

# MAIL BAG

## English Orthoteny

Sir,—With regard to *Isle of Wight Antics* a section of the "World Round-Up" feature in the March REVIEW, perhaps you would be interested to know that there is a suspected orthoteny (discovered by Gordon Creighton) running from Burton, through the Charlton Crater site, through Ringwood to the Isle of Wight (it goes through Ventnor). This is an integral part of the British orthoteny system, and runs to a major orthotenic centre in the English Channel, 40 miles from the Isle of White.

The line is also a primary ley, and with other such leys and ley-orthoteny makes up a very symmetrical diamond pattern which I think is the basis of all the leys and orthoteny in Britain.

J. Goddard, Wynchland, Walton Bridge Road, Shepperton, Middlesex.

## Robert Gribble on N.I.C.A.P. and NICAP

Sir,—In the interest of truth and accuracy, I should like a correction printed regarding the letter from George W. Earley—FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, *Mail Bag*, March-April, 1966.

Mr. Earley's statement that I organised N.I.C.A.P. in mid-1962 following my expulsion from the original NICAP is untrue. The organisation that now operates under the name National Investigation Commission on Aerial Phenomena was organised on January 1, 1955 and has been active since that date—under several different names. Also, the name National Investigation Commission on Aerial Phenomena replaced the previous name prior to my expulsion from the original NICAP by some four weeks.

Mr. Earley also states "Prior to his membership in the original NICAP, Gribble organised and headed the Aerial Phenomena Research Association and it is because of that somewhat tenuous link that he claims that his N.I.C.A.P. has been serving the public since 1955." This statement by Mr. Earley is also untrue. At no time did I ever organise or belong to an organisation known as Aerial Phenomena Research Association.

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.

Also, in Mr. Vallee's article in a recent issue of the REVIEW, he states—or implies—that N.I.C.A.P., Seattle supports all of the contact claims. This statement is untrue. We have stated in print our backing for two of the contact claims—and no more.

Robert J. Gribble, Director, National Investigation Commission on Aerial Phenomena, 5108 South Findlay Street, Seattle, Washington 98118 U.S.A.

## Further thoughts on dematerialisation

Sir,—Invisibility need not be due to dematerialisation and the Cappoquin photograph supports this contention. Here is a picture showing more than was seen by the eye. Checking the light sensitivity of the type of film exposed revealed that it was particularly sensitive in the ultra violet region. The significance here is that most of the effluence was invisible against the blue sky to the eye but not to the camera (U. V. radiation being at the blue end of the spectrum).

Taking this idea further, could not the Valensole sighting (disappearance) be explained this way, if it flew off above the horizon into a clear sky. Also James R. Peek's Gemini 5 photographs (*The greatest flap yet? Part 2*) would surely have been taken against a blue sky, taking note that the only one he saw was green.

The Templeton photograph could fit into this theory, although it was of a man and not of an object. I presume the sky was clear and the man was against the sky. And was Mr. Templeton questioned about the weather?

A. Calvert, 26 Well Rd. Barnet, Herts.

## Angel Hair Theory

Sir,—I have long wondered why I have never seen a clear indication as to the real nature of "angel's hair".

While reading M. Jacques Vallee's book, *Anatomy of a Phenomenon*, I thought I was to have it at last. On page 62 he has the line: 'These fibres . . . dissolve spontan-

eously upon touching the ground, as if formed of ionized particles in an unstable state.' But he stops there, not taking the one step onwards.

I can best take this step myself by quoting from the Science Programme entitled *Universe*, prepared by Science Service Washington, D.C., and published in 1964 by Doubledays. Under the heading "Electrons propel Spacecraft" it reads as follows:

"A new electrical propulsion technique ejecting hot electrons and ions should be capable of propelling spacecraft to distant planets at speeds of more than 100,000 miles per hour.

"In the new technique the electrons in a plasma are trapped by crossed electrical and magnetic fields. The first causes them to absorb energy, and the second causes them to spiral around the lines of force. Eventually the electrons escape through the exhaust nozzle, indirectly pulling ions with them."

And so producing Angel Hair?

H. Bowden, 6 Denman Drive, Newsham Park, Liverpool, 6.

## Demat?

Sir,—With regard to UFOs seeming to disappear suddenly and the thought in certain peoples' minds that perhaps these phenomena came from another dimension.

I have watched flights of birds at different times—and there probably could have been a hundred or more in a flock—and at one point as they fly in the distance, presumably turning in some way, they disappear completely only to appear again in a split second (you will have observed this yourself). Is it conceivable that if they stayed on the same course when they disappeared and not turned to appear again, then to all intents and purposes to an observer they would have disappeared completely? Or is it possible that in flight they all enter another dimension momentarily?

Perhaps the same principle may apply to UFOs.—

Miss Beryl Green, 74 King Street, Egremont, Wallasey, Cheshire.