

# HIGHLIGHTS FROM RECENT BACK NUMBERS OF FLYING SAUCER REVIEW..

1979

- Volume 25, No. 3**  
**THE SUNDERLAND FAMILY ENCOUNTERS**  
 J. Randles & P. Whetnall
- Volume 25, No. 2**  
**THE TOURIST THEORY, or .... why they are here** R. DeLillo & R. H. Marx.
- Volume 25, No. 1**  
**THIRTY YEARS AFTER KENNETH ARNOLD: a Summing up...** Dr. Pierre Guérin

1976			
	<b>Volume 22, No. 6</b>		
85p	<b>SWEDISH SCIENTIST'S UNQIE UFO PICTURES</b>		
	Sven-Olof Fredickson	£1.00	
	<b>Volume 22, No. 5</b>		
85p	<b>UFO &amp; SILVER - SUITED ENTITY SEEN NEAR WINCHESTER</b>		
	Leslie Harris	£1.00	
	<b>Volume 22, No. 4</b>		
70p	<b>UFO-HELICOPTER CLOSE ENCOUNTER OVER OHIO</b>		
	Jennie Zeidman	£1.00	
	<b>Volume 22, No. 3</b>		
	<b>THE "STONEHENGE" INCIDENTS OF JANUARY 1975</b>		
70p	Ted Bloecher (Also in Vol. 22 No. 4)	£1.00	
	<b>Volume 22, No. 2</b>		
	<b>THE NIGHTMARE EXPERIENCE OF MONSIEUR CYRUS</b>		
70p	G. Cattiau	£1.00	
	<b>Volume 22, No. 1</b>		
70p	<b>BENACAZON LANDING AND HUMANOID</b>		
	Juan J. Benitez	£1.00	
	<b>1975</b>		
70p	<b>Volume 21, No. 6</b>		
	<b>IS KEMPSEY A UFO "WINDOW"?</b>		
	Eileen Buckle	£1.00	
70p	<b>Volume 21, No. 5 Out-of-print</b>		
	<b>Volume 21, No. 3 &amp; 4 (Double issue, 64 pages)</b>		
70p	<b>THE CARL HIGDON CASE</b>		
	Dr. Leo Sprinkle		
	<b>BASIC PATTERNS IN UFO OBSERVATIONS</b>		
	Dr. Claude Poher & Dr. Jacques Vallée		
	<b>Volume 21, No. 1 &amp; 2 Out-of-print</b>		
	<b>1974</b>		
85p	<b>Volume 20, No. 6 Out-of-print</b>		
	<b>Volume 20, No. 5</b>		
85p	<b>THE ROBOTS AT WARNETON</b>		
	J. M. Bigorne et al	£1.25	
	<b>Volume 20, Nos 4, 3, 2 Out-of-print</b>		
	<b>Volume 20, No. 1</b>		
	<b>BERSERK: A UFO-CREATURE ENCOUNTER</b>		
85p	Dr. Berthold E. Schwarz	£1.25	
	<b>1973</b>		
85p	<b>Volume 19, No. 6</b>		
	<b>ABDUCTION AT BEBEDOURO</b>		
	Prof. Hulvio B. Aeixo	£1.25	
	<b>Volume 19 No. 5</b>		
85p	<b>URI GELLER, THE MAN WHO BENDS SCIENCE:</b>		
	Gordon Creighton	£1.25	
	<b>Vol. 19 Nos. 3,2,1. Vol. 18 Nos. 5,4,3,2</b>		
85p	<b>Vol. 17, Nos 2,1.</b>	each £1.25	

US dollar rates: \$1.85 (70p), \$1.95 (85p), \$2.30 (£1.00), \$2.90 (£1.25), \$3.20 (£1.40)

Remittance with order to: FSR Publications Ltd., (Back Issues), West Malling, Maidstone, Kent, England.  
 An element to enable exchange conversion is included in these conversions.

# Compendium Books

Books of interest to readers of FSR

UFOs: A BRITISH VIEWPOINT	Jenny Randles and Peter Warrington	£5.25
THE DYFED ENIGMA	R. Jones - Pugh & F. E. Holiday	£5.95
THE LEY HUNTER'S COMPANION	Paul Devereux, Ian Thompson	£6.50
THE INVISIBLE COLLEGE	Dr. Jacques Vallée	£2.45
MESSENGERS OF DECEPTION: Contacts and Cults	Dr Jacques Vallée	£3.95
Paperback		
THE UFO PHENOMENON	J von Buttlar	£6.95
UFO MAGIC IN MOTION	A. Shuttlewood	£1.10
Paperback		

Many other titles in stock: UFOs, Forteana, Comparative religion, parapsychology, etc.

Postage and packing 12½% extra, minimum 18p. Please let us know if you would like to be added to our mailing list.

Compendium Books  
234 High Street  
LONDON NW1 ENGLAND

Telephones:  
01-485 8944  
01-267 1525

If you are new to the subject, or a new reader of FSR this book is remarkable value at the price ...

## ENCOUNTER CASES FROM FLYING SAUCER REVIEW



Compelling reading, this is an anthology of cases old and new, which builds up a picture of a phenomenon with a remarkable degree of strangeness.

Price 95p

Plus 20p postage & packing  
From FSR Publications, West Malling, Maidstone, Kent.

## FLYING SAUCER REVIEW

**Annual subscription** UK and Overseas £4.80, USA \$11.00 (bank exchange commission on personal cheques in US dollars drawn on banks in the USA is covered by this amount). **Single copies** 85p (US \$1.85). We would prefer subscribers to remit £ sterling by International Money Order.

NOTE CHANGE  
IN \$ RATES

**IMPORTANT NOTICE:** Subscribers in the Republic of Ireland and in Canada are requested to remit the sterling amount by **International Money Order**, or by **Giro** (FSR Publications Ltd. Giro No. 356 3251) and **NOT** by personal cheques drawn in sterling (unless these are drawn on a bank in the United Kingdom), or drawn in US dollars (unless they are drawn on a bank in the United States of America).

**Airmail extra:** for USA, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil £3.30 (US \$7.50); Australia, New Zealand etc., £3.60; Middle East £2.50.

**Overseas subscribers** should remit by bank draft or personal cheque drawn on a bank in the United Kingdom, by personal cheque in US dollars drawn on banks in the USA only, or by International Money Order in Sterling (our preference). If remitting by Giro, FSR's account number is 356 3251.

All mail, editorial matter and subscriptions should be addressed to:

*The Editor, FSR Publications Ltd., West Malling, Maidstone, Kent, England.  
(Tel: 01-639 0784)*

Remittances should be made payable to "FSR Publications Ltd."


Artwork: Terence Collins

FLYING  
SAUCER  
REVIEW



Volume 25, No. 4 July-August 1979

85p



Our artist's impression of one of several persistent rumours. Is there any truth in them? See ....

## RETRIEVALS OF THE THIRD KIND

(page 13)



FLYING  
SAUCER  
REVIEW

Editor CHARLES BOWEN

Consultants

GORDON CREIGHTON, MA, FRAI, FRGS, FRAS  
C. MAXWELL CADE, AInstP, FRAS, AFRAeS, CEng, FIEE, FIERE  
BERNARD E. FINCH, MRCS, LRCP, DCH, FBIS  
CHARLES H. GIBBS-SMITH, MA, FMA, Hon Companion RAeS, FRSA  
R. H. B. WINDER, BSc, CEng, FIMech E JONATHAN M. CAPLAN, MA  
I. GRATTON-GUINNESS, MA, MSc, PhD, DSc PERCEY HENNELL, FIBP

Overseas J. ALLEN HYNEK, PhD

AIME MICHEL BERTHOLD E. SCHWARZ, MD

Secretarial Assistant JENNY RANDLES

An international journal devoted to the study of Unidentified Flying Objects

Volume 25, No. 4  
(published November 1979)

## CONTENTS

Landing, EM effects and Entities at Torrita di Siena	Roberto Pinotti .. .. 3
Another CEIII report from Italy	Maurizio Verga .. .. 6
Close encounters of an untinkable and inadmissible Kind	Gordon Creighton .. 8
Retrievals of the Third Kind — Pt. 1	Leonard H. Stringfield .. 13
The Sunderland family encounters — Pt. 2	Jenny Randles & Paul Whetnall.. .. 20
Creating one's own UFO	Charles Bowen .. .. .. 23
UFOs over Leys (BK Review)	Janet Bord .. .. .. 24
Swimming against the Tide	Jenny Randles .. .. .. 25
UFO 'spies' on a traffic jam	Tony Faulkner .. .. .. 26
The UFOIN concept	Jenny Randles .. .. .. 28
Mail Bag .. .. .. .. 30	
World Round-Up .. .. .. .. 32	

© Flying Saucer Review

Contributions appearing in this magazine do not necessarily reflect its policy and are published without prejudice

For subscription details and address please see foot of page ii of cover

## COVER-UPS?

ONE morning in mid-August we caught a snatch of an advertisement on commercial radio. Details of a cover-up, we gathered, would be revealed in the national daily, *The Sun*. A repeat of the advert confirmed what we suspected, and that was that while no change was to be expected in the page 3 policy of a newspaper famed for its photographs of nude beauties, they did propose to titillate their readers with a big series on UFOs.

This came as no surprise for we had had a couple of interesting interviews with freelance writer Alec Bestic who had been engaged to write a "three-day serial" for *The Sun*. This was to be woven around a forthcoming book by a German writer Johannes von Buttlar, and interviews with British ufologists: these included, or were to include, the Earl of Clancarty, and representatives of UFOIN, Contact International and BUFORA as well as FSR.

As far as FSR was concerned Mr. Bestic enquired whether we knew of Herr von Buttlar. We couldn't say we were sure we did, but explained that we had had meetings with a gentleman who, speaking fluently in English with a hint of an American accent, let it be known that he was a German national who worked for an American company. Indeed his left-hand drive *Porsche* carried German registration plates, and he introduced himself as Johannes, Baron von Buttlar-Brandenfels. The Baron showed a lively interest in UFO reports in general, and in *Flying Saucer Review* and *The Humanoids* in particular. At that time, some eight or so years ago, he told us he was very keen to write a book on the subject and to promote FSR in every way.

