

up as a cosmic guru. Somewhere beneath all this there is an interesting case history for the psychiatrist and psychic investigator. Although the writing is too disorganised to appeal to a wide readership, this book may however be of interest to the specialist student of abduction literature.

Books dealing specifically with UFO occupants are surprisingly rare. We can only recall *The Humanoids* and a couple of books by the Lorenzens. Now French researcher **Eric Zurcher** has written **Les Apparitions D'Humanoïdes** (published by Editions Alain Lefeuvre, price not known; write to the publisher at 29, rue Pastorelli, 06000 Nice, France). It is subtitled "202 encounters of the third kind" (all in France), and Zurcher has meticulously divided and sub-divided his data so as to extract the maximum comparable information from it. We learn that there are eight main groups of entities (illustrated), that 79 of the encounters took place in the extraordinary year of 1954, that 25% of witnesses were children or students, and much other information relating to the entities themselves, their craft, the witnesses, the locations of the sightings, and so on. Comparisons are made with the creatures of folklore, with visions of the Virgin Mary, and with paranormal phenomena, and conclusions are drawn with reference to hypotheses such as the ETH (in French 'HET'). No stone seems to have been left unturned, and we can only wish that an English

translation of this useful book was available for those many potential readers who will be discouraged by the thought of having to dust off their French dictionaries.

Full references are given, we are glad to see, but two notable omissions are an index, and full details of the 202 encounter cases. These are listed briefly in one line apiece, giving date, time, place, name of witness, and the author's main source of information. Ideally the details of each encounter should have been summarised as well, but we realise this could have added, at say four a page, 50 pages to an already full book of 328 pages. Nevertheless, this is a valuable book, and Zurcher's idea could usefully be taken up by researchers in other countries.

To read only UFO books is to have a blinkered outlook, especially in the 1980s when many researchers are realising that aspects of "paranormal" research contain clues to the nature of UFOs. Anyone wishing to widen their knowledge could do no better than start by obtaining the Society for Psychical Research's Study Guide No.4, **Books on the Paranormal: An Introductory Guide** which has been compiled by **Nicholas Clark-Lowes**, the S.P.R.'s Librarian (price £1/U.S. \$2.50 including postage, from The Secretary, S.P.R., 1 Adam & Eve

(Continued on page 27)

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.

C.U.N. address correction

Dear Sir, — With reference to FSR Vol. 25, No. 4, Page 6, may I state that the precise address of Italian Centro Ufologico Nazionale (C.U.N.) and of its official journal *Notizario UFO* for overseas contacts (Foreign Relations Secretariat) is as follows: C.U.N., Via Magenta 49, 10128 Torino, Italy.

Several publications did indeed refer to a Rome P.O. Box, which is not our address, but our publisher's one instead. As for the old "Via Vignola 3, 20136 Milano" address (referred to in the same issue of FSR, Page 3), it is no longer operative, although mail will be forwarded to us from there.

Thanking you for this clarification, let me wish the best UFO magazine in the world another 25 years of life.

With compliments,
Edoardo Russo,
Foreign Liaison Officer,
Centro Ufologico Nazionale,
Via Magenta 49,
10128 Torino,
Italy.
June 11, 1980.

A complaint from BUFORA investigator

Dear Sir, — The highly imaginative and rambling account of the CE2 (Taylor Case) at Livingston by Messrs. Keatman and Collins includes an incidental comment that I was contacted by the press and that I stated that the phenomenon encountered was possibly ball lightning. The implication is that I did nothing else.

In fact I have conducted a most thorough investigation of this case, and was at the scene of the incident the day after it occurred, before any snow fell. Thus, unlike Keatman and Collins, I saw the ground markings before they were permanently obliterated. A preliminary, but full and accurate account of the case can be seen in *Journal of Transient Aerial Phenomena* (Vol. 1/2; Mar 1980), but a full report will be available later as a BUFORA Case History. But my task was not made any easier by the unwarranted interference of so-called investigators from south of the border.

