. See FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, September-October, 1961 (World Round Up).

4. IBID, July-August, 1962.

5. IBID, September-October, 1963.

6. IBID, September-October, 1962, "Mars and the Flying Saucers," article by Jacques Vallée.

# THE COSFORD UFO

## The mystery deepens

**I**N the February-March issue of the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW there was a full account of the landing at Cosford R.A.F. camp. The attempts by the Air Ministry to close the incident proved unsuccessful and the REVIEW was able to quote statements made by a young Chaplain attached to the station to Mr. Wilfred Daniels, who happened to meet him by accident. The padre did not want his name disclosed by Mr. Daniels, who honoured this request.

In view of this further information, the REVIEW decided to reopen the matter and telephoned Cosford. Before long it was able to obtain the name of the Church of England Chaplain which was Flight-Lieutenant Henry, but was unable to speak to him personally. However, in the course of conversation, a Flight-Lieutenant Stevens gave the following explanations of what had occurred at Cosford last December :

1. Nothing at all.
2. Two apprentices were drunk.
3. The apprentices were hallucinated.
4. The apprentices were misled by smoke and fire from a British Railways steam train into believing they had seen a UFO.
5. The apprentices indulged in a hoax.

Thus, if we add Flight-Lieutenant Henry's explanation that the youths saw a genuine flying saucer, we have six different explanations. They cannot all be correct : they cannot all have been put forward as sincere replies to a serious inquiry.

In the course of his telephone conversation, Flight-Lieutenant Stevens, in trying to deny the padre's explanation, admitted that an investigation had been carried out, and made the curious observation that no scorch marks had been found and that the object, had it landed, must surely have left some trace as the UFOs "must possess some motive power." (It should be borne in mind

that the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW did not claim an actual landing, but mentioned that as the UFO had disappeared behind a hangar it might have been hovering near the ground instead of touching down. Flight-Lieutenant Stevens admitted that the investigation had taken place behind a hangar.

As the REVIEW has advised before, investigations should not be abandoned immediately an official "explanation" has been handed out. That is the time to start probing. Nine times out of ten, officialdom's explanation can easily be exploded and there is nothing more likely to convince the public that flying saucers exist than the exposure that the Air Ministry is desperately trying to hide the facts. If flying saucers do not exist there can be no need to invent fictitious stories every time one of them appears.

The FLYING SAUCER REVIEW has received an assurance that the subject of UFOs is not under any official censorship. If that is so, it is high time that the Air Ministry was reminded of its duty either to tell the public the truth or, at least, not to confuse the public by laying false trails. If the assurance given recently is correct, then investigators are being prevented from reaching the truth by a petty tyranny which should be first exposed and then terminated.

Investigators should not readily give their word of honour not to quote names. The request for such secrecy usually comes at the end of a statement. Why should anybody give such an assurance ? The reply should be that the subject is in no way barred from public discussion. Flight-Lieutenant Henry's request that his name should be kept secret is further evidence that some Jack-in-Office is exceeding his powers and is using intimidation as a weapon. It is high time that all those who have either seen a UFO or are in a position to know the truth took steps to end this totally unauthorised censorship.

A number of enquiries made at Cosford by the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW and by others on its behalf led to the whole matter being referred to the Air Ministry in London. When asked which of the several "explanations" of the affair was to be regarded as official, the spokesman, a Mr. B. E. Robson of Whitehall, London, S.W.1, appeared to waver between "nothing at all" and something that really did not amount to a hoax. Youthful high spirits was another explanation offered to one of our readers. This, of course, is an evasion because no explanation was offered as to what form the not-quite-a-hoax took or how the youthful high spirits manifested themselves. In the same letter, Mr. Robson appeared to repudiate Flight-Lieutenant Henry's statements to Mr. Wilfrid Daniels, but it is significant that attempts to obtain this repudiation direct from either the Padre or Ian Jones, one of the boy entrants, have so far failed.

On March 6 what was described as an informal visit was made to Cosford by a deputation which

included the Secretary of State for Air, Mr. Hugh Fraser, Air Officer Commanding in Chief, Air Vice Marshal Sir Donald Evans, Air Officer Commanding 24 Group, Air Vice Marshal J. K. Rotherham, and Station Commander, Group Captain C. F. Thomas. Mr. William Yates, M.P. (Wrekin), also met Mr. Fraser.

The Air Ministry denied that this "informal" assemblage had any connection with the incident, or lack of incident, at Cosford last December. In view of the long series of misrepresentations by the Air Ministry on the subject of UFOs, it was pointed out to Mr. Robson that the public could not be blamed if the explanations and denials issued were received with a great deal of reserve. It certainly seems to be an extraordinary coincidence that so many of the "top brass" should descend on what is only a training station at the very moment that the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW and others were applying pressure to arrive at the truth.

#### WHAT THE PRESIDENT SAID

"I have referred your interesting material to the staff of the Preparedness Investigating Sub-Committee which, at my direction, as you know, is keeping a close watch over new developments in this field with standing directions to report to me any recent significant sightings of unidentified flying objects . . ." From a letter from Lyndon B. Johnson, now President of the United States, dated July 6th, 1960, to Major Donald E. Keyhoe.

"This is an area of considerable controversy in the area of what was seen by responsible persons who have witnessed sightings of these aerial phenomena. Reasonable and objective persons have reached different conclusions as to the origin, nature and significance of these phenomena. Let me assure you that this matter is receiving careful attention." October, 1960.

#### MAILBAG (continued from page 23)

area a purely random choice? In other words, were the Americans attempting to obtain a close-up of the bridge so as to be able to decide whether it was natural or artificial?—Ronald W. J. Anstee, 9229 Verville, Montreal, 11, Canada.

#### Fatima

Sir,—With reference to Mr. G. B. Proctor's letter in the July-August, 1963, issue of the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, I think he is wrong when he says that Fatima, Portugal, is on the continued Bayonne-Vichy line. I find that BAVIC passes some 50-60 miles to the south-west of Fatima. I have come to this result both by drawing BAVIC across a map of Iberia and also by calculating BAVIC's path from a graph—the graph was drawn using P. K.

Haythornthwaite's table of values of BAVIC, published in the November-December issue of the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW.

The Fatima referred to is about twelve miles south-west of Leiria and is in Santarem.—Peter J. Kelly, 31, Sycamore Road, Hollybank, Hythe, Hampshire.

#### Lenticular Clouds

Sir,—As the contributor who submitted to the REVIEW the article and photograph printed in the May-June 1963 issue, I have followed with interest the exchange of views between Messrs. Moulster and Bowen. On first being shown the original colour-slide I too thought that the object in question could have been a cloud. When, however, I asked the photographer if at the time he had thought that this was so, he replied bluntly, "No. I

wouldn't have wasted a good colour film photographing a cloud! It was a solid object." This opinion was shared by the other two witnesses.

There may of course be truth in the view of both Mr. Moulster and Mr. Bowen in that it is possible that a large cigar-shaped craft was being deliberately concealed in its own cloud camouflage. I am sure that close and prolonged study of a cloudy sky could on occasion prove very rewarding to ufologists. Unfortunately few of us have the time to indulge in such a pastime.

Incidentally it is perhaps rather refreshing to think, that somewhere in Space a photograph of the "Flying Scotsman" is being studied with blank incredulity.—David Rudman, 54, Sylvan Way, Sea Mills, Bristol, 9.