

"They are not from any planet we are familiar with . . ." Schirmer reported during the hypnotic session. "They came from a neighbouring galaxy . . . though they have bases on Jupiter and Mars . . . They told me that this was the first of three meetings I would have with them . . . The next two are supposed to come about before the end of 1968."

Schirmer also said the UFO "was operated against gravity" and was extracting electricity from a nearby power line to set up a force field that "could stop anything from interfering with them at this time."

The UFO Investigator editor then carefully re-states the NICAP position:

NICAP is investigating the case as thoroughly as possible. We hope to obtain a full account of the hypnotic experiments, even though the Colorado conclusions probably cannot be released until Dr. Condon's final public report. . .

It is NICAP's position that any alleged "contact" case must be fully authenticated before we can accept

it as true. Otherwise, we would be criticised—and rightly—as departing from our long-standing policy of careful, factual investigation. So far, we know of no contact case which has met the test. Most of the alleged witnesses have been obviously unreliable or unstable. There have been a few exceptions, mainly in so-called "encounter" cases (no communication claimed) where witnesses of good reputation have reported seeing supposedly extraterrestrial beings near or aboard UFOs. Even here, honest errors of identification are quite possible. We know of no case proved beyond all reasonable doubt, though we feel that a distinction should be made between such reported "encounters" and the majority of unacceptable "contactee" tales.

Postscript:

The UFO Investigator is the journal of the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena, 1536 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington D.C. 20036 U.S.A.

MAIL BAG

From Jacques Vallée

Sir,—With reference to John Keel's article *A New Approach to UFO Witnesses* (FSR, May/June 1968), I would like to convince John that precisely because "the truth about UFOs is infinitely more complex than the extraterrestrial type of conclusion" it will take the combined efforts of several researchers to solve it. This team should include professional scientists working within their field of competence; otherwise it will never get adequate tools to support its hypotheses and test them. It will soon find itself sitting on a shapeless mountain of disorganised "evidence" — a situation which is typical of all the amateur groups today.

Clearly we need quantitative data here. When John says "Look at the growing number of close sightings around schools" I want to ask: How do we know this category is growing faster than other categories? The term "close sighting" is not even defined! And how could it be defined if we ignore the witness's description of the object, its apparent size, its manoeuvres and general behaviour?

It is precisely to eliminate the most obvious biases of this kind that we need computers. Now, to assume that the computer can save us the effort to make field investigations would be entirely childish—here I emphatically agree with John. The statistics are a by-product, not the main purpose of the reduction of the files. What is the main purpose, then?

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.

There are five meaningful tasks a computer can perform for us in the field of UFO research: (1) to assist field investigators by providing background information such as names of witnesses and previous sightings in a given area, (2) to guide in the formulation and testing of hypotheses by recalling those details which human memory is unable to retain, (3) to help in detecting global trends and geographic patterns, (4) to assign quantitative values to interpretations formulated loosely in qualitative terms, (5) to monitor abusive manipulations of the files by officials in charge of the evaluation and to provide information on selection effects.

Finally I would take issue with John's statement about the scientific method. He misses the obvious point that the scientific method has *never* been applied to this problem. Jacques Vallée, June 25, 1968.

Not Extraterrestrial

Sir,—As one who has studied the UFO phenomenon intensively for several years, during which time I have researched scores of books and periodicals, let me say that John Keel needs to explain far more than "Phase 3" and "Odd 'March pattern'" referred to in your note following his article in your January/February 1968 issue.

My research has failed to reveal even one solid indication of contact by outer space creatures. The more impressive landing stories—Socorro, New Mexico, South Hill, Virginia and

Valensole, France—are all based on the testimony of *one* witness. Moreover, both of the U.S. cases have strange loopholes which cast grave doubt that an extraterrestrial visitation took place.*

In accounts about the mysterious "men in black", pregnant women and strange telephone calls, no incontrovertible evidence is ever given. In my opinion, there is a credibility gap in such stories as wide as the Atlantic!

A few months ago I attended a meeting in which Mr. Keel was guest speaker. During the talk he noted that a strange chemical (mecnacide) is starting to show up in our water supplies, and that if taken in sufficient quantities it could cause mental confusion and even death. The implication was that outer space creatures were responsible. Under questioning by the audience, however, Mr. Keel admitted that this chemical is found in trace amounts of compounds in fluorine. In other words, UFO occupants are not putting it in the water — *we are!* (through our fluoridation of water).

F. D. Marrow Lazybrook Road, RD No. 1, Flemington, N.J. 08822 March 4 1968

* For a complete analysis of the Socorro sighting, see a new book, *UFOs-Identified*, by Philip J. Klass, published by Random House, New York, N.Y.

[I suggest that the fact that "outer space creatures were responsible" was the inference drawn by our correspondent when he attended Mr. Keel's

lecture. I cannot recall Mr. Keel in his articles for FSR—or, come to that, in his private correspondence—having claimed that reported visitations are by extraterrestrial entities.—EDITOR.]

UFO Detector and the Storrington Reports

Sir,—I purchased one of the McCarthy detectors in August 1967 and installed it about the middle of that month. I did keep a log and am prompted to write to you having just read FSR Vol. 14, No. 2, page 5, reference Mrs. Quick's experience on Thursday, November 16, 1967.

On August 30, at 1610 GMT, the McCarthy triggered and I reset it without difficulty. Observation from the garden revealed nothing unusual. Sky clear, some slight high cloud.

