



British UFO Research Association

11 FEB 1985

FILE

Please reply to:

Section 40

Section 40

31 January 1985

Dear

Section 40

I will skip the introductions, as we both know who one another is. I apologise for placing several requests in one letter, but trust that you will bide with me.

1: RAF Woodbridge 27 December 1980: I realise we have discussed this matter at length, but a great deal of vital new information has come our way since concluding our book "SKY CRASH" last year. I would like to pose some specific questions to you:-

(a) What is your position regarding the involvement of the British civilian police in the taking of photographs of the landed object? We have excellent evidence for this, and presume that the British police would advise the MoD. If not, then why not?

(b) You have doubtless seen the extensive "smear" campaign being successfully waged by the British media (under whose guidance I wonder?). Eg "The Guardian", 5 Jan 1985. On this thesis a gross mistake was made (a lighthouse seriously misperceived, background radiation levels viewed as sinister, rabbit holes regarded as something else). Not only that, but this "evidence" was supported by the US deputy base commander and the UK base commander, whom 17 days later could surely have figured some of these cock-ups out. This grand blunder is then perpetuated over the course of years; the UK commander remains in charge, the two base commanders (US), at the time and subsequently, endorse all the evidence (we have it in writing) and the deputy commander gets promoted to base commander. Now regardless of what sort of MoD investigation into these events was (or was not) conducted this leaves one with a serious dilemma. If the "lighthouse/normal radiation/rabbits" theory is correct then all your strategic commanders at a NATO base (for which you certainly have jurisdiction) are incompetent dodos who might be expected to misinterpret Orford Ness lighthouse for an invading MIG jet, not have a clue whether they have been irradiated by an exploding neutron bomb, and waste a great deal of the war filling in bomb potholes made by the Rendlesham Forest wildlife! I think the people of this country might be rather worried if that were the case. And frankly, unless you can help us refute this lighthouse nonsense then we are just going to have to make sure the British people see this interesting paradox. Believe me we have people in the right place to make sure this happens! Comments please.

(c) Since it is vital to the Section 40 theory that the date not be 27 December 1980, but 26 December, then have you any way of confirming or denying the real date? Of course the Halt memo to you says the 27th, but that is dated 17 days later and Section 40 suggests that he just made yet another mistake. (In view of such a plethora of errors how could Halt possibly have merited a base commandership?) However, some sort of action must have occurred between 26/27 December and the 13 January memo; either at your end, elsewhere in government, or at the base. The correct date would have been essential to confirm or refute options (eg a spy-plane mission). So I am sure there are ways you can look into this. I am not asking for details - just a statement regarding your level of confidence in the Halt memo dating.