

of any saucer was taken into consideration by Michel—but not by himself.

If Dr. Menzel had taken into account the chances of three or more sightings falling on the same straight line *and* involving an object travelling to within a certain angular limit, say  $1^\circ$  in  $180^\circ$  (or what he will), then the chances of this taking place would have been far less—he can work that out for himself I am sure. Those saucers sighted in a stationary attitude would not, of course, apply but they are, I believe, in a minority and their effects may also be obtained mathematically. Arguments based on this so far forgotten fact are many and I am sure if both Menzel's and Michel's attentions were drawn to it they will use them all.—M. G. Maunsell, 218A, Hatfield Road, St. Albans, Herts.

### Menzel versus Michel

Sir,

Dr. Menzel is not really in a position to accuse others of being unfair in an argument when his own methods are not above suspicion. I would like to point out that he has been less than fair to Aimé Michel (see the *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW*, March - April issue) when he accuses him of lack of method in including those 1954 French sightings alleged to be "poor." Michel was well aware of the need for discipline and makes this perfectly clear in his book on page 51 when he writes: "Applying the methods always used by investigating committees up to that time, I discarded all the poorly reported, poorly proved, and doubtful cases." It was Jean Cocteau who persuaded him to include *all* the sightings and the patterns then emerged. There is surely nothing wrong in this. What Michel did, in fact, was to remove the subjective element from the survey. No scientist can complain and, in any case, Michel has been quite open about the method he employed. If Dr. Menzel had wanted to be wholly fair he would have mentioned all the circumstances or, better still,

refrained from making an unjustified innuendo.

While Jean Cocteau *may* have expected a pattern to emerge it is wrong to suggest, on the evidence available, that Michel sought deliberately to impose it by unfair selection. — Charles Bowen, 8 Paxton Gardens, Woodham Lane, Woking, Surrey.

### The 'entities': the facts and the legend

Sir,

Thanks to Aimé Michel and some of our friends in France and in the U.S., new information has been gathered about the reports of alleged "landings." Although this is not worth a new article, we feel that the readers of the Review should know about these developments. On the basis of these new documents, we are able to reject as hoaxes a number of the "contact claims" considered in our original statistical description. This is the case in the Mertrud (October 5, 1954, witness Nancy) observation, in the Kearney (Nebraska, November 5, 1957) incident and in the Sierra Gardunha sighting in Portugal, September 24, 1954: this point was the famous "seventh point" on BAVIC, discussed by Dr. Menzel. It is definitely a hoax. In addition, we recommend the rejection as probable hoaxes or illusions of the following cases: Jussey (October 1, 1954), Loctudy (October 5), Roverbella (October 5), Brovst (September 12, 1953), Greenhills (August 25, 1955), Everittstown (November 6, 1957) and the Province of Salta case of October 24, 1960 (insufficient information or conflicting data are the reasons of these rejections).

By checking against original sources we have also found a mistake in the G. Quincy catalogue: the sighting at Ste Marie d'Herblay (October 16, 1954) should be disregarded; the child named Gilbert Lelay is the witness in the October 12 case at Erbray, and the story is definitely another hoax.

As a consequence of this improvement and clarification of

the files, the category of the "giants," already very dubious (see FSR of January-February 1964, page 9) can be completely disregarded now, as a product of pure imagination. And the "Erchin Entity" (A dwarf with no diver's suit) should be considered with renewed caution: we are still unable to show that all six cases of "hairy-faced martians" were hoaxes, but: the Mertrud case was definitely one; the Loctudy case is far from clear; there was only one witness in the Montluçon (October 10) case; no UFO was seen in the Erchin case, only the "dwarf," and there was only one witness . . . and we might add that big fat apes do get loose from time to time! None of the alleged "contacts" of this category can be considered very seriously from the data we now have. In our opinion, the investigation about the entities associated with Type I sightings narrows now into the more simple problem of checking only two categories of reports: the descriptions of men of the Chaleix type and the descriptions of "dwarfs with diver's suits." Obviously, the discussion about the real meaning of these incidents in connection with the Arnold Phenomenon remains open.—J. Vallée.