On August 22, 1979, *The Sun* duly published its article based around von Buttlar's book (at the time of writing, the forthcoming book) entitled *The UFO Phenomenon*. The article in *The Sun* went under the headline "The Great UFO Cover-up" and the theme was von Buttlar's assertion — according to Mr. Bestic — that "Both America and Russia believe that UFOs are spacecraft manned by beings from other planets spying on earth. Yet for 30 years both have cynically maintained a massive cover-up — using lies, ridicule, and threats to dismiss the possibility of close encounters of the third kind." For visual effect the article was supported by a collection of dubious photographs which included a well-known misidentification, pictures of clouds and several inconclusive items. The main article was also flanked by a piece on the 1977-78 flap in Dyfed, West Wales, and on the other side by an item alluringly headlined "My loving encounter with a girl from outer Space" and "I was in a sex trap." There, among other delectable morsels, was the Antônio Villas Boas encounter in pre-digested form from "... his incredible story told in Johannes von Buttlar's book that he had made love to a woman from outer Space."

That then was the fate of a story which, despite the sensational content of its claims, FSR always contrived to present in a cool scientific manner in our probing, speculative Buhier version of 1965, and in the authentic and detailed Fontes version of 1966 in FSR, and 1969 in *The*

*Humanoids*; an account was also given by your Editor in sober fashion in Hugh Burnett's BBC-TV documentary *Out of this World* in 1977.

There can only be two sources for this story (three, if one includes the Spanish language version published in the Rio de Janeiro magazine *O Cruzeiro* in Portuguese speaking Brazil — a parochial cover-up if ever there was one!). The first of those is the Dr. Olavo T. Fontes/Gordon Creighton version in *The Humanoids* (published by Neville Spearman Ltd., London, in 1969 and by Henry T. Regnery, Chicago; also in paperback by Futura Publications in 1974 — reprinted 1977); a version based on six articles which appeared in *Flying Saucer Review* in 1966-67. The other possible source is the "sanitized" version by Mrs. Irene Granchi (an associate of the late Dr. Fontes in Rio de Janeiro) which was published by the Lorenzens of APRO in Tucson, Arizona.

This of course discounts poached versions in pot-boiler re-hashes over the years, and it is to be hoped

that this latest version does not fall into that category. By the time this Editorial appears we will know which version was used for publishers Sidgwick and Jackson will have brought out Von Buttlar's book by then; what is certain is that some of the material of that work can only be described as "old hat." Be that as it may we sincerely trust there will have been no further great cover-up attributed by the relative credits for original work done for, and published by FSR, or any other genuine research outlets.

Finally, what happened to the promised three-part article in *The Sun*? Lord Clancarty got a quote in the main article, and BUFORA, via investigator Barry King, was credited with the claim that "Aliens have also hi-jacked men and women for sex" etc. No other parts appeared, and all the time given in interviews by other researchers was wasted. For them, maybe, it was just as well they were the victims of an editorial cover-up.

## POSTSCRIPT TO EDITORIAL

A copy of the book *The UFO Phenomenon* by Von Buttlar was obtained shortly before this issue of *Flying Saucer Review* went to press. Perusal of chapter 9 — "The Fantastic Encounter of Antônio Villas Boas" — shows that the account given by Boas of his experience is nothing more than a version of the deposition made by him to the late Dr. Olavo T. Fontes and João Martins at Dr. Fontes' consulting room in Rio de Janeiro on February 22, 1958; a copy of which deposition Dr. Fontes sent, for publication, to *Flying Saucer Review* through Gordon Creighton on April 25, 1966. The doctor chose to send us this deposition, and his clinical notes and medical report because FSR, in 1965, had published a report of a separate investigation conducted four years after the event by Dr. W. Buhler, a report which proved to be incomplete. The full version, incorporating the correspondence with Dr. Fontes, the deposition, and the medical notes, was published by FSR in 1966/7, and next appeared in our book *The Humanoids* (The Futura Books paperback is still in print).

In the foregoing paragraph we speak of "... a version of the deposition." It should be noted that the original version, and the medical notes, were translated from the Portuguese by Gordon Creighton.

Von Buttlar's book probably used a translation, from Creighton's English, into German. While the present Sidgwick and Jackson version was presumably re-translated into English, from that German version, by Nicholas Fry. Naturally this has led to minor differences in the language, but the layout is identical, the details are the same, and there are details which do not appear in Mrs Granchi's version of the case.

Messrs Creighton and Bowen are mentioned (but not in connection with FSR) in the acknowledgements in *The UFO Phenomenon* while *The Humanoids* and *Flying Saucer Review* (just that and no more) are listed in the bibliography. As with pot-boilers the world over, sources are never quoted.

Elsewhere as illustrative material in this book, which dwells a little on CIA and KGB interest in UFO reports, we find the Mantell case, the White Sands encounter, the 1897 wave, 1934 Ghost aircraft over Scandinavia, Lakenheath, Trindade, Papua, Socorro, Pascagoula, Betty & Barney Hill, and so on. A collection of "golden oldies" suitable perhaps for a German audience, but a tired re-hash for English-speaking readers.

## OVERSEAS REMITTANCES

The recent swift fluctuations, in either direction, of the value of the £ sterling against the US \$, are making a nonsense of our attempts to give prices of FSR publications and subscriptions in U.S. dollars. Accordingly we recommend all overseas readers — and that includes those in Canada and the Irish Republic — to remit the exact amount in pounds sterling by International (or Bankers') Money Order. This will ensure that readers get a square deal and that we receive the right money.

# LANDING, E.M. EFFECTS AND ENTITIES AT TORRITA DI SIENA

Roberto Pinotti

Dr. Pinotti is Vice-President of the Italian National UFO Research Centre (C.U.N.) which has its headquarters at Via Vignole 3, 30136, Milan. He himself lives in Firenze (Florence). This article is based on a translation by Maurizio Verga.

IN the evening of September 17, 1978, between 8.15 and 8.20 p.m., Signora Ultimina Bosagli of Torrita di Siena and her son Riccardo (12), heard an intense noise. It was like a round of artillery fire and from where they were standing in the street in front of their house (on the via pie agli Orti) they looked up to see a fireball with yellow-orange contours and a reddish trail. Suddenly, in a blinding dazzle, the object vanished.

The lower part of the round-shaped object had been seen to be reddish in colour, and a very bright white in the upper part. Signora Bosagli and her son were so frightened that they retreated quickly into their house.

## An object lands

Other witnesses of the phenomenon were Signora Santina Faralli and her son Rivo (25). Signora Faralli was indoors watching television and she heard the noise and was aware of the dazzling light outside. Indeed the electric light, she said, was extinguished suddenly, but then came back on. Soon after that Rivo, a barber by profession, arrived at the house where he stayed for about half-an-hour. Then, at about 9.00 p.m. he left, got into his car, a Fiat 127, started up and moved off. He had only gone a few metres when it stalled and stopped, the electrical system having ceased to operate. While he was still puzzled, a strange bright object, preceded by a beam of red light, landed on the road in front of him. The lower part of the object was discoidal in shape while the upper part was hemispherical and orange in colour like the colour of a priest's hat. It was so bright that it illuminated the area around it, and it appeared to be standing on the road on three iridescent beams of light varying from yellow, to green, to red, to sky blue. The object had a diameter of three metres and it covered all the carriage-way, at the same time touching a dry stone wall with one edge. It hung in the air at about the height of the Fiat 127's bonnet.

## Humanoid entities

Suddenly, on this object — presumably a UFO — a "port" opened in the fashion of a double door,

## INTRODUCTION


During 1978 there were in Italy some very interesting UFO landings, with occupants reported. The subject of Dr. Pinotti's article is a landing near Siena in Tuscany during September of that year, and it was part of an intense wave which was located principally in Central and Southern Italy. There was a massive onset of the UFO phenomenon between the 13th and 20th September, with a "peak" in the number of reports on the 14th with more than 40 incidents, and an overall total of 120 cases. (It should be noted that in this figure there are several reports of objects readily explainable as natural phenomena or man-made artifacts, reports generated no doubt by the effects of the heavy TV, radio and press coverage of the main UFO sightings and encounters.

One of these was the close encounter of the third kind with EM effects which was reported from the province of Siena. The investigation of this incident was carried out by Dr. Roberto Pinotti, the leading authority of Italian ufology and well-known to FSR readers, who also edits the excellent review *Notiziario UFO* which is devoted to ufology and astronautics. Dr. Pinotti was assisted in his investigation by Sig. Gianfranco Rudoni and by a colonel of the Italian Army.

MAURIZIO VERGA

one part to the left, the other to the right. Two beings emerged and proceeded down from the object. They were about 1.00 to 1.10 metres in height and they descended in a fluctuating motion until they were about 10 centimetres from the ground. In that position their heads were level with Rivo Faralli's face as he sat in his car, and it was this that enabled him to estimate the entities' height.

Rivo saw that they had green "coveralls" and big helmets, and that part of these helmets was transparent. The creatures' skin seemed also to be green, and while their faces were to a degree human-like, they were flat and lean with bony, arched cheeks (zygomatic), regular noses and thin lipless mouths. The witness couldn't see their eyes and ears as they were hidden in a shaded zone. The fronts of the helmets had what appeared to be two slender cylindrical protuberances like springs, or similar helical structures.