Nothing further from the detector until 1400 GMT on November 16, 1967. On this particular day I was in London on business in my car. Finishing early I took the car up onto the motorway at Chiswick heading for the M4 at about 3.25 p.m. (1425 GMT) when I sighted what looked like a Zeppelin-shaped object a long way off. I am old enough to remember the dirigibles and this was the description which came at once to mind. It showed up clearly against an otherwise red sky of the setting sun. My first point of observation was as I passed the Honeywell Building and my "Zeppelin" was then 20 degrees above the horizon (approx.) and stationary.

Approaching the railway bridge below the flyover, I lost sight of the object. It occurred to me that as the object was white and lay, when last seen, on a bearing across London Airport, it might well be the residue of a vapour trail from a high flying aircraft.

Approaching Slough, I noted that its bearing and altitude and its shape had not altered but its attitude had indeed changed, the Southerly end of the object now being lower than its Northerly and it had thus adopted an angle of some 30 degrees to the horizontal. It remained clearly defined, and this alteration of attitude dispensed with my vapour trail theory.

From Honeywell and from West Drayton-Slough, it bore, I guess within an arc formed by a line joining Basingstoke and Guildford, but a great deal further to the South. In view of its magnitude and altitude I would assume that the object could well have been as far away as Portsmouth or Southampton.

On reaching home at about 4 p.m., (1500Z) I said nothing to anyone about my sighting. My wife, however, informed me that the magnetic flux detector had been giving her "a lot of trouble" during the early afternoon.

At about 1400 GMT she was working in the lounge when the buzzer sounded. She attempted to reset the instrument, but every time it tripped again and she was quite unable to turn it off. Obviously the influence on the detector coil was very strong. Eventually, frustrated by her inability to silence the buzzer she disconnected the electricity supply thus restoring peace and quiet to the house! She went outside but saw nothing. On hearing this, my son reconnected the mains supply to the detector in my presence, whereupon it stubbornly declined to "reset" indicating to me the continued presence of an exceptionally strong magnetic field. At about 1630 GMT, resetting of the detector became permanent. All remained quiet until 2010Z when again there was a strong field lasting about 3 minutes. At 2050Z a weak field. At 2102Z a strong field lasting 3 minutes. At 2110Z an extremely powerful (unresettable) field continued for 4 minutes. Nothing more occurred that night, but on November 17, the buzzer sounded at 1340Z and again at 1350Z and was easily reset both times. The next was on November 20 at 0705Z, weak, and the last times at 1825Z on November 21, and 0130Z on November 22. The McCarthy detector has never sounded since.

It is attractive to correlate Mrs. Quick's second incident, although apart from the M4 sighting, none of us have actually sighted anything at all. Perhaps you, or Mr. Creighton will say that my hunch is unscientific in relation to the Storrington report? J. R. D. Sainsbury Maidenhead, Berks. —April 5, 1968

P.S. I am sorry that I omitted to mention weather conditions in each case.

August 30. Sky clear. Slight high clouds.

November 16. Sky clear. Some high cloud. Bright and sunny. Red sunset. Starlit night.

November 17. Fine and clear.

November 20. Sky 10/10 cloud. Slight fog or mist.

November 21. Sky 9/10 cloud.

J.R.D.S.

[*Why should we think our correspondent's "hunch" is unscientific? We find the "hunch" interesting and the details well worthy of inclusion in the record—EDITOR]*

Reply to Messrs Brunt and Brandt

Sir,—As "*Flying Saucer Review's* resident pessimist", I feel that I must defend my position against the attacks of Messrs. Brunt and Brandt ("*Mail Bag*", March/April 1968).

To start with A. J. Brunt's letter:

The hypothesis outlined in my article (*Why UFO's are Hostile*, November/December 1967) does not

"rely on the UFOs having a common origin or at least a common design for earth". In fact, I wrote, "The ufo-nauts could behave in this manner whether their motives happen to be "good" or "bad" for us (probably only an incidental question to them)—just so long as their purposes are concealed from us".

It appears that there are both pro- and anti-human groups involved in the UFO picture. Yet even the "pro" groups prefer that we be kept in the dark about what is happening, and they are willing to use "hostile" methods if such are necessary to keep us at a distance. It would seem, on the basis of detailed, mostly unpublished evidence shown me by a prominent American researcher, that the "pro" elements are on our side simply because our interests and "their" interests happen to coincide.

The source for the incident which led off my article is the C.R.I.F.O. *Orbit* for November 4, 1955. *Orbit* was published by Leonard Stringfield, certainly a respected, reliable ufologist of whom even the ultraconservative Major Keyhoe has spoken well.

"In no case," Mr. Brunt says, "was there good evidence that the UFOs in the incidents (involving hostile acts) were involved on secret operations." Then the only alternative explanation is that the ufo-nauts killed and injured human beings for no other cause than innate nastiness—which is really a much more frightening idea than any I suggested. What chance has the human race at the hands (or whatever) of deranged creatures who swoop down and do us harm for no reason whatsoever?

As for there being no "good evidence . . . (of) secret operations," I urge Mr. Brunt to re-read my article, noting particularly the Cisco Grove and 1962 Brazilian cases. I admit to being hampered by the fact that a number of very specific cases were given me in confidence and cannot be used. (Mr. Brunt may make of that whatever he chooses.) Nonetheless, the published literature of ufology ought to be enough to demonstrate my point—and also the lack of a more plausible explanation why hostility occurs almost invariably under the same kinds of circumstances.

Most of Ivan Brandt's arguments strike me as rather irrelevant and at times naive. For example, surely no one with any amount of experience in the saucer field could ever make so wild an assertion as, "Even if the death of one man on this earth was definitely known and proved to have been caused by an alien from outer space—an authenticated act of hostility beyond the shadow of doubt—can anyone believe that the presses of the world