The attribution to me of a ball lightning explanation is apparently derived from a report in *The Sunday*

Express, which is not accurate and oversimplifies. Keatman and Collins have never checked this report with me, nor have they ever asked for my views on the matter. My personal views are not necessarily those of BUFORA.

Yours faithfully,
Stuart Campbell,
Scottish Investigations
Coordinator (BUFORA),
4 Dovecot Loan,
Edinburgh EH14 2LT,
Scotland.

Copyright to curb discussion?

Sir, — In light of what Jenny Randles has written concerning the aims of UFOIN (FSR.25.4.1979, pp28-29), I find it extraordinary that a UFOIN-sponsored report "Physical Assault by Unidentified Objects at Livingston," by Messrs. Keatman and Collins, which appears in FSR.25.6.1980, pp2-7, should be followed by a copyright claim on behalf of the investigators which also seeks to prevent public discussion of the material in the report.

As a member of UFOIN myself I do not recall the organisation vesting copy-

right of investigations undertaken on its behalf in themselves, and while I can understand the need to prevent commercial exploitation of a report by bodies outside ufology which may wish to profit from the work of ufologists, I find it difficult to see any sense or reason in an attempt, which cannot work, to prevent serious discussion of an interesting case.

If ufology is to be taken seriously the last thing it should be attempting is to curb discussion; indeed in scientific circles the interchange of conflicting ideas is of vital importance. In the case of the Livingston event another investigator, Stuart Campbell, who is referred to in the Keatman-Collins paper, has also published a report in which there is data which conflicts with that presented by the UFOIN report, eg. Keatman and Collins state the large object to have been "resting silently on the ground," while Campbell states that it "was hovering" (*Journal TAP*.1.2.1980, pp43-46). Which report is correct? Only an interchange of views can establish this, but Messrs. Keatman and Collins, unlike Mr. Campbell, want to prevent discussion by a blanket copyright claim.

In point of fact while Keatman and Collins may be able to claim copyright on their own report they cannot prevent discussion, nor do they have an exclusive claim to the facts of the case. Copyright legislation, in so far as I understand it, permits reasonable discussion for purposes of review or criticism. However, this fact should not be taken as mitigating what is all too clearly an attempt to prevent the case being discussed, an act which does little credit to its authors and reflects badly upon UFOIN.

Yours faithfully,
Robert Morrell, B.Sc., Ph.D., F.L.S.
443 Meadow Lane,
Nottingham NG2 3GB.
June 10, 1980.

Support for Stringfield

Dear Sir, — I feel I must comment on the opinion of correspondent A. J. Papard (FSR 'Mail Bag' Vol. 25, No. 6). He seems to be of the impression that if the US military had had a UFO intact for about 30 years then they would have been able to copy it. However he does not seem to appreciate what technical progress really means.

If, for example, a present day American jet fighter was to fall into the hands of, for example, the Russians, the latter would be able to learn and copy from it.

However if the same aeroplane were "time travelled" back even 50 years, the military experts would be able to identify some parts but would learn very little from it. The mechanical engineer would be fascinated by the engines, but how would he copy a titanium part when he

has no knowledge of the material. The control of the engines and many other functions would be performed by boxes containing integrated circuits each of which would contain the equivalent of about 100,000 of his triode valves in a space of about a square millimetre.

This is obviously only one example! What would have Leonardo da Vinci have done with this aeroplane? He would probably have realised that the seat was to sit in!

If the US and other countries have UFOs in "captivity" they would certainly be meaningless to them, which is the one reason why they would be so scared. My congratulations to Mr. Stringfield on an excellent series of articles.

With regard to the Livingston incident has anyone compared the hoof prints left by the two spheres with the "Devil's hoof prints" which occurred in Cornwall at about the turn of the century (I have no sources to look up exact dates)?

With many thanks for FSR I am,
Yours sincerely,
D. I. Norman,
Seestrass 15,
CH 2563 Ipsach,
Switzerland.
June 9, 1980.