Location of the events at Torrita di Siena

Right: Santina Faralli's house

Below: Witness Rivo Faralli with his mother



**Right: Graphic reconstruction, based on Rivo Faralli's description of the UFO and entities as seen from his car.**



**Below right: The marks on the carriageway of the via Pie agli Orti.**

The overall garments seemed to be of one piece and they were neither close-fitting nor large; indeed, the shapes of their limbs were visible and their proportions appeared normal as they walked towards the car. Their gait was awkward as they encircled the vehicle. They seemed to have more interest in the car than in its owner, and when they were behind him he could still see them by way of the driving mirror. In fact Rivo noticed that their awkwardness seemed more marked. After completing the round trip they headed back for the UFO to which they ascended with the same fluctuating motion as they had displayed when descending. Once aboard, the first of them settled in the bright dome — the hemispherical section. The witness couldn't say whether the entity was sitting or standing, for he could see only its head (helmet? — CB) and part of its back. Before entering the object the second entity turned back and looked at the witness as though he wanted to say something, then checked, turned away, entered the strange craft and took position beside his companion. The port shut and from the lower part of the "body" came two very intense beams whereupon the craft rose vertically for about 10 metres, then shot away in level flight leaving a bright horizontal trail. As the UFO disappeared the headlights of the Fiat came back on, automatically, and since the gears were still engaged **the car started to move forward** without any action by Rivo Faralli. Signor Faralli had not touched the controls when the craft first appeared as he was at first stupefied and bewildered, and then almost paralyzed with terror.

For three days after the incident Rivo experienced "burning" eyes.

It was reported that in the next street, at about 9.30 p.m. on the evening of September 17, 1978, several television receivers went off for about a minute, and then returned to normal operation.



#### **Physical traces**

When I went to the scene of the landing with Gianfranco Rudoni we found some strange traces in the road. In the middle of the carriageway there was a black circle 50 cm. in diameter which appeared to have been caused by considerable heat. To the right and to the left of this mark there were two other traces of fire, one close to some bushes (see sketch map) and where there were broken stones (broken by heat?), burned and hard but very light in weight.

Two samples of soil were taken, one from the

area where the surface was scorched, the other from beyond the burnt ground. These samples, plus some blackened gravel picked up by Rivo Faralli the following day, were subjected to chemical analysis by CUN consultants in the Euratom laboratories of Ispra. Analyses of radioactivity, of fluorescence and "X and (at the carbon diration (by combustion at 1100°C with current of oxygen and measuring of the carbon dioxide)"\* were undertaken. Unfortunately the results weren't very conclusive and showed neither magnetization nor much radioactivity, other

than minute traces above the lower limit imposed by the testing equipment: the possible active residues may have been diluted by rain water. No abnormal element or compound was found; for the analysis the samples were subjected to a temperature not exceeding 500°C.

\* [As it is not clear what he means, I have left this passage in Sig. Verga's translation — and, I suspect, rearrangement — exactly as given in his manuscript — CB]

# ANOTHER CE III REPORT FROM ITALY

With some observations on the Torrita Di Siena case

Maurizio Verga

From a text supplied in English. Subedited by Charles Bowen

THANKS to some unusual characteristics the Torrita di Siena CE III case is a very interesting one. For example, there were the EM effects on Sig. Rivo Faralli's car: did the emanations from the UFO "absorb" the current delivered by the dynamo and the car battery;† was anything emitted which affected the distributor, plugs or coil as far as the running of the engine was concerned? What is strange is the report that the ignition allegedly was reactivated of its own volition and that, having been left in gear, the car started to move forward of its own accord as the UFO departed.

As far as the witness is concerned, the report seems to be reliable. Then there is the consideration that shortly before the strange encounter a bright object, the apparent size of which was less than that of the full moon, was seen in the same area. Again, three days earlier, a Signor Viero Foianesi saw in that same district, another bright flying object. A similar case took place on December 18, 1962, at 2.20 a.m. in Milan, an incident which was reported in *Il Corriere della Sera* for December 19, 1962.

## Colle del Castello CE III

The Torrita di Siena case wasn't the sole CE III case in Italy in 1978 — as FSR readers will no doubt be aware — and one of the other reports came from Colle del Castello, near San Donato di Tagliacozzo in the province of L'Aquila. At time of writing, this incident which occurred on November 14, 1978,

at about 5.00 a.m., has only been sketchily reported, and my sources are daily newspapers, particularly *Il Messaggero* of November 15, 1978. Here are the details I have collected so far:—

The witness was a Signor Giuseppe di Giovanni, a married man of serious nature aged 51, who was tending the cattle — and at the moment in question, searching for a cow which had strayed — when suddenly he saw a circular object of an estimated diameter of 5 metres, and height 1.50 metres. He said it looked like "a brown shoe-polish box," with some small windows, lying in a field.

Sig. di Giovanni approached the strange object and looked inside (presumably through one of the ports—CB) where he saw 6 or 7 "people" of human aspect. They were very small, wore green overalls, and were smiling like children — which reminds one of the Cennina landing of 1954. Two of the entities were "women," like dolls. While the "women" were blondes, the "men" were dark haired, and gave the appearance of being much older than the "women." The witness was suddenly overtaken by fear and hid himself behind a bush. He rubbed his eyes but the object "was still there." Then he closed his eyes for a minute or so, but when he re-opened them the strange object was gone.

The preceding case, that of Torrita di Siena, that of Sturno,<sup>1</sup> and those of Etna (July 4, 1978) and

*Notiziario UFO* is the official review published by the Centro Ufologico Nazionale, of which Dr. Pinotti is a director. Address of Editor Riccardo Mariotti: Casella Postale 3185, Roma, Italy.

† [Did the witness's Fiat 127 have a dynamo or an alternator? — C.B.]

Veglienza, in Ferrara (August 14, 1951) which I have described briefly in *Flying Saucer Review*<sup>2</sup> are but five of the total of more than 40 Italian CE III reports. With the exception of these and of Villa Santina of August 14, 1947<sup>3</sup> (some doubts about that case), Cennina of November 1, 1954,<sup>4</sup> Parravicino d'Erba of October 14, 1954<sup>5</sup> and Abbiate Guazzone of April 24, 1950<sup>6</sup> major sightings and encounters in Italy are not well-known in international ufological circles.\* Accordingly I am researching and preparing a catalogue of Italian observations of entities associated with unidentified flying objects. This will be quite detailed, with witnesses' sketches, and a statistical and analytical part, and when completed I trust it will be considered for publication by FSR.

\* [After a recent meeting in London between Dr. Roberto Pinotti, Edoardo Russo, Gordon Creighton and myself, it is our intention at FSR to continue to make good this omission in forthcoming issues, a process already started with the help of our old Italian friends, and our new young colleague Maurizio Verga — CB]

#### Notes

1. See "Seven scared witnesses and a Humanoid" in FSR Vol.25, No.1 (Jan.-Feb. 1979).
2. See FSR Vol.24, No.6, page 24: "Two Entity reports from Italy."
3. See *The Humanoids* Ed. Charles Bowen; Neville Spearman Ltd., London (1969); currently in paperback by Futura Publications Ltd., London.
4. S. Conti: "The Cennina landing of 1954" in FSR Vol.18, No.5 (Sept.-Oct. 1972).
5. J. Vallée: *Passport to Magonia*; Henry Regnery Co. of Chicago 1969.
6. See FSR Vol.9, No.2 (March-April 1963).

## THE DYFED ENIGMA

### UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS IN WEST WALES

by Randall Jones Pugh  
and F. W. Holiday

A history of the more dramatic manifestations of ufological activity in West Wales between 1974 and 1977 — bizarre and frightening events which involved some down-to-earth country people described and discussed by researchers who have always lived and worked in the district

Price £5.95 net

FABER & FABER LTD.,  
3 Queen Square,  
London WC1N 3AU

## PERSONAL COLUMN

### PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF RATE

£0.35 (\$0.80) per line or part, e.g. £1.20 (\$2.75) for 4 lines, and so on

WANTED: a secondhand copy of *The Dragon & the Disc* by F. W. Holiday. Please advise cost, with packaging & postage: K. C. Bayman, PO Box 23, Benoni, Transvaal, Republic of South Africa.

JOURNAL of the New England UFO study group. Quarterly, in-depth local investigations which are a microcosm of the entire UFO scene. Sample by surface mail \$1.00 US currency or \$2.00 by air. N. E. UFO News, c/o J. Nyman, 19 Longmeadow Road, Medfield, Maine 02052, U.S.A.

UFOs, famous flying saucer photograph, badge, comprehensive booklist etc. Send £1.00 to UFOs, 47, Belsize Square, London, N.W.3.

### UNIQUE IN UFO RESEARCH!

Participate in our scientific study on UFO waves occurring throughout the world. Send to the Scientific Department of SOBEPS (Belgian UFO group) your general sightings catalogue. Don't hesitate to write for fuller details. Our address is: SOBEPS, Avenue Paul Janson 74, 1070 — Brussels — Belgium.

## UFOs & SPACE AGE PUBLICATIONS

THE EDGE OF REALITY, by Dr. J. Allen Hynek £5.00

THE ROOTS OF CONSCIOUSNESS, by Jeffrey Mishlove Illust. colour £6.95

UFO OHIO YEARBOOK 1979, by Len Stringfield £2.25

APPARATION PHENOMENON. Manifest at Zeitun, Cairo, Special Page Report £3.20

LAST BATTLE FOR EARTH, by Walter Wiers. UFOs link with the Gods; Opposing forces in the heavens and Oahspe. £4.35

AN ACCOUNT OF A MEETING WITH DENIZENS OF ANOTHER WORLD 1871, by William R. Loosley £5.60

INTO THIN AIR: people who disappear, by Paul Begg £6.65

MURMURS OF THE EARTH, by Dr. Carl Sagan Illust. colour £10.70

UFOs, CRITTERS & OCCUPANTS, by J. Musgrave £3.80

THE UFONAUTS, by Prof. Hans Holzer £1.25

PEOPLES OF THE SEA, by Velikovsky £2.10

COSMIC INFLUENCES ON HUMAN BEHAVIOUR, by Michel Gauquelin £1.10

SUNGODS IN EXILE, by Karyl Robin Evans. edited by David Agamon. SECRETS OF THE DZOPA OF TIBET, £4.10

TIMEWARPS' by Dr. J. G. Gribbin £6.70

Prices include postage and packing. Dollars acceptable and other foreign currency, plus bank exchange. Booklists sent free with orders; 25p if sent separately. Prices and availability subject to change. Enquiries should enclose s.a.e.

