

# 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.

## A correction

Dear Mr. Bowen, — Thank you for the October issue of FSR (Vol.22, No.3) in which I was delighted to find material from the CUFOS conference, namely the articles by Ted Bloecher, Richard Haines and Al Lawson. Al, by the way, has just joined our informal group of about half a dozen workers in the Humanoid study field. His expertise in the social sciences will be very useful.

My main purpose for sending this letter is to ask you if you will kindly publish a correction in the next convenient issue. In Dr. Haines's article summarizing the conference, my talk is paraphrased incorrectly. He states: "UFO-related abduction cases number over 1000..." My list of *abduction cases* presented at the conference numbered over 50. Richard (or FSR) apparently mixed up some numbers; Ted Bloecher and I have on file in the Humanoid Study Group now more than 1400 specific references to *humanoid cases in general*, and at the time of the conference that number was probably quoted as being over 1000. So you can see it was a serious and misleading error.

Ted has kept me up to date on the exciting BUFORA conference to which he was invited. I have never seen him in such euphoric mood as when he returned from his English journey! I hope we will keep up the co-operation between the U.S. groups and those in the U.K.

Sincerely,  
Dave Webb,  
Humanoid Study Group, CUFOS,  
924 Chicago Avenue, Evanston,  
Illinois 60202.  
December 12, 1976.

## Lens flares & "experimental" hoaxing

Dear Mr. Bowen,—I should like to assure Dr. Pierre Guérin (Mail Bag, FSR Vol.22, No.3) that it gives no pleasure to the editorial team of MUFOB when *any* UFO journal is misled into printing dubious photographs of alleged UFOs. (And now that MUFOB is litho-printed, allowing half-tone reproduction, our time may come!)

Dr. Guérin doubtless feels, along with some other ufologists, that the publication in our March 1976 issue of the article *Experimental UFO Hoaxing* was intended to dismiss all UFO reports as hoaxes and misinterpretations. This was far from the case, and

I would again point out that the hoax was perpetrated by the SIUFOP group (The 'S' stands for 'Society', not 'Surrey'), which has had no connection at any time with MUFOB (which at the time of the hoax was indeed published from Merseyside). When presented with the details of the 'experiment' in late 1975 the MUFOB editors felt that it was in the best interests of ufology that the details of this affair should be made public, and cleared up once and for all. We felt that many valid points had been made about the manner in which UFO reports were presented and analysed; and before publication we assured ourselves that the hoax was not done as a deliberate plot to 'get' at any particular UFO group or journal, and that the motives behind it were serious.

I fear Dr. Guérin is doing MUFOB less than justice if he, by implication, categorises us as 'anti-saucerites'. UFOs are a real experience (though we may argue all night about what 'real' may mean in this context) and to be anti them is as futile as being 'anti-asteroid'!

My own position on UFO photographs I have made clear — I think that they are *all* doubtful, to a greater or lesser degree, and I would certainly not disagree with Dr. Guérin's analysis of the ones to which he refers in his letter. I am however in no way gladdened that this should be so.  
Yours sincerely,  
John Rimmer,  
Editor, MUFOB, 11 Beverley Road  
New Malden, Surrey.

We have had a letter from Mr. F. Gheorgiță and a further letter from Dr. Pierre Guérin (see his letter in the "Mail Bag" column of Vol.22, No.3) on the matter captioned above. The two correspondents maintain their positions, and the matter is closed.

## Retraction was published

Dear Sir,—With reference to Hope Alexander's letter in Vol.21, No.6 of FSR and your remarks which follow with regard to non-retraction of the Adamski/bottle cooler business. I too have found it hard to find a reason why the *Evening News* who started the story hadn't retracted, when Frank Nicolson came forward with his evidence — especially as nearly all the other newspapers did

including, I recall, the *Daily Mirror* and *Guardian*.

Your Editor's Note prompted me to contact the *Evening News* and their assistant editor Mr. Percy Trumble informed me that in fact *two* retractions had been published in prominent positions on the widely read Letters Page. One of these letters actually is in the hand of Mr. Ken Rogers!

To be fair to the *Evening News*, I think it would be right if you rectified your Editorial Note.

Yours faithfully,  
John E. Jones  
21 Midhurst Avenue,  
Muswell Hill, London N.10.  
June 7, 1976.

[The delay in publishing this letter is regretted — EDITOR].

## The Travis Walton affair

Dear Mr. Bowen,—To finalize Travis Walton's misquotation which appears in your FSR Volume 22, No.2 (1976) page 32, I enclose a xerox of a letter from Dr. Allen Hynek for your perusal.

I hate to suggest that additional space be wasted on this incident, but I do feel that the remarks made by Walton slander GSW's character and that some form of clarification is warranted for your readership.

Respectfully,  
William H. Spaulding  
Director GSW (Ground Saucer Watch),  
13238 N. 7th Drive,  
Phoenix, Arizona 85029.

[The relevant extract from Dr. J.A. Hynek's letter from CUFOS dated November 10, 1976, to Mr. Bill Spaulding is appended... EDITOR]

"...Quoting out of context...as we can see from the case at hand, only causes misunderstanding.

"It seems to me that the quotation in question — 'I guess I sent the wrong man in on this one' — would be rather out of place since I, in fact, never 'sent you in' in the first place. As you remember, you contacted me before I called you for information on the Walton case. I assumed, I suppose, that you had already, or would be soon, interviewing Walton, but the Center did not commission you to do so. Since the Center did not 'send you in,' it would be quite illogical for me to make such a statement. If I did say something resembling the misquote, it must have been in a different context entirely."