Interstellar "nuts and bolts" spacecraft impossible

Dear Mr. Bowen, — I don't believe a word of "Retrievals of The Third Kind" (FSR Vol. 25, Nos. 4, 5 & 6) by Leonard H. Stringfield. The reason for my scepticism is quite simple:

If UFOs were so imperfect as to crash on to our soil, they would logically be incapable of covering vast interstellar distances for which even the speed of light is far too slow. Interstellar travel is out of the question for any mechanical "nuts-and-bolts" spacecraft (cf. Einstein's theories of Relativity).

I don't think the U.S. authorities are withholding any UFO data from the world public. They just don't know the answer to the UFO enigma any more than we do, except that it is of parapsychical nature.

Yours sincerely,
Julian H. Kaneko,
18, rue Le Corbusier,
CH-1208 Geneva, Switzerland.
June 3, 1980.

On the nature of the "Parapsychical Intelligence"

Dear Sir, — The more letters I read in FSR of the calibre of that emanating from Mr. Julian H. Kaneko (Vol. 26, No. 1, Spring 1980), the more I become convinced of the validity of the Karmic claims in respect of birth, death and rebirth.

I would contest most strongly, therefore his assertion that the "Parapsychical Intelligence" to which he refers in his letter, is neutral, or indeed that it is neither God nor Devil. There is no such thing as Cosmic neutrality, material or immaterial, physical or spiritual, since the Cosmos itself, in all its implications, is wholly dependent on the ever-present activity of opposing forces. As such, therefore, there can be no such thing as the doctrine of agnosticism, since the sum total of the process we call life is the realisation that good and evil are most certainly *not* "purely human concepts," but that they exist in Nature and are wholly relevant to the way one lives.

And with regard to the last paragraph of his letter, I would wholly support Hilary Evans' theory that parallel universes, or perhaps we should call them dimensions, do indeed exist. Indeed I have in my possession a tape recording I made when interviewing a local farmer who is clairvoyant, and who has on many occasions encountered Nature spirits during his solitary walks around the lonely hills of Pembrokeshire.

These denizens of our planet's "other dimension" are as natural in the overall scheme of things as are God and the Devil. However, I could perhaps agree with Mr. Kaneko's assertion that "parallel universes are neither superior nor inferior, but equal to our universe." The one disconcerting element in this degree of universal 'sameness' is the fact that some of the inhabitants of our analogous dimension seem to be much more advanced technologically, intellectually and even physically than Homo Sap. himself! The remainder are, theologically and secularly, cast much in the same mould as Man is.

Yours truly,
R. Jones Pugh, M.R.C.V.S.,
"Parkland Place",
St. Brides View,
Roch,
Haverfordwest, Pembro.,
West Wales.
July 9, 1980.

Laser projection of UFO images

Dear Mr. Bowen, — I found J. G. Adams article "Projection of Humanoid Images" (FSR Vol. 25, no. 6) interesting throughout, and a quite acceptable explanation to account for the cases selected.

An additional point of value and something which, I might add, would be part and parcel of the "Holograph" theory, is the possibility that holographic images are used to produce the diversity of shapes and types of UFOs reported.

If images of aliens or entities could be projected into open space, is it not feasible that some of the "objects" themselves are also projected images?

Also, movie-like projections produced

by UFO entities have been reported by percipients involved in "abductions" in recent years, two that come to mind are the "Dapple Gray Lane" and "Aveley" incidents (FSR Vols. 23 Nos. 1 & 2; Vol. 23, no. 6 and Vol. 24, no. 1 respectively).

Yours sincerely,
R. Boundy,
27 Heavy Cres.,
Whitfield,
Cairns, Queensland,
Australia 4870.
June 12, 1980.

Italian entity's "double"?

Dear Sir, — May I refer to the sketch of the entity allegedly seen by Sig. Zanfretta, which appears on page 7 of FSR Vol. 26, No. 1 (Spring 1980).

This entity is quite similar, if not exactly the same as, a creature used in an old horror film.