Write to:

Miss S. R. Stebbing, 41 Terminus Drive, Beltinge, Herne Bay, Kent CT6 6PR.

# CLOSE ENCOUNTERS OF AN UNTHINKABLE AND INADMISSIBLE KIND

Gordon Creighton

THE very first issue of FSR (Spring 1955, Vol. 1, No. 1) carried on its third page an extraordinary report that had come from a man who today is well known in the world of broadcasting and television on both sides of the Atlantic. Because few readers today possess or have access to FSR No. 1, I am here reproducing the report, which appeared under the heading "Star Puzzled" in full:—

"Broadcasts reporting a flying saucer crash picked up on his car radio as he drove across America have baffled stage and radio star Hughie Green since June 1947.

"He was driving alone from Hollywood to Philadelphia for a business appointment and was tuned in to broadcasting stations most of the time ... 'because it's a long and boring trip.'

"But let Mr. Green take up the story.

"'About 250 miles out of Philadelphia,' he said, 'a commentator interrupted the programme to announce that a flying saucer had crashed in New Mexico, and that the Army were moving in to investigate.'

"'Later the programme was interrupted again, and quite a few details were given.'

"'Several newsflashes about the incident, from various radio stations, followed. The last I heard was just before reaching Philadelphia. The announcer promised further bulletins. None followed.'

"'When I got to Philadelphia I bought all the newspapers I could lay my hands on. But not one carried the story. And questions at the radio stations just drew a blank. It's mystified me ever since.'

"This is not the first time the story has been heard. But it is the first time someone who actually listened in to the transmissions has been interviewed.

"The question arising from Hughie Green's account is: '*Do the Americans have a flying saucer in their possession?*'

"Reports from America suggest that the U.S.A.F. has more than one! One — or parts of one — at Wright Patterson Field, the American Farnborough, and another at Edwards Air Force Base, the U.S. equivalent of the Ministry of Supply's experimental station at Boscombe Down.

"Flying Saucer enthusiasts all over the world believe there is some truth in the story, but that it is being as carefully guarded as any atomic or military

secret for fear of causing public panic.

"In London the Air Ministry persists in not having a clue about flying saucers. And the indications are that they would give a lot to know what they really are."

Such, then, was the intriguing Hughie Green story. It only remains for me to add that, if my memory is not at fault, Mr. Green had himself been an officer in the Royal Air Force, and so may well have been especially intrigued by the UFOs because either he or some of his friends in the Service had "seen things" themselves during World War II, or had heard rumours about other colleagues who had done so.

(FSR's first Editor, who was responsible for the selection of this extraordinarily interesting report, was of course Derek Dempster, himself also a former pilot in the Royal Air Force.)

\* \* \* \*

Let us move on now to the third issue of FSR (July/August 1955) where we find, on page 6, another fascinating story, which I also reproduce in full. This account appeared under the heading "UFO crash in Britain?"

"Has a flying-saucer crashed in Britain? This story cabled to America through the *International News Service*'s London office by Dorothy Kilgallen, a staff-correspondent on the *New York Journal-American*, indicates that one has, and that it has been examined by British scientists and airmen. Here is the account, reproduced from the *Los Angeles Examiner*:

"London, May 22: I can report today on a story which is positively spooky, not to mention chilling. British scientists and airmen, after examining the wreckage of one mysterious flying ship, are convinced these strange aerial objects are not optical illusions or Soviet inventions, but are flying saucers which originate on another planet.

"The source of my information is a British official of Cabinet rank who prefers to remain unidentified. "We believe," he said "on the basis of our enquiry thus far, that the saucers are staffed by small men — probably under four feet tall. It's frightening, but there is no denying that the flying saucers come from another planet."

"This official quoted scientists as saying a flying ship of this type could not have possibly been constructed on earth. The British Government, I learned,

is withholding an official report on the "flying saucer" examined at this time, possibly because it does not wish to frighten the public.

"When my husband (Richard Kollmer, Broadway producer and radio commentator) and I arrived here in Britain for a brief vacation, I had no premonition that I would be catapulting myself into the controversy over whether flying saucers are real or imaginary. In the United States all kinds of explanations have been advanced.

"But no responsible official of the United States Air Force has yet intimated that the mysterious flying ships had actually vaulted from outer space."

"*Flying Saucer Review* has made big efforts to get to the bottom of this account, but without success. Said the London news editor of the *International News Service*: 'We tried hard to get the source of this story, but drew a blank.'

"Was this a party hoax, an attempt by the official concerned to sound out world reaction, or is it true? The question remains unanswered for the time being."

\* \* \* \* \*

So much, then for the second intriguing little story which I have culled from the very earliest pages of FSR, pages printed a quarter of a century ago. But I can add a few further details which will not be thought devoid of interest. Firstly, as regards the identity of the very famous Englishman from whom Dorothy Kilgallen said she had got this story, I learnt later that, as indicated in the closing paragraph of her report, the conversation took place among a gathering of very distinguished guests at a cocktail party in London. As regards the identity of the titled Englishman, I had no doubt at the time as to who he was — a great leader and servant of our country who has represented us well both in one of the highest of our military posts in World War II and in the political sphere during the early post-war era. He is a man who, as Editors of FSR have always known, has taken a deep interest in the UFO problem since the beginning. A year or two later I saw a fuller account, received from a correspondent of mine in the USA, of what precisely Dorothy Kilgallen had said in her very widely syndicated newspaper column. She had described her British host as *an Englishman of Cabinet rank — a man whose name is a household word to every American.*

Dorothy Kilgallen herself, whose regular syndicated reports appeared, as I recall, in a large chain of America's regional newspapers, died a few years or so afterwards. However, as soon as I saw her UFO story I at once wrote to her, through the *International News Service*, in the hope that I might be able to winkle out of her some further scraps of intriguing information. But I never got an answer. Once again, as has happened so often, an individual who yesterday spoke out loudly and clearly today falls inexplicably silent. I never heard of any further utterances given by Dorothy Kilgallen about UFOs. I imagine that she was effectively silenced, as so many others have been over the past thirty years.

The Kilgallen report of May 22, 1955, was reproduced, as I have indicated above, in FSR, issue No. 3 (July/August 1955.) But be it noted that already, in his Editorial leader in Issue No. 2 (May/June 1955) Derek Dempster had opened with the following significant paragraphs!:-

*"Government statements on Flying Saucers have always been confusing, and the general consensus of opinion has been that officialdom was just as anxious to know the answer to the riddle as anyone else.*

*"But last month something happened which gave rise to the belief that Whitehall did in fact have the UFO answer.*

*"The Air Ministry announced that the results of a five-year probe into Flying Saucers by the Royal Air Force had been submitted to high-ranking officers, but that, for security reasons, it was never to be revealed to the public.<sup>1</sup>*

I find it remarkably strange that nobody today ever seems to remember this Editorial in FSR, or quotes from it. Clearly it has been generally forgotten — a fact for which the faceless bureaucrats in Whitehall have surely had reason, many, many times in the past quarter of a century, to be more than ordinarily grateful.

\* \* \* \* \*

We come now to FSR Vol.1, No. 4 (September/October 1955), where we find, on page 5, a report under the heading "Landed disc entered in Argentine." The report ran as follows:—

"On May 7, the Caracas, Venezuela, daily *El Universal* carried a story of an engineer's encounter with a saucer and its dead occupants in 1950.

"The engineer was driving along a road in the Bahía Blanca district of the Argentine, when he saw a metallic disc-shaped object on the ground. He stopped his car, got out, and went to investigate.

"He watched for a few moments to see what would happen, but, as all was quiet, he approached it and found a sort of curved divan with three seats, two of which were occupied by small beings covered from head to foot, except for an opening for the face, in tight-fitting overalls.

"He estimated their height to be about four feet. Their faces seemed charred and burnt. Another little creature was sprawled in a seat situated in approximately the centre of the cabin.

"In front of them was a screen with rays playing on it, and on the top of the screen was a rotating glass-like globe.

"An ungovernable impulse urged the engineer to touch one of the creatures. It felt stiff and rigid. It was then, he said, that some inner voice warned him to get out as soon as possible, as he was in the presence of 'strange life.'

"He rushed to his car, and returned to his hotel at high speed to relate his story to a few intimate friends, who returned to the scene with him on the following day.

"On reaching the spot, however, all they found was a heap of ashes<sup>2</sup> and, in the sky above them, a cigar-shaped object and two discs.

"One of the discs was hovering at an estimated height of 2,000 feet. It was about 30 ft. in diameter. The engineer took pictures of it, but of the six exposures, only two showed the craft with any degree of clarity.

"The group felt that they had been observed during their visit, for the two discs shot up, merged with the 'cigar', which, after travelling horizontally for a short distance, disappeared into space at a colossal speed."

(This report was also published by *APRO* in their Bulletin.)

Three years later, in the summer of 1958, FSR reader Peter Roe of Nottingham was good enough to send me a slightly fuller version of this same report, which gave the name of the man who had had this experience in Argentina with a crashed disc. He was, it seems, Signor Eorice Bessa, aged 44, and Italian architect, formerly a pilot in the Italian Air Force in World War II, who had since become a citizen of Argentina.

\* \* \* \* \*

My next selection from the past comes from FSR Vol. 2, No. 1 (January/February 1956) where we find, on page six, under the title *Let's Talk Space. Flying Saucers Are Real*, a highly interesting report from a Special Correspondent of FSR visiting Mexico.

The first part of the article runs as follows:-

"The United States Authorities have established that flying saucers are manned by visitors from outer space. They are trying to work out a method of breathing and staying alive in our atmosphere before landing and establishing contact.

