

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.

Mr. Trench replies to M. Michel

Sir,—I have a high regard for Aimé Michel's work in the UFO field, as well as for his books and many fine articles. However, in his letter (FSR, May/June 1969) he has criticised the early period of the REVIEW, subsequent to Derek D. Dempster's editorship and prior to that of the late Waveney Girvan. It was during that interim period of about three years that I was editor of FSR.

Michel refers to this period as the Middle Ages compared with the previous Classical one, and also states that a good proportion of the articles were "devoted to contact stories or to pseudo-psychism and with no bearing on para-psychology which is a respectable science."

It is my contention that the REVIEW published between 1956-59 a remarkably high standard of articles as it has always done under the respective editorships of Messrs. Dempster, Girvan and Bowen. Some of the scientific writers who contributed were Dr. M. K. Jessup, Professor Charles A. Maney, Dr. H. Percy Wilkins, Dr. Bernard E. Finch, Charles H. Gibbs-Smith, Dr. W. Gordon Allen (a contributor to *Beyond Condon . . .*), C. F. Krafft and Wilbert E. Smith, former head of the Canadian Project Magnet.

Other contributors included Desmond Leslie, John Lade, Derek D. Dempster, Bryant and Helen Reeve, Waveney Girvan, Antonio Ribera, N. Meade Layne, A. R. Holden and W. H. Watson.

The late Arthur Constance, author of *The Inexplicable Sky*, contributed a series under the title *This Amazing Universe*. Another regular contributor was W. Schroeder, author of *Practical Astronomy*. His "From an Astronomer's Notebook" was very popular.

Contactee contributors included George Adamski, George Hunt Williamson, Howard Menger, Dino Kraspedon, Daniel W. Fry, Philip Rodgers and Dr. T. Lobsang Rampa.

I have not mentioned all the contributors during that period, but would emphasise that FSR was a serious journal in those days as it is now. Some of the scientific writers mentioned wrote several articles for the REVIEW. Professor Charles A. Maney, head of the department of Physics at Defiance College, Defiance, Ohio, contributed many studies in depth of

various aspects of the UFO. The late Dr. H. Percy Wilkins, well-known lunar authority, wrote several first-rate articles for me.

It is true that a large number of contactee articles were published. The contactee contributors listed earlier were very much in vogue over a decade ago and our readers wanted to know their stories. At that time the contact stories were part of the UFO picture, and therefore news. Today, our thinking on the subject has changed. The REVIEW is once more looking at contacts, perhaps with a different approach.

Incidentally, during my period of editorship the REVIEW pulled off several fantastic news scoops. For instance, the May/June 1958 issue carried the exclusive story of the Portuguese Air Force pilots who spent 40 minutes in the air with UFOs. This was a great story and we were indebted to Señor D. Alves, our Lisbon correspondent at the time, for his prompt action in interviewing the squadron commander, Captain Ferreira, at Ota Air Base, and for sending us the signed story, together with pictures of the pilots.

On the whole, it would seem that the period 1956-59 under my editorship was an exciting and worthwhile one. I would not place it in the "Middle Ages" or below par.

Finally, I prefer not to be dogmatic as Aimé Michel is over the claims of the late George Adamski. In his letter Michel states he took both Waveney Girvan and his predecessor (myself) to task over this issue. I hold no brief, one way or the other, as regards Adamski, and prefer to keep an open mind. Brinsley Le Poer Trench, London SW10, July 5, 1969.

A BUFORA view of John A. Keel

Sir,—Your correspondent Keel has recently presented several thousand words of ufology to the readers of both the FSR and your excellent edited collection of papers under the title "BEYOND CONDON . . .". I disagree with Keel's method of approach to ufology and by way of encouraging discussion I would like to put forward some contrary views.

The UFO phenomena are extremely varied and complex in nature. Keel thinks that this variety is objective¹; but he is forgetting one very basic factor that must not be overlooked

when considering the methodology of UFO investigation. The ufologist does not investigate UFOs, he investigates *UFO-Reports*, or at best *UFO-Accounts*.² These *Reports* or *Accounts* are the products of human beings with varying abilities to remember and translate into words what basically is a visual phenomenon. The very variety of the witnesses, the subjects, themselves determines to a large extent the variety to be found in the objects. A clear example of this can be found in those rare cases where many people report seeing the same identifiable phenomenon.³

Any "overview"⁴ of *UFO-Accounts* is likely to reflect this (perplexing) variety, and by their nature *UFO-Reports* are going to add to this complexity. The process of UFO research should consist of three stages. The first part is to proceed from the receipt of a *UFO-Report* to the acquisition of *UFO-Accounts* from as many witnesses of the same phenomenon as possible. This process, as Keel has pointed out,⁵ frequently leads to a snowball effect producing many more reports. This effect was also observed by Pace and Stanway during their investigations around Stoke-on-Trent.⁶ Next must follow individual evaluation of each UFO case to classify from the accumulated material those reports that can be attributed to known or hypothesised causes, including alien intervention. Finally the cases built up should be examined within geographical and temporal frameworks for comparisons between the cases from different countries and different years. This process can either be done from the prior evaluation or without recourse to it, but if done without recourse then the prior evaluations should be viewed in the context of any geographical or temporal correlations found, and *vice versa*. The two examinations cannot be applied in isolation or spurious results are bound to appear.