If my memory serves me correctly the film was called *The Creature from the Black Lagoon*, and it was made, I think, about 1955. Perhaps some FSR reader who is into horror movies could look this matter up.

Yours faithfully,
A. Ryan,
27 Temple Court,
Lansdown Green Est.,
London SW8.
July 7, 1980.

A projected image?

Dear Sir, — In the last issue received of FSR (Vol. 25, No. 6) the article by J. G. Adams on "Projection of Humanoid Images" brings to mind an incident observed by myself at sunset on November 4, 1954. I recorded detailed notes of the sighting.

The link with Mr. Adams' theory is as follows:

What I saw was something that resembled the rear nozzle of a jet motor

belching flames. It was immense and silent. The most intriguing thing was that the "flame," which I estimated at about 50 yards in length, appeared "fixed" in the sky, like a drawing, although it was travelling. It was not like a flame from a blow torch flickering at its edges. Instead, it was clear cut in detail.

The observation I made was also reported in our papers by two boys who said they had seen a football type object [*rugby football?* — ED] at approximately the same time. The object was reported to have windows or port holes. It was in the same direction as the object I saw. Furthermore, some Air Force men at Taieri airfield also reported a sighting in a continuing line with the boys' and my sighting. But as I stated, I only saw the strange "flame" issuing from the huge jet nozzle.

Yours faithfully,
F. J. Burton,
Dunedin,
New Zealand.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS ON THE RIZZI CASE

Gordon Creighton

SIGNOR WALTER RIZZI, the author of the following article, is, as readers see, of Austrian-Italian parentage, and lives in that part of the Austrian Tyrol which was incorporated into Italy after World War I. His mother-tongue is evidently Italian, and, as he admits, his German is not quite 100% accurate, and there are a few passages — fortunately not important ones — where I have had to do a little guessing about his precise meaning.

The Rizzi story came to me in December 1979 from FSR readers Hans Hermann Markert and Frau Daphne Markert, of Mannheim, Germany. (Daphne Markert is British-born, being the daughter of the well-known UFO investigator and FSR reader Mr. Ian Norrie, an engineer and Cambridge graduate, who lives and works in Mexico City and whom some of us had the pleasure of meeting when he was visiting London a couple of years ago).

It seems that Herr and Frau Markert first learnt of the Rizzi story when they heard Rizzi lecture about it in Germany in October 1979. They had the opportunity to speak to Rizzi after his talk, and from his general manner and behaviour, and his vivid way of narrating his experiences, they were left with the very strong feeling that the man was genuine. They are still in constant touch with him and are still investigating the case.

They then sent the whole of the material on to me, plus sundry other items, such as maps of the landing area and a number of Rizzi's colour slides of the landing site and vicinity.

Herr Markert explained that in passing this material to me it was his hope that FSR might be able to extend the

investigation still further and give their critical evaluation of the Rizzi case. Such a course, regrettably, is not within our power. The scene of this close encounter — if it happened — lies far from Britain, and is said to have occurred twelve years ago. It is obvious that, however many investigators we had and however much money we had to spend, we should probably never be any the wiser. This UFO report, as indeed do all close encounter claims, **stands or falls by the inner feeling we get as to the integrity and probity of the alleged percipient.**

I have been "sitting on" the Rizzi case for the past six months, ruminating on it and wondering what, if anything, we ought to do about it. My personal feeling is that the story could very well be true. If so, then the report is of great importance, for the Rizzi story contains a "message" for mankind. This message is unpalatable, to say the least. But it is a message that happens to be borne out by an increasing volume of corroboratory evidence coming from the most diverse quarters, and from individuals who by no means all "believe" in UFOs or know anything about the UFO Phenomenon.

I came finally to the decision that I ought to take the trouble to translate the report in full and submit it to the Editor of FSR for possible publication. For *Flying Saucer Review* is not, nor has it ever claimed to be, anything other than a **forum** wherein UFO accounts and UFO-related claims might be ventilated and discussed. If I were to go on "sitting on it," our readers might in all probability never hear of Signor Rizzi. If the case is published,