"This statement was given to a *Flying Saucer Review* special correspondent by a top ranking American V.I.P. — a man whose name would ring millions of bells throughout the world. Here is the report.

'One morning during the summer of 1951, news reporters, news photographers and movie camera men moved into the airport at Mexico City to meet a V.I.P. from the United States. The group was gathered together, and waiting for the visitor, when somebody looked up and gave a shout. Three saucers were hovering over the airport at a height of about 5,000 feet.

'Immediately the cameras went into action, and many photographs, in colour, black and white, stills, and movies, were taken. People poured out of the waiting rooms and restaurant, and several hundred had a fine view of the saucers before they darted off at high speed in a southerly direction. The day following, the newspapers of Mexico City broke the story on their front pages, but there were no pictures. It was reported that the pictures had all been taken by the authorities, and that, after a study had been made by the Mexican

and United States authorities, they would be released for publication. So far<sup>3</sup> they have not appeared.'

"Later that summer, a highly placed American who was in touch with Air Force Intelligence and in a position to know the facts about flying saucers, admitted to *Flying Saucer Review*'s special correspondent, after trying to shrug off the Mexico City Airport incident as 'mob hysteria,' that a camera does not become hysterical, and that dozens, perhaps hundreds, of pictures were taken that day.

*"Having got that far, he revealed that it had been established that these were visitors from another planet. That they were completely friendly — their hovering over defence establishments and airports being taken to mean 'We could blow you all to bits at our leisure if we had any evil intent.' That they were undoubtedly trying to work out a method of remaining alive in our atmosphere before landing and establishing friendly communications, and that the United States authorities were completely convinced that Earth had nothing to fear from them. That the U.S. Air Force had been ordered to take no action against their craft.<sup>4</sup>*

"Asked why such emphasis had been imposed on denying their existence, and on censoring reports, the V.I.P. official — who would equal a British Cabinet Minister — said that the U.S.A. wanted her people to concentrate on the real menace, Communism; and not to be distracted by the visitors from outer space.

"He went on to say that the Orson Welles broadcast some years ago had demonstrated what reaction might be expected were the true facts generally known: a welter of hysterical nonsense, and a complete disorientation from the tasks in hand. Rumours and speculation would create an atmosphere that the skilled propagandists of the Kremlin would be sure to make the most of.

"Questioned about landings, the official admitted that there had actually been contact with the men in the saucers, and that on three occasions there had been landings which had proved disastrous to the occupants. On each of these occasions breathing the heavily oxygenated atmosphere of this Earth had literally incinerated the visitors from within and had burned them to a crisp.

"At Cuernavaca in Mexico later in the summer of 1951, flying saucers came up in a conversation between our Special Correspondent and a group of Mexican professional men. One of them, an engineer engaged in highway construction, said that he had actually helped to load a flying saucer and its dead crew into an American 'Flying Box-Car' aeroplane. The saucer, according to the engineer, had come down in an uninhabited valley in the Sierra Madre, near where his crew were working.

"'Ah, Señor,' he said, 'they were handsome, those little men, with fine features and beautifully formed tiny hands. But there must have been an explosion in their craft, for they were burnt black, and when I touched the face of one of them the

skin came off under my finger as though it had been cooked!"

\* \* \* \* \*

Such, then, was the gist of the special report from FSR's correspondent who went to Mexico in 1955 and secured a personal interview with a top-ranking American V.I.P. regarding the reality of crashed saucers containing small dead beings. But who, you may ask, was this "top-ranking American V.I.P." anyway, and why should one attribute any value whatsoever to such a tale?

The truth as to the identity of the V.I.P. can be revealed, as he is no longer in this world. I contacted FSR's Editor, Derek Dempster, immediately after reading this article in our Journal early in 1956. I asked whether he would kindly tell me, in strict confidence, who the American V.I.P. was?

*He replied that it was General George C. Marshall, America's impressive Army Chief of Staff in World War II and, subsequently, the equally brilliant Secretary of State whose name is for ever enshrined in that of the famous Marshall Plan, the unique and unparalleled act of vision and idealism whereby America was able rapidly to see the free nations of Europe on their feet once more, put them firmly on the road to economic recovery.*

\* \* \* \* \*

My recapitulation of events and reports as given in FSR of almost a quarter of a century ago has been long enough, and I am anxious to keep it down to a manageable length. But there is still one more piece of evidence to which I must refer if this extraordinary business of the early FSR reports of crashed UFOs and little dead men is to be grasped in its proper perspective.

This final piece of evidence is not merely a report, but a whole book, *Behind the Flying Saucers* by Frank Scully, an American journalist. Frank Scully was a veteran newspaperman, and his book, first published in the United States in 1950, is, so far as I am aware, probably only the second or maybe the third of all the many hundreds of books that have now been written on the UFO Phenomenon. Victor Gollancz of London produced a British edition of it in that same year, which sold out very rapidly. Gollancz had difficulty in finding a single copy when they decided they would like to re-issue the book in 1955, and this edition too was soon exhausted.

Scully's story was about an electrifying lecture, which he said had been delivered at 12.30 p.m. on March 8, 1950, before a small audience (350 students) at the University of Denver, Colorado. There was no advance publicity for the talk, which was described simply as "confidential and scientific." It was given during the lunch break, so that the students had to skip lunch to hear it. The lecturer was brought to the auditorium by a Mr. George T. Kohler of Denver, a staff member of a local independent Rocky Mountain radio station with the call

letters KMYR. As to the identity of the lecturer himself, it does not seem that anyone was over-anxious to divulge it at the time, and only after he had gone was it discovered that nobody at the University could say who he was. The local press, when reporting the lecture, simply described him as "an unidentified middle-aged lecturer." Only later, when Scully's book came out in the same year (1950) was it revealed that the lecturer was a famous businessman and personality, Silas M. Newton, a graduate of Yale, a Texan by birth, and one of the great geophysicists of the American oil industry, with a record of successful oil exploration second to none (and a millionaire as a result).

The subject of Newton's astonishing talk to the students was crashed saucers and little dead crews. Newton told his listeners that there had been, up till that date (March 1950), three of these wrecked craft found in the USA, with their dead crews, and that all three machines and the crews had been inspected by scientists with whom he himself was currently associated in geophysical research. He said that the three machines had contained a total of 34 little men measuring between 36 inches and 40 inches in height. The first saucer, said Newton, was found, "less than a year ago," at a place "within 500 miles of Denver."<sup>5</sup> It was 99.99 feet in diameter and its cabin was 18 feet wide and 6 feet high. The second machine, 72 feet wide, also contained, like the first one, 16 little dead men who, however, had seemingly not suffered from burns like the crew of the first disc, because they had fair complexions. They had no beard, apart from a fine facial down "resembling peach fuzz."

The third disc, said Newton, measured 36 feet in diameter, and contained only two little corpses. The little men had apparently been alive when it landed, but had died as they tried to emerge from the cabin.

Newton gave a vast amount of detail about the craft and the little men — far too much for me to reproduce here. He described the current theories of the American scientists, namely that the discs were *operated magnetically*, and he also related how American service personnel had succeeded in looting a great many of the smaller instruments and fittings before the authorities could put a stop to this souvenir-gathering. Those who want to see the story in detail must try to get Scully's book and read it. And that may not be easy, for, unless somebody has the sense to republish it, I predict that it will remain a rare and much-sought item. Indeed, in the light of the material already winkled out of the Pentagon by Ground Saucer Watch under the terms of the American *Freedom of Information Act*, and in the light of the revelations now made by Mr. Leonard H. Stringfield in the article *Retrievals of a Third Kind* which follows this, there may be a mad rush soon to get Scully's book — poorly written though it may be, like so much of the UFO literature.

The Scully book was dynamite, and it naturally created a sensation. It was therefore imperative that Scully be stopped in his tracks, and a feverish and powerful campaign was at once launched to damn and discredit him utterly. That campaign was 100%

successful. Today I wager that you will not find a soul anywhere who has a good word to say for Scully. An unscrupulous hoaxter, they all tell us. *They know.*

But, as Stringfield remarks, the job is now seen to have misfired somehow. For, "so completely was Scully's *UFO retrieval story* 'put down,' that some researchers today have begun to wonder, in retrospect, whether the 'exposure' was not contrived." (Leonard Stringfield, address to MUFON Symposium, July 29, 1978).

I have been in correspondence with Mr. Stringfield and we are extremely grateful to him for his permission to use in our Journal the whole of his material published thus far. In a letter dated March 13, 1979, he has informed me moreover that he has now gathered a considerable amount of further evidence since he wrote the paper which he read before the MUFON Symposium last year. He has at present statements supplied by more than fifty witnesses.

Well, they say "there's no smoke without fire." I suggest that fifty such statements must mean a powerful lot of smoke, and I suggest that the time has come for us to weigh most carefully these extraordinary claims now being made by Leonard Stringfield. It looks as though there may be a real likelihood at last that the whole cover-up will be blown sky-high. If this happens, UFO researchers everywhere will owe a great debt to Leonard Stringfield.

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

1. My italics.
2. One may deduce that the corpses had been cremated at the site, and the disc retrieved.
3. The Mexican report from FSR's Special Correspondent presumably dates from some time in 1955, four years after the alleged taking of the numerous photographs. Is it necessary for us to add that today, in 1979, there still appears to be no evidence that those pictures have ever been released for publication?
4. From what we know now about the over-all UFO situation, this idea that *all* UFO occupants are harmless to mankind would seem to be an extremely dangerous one to embrace. As to the suggestion that Air Force pilots had, or have, been ordered to take no action against UFOs, we now know that there is a mass of evidence to refute this and that airmen have lost their lives when going after UFOs. Perhaps we may conclude that in 1955 somebody in high office still *thought* that all UFOs were "friendly," but that today they know far too much to fall any more for such a naive idea.
5. This is the UFO which Leonard Stringfield says came down in 1948 at Aztec, New Mexico (Lat. 36° 49 N. Long. 108° 59 W.). Stringfield takes it to be the first of the crashed hardware, but I would point out that if Hughie Green's story is true then it cannot be the first, since Green says he heard his radio newscasts about a crashed saucer in June 1947, the same month as Kenneth Arnold's famous sighting which began it all.