### The Fourth Dimension

Sir,—The article written by Luis Schoenherr was fascinating in its attempt to explain some of the most mysterious aspects of UFO manifestations. And every attempt to discuss the evidence scientifically is to be encouraged. It is, however, everyone's duty to examine the truth and plausibility of each hypothesis. Besides the methodology of science there is philosophy as an additional tool. It is proposed to show, using a little elementary philosophy, that the basic assumption in this article is not true. I refer to the hypothesis based on the "Fourth Dimension."

It is now proved beyond all scientific doubt that the Special and General Theories of Relativity are "true" in their fields.

The Fourth Dimension is "Time" and we all know it and live in it. Mr. Schoenherr should therefore have referred rather to the Fifth Dimension, whose identity we do not yet suspect.

It must be pointed out that the notion of beings living on a plane and unconscious of any three-dimensional object outside that plane is only a notion. This notion was used by Dunn (among others) to demonstrate his thesis on Serial Time. These illustrations are used by Science to make things clearer. But they are only analogies and may break down in some conditions.

Now, things exist in two ways, either (a) they are spiritual or (b) they are material. Material things are limited in space and have a beginning and an end in time. So, to say that an object exists is to say that it is something with three spatial dimensions.

We know that as a matter of common experience all material things have length and breadth and thickness. There are no such things as "flat planers." The perfect plane does not exist in nature. Even if "flat-planers" could exist in or near on the plane they might have eyes seeing up or down since they *could not* have them on an edge of no thickness. These eyes could "see" an object poised over them.

In order to explain the mystery we call "Gravity" mathematically, "n" dimensions may be required. But then we live in these "n" dimensions and presumably we will recognise them when someone has told us what they are.—S. A. Paris, Brooklands, Up Holland, Lancashire.

### Moon Rocket

Sir,—In January this year the Americans landed a rocket on the Moon, apparently within 15 miles

of its target, but I have seen no comment on a fact that may be highly significant.

In December, 1953, the late Dr. Percy Wilkins claimed that he had observed a bridge on the Moon which had also been observed by an American astronomer. This giant construction was seen by both to be on the edge of the Mare Crisium, the Sea of Crises, situated between two promontories, Lavimium and Olivium. The American rocket landed in the Mare Tranquillitatis or the Sea of Tranquillity, about 300 miles from the bridge seen by Dr. Wilkins. Had the cameras carried by the American rocket functioned they were supposed to have photographed an extremely wide area — between 9,480 and 1,950 square miles. The bridge in question, it will be seen, is well within that area. Was the target

(Continued on Page 32)

## A MESSAGE FROM OUTER SPACE?

**A**N announcement of a mysterious message having been received came from Television's Granada News at approximately 11.10 p.m. on January 10: "Mr. E. Lowe, a radio amateur, claims to have picked up several times over the past week signals from 'Outer Space' in English and a foreign language. Jodrell Bank said it was a hoax." The *Wigan Evening Post and Chronicle* on January 10, also reported the matter in greater detail: "Northern radio experts were today trying to trace the source of a short wave message from 'outer space' received by an Ashton-in-Makerfield radio amateur.

"On five mornings in the past week 23-year-old labourer, Eric Lowe, of 48, Lowbank Road, has tuned in to hear a voice speaking alternately in English and a foreign language. The message says: 'THIS IS A TEST TRANSMISSION FOR CIRCUIT ADJUSTMENT PURPOSES FROM A RADIO STATION OF THE DOMANIAL TELE - COMMUNICATION OR DOREVATION. THIS STATION IS SITUATED IN OUTER SPACE.'"

Mr. Lowe, when questioned, said that the first

time he heard these words was on Saturday, January 4, from 12.50 a.m. to 1.10 a.m. Since then he claimed to have picked up the message on four mornings at about the same time. He thought it must be a satellite. His friends were sceptical, but when invited to his home they were able to hear it for themselves.

While B.B.C. officials were trying to trace the source of the message, a spokesman of the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope, Cheshire, made the following comment: "We have heard of the same message being picked up before, although not by us here. Someone seems to be doing this as a hoax. It should really be reported to the G.P.O."

Mr. Wilfrid Daniels went to see the radio amateur, Mr. Eric Lowe, in the course of his investigations on behalf of the Direct Investigation Group on Aerial Phenomena. Mr. Lowe has made a recording of the "space messages" for analysis. He pointed out that the frequency is approximately in the region of 30 metres (ten megacycles) and he has picked them up over a dozen times so far, once on a Wednesday at 7.30