

# 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.

## The "cow" explanation defended

Dear Sir, — While J. R. Taplin (25.1) is fully entitled to describe my explanation of the Rainford incident as "preposterous," he is then obliged to refute in detail the considerations advanced in support of the conclusions I draw. This he fails to do.

Although the police stated that the witnesses were not intoxicated they carried out no tests to establish the fact, and from what the witnesses themselves related we know they stopped on the journey for a drink, having spent the earlier part of the evening at a social function at which intoxicants were available. It is a known fact that the degree of intoxication can be curbed through shock, and on the journey back, after the witnesses had visited a public house, the car skidded while rounding a bend and almost crashed — it ended up in a small ditch close to a hedge. As an individual can appear reasonably sober while not being so, mere appearance cannot be accepted as demonstrating that the witnesses in this case were not intoxicated. These facts, then, show that the issue of intoxication cannot be got around quite as easily as Mr. Taplin imagines it can.

As the Nottingham UFO Investigation Society has never investigated a UFO landing at or near Crich — nor for the matter have I — it is quite impossible to comment upon the second part of Mr. Taplin's letter which refers to such a case, claiming that NUFOIS investigated it and presented certain conclusions involving a cow. NUFOIS publishes the reports of its investigations in its journal, the *UFO Research Review*. In the four years this magazine has been published no report has been printed which refers to a cow as an explanation; furthermore, no investigation report on file at NUFOIS H.Q. (and reports go back seven years) which has remained unpublished carries such a conclusion. Naturally NUFOIS cannot be held responsible for the content matter of newspaper reports, and anyone seriously interested in UFOs rapidly comes to a position from which all such material is treated with extreme caution in so far as its accuracy is concerned, it would seem, though, that Mr. Taplin is an exception to this rule, and rather than quote directly from any official

NUFOIS publication, or NUFOIS files (which are open to inspection subject to certain safeguards), presents a garbled comment based upon some half-remembered newspaper cutting. If he seriously thinks that NUFOIS presented as a conclusion to an investigation that all a witness saw was a cow then let him quote from the report in question, giving the date on which NUFOIS published the report and in what publication. If he has any difficulty getting hold of NUFOIS publications he can always come over to Nottingham and go through those in the library at NUFOIS H.Q., or in the Nottingham Public Library Reference Library. A full run of NUFOIS publications can be consulted at the British Library in London.

Yours faithfully,  
R.W. Morrell,  
Nottingham UFO Investigation Society,  
443 Meadow Lane,  
Nottingham NG2 3GB.  
7 July 1979

## The ufologist's dilemma

Dear Sir, — I have in the past admired Pierre Guerin's soundly analytical approach to the UFO problem, notably his essay on the question of proof in Bourret's *Nouveau Defi des OVNI*: so I was the more disappointed that his trenchantly argued and splendidly thought-provoking piece in FSR 25/1 should lead him to such negative inconclusions. By contrast Vieroudy, whom he so lightly dismisses, seems to me to have far more to offer by way of constructive suggestion.

Vieroudy recognises the basic dilemma which faces the ufologist, that UFOs are *at the same time* (i) 'real' objects and (ii) 'psychic' constructs. He insists that any explanation must start by taking into account this paradoxical duality.

We at the Society for Psychical Research have long been aware that a similar paradox exists with regard to many of the phenomena we are called upon to study. The question 'Do you believe in ghosts?' that I am asked when wearing my SPR hat is precisely as question-begging as the 'Do you believe in UFOs?' put to me as a BUFORA member: and the question

begged is the same one — how can a 'ghost' or a UFO be *both* an autonomous entity *and* an illusion, modelled if not actually generated by our own subconscious mind?

Vieroudy, though perceptively spotlighting recurrent 'psychic' patterns in UFO sightings, refuses to allow them to persuade him that therefore UFOs have no material existence. His firm insistence on accepting this paradox, in defiance of seeming logic, gives us, in my opinion, the firmest basis on which a solution may, hopefully, ultimately be constructed.