## ADVERTISEMENT

# Fortean Times

The World's Foremost Journal of Strange Phenomena.

Wolf-Children & Wild Men  
Poltergeist Phenomena  
The 'Surrey Puma' & Other Exotic Aliens  
Coloured Snows & Rains  
Weather & Quake Superlatives  
Spontaneous Combustion of Humans  
Stigmata & Levitation  
Discoveries of America before Columbus  
Falls of Fish, Blood & Ice from the Sky  
People who Vanish & Others who Appear  
Mysterious Aerial Sounds  
Occult Crimes  
Impossible Objects in Ancient Strata  
Electromagnetic Enigmas  
UFOs & Related Phenomena  
Teleportations of People & Things  
Evidences of 'Little People' & Giants  
Ball Lightning & Odd Lights  
Ghosts & Apparitions  
Relics of Ancient Technology  
Cycles & Coincidences in Phenomena  
Bigfoot & Unidentified Animals  
Visions & Miracles



Strange Deaths, Murders & Accidents  
Phantom Smells & 'Mass Hysteria'  
Curious Astronomical Phenomena  
Mystery Explosions & Flashes  
Psi Powers  
Swarms & Migrations  
Curiosities of Behaviour & Psychology  
Freaks of Lightning & Meteorology  
Paranormal Experiences & Alternate Realities  
Lake & Sea Monsters  
Hoaxes & Controversies in Science  
'Hollow Earth' & Other Cosmologies  
Attacks On & By Animals  
Vampires, Werewolves & Possession  
Antiquities & Lost Continents  
Curiosities of Biology & Teratology  
Mysterious Images & Photos  
Challenges to Darwinism  
Sightings of Prehistoric Creatures  
Antiquarian Evidence of 'Spacemen'  
Unusual Darknesses  
Thought Forms & Psychotronics  
Toads in Stones

Sample 75p. Airmailed sample \$3.00.

FORTEAN TIMES(F): 9-12 St Annes Court, London W1, UK.

# RETRIEVALS OF THE THIRD KIND – Part 1

A Case Study of Alleged UFOs and Occupants in Military Custody

*Leonard H. Stringfield*

This contribution to FSR is based on a paper delivered by the author at the MUFON Symposium on July 29, 1978. © Leonard H. Stringfield (address: 4412 Grove Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45227, USA).

SINCE the advent of the UFO, dating back to World War II when there was official recognition of the "foo fighter," one hard fact stands out: the world public at large still disbelieves its existence. Another fact: most of our world's scientific community does not believe in UFOs either, although a small number of its Fellowship today will admit their puzzlement, and sometimes curiosity, over the persistence of UFO reports.

For those of us dedicated to serious UFO research, working in all professional levels, there is no doubt that a real interloper from somewhere exists! Knowing this is frustrating. Today, after 31 years of prodigious effort, our research has failed to discover, or uncover, the real nature of the UFO, its origin or intent — and I hasten to add, to force open the door of alleged official secrecy behind which may be concealed the hard evidence, or, if you will, the extraordinary and sobering *proof* we have all sought.

Today, considering the long, evasive history of the UFO, and an equally evasive official posture, our research stands at a critical crossroad. Here we find a two-way split-off, a growing and sharpening divergence of opinion about the nature and origin of the UFO.

One view entertains the notion that the UFO is a paraphysical or psychical visitant from another realm, or of another dimension, and that all the paranormal evidence reportedly associated with the UFO precludes a simple "nuts and bolts" physical explanation. This hypothesis, in the view of some researchers, rules out the interplanetary "nuts and bolts" spaceship.

The other major hypothesis, and now considered a conservative view, postulates that the UFO is a structured machine and comes from across the vast reaches of space and time from another solar system. This belief maintains that the extraterrestrial race has, by virtue of its advanced technology, overcome the problem of spatial distance and has developed great psychical powers by which it can manipulate man's mind when it sees fit to do so. Thus, in this postulation, the reported paranormal events can also be explained.\*

Of course, there are many other provocative

splinter theories, some interlacing the two major hypotheses and some radically disregarding the known facts. Theories are free, and are a dime a dozen.

In its honest endeavour to proceed down either hypothetical path, research today continues to investigate UFO reports, correlate and compute the reported data, computerize photographs, conduct conferences and symposia, and drudge over the 13,000 UFO reports released by the Air Force's former Project Bluebook which have been made available for public study at the National Archives in Washington, D.C. Therefore, it is not by accident that UFO researchers have provided for their brethren, a convenient language by which to describe events and, more specifically, a terminology so that UFO reports can be classified.

Speaking of terminology, we borrow a page from the eminent Dr. J. Allen Hynek's book *The UFO Experience, A Scientific Inquiry*. From this major work, we now have Close Encounters of the First, Second and Third Kind, which are labels covering a hypothetical set of conditions wherein the human witness observes or experiences a UFO at close range. These include physical or electromagnetic effects on a witness or his surroundings, or an encounter with a strange alien being.

Popularized by the movie of the same name, "Close Encounter of the Third Kind" has become a household name. Now anybody and everybody can share in an awareness of these rare and bizarre events. But there is another event of the Alien Third Kind. This is an event known mainly through rumour. Even knowledgeable researchers admit they know of it only from shadowy sources, and when they pursued these, they encountered sudden dead ends.

\* [The Editor of FSR and his consultants have long considered it possible that visitants from extraterrestrial — or other — regions could be capable of inducing paranormal phenomena, or of projecting images into the minds of human observers, or even of influencing or imposing controls on those observers, so creating the impression that the UFO phenomenon is of a psychic nature — C.B.]

Through patience, perseverance and careful, courteous diplomacy, I have wended my way through the many shadowy mazes and found, to my surprise, sources of light at many of the so-called dead ends. What I have learned from these sources describes events which I shall call, "Retrievals of The Third Kind."

Retrievals of The Third Kind, of course, relate primarily to the alien being. To be more precise, I refer to incidents where a UFO allegedly crashed, and both it and the occupants were retrieved by military personnel who were dispatched to the scene. According to my sources, these immobilized craft and deceased occupants, described as humanoid, have been placed in custody at certain military installations where they were studied under the highest security measures.

Now, for the first time, sufficient data have been amassed to lend support to some of the old retrieval claims. But, looking back to the 1950's, there was little or no desire then to pursue the reported claims. At that time active researchers, including myself, did little more than scoff. We thought we had good reason.

The cause of this "scoffing" was one grand hoax. Here, I refer to a book, *Behind the Flying Saucers* by the late Frank Scully, published in 1950. Briefly, it told about a reported saucer crash in Aztec, New Mexico in 1948. Scully went on to relate that a scientist he had met, had possession of metal artifacts taken from inside the craft which was proof that the saucer was from outer space. Investigation, however, revealed Scully's scientist to be a fraud. With the book's subsequent exposure as a hoax, which got a lot of publicity, it became unfashionable for any objective researcher to write or talk about crashed UFOs and their alleged "little men."

Adding fuel to the fire of a condemned book were strong Air Force denials in 1954 that a retrieved UFO was in hiding at Wright-Patterson AFB. I remember calling Lt. Colonel John O'Mara, Chief of Intelligence, at the air base, inquiring about the alleged retrievals. His reply, in part, "Ridiculous!"

So completely was Scully's retrieval story put down that some researchers today wonder, in retrospect, if the book and/or its exposure were contrived. And, despite denials and the suspicions of research, the crash and retrieval stories persisted. Then, like a bolt from the blue, while preparing the manuscript for my book, *Situation Red, The UFO Siege*, to be published by Doubleday, some new reliable sources opened up. Then, once again to my surprise, after the release of my book in 1977, still more sources surfaced to talk about what they knew. Then one by one the jigsaw pieces began to fit together and a picture emerged.

Now, I believe this is the time and certainly the place — Dayton, Ohio, and so close to Wright-Patterson AFB — that we must face this greatest of issues head-on. We must now take a new and honest look at the old rumours. And, we must also take a new look at the possibility of a grand official cover up and why.

If any one of the alleged retrieval incidents is true,

or if only one of my informants is telling the truth, then human-kind is in for a shock. *The impact of its sudden revelation — or forced admission — through official pronouncement, would probably shake up man's lifestyle, his philosophies and even his economy.*

And, if it is true that alien humanoids have been retrieved and are held in a preserved state at one or more military installations, then our government, and all consorting governments, responsible for this concealment will have to explain their policy of prolonged secrecy. We may then rightly ask what else is hidden about the UFO of a more frightening nature?

Probably following any official pronouncement of this magnitude, there would be strong public reaction. There would be demands for more hidden facts, and as always, the blame would have to be pinned onto someone, or some agency. Certainly at the top of the list would be the military establishment, and other covert intelligence agencies.

Also to blame would be the media. Where was their prowess in probing for the truth? It seems strange that some of their audacious members who helped bring down a president failed to reach the right people with the right UFO facts — or, were they, too, in certain key areas, a part of the big cover up?

And UFO research, too, can share in some of the blame. Too much disunity among the major research groups is one factor. Perhaps a more concerted action would have carried more weight at critical moments when pressures were put to bear in areas of known cover-up. Also, perhaps, too much time has been spent by influential researchers looking for a paranormal answer for the UFO. One fact has stood out for years. The average reported UFO appears to be a metallic, structured craft with windows, and, when in a landing position, sometimes uses tripods. While this general description may apply to a vehicle from any other mysterious realm, it does suggest that the design is more a feat of engineering than of psychical or spiritual manifestation.

And now for an academic thought. Is it right or wise for research — or myself — to try and pry open the lid of a possible Pandora's Box? Is it not morally right to know about the crashed UFO and its alien occupants? Is there something sinister about the continuing surveillance of Earth?