I cannot complete this letter without a word or two on other observations by Keel. Firstly Keel has clearly misinterpreted the extension of Michel's straight-line theories (orthoteny) to Vallée's great circle alignments.⁷ Keel's circular path from Michigan to Manitoba via Illinois, Nebraska, Wyoming, Montana and Saskatchewan is a circle on a Mercator map of North America, it is not a great circle route around the

Earth. A great circle route lies along the intersection of a diametral plane through the Earth and the surface of the Earth. Keel's circle is no more significant than many of Michel's straight lines or Smith's parabolas.⁸

Secondly, satellite re-entries⁹ do take appreciable amounts of time, are spectacular, and can be seen over large areas of countryside. The re-entry of 1968-102B, Cosmos 253 rocket, over Great Britain was observed¹⁰ from the Hebrides to Kent, a distance of more than 500 miles, small by American standards but hardly insignificant.

In passing it is of interest to note that the number of reports received by the B.A.A. of the Cosmos re-entry (over 150) tallies well with that derived by means of the Condon Report's formulae for this purpose.¹¹

Stephen Smith, M.A. (Director of Research, BUFORA), July 7, 1969.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Keel, J. A., *The Time Cycle Factor*, FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, 15, 3, p. 9.
- ² Miller, S., speaking at BUFORA Research Seminar, Cambridge University, on April 19, 1969, on UFO reporting and the pitfalls defined the following chain of events from UFO-Event via UFO-Account to UFO-Report each one step further from the actual UFO and one step more inaccurate a portrayal of the UFO.
- ³ *Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects*, the Condon Report, pp. 567 et seq., Chapter 2, Section VI, by W. K. Hartmann.
- ⁴ Keel, J. A., *The "Flap" Phenomenon in the United States*, included in BEYOND CONDON . . . , FSR Special Edition, June 1969, p. 24.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ⁶ Stanway, R. H., and Pace, A. R., *Flying Saucer Report, UFOs Unidentified, Undeniable*, published privately February 1968.
- ⁷ Vallée, J., and Vallée, J., *Challenge to Science, The UFO Enigma*, Neville Spearman, 1967.
- ⁸ Smith, S. L., as yet unpublished account of how all British sightings can be shown to lie on intersecting parabolas with ley crossings at their foci.
- ⁹ As reference 4, p. 24, end of column 2.

¹⁰ Miles, H., *Journal of the British Astronomical Association*, 79, 2, p. 156.

¹¹ As reference 3. On p. 587 Hartmann derives three formulae of interest to us here, relating the duration and position of a short-period atmospheric event to the numbers of witnesses, recovered reports, and recovered photographs. If we make some first-order approximations of values for these formulae in the case of the Cosmos 253 re-entry we arrive at the following:

N = population capable of seeing the event	= 35,000,000
t = duration of the event (from report)	= 30 sec.
1/C(w) = witness factor from ref. (3)	= 10,000
1/C(r) = report factor	= 6,000,000
1/C(p) = photo factor	= 5,000,000,000

From these we have:

Predicted no. witnesses	= 105,000 (actual unknown)
" " reports	= 175 (actual over 150)
" " photos	= 0.2 (actual was one)

JOURNAL OF PARAPHYSICS

International scientists contribute articles on hyperspace, gravity waves, time-reversal, extra-terrestrial civilisations, ufology, ESP, parapsychical detectors, etc.
 Fantastic Russian and Czech experiments on telekinesis ("mind-over-matter").
 New Russian theories on speeds faster than light.

Annual subscription: 33s. (\$5.50c.)

Parcel of back numbers: 30s. (\$5)

Reduced combined rate for above: 60s. (\$10)

PARAPHYSICAL LABORATORY (UFO OBSERVATORY)

Downton, Wiltshire, England

PERSONAL COLUMN

(Rates: first three lines 10s., each additional line, or part, 5s. —\$1.50 for three lines minimum, and 50c. each additional line)

PERCEPTION is a monthly newsletter on UFOs. Specimen copy: 1s. Annual subscription: 12s. J. Graham Cowell, 17 Oatfield Road, Orpington, Kent, England.

FRENCH PRIVATE GROUP would like to have contacts with people interested by the link between UFOs and parapsychology. Write to: M. Lesage, "Les Argonautes", 9 Rue Gounod, Nice, France.

"**THE CASE FOR THE UFO**" by M. K. Jessup. I have a used paperback copy which I would like to exchange for a similar copy of Jessup's *The E-X-P-A-N-D-E-D Case for the UFO*. Write to: G. Dibblee, Box 485, Cardiff, California, 92007, U.S.A.

LINK-UP brings news, information and opinions from UFO groups. 5/- for four issues from J. Goddard, 43 Walton Bridge Road, Shepperton, Middlesex.

WILL UFO 'KEY' TURN by mid-1970s? Read 'WARNINGS FROM FLYING FRIENDS' by Arthur Shuttlewood, now making a big impact amongst sincere ufologists overseas, finding corroborating evidence to Warminster happenings. Price 26s.; Portway Press, Warminster, Wilts. Add 1s. 6d. for postage.

CONTACT (U.K.) holds monthly lecture and discussion meetings on the first Saturday of every month at the Caxton Hall, Westminster. Details from Anne Paterson, 413a Upper Richmond Road, London SW15.

FLYING SAUCER FACT INVESTIGATION SOCIETY

General Meeting and Lectures
 Saturday, October 25, 1969:
 commencing 6.45 p.m.

The following guest speakers will lecture . . .

Philip Rodgers former writer for *Flying Saucer Review* who has lectured at BUFORA

Norman Oliver Director of COS-MOS, BUFORA committee member and author of *Sequel to Scoriton*

Roger Stanway, FRAS Co-author of *UFOs, Unidentified* —*Undeniable*

Magazines for sale; Small display; Tea and coffee; A chance to meet afterwards. Tickets 5s.

Write for full details (please enclose SAE) . . .

Christopher Rose (Chairman), 8 Findon Place, Sheffield 6, Yorks.

* * * * *

If unable to attend, why not order a copy of *Flying Saucers are Fact?* Glossy cover, fully lithographed, with photographs. Sample copy 2s. 6d.; annually 10s.