Yours sincerely,  
Hilary Evans,  
Chairman,  
UFO Study Group,  
Society for Psychical Research,  
1 Adam & Eve Mews, London W8,  
12 July 1979

## A matter of Spatial Speech

Dear Sirs,—I am writing to point out a mistake in one of your articles that could be very misleading to other readers. The article in question is "Thirty Years After Kenneth Arnold" which appeared in volume 25, No 1.

In the passage entitled "The inadequacy of the Classic Extraterrestrial model" Pierre Guerin frequently uses the theory of relativity to discourage people who favour the Spacecraft Theory. Unfortunately, he has made a mistake. Einstein's theories (which have since been proven in the laboratory) said that no matter could travel AT the speed of light. there is nothing to prevent a space craft from travelling at superphotic speeds, as long as this crucial speed of 186282. 39 miles per sec. is never attained. This presents many problems, but who knows what "they" can do!

If achieving a speed without passing through a lower one seems to be unbelievable, recent work has yielded another way around the problem. A trip through a black hole is not, as some might think, a science fiction dodge, but a properly worked-out theory. (For details of the black hole theory, Adrian Berry's book *THE IRON SUN* is excellent). This gives a

possible answer to why UFOs are so interested in our planet. The end of a black hole 'tunnel' is fixed, so perhaps the earth is the only place they *can* go, at least through that particular tunnel.

I personally prefer the first method, and I would like to say that in pointing out his mistake I mean no disrespect, but the mistake is fairly serious.

Yours sincerely,  
A. C. Hain,  
101 Newport road,  
Barnstaple,  
North Devon.  
9 July 1979

### Beware of Strangers

Dear Sir,—May I reply to Tricia Mooney's letter in Issue 24/6, since, because of my letter in Issue 23/6, I am one of the persons with whom she is irritated?

I admit crying "Havoc"; I was annoyed by the too cosy attitudes that are prevalent . . . "Pop the kettle on Daphne, that nice little man from Bootes is back."

To be serious for a moment, it is a sad fact that owing to the rising incidence of child molestation, children are being given stickers and pamphlets warning them to "Beware of Strangers." Now Tricia Mooney may be right and 99 out of 100 of the aerial strangers may be inter-stellar Neil Armstrongs, happy just to chat us up whilst they wait to return to their wives and kids. But how shall we poor innocents recognise the 100th when he proffers his candy bar?

Yours faithfully,  
M. Sweetman,  
'Elmside' Fernleigh Road.,  
Plymouth, PL3 5AN.  
5th June 1979.

### The nature of Intercosmos

Dear Mr. Bowen,— With regard to the article "Life In The Cosmos," FSR Vol. 25, No. 1, page 25, Gordon Creighton in his Notes and Comments asks for information concerning an unspecified Soviet organisation known as "Intercosmos." Well, as you will gather from the enclosed photo-copy,\* Intercosmos would seem to be a press/public information council very closely connected with the Russian equivalent to N.A.S.A.!

Finally, I must say how much I enjoyed reading Dr. Pierre Guérin's review of the UFO situation. While I have certain misgivings about his conclusions I find the general level of the discussion most stimulating, and hope most sincerely that many more

articles of this calibre appear in the future editions of FSR.

I Remain,  
Most Sincerely,  
W. P. Dillon  
43 Hollybush Road, Vauxhall Park  
Estate, Luton, Beds.  
July 16th, 1979.

*\*[The enclosed photocopy was of page 363 of Spaceflight Vol. 21, 8-9 Aug-Sep. 1978. — EDITOR]*

### Tourists from parallel universes as well?

Dear Sir,—I found *The Tourist Theory* of Messrs. de Lillo and Marx (FSR Vol. 25 No. 2) very credible and refreshing after the complex theories currently so popular.

Surely a completely open-minded approach is the best one, and de Lillo and Marx are so right when they point out that UFOs could well come from more than one source. In my view these sources could be various parts of our universe, various parts of parallel universes and various times in the future (i.e. time machines from our own descendants). Each of these three categories could be visiting us, both as casual tourists, and as scientific/student researchers. With the millions of inhabited planets estimated to be in our galaxy alone, is it any wonder that there are so many types of UFOs and occupants reported?