And what, you may ask, is my own opinion of my informants endowed with such powerful testimony? Frankly, I cannot refute the credibility of any of my informants. They are from scattered areas, many of whom I have pursued with great effort. Knowing something about the character of each of them, suggests that none is hoaxing, and, it is difficult to believe that any one of them was a "plant," and, even if one or two were "plants," what about the others? And, I may ask, why plant the kind of information that could work against the official position which is to play down the notion of secrecy about UFOs?

It is with equal candour that I must state that I am not in a providential position to pass a positive or final judgement on the retrievals stories or on my

informants. On this tenuous ground I must allow for some marginal error in observation or tiny flaw in human judgement for each reported account. However, let me quote an old adage: "Wherever there is smoke there is fire," and from my position I certainly can see a helluva lot of smoke!

Now, let me switch from my beliefs to yours and consider what you may think about me relative to my exposé. To help guide your appraisal, allow me to state that I personally have neither seen a retrieved UFO, nor parts of one, nor its occupants.

Also, for the record, I do not possess a single affidavit to prove that any one of my informants has seen a retrieved craft or its occupants. I have only their names and their testimony. Unfortunately, I cannot use these names. Anonymity has been requested and will be respected. The reasons should be obvious to all. In essence, therefore, the cases I present in this paper without names to back up the informant's testimony can be construed as hearsay.

If perchance hearsay is to be my undoing, then I must make my stand on the merits of my own credibility, which I trust has already been established in my 29 years of UFO research. You are the judge and jury. I will now proceed with the testimony of my informants concerning Retrievals of the Third Kind in the following abstracts:

#### ABSTRACT I: UFO down in Mexico, near Laredo, Texas


In 1948, according to reports from hazy sources, a UFO with occupants numbering anywhere from one

to sixteen, had crashed in a desert region of the South Western United States, or Mexico, and was retrieved by U.S. military authorities. But the reports never got beyond rumour because 1948 was the year when Frank Scully's book unloaded an alleged hoax on the public about a crashed UFO at Aztec, New Mexico.<sup>†</sup>

In the fall of 1977 new word of a 1948 crash came to me from a well-informed military source. His information, however, was scanty. He had heard from other "inside" military sources that a metallic disc had crashed somewhere in a desert region. His only details indicated that the craft had suffered severe damage on impact and was retrieved by military units.

By coincidence, weeks later in 1977, I was to learn more about a crashed disc occurring in 1948. This came from researcher Todd Zechel, whom I had known since 1975 when he became Research Director of Ground Saucer Watch. Formerly with the National

[ Refer to Gordon Creighton's article "Close Encounters of an Unthinkable and Inadmissible Kind" and particularly to the Section on page 11 wherein he discusses the Scully book.. I possess a Gollancz 1955 edition of the book, and in it the copyright is attributed to Frank Scully in 1950, which is also shown as the date of first publication. I can confirm too that Scully gives the date of the Denver lecture as March 8, 1950, all of which seems to conflict with Mr. Springfield's 1948 dating — EDITOR].



Security Agency, Zechel stated that an Air Force technician told him that his uncle, then a Provost Marshall at Carswell Air Force Base near Ft. Worth, Texas, had taken part in the recovery of the crashed UFO which was described as a metallic disc, 90 feet in diameter.

The crash occurred about 30 miles inside the Mexican border across from Laredo, Texas, and was recovered by U.S. troops after it was tracked on radar screens. The job assigned the Provost Marshall, now a retired colonel, was to cordon off the crash site. The retired colonel, now living in Florida, was tracked down by Zechel. Among other facts revealed by the colonel was that found aboard the craft was one dead alien described as about 4 feet, 6 inches tall, completely hairless, with hands that had no thumbs.

Zechel learned from his source that the troops involved in the retrieval were warned that if they said a word about the incident they would be the "sorriest people around."

Continuing his investigation, Zechel pieced together other eyewitnesses to the 1948 crash event. In his statement, Zechel relates the following: "I traced another Air Force colonel, now retired in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. He had seen the UFO in flight. He was flying an F-94 fighter out of Dias Air Force base in Texas, and was over Albuquerque, New Mexico, when reports came of a UFO on the West Coast, flying over Washington State. Radars clocked its speed at 2,000 miles per hour.

"It made a 90-degree turn and flew east, over Texas. The colonel, then a captain pilot, actually saw it as it passed. Then suddenly it disappeared from radar screens. At Dias base, the radar operators plotted its course, and decided it had crashed some 30 miles across the Mexican border from Laredo. When the captain got back to base, he and a fellow pilot got into a small plane and took off over the border after the UFO. When they landed in the desert at the crash site, U.S. troops were there before them.

"The craft was covered with a canopy, and the two pilots were not allowed to see it. They were then called to Washington, D.C. for debriefing and sworn to secrecy about the whole event."

Zechel also traced a U.S. naval intelligence officer who was in Mexico City at the time of the crash. He was rushed to the spot, but got there just as the craft was being loaded on to military trucks.

#### Comment

Todd Zechel related to me by phone on March 15, 1978, that additional details pertinent to this 1948 incident will be made known in his forthcoming book, *Under Intelligent Control*, to be published in 1978.

Zechel also related that he has a signed affidavit by the retired Air Force Colonel who was involved in the cordoning-off operations.

#### ABSTRACT II: Retrieval of burned-out craft with small dead bodies

1952, the year of a great wave of UFO sightings throughout the U.S.A., can also share in the history of retrieval data.

My information for one known UFO crash incident in 1952 comes from a reliable person in a technical position at a large General Electric plant. His brother, who wishes to be unnamed, was on duty as a radar specialist at Edwards Air Force Base, California, in 1952, when he saw a UFO descending toward Earth at great speed across his radar screen. When the UFO had been confirmed to have crashed, the Captain on duty gave him instructions: "You didn't see anything!"

A short time later the specialist learned from base officials that an unidentified craft did crash in a nearby remote desert area. The retrieved craft was more than 50 feet in diameter with a row of windows around its equator. Its metallic surface was in a burned-blackened condition. He also had heard that the craft was occupied by dead humanoid bodies approximately 4½ feet tall.

Also, the specialist recalls that he had heard reports that the damaged craft was held temporarily in a hangar at Edwards Air Force Base before it was shipped by truck to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

#### Comment:

I had asked my informant if I could discuss this incident with his brother, but when he checked by phone he was reminded that the incident was classified as secret and that the brother would not be in a position to disclose further details.

In possible conjunction with this 1952 event, I have talked with two sources who had witnessed a large military vehicle or lo-boy drag, with suspicious cargo under tarpaulin, destined for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. One observer was quartermaster at Godman Field, Kentucky, when the lo-boy, under heavy guard at night, made a transient stop there. Word on the base was that its hidden cargo was a crashed UFO.

Other witnesses, who had observed a strange cargo being transported on a lo-boy into Wright-Patterson AFB in 1952 were a man and his wife, then residing in Circleville, Ohio. By telephone in 1952, they claimed that while driving their car near the base that traffic was stalled. Escorting the vehicle, they said, was a motorcade of military police.

#### ABSTRACT III: Bodies of small ufonauts allegedly seen on truck entering Wright-Patterson AFB.

Additional testimony in support of a crashed UFO incident in 1952 comes from an unquestionable source: John Schuessler, Deputy Director of MUFON, and engineer for McDonnell Douglas at NASA; his data comes from his father and step-mother, who, equally unquestionable, secured their data in 1968 from an unquestionable first-hand source, who was their neighbour in a small town in Pennsylvania.

According to John Schuessler, his family's close friend was formerly a civilian guard serving at a Receiving Gate for internal security at Wright-Patterson AFB. While on duty, sometime in 1952, he witnessed a tractor with lo-boy hauling a tarpaulin-covered craft into a tight security area at the base.

The guard also had told the Schuesslers that at the

Receiving Gate he witnessed the deceased bodies recovered from the crashed UFO at a site vaguely referred to as somewhere in the U.S. Southwest.

The guard described the bodies, packed in crates, as being "little people" or humanoids. It is not known whether the bodies arrived at the same time at the base as the craft or on the lo-boy or at another time by other means. One point he did make clear to his Schuessler friends about the area in which he worked: "Everything delivered had to pass by me."

John Schuessler said he tried to follow up to get more information by arranging a meeting with the former guard through the influence of his parents. But, his efforts were futile. Said John: "He refused to talk about it, even to me."

#### Comment

The brief testimony of the Security Guard at Wright-Patterson AFB, and that of the radar specialist at Edwards AFB (cited in Abstract II) suggests that the official cover-up of vital UFO data is so great that some of it which concerns the captive craft and occupants is under a special system of files — and has always been independent of those maintained by Project Bluebook and, perhaps is *without* classification, so that even the Freedom of Information Act cannot reach them.

Probably the area in which the Security Guard had served his tenure of duty from the late 1940s to the mid-1950s, was the same as that referred to by Senator Barry Goldwater in his letter to me dated December 3, 1974, in which he stated ... "I made an effort to get into the room at Wright-Patterson where the information was stored, and I was denied that request..."

#### ABSTRACT IV: UFO control-panel symbols allegedly seen

More corroborative evidence of a crashed UFO during 1952, and/or earlier, comes from Richard Hall, now MUFON International Co-ordinator and Editor of *MUFON UFO Journal*.

When Hall served as Assistant Director of NICAP he was aware of all communications received by that group. One item received by phone came from a president of a stainless steel company, dated 1957, Coral Cables, Florida. In the same company with this businessman was Bill Nash, former Pan American Airline pilot. He was well-known in the early years of UFO research for his and co-pilot Bill Fortenberry's outstanding sighting, on July 15, 1952, of eight circular bright red UFOs manoeuvring under their aircraft.

Nash revealed by phone to NICAP that he had interviewed a young lady who had worked in Communications, Army Intelligence at a base in Arizona. The date was around 1952. She reported that for a two-week period her base was on red alert for a possible attack by UFOs. One UFO she said had landed or had been brought down and had been sent to Wright-Patterson for analysis. She added that the UFO's interior control panel showed markings or symbols. She also saw a photograph of the object but was unable to give precise details.