Yours sincerely,  
A. J. Papard,  
65 Jay Court, Austin Road,  
London SW11 5JN  
August 29, 1979

### That cigarette, burned to the filter

Dear Sir,—On page 18 of FSR Vol. 25, No. 2 you have a very interesting account of a witness — you call her a young matron — describing an incident concerning a UFO.

The account is all the more interesting because it took place in daylight.

Your report states: "...a daylight disc observed for 15 minutes" and goes on to say: "...she had just finished lighting a cigarette when she noticed a sharply defined black oval object."

The report goes on to record the end of the incident and the writer states: "She discovered that she still held her cigarette, burned down to the filter."

I do not smoke cigarettes, and do not know how long it would take to "burn down to the filter," but I suspect it would take *less than 15 minutes*.

So, do we not have a valuable time check here as to *exactly* how long the incident took?

Simply allow a cigarette to burn itself down to the filter tip. Using of course the same brand that our excellent witness used.

Congratulations to her and to the investigator Patricia B. Grant.

Yours faithfully,  
F. Spittles  
15 Duppas Hill Road, Croydon,  
Surrey CRO 4BG

*[There could, of course, be an imponderable here. Having burned down to the filter tip, had the cigarette extinguished? If such was the case it could have been out for many minutes — EDITOR]*

### Elemental rather than ET?

Dear Mr. Bowen,—Now that we are being weaned gradually from the ET theme, I thought it might be helpful to quote from R.G. Torren's book, *The Inner Teachings of the Golden Dawn*:—

"...elementals, who procreate after the manner of men, are said to have bodies of an elastic half-material essence, which is sufficiently ethereal not to be visible to the physical sight, and comparable to matter in the form of invisible gases. W. B. Yeats has given this explanation: 'Many poets, and all mystic and occult writers, in all ages and countries, have declared that behind the visible are chains of conscious beings, who are not of heaven but of *Earth*, who have no inherent form, but change according to their whim, or the mind that sees them.'

" (My italics.) "Further on Yeats says, 'Do not think the fairies are always little. Everything is capricious about them, even their size. They seem to take what size or shape pleases them. Fairies in Ireland are sometimes as big as we are, sometimes bigger, and sometimes, as I have been told, about three feet high.'"

Later in the same chapter Torrens says "To say that we know reality through sensual perception is an error, as all schools of scientists should nowadays admit. Nature is forever eluding the senses; she masquerades in disguise until science tears away her mask. We must always adjust the senses to the world itself; where there are only vibrations in ether, man sees light and he hears sounds. We only know things through the way in which *our senses react upon them*."

I am pretty sure that at some time



either you or Mr. Creighton will have read this book, published by Neville Spearman Ltd., in 1969.

Yours sincerely,  
Clare Branch (Mrs.)  
44 Queen Street, Honiton,  
Devon, EX14 8HD  
July 26, 1979.

#### Who gives the correct data?

Dear Sir,—I wonder how many of your readers have also read *The Uninvited*, a recent paperback from Star Books, by Clive Harold.

This book is an account of all the unusual events which took place at Ripperstone Farm, Dale, Dyfed., between January and December 1977. Mr. Harold, in his Epilogue (page 162), states that he has related the story as

accurately as possible, after spending weeks with the family in research, and that their stories never varied. Yet his Chapter 9 (page 100), dealing with the Stack Rocks incident, differs in two major respects from the account given by Randall Jones Pugh (*Flying Saucer Review* — Volume 23, Number 6, page 7.), namely:—

1. The date of the incident. R. Jones Pugh gives this as October 30, 1977 and C. Harold as November 12, 1977.
2. The witnesses. R. Jones Pugh says they were Pauline Coombs, her 4 children and her mother. C. Harold says they were Pauline Coombs, her 4 children and her sister.

These inconsistencies are obviously very important for they cannot both

have their facts right. It is a matter for conjecture actually who is right, and for the purposes of my letter it does not matter anyway. The purpose these facts do serve, I hope, is to underline the importance of accurate reporting of unlikely events.

Our science is concerned with incredible and unexplained aerial happenings. To convince others of the truth of what is occurring requires many things, not least of which are accuracy and consistency. Without these two, any particular science must be doomed.

Yours sincerely,

Gerald L. Wilkinson  
12 Althorpe Drive, Loughborough,  
Leics. LE11 0QU  
15 August 1979

# World round-up

*of news and comment  
about recent sightings*

## United Kingdom

### Admiral's Interest in UFO Reports

In the pages of the *Sunday Express* of August 19, 1979, we see it confirmed,\* in an item under the headline "Navy Chief in UFO probe," that —

"Lord Hill-Norton, Admiral of the Fleet and former Chief of Defence Staff is taking a surprising interest in unidentified flying objects.

"He has attended a meeting of the House of Lords study group on UFOs, and members have welcomed the Defence Supremo's interest.

"There are things in this field that have not been explained to my satisfaction," says Lord — formerly Sir Peter — Hill-Norton, 64, from the Orkneys where he is making a film with the BBC on the sinking of the battleship *Royal Oak*.

"I have never seen a UFO, and I don't know anything about the subject; but I have an open mind.

"I went to the meeting out of curiosity. I shall almost certainly go to the next meeting."

"The group's chairman, the Earl of Clancarty, 67, author of seven books on UFOs, is delighted that a pillar of the defence establishment is taking such an active interest.

"There has been a cover-up in this country over UFOs," he tells me. "It's almost impossible to get information out of officials."

\* See *FSR Vol. 25, No. 3, item on page ii (inside front cover) wherein details of the meeting attended by Lord Hill-Norton were given; the*

*meeting at which the Editor of FSR gave the talk.*

## United States of America/U.K.

### E.T. Bodies?

The following item is taken from a chat column in the *Daily Express* of August 21, 1979, and, as far as this issue of *FSR* is concerned, is quite topical, —

"Following alarming reports from America that the U.S. Government is hiding 30 bodies of extra-terrestrial creatures killed in UFO crashes, I immediately contacted the House of Lords' flying saucer expert, the *Earl of Clancarty*, 67.

"Says the author of *The Sky People* and *The Flying Saucer Story*: 'Yes, I've heard. I hope you are not going to make fun of it.'

"Certainly not. Indeed, I hear that the UFO movement is gathering strength in the Upper House. There are now no less than 20 peers of the realm who have joined Clancarty's study group. And more are showing interest.

"Says Clancarty: 'We have sightings all the time.'"

## USA/The Moon

### UFOs seen by Apollo 11 crew

A sensational item was published in the columns of the *Sunday Mirror* on September 9, 1979. It reads,—

"Were aliens watching when US astronauts first landed on the Moon?"

"Astonishing claims from both

American and Russian sources say that two UFOs were already on the surface. Apollo spaceship commander Neil Armstrong spotted them as he made his historic 'one small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind.' But then, it is claimed, his radio report of the sighting was blacked out by mission controllers on earth.

"NASA — The National Aeronautics and Space Administration — discuss the claims as 'absolutely ridiculous.' But Maurice Chatelain, a former NASA consultant, insists his version of the first Moon landing in 1969 is true.

"He says Apollo leader Armstrong reported seeing the craft perched on the rim of a crater.

"His reports were blacked out in broadcasts to the world for security reasons," says Chatelain.

"Chatelain's claims are backed by two Soviet space experts who say they learned about the incident two years ago. But NASA's chief spokesman John McLeaish, who denied the story, said: 'The only breaks in transmission from Apollo 11 occurred when it went round the other side of the Moon. The only conversations we have never made public were private talks between the astronauts and doctors.'

"Chatelain says that NASA ordered a cover-up of the Moon incident. He went on to claim that while Armstrong was reporting his findings, his colleague Buzz Aldrin filmed the alien craft from inside Apollo 11.

"In Moscow, university professor Dr. Vladimir Ashazha said: 'I am