More on Bill Nash: In the March, 1965 issue of *Saucer News*, published monthly by James W. Mosley in Fort Lee, New Jersey, the following story told about Nash's and Fortenberry's experience during their interrogation by Air Force Intelligence following their aerial encounter with UFOs. The article, entitled "Reconsidering The Mysterious Little Men," by Keith Roberts, quotes Nash as saying: "Before the interview, Fortenberry and I had agreed to ask the Intelligence men if there was any truth behind the rumour that the Air Force had one or more saucers at Wright-Patterson Field. Bill remembered to ask, and one of the investigators answered, 'Yes, it is true!' Later, when we were all in one room, following separate de-briefings, I remembered to ask the question. All of the investigators opened the mouth at the same time to answer, but Major Sharp, who was in command, broke in with a quick 'NO!' It appeared as if he was telling the others to shut up..."

Quoting further from the *Saucer News* article, "Nash said that an unnamed informant told him that *Life* magazine had been briefed by U.S. Intelligence to the effect that the government does have crashed saucers..."

#### Comment:

First, if it is necessary to establish that Bill Nash was a Pan Am pilot who, with co-pilot Fortenberry, had a significant UFO sighting in 1952, researchers will find an account of their encounter fully recorded in an issue of *True* magazine in 1953. Also, while editor of *Orbit* in the 1950s, I had an exchange of correspondence with Bill Nash, so he is no figment of the imagination.

Incidentally, in a telephone comment to NICAP in 1957, Nash said that Pan American Airlines had asked him not to link his company with any more public statements or appearances. In reference to the young lady's disclosures about symbols, or glyphs, appearing inside the UFO, I have heard from another reliable military source in 1978 that he had seen photographs showing such markings at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

#### ABSTRACT V: Claim by radar specialist to have seen film of UFO and dead occupants

Mr. T., who holds a high technical position in civilian life today, was aged 20 in the Spring of 1953, and was a radar specialist with secret security clearance. While stationed at Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey in 1953, he and a small select number of radar specialists were summoned to view a special film at the base theatre.

Without any briefing, the 16 mm movie projector was flicked on, and the film began to roll on the screen, showing the usual flaws and scratches found in combat photography film. Suddenly, without any titles or credits, or music, there appeared a desert scene dominated by a silver disc-shaped object embedded in the sand with a domed section at the top. At the bottom was a hatch or door that was open.

In the next scene, Mr. T. recalls seeing 10 to 15

military personnel all dressed in fatigues and all without identification patches, standing around what appeared to be the disabled craft. By judging their height against the UFO, Mr. T. determined that its width was approximately 15 to 20 feet, and that an open hatch or door at the bottom was about 2½ feet wide and perhaps 3 feet high. At this point Mr. T. had no idea of the movie's purpose. I asked about the activity of the personnel? "They were just looking at the object," he said.

Then the movie switched to what appeared to be the interior of the craft. A panel with a few simple levers was shown, and he remembers being impressed by the muted pastel colours and sudden glares of white — a sign of poor photography.

Again there was a change of scene. Now in view were two tables, probably taken inside a tent, on which, to his surprise, were dead bodies. Two were on one table, and one on another.

Mr. T. said the bodies appeared small by human standards, and most notable were the heads, all looking alike, and all being large compared to their body sizes. They looked mongoloid, he thought, with small noses, mouths and eyes that were shut. He didn't recall seeing ears or hair. The skin, he said, was leathery and ashen in colour. Each wore a tight-fitting suit in a pastel colour.

The sight of the dead bodies was the end of the movie. Whereas most military movies credit the Signal Corp or some other source, this one "stopped cold," said Mr. T. When the lights came on again in the theatre, the officer in charge stood up and instructed the viewers to "think about the movie," and added firmly: "Don't relate its contents to anyone." Mr. T. said in good faith that he didn't even tell his wife who lived near the base.

To Mr. T.'s surprise, two weeks later he was approached by an Intelligence Officer on the base and told: "Forget the movie you saw; it was a hoax."

Shortly after seeing the movie he heard from a couple of top security officers on the base that a UFO had crashed in New Mexico and had been recovered with its occupants. The date of the crash was 1952, said Mr. T.

Commented my informant, "The 5-minute long movie certainly was not a Walt Disney production. It was probably shot by an inexperienced cameraman, because it was full of scratches, and had poor colouring and texture."

Mr. T., when asked about his interest in UFOs, claimed that neither then nor now was he interested, but he has always been curious about the purpose of that film in relation to his work in radar. Years later, he met an old army acquaintance who also was a radar specialist. To T.'s surprise, he learned from this man that he, too, had seen the same film at another base under the same similar hush-hush conditions.

#### Comment:

Considering the credibility status of my informant, I believe he saw the movie and describes the subject matter to the best of his recollection. Regarding the subject matter, he believes that the crashed craft and the dead bodies were *bona fide*. It would have been

difficult, even for a major Hollywood studio, to have made dummy bodies look so real for use in what was otherwise a make-shift film. And for what morbid purpose?

#### ABSTRACT VI: official investigation of crashed object; armed guard on tiny dead ufonaut

Research Director for MUFON, Raymond E. Fowler of Wenham, Massachusetts, watched incredulously as Fritz Werner signed the following affidavit, dated June 7, 1973:

"I, Fritz Werner, do solemnly swear that, during a special assignment with the U.S. Air Force on May 21, 1953, I assisted in the investigation of a crashed unknown object in the vicinity of Kingman, Arizona.

"The object was constructed of an unfamiliar metal which resembled aluminium. It had impacted 20 inches into the sand without any sign of structural damage. It was oval and about 30 feet in diameter. An entranceway hatch had been vertically lowered and opened. It was about 3½ feet high and 1½ feet wide. I was able to talk briefly with someone on the team who did look inside only briefly. He saw two swivel seats, an oval cabin, and a lot of instruments and displays.

"A tent pitched near the object sheltered the dead remains of the only occupant of the craft. It was about 4 feet tall, with dark brown complexion and it had 2 eyes, 2 nostrils, 2 ears, and a small round mouth. It was clothed in a silvery, metallic suit and wore a skull cap of the same type of material. It wore no face covering or helmet.

"I certify that the above statement is true by affixing my signature to this document on this 7th day of June, 1973.

According to Ray Fowler, a researcher of the highest credentials, here is Werner's story:

"I was project engineer on an Air Force contract with the Atomic Energy Commission for 'Operation Upshot-Knothole' at the atomic proving ground, Nevada. My job involved the measuring of blast effects on various types of buildings especially erected for the tests.

"On May 20, 1953, I worked most of the day at Frenchman Flat. In the evening, I received a phone call from the test director. Dr. Ed Doll, informing me that I was to go on a special job the next day. On the following day, I reported for special duty, and was driven to Indian Springs Air Force Base, near the proving ground, where I joined about fifteen other specialists. We were told to leave all valuables in the custody of the military police. We were then put on a military plane and flown to Phoenix, Arizona. We were not allowed to fraternize. There, we were put on a bus with other personnel, who were already there. The bus windows were blacked out so that we couldn't see where we were going. We rode for an estimated four hours. I think we were in the area of Kingman, Arizona, which is North West of Phoenix and not too far from the atomic proving

ground in Nevada. During the bus trip, we were told by an Air Force full colonel that a super-secret Air Force vehicle had crashed and that, since we were all specialists in certain fields, we were to investigate the crash in terms of our own speciality and nothing more.

"Finally, the bus stopped and we disembarked one at a time as our names were called, and were escorted by military police to the area that we were to inspect. Two spotlights were centered on the crashed object, which was ringed with guards. The lights were so bright that it was impossible to see the surrounding area. The object was oval and looked like two deep saucers, one inverted upon the other. It was about 30 feet in diameter, with convex surfaces, top and bottom. These surfaces were about twenty feet in diameter. It was constructed of a dull silver metal, like brushed aluminum. The metal was darker where the saucer 'lips' formed a rim, around which were what looked like 'slots.' A curved open hatch door was located on the leading end and was vertically lowered. There was a light coming from inside but it could have been installed by the Air Force.

"My particular job was to determine, from the angle and depth of impact into the sand, how fast the vehicle's forward and vertical velocities were at the time of impact. The impact had forced the vehicle approximately twenty inches into the sand. There was no landing gear. There were also no marks or dents, that I can remember, on the surface — not even scratches. Questions having nothing to do with our own special areas were not answered.

"An armed military policeman guarded a tent pitched nearby. I managed to glance inside at one point, and saw the dead body of a four-foot, human-like creature in a silver metallic-looking suit. The skin on its face was dark brown. This may have been caused by exposure to our atmosphere. The face was not covered but it had a metallic skull-cap device on its head.

"As soon as each person finished his task, he was interviewed over a tape recorder and escorted back to the bus. On the way back to the bus, I managed to talk briefly with someone else going back to it at the same time. He told me that he had glanced inside the object and saw two swivel-like seats, as well as instruments and displays. An airman who noticed we were talking separated us and warned us not to talk with each other.

"After we all returned to the bus, the Air Force colonel who was in charge had us raise our right hands and take an oath not to reveal what we had experienced. I was instructed to write my report in longhand and not to type or reproduce it. A telephone number was given me to call when the report was complete. I called the number, and an airman picked up the report.

Ray Fowler states that Werner held several engineering and management positions at Wright-Patterson AFB between June 1949, and January, 1960.

During that period, he worked in the Office of Special Studies of what was then the Air Material Command Installations Division. Later, he designed aircraft landing gear, and became Chief of alighting devices within the Aircraft Laboratory at Wright Air Development Center. At the time of the alleged incident, he was on assignment to the Atomic Energy Commission at the Atomic Proving Ground in Nevada.

Fowler also states that Werner told him that he sympathized with the Air Force's secret handling of the UFO problem and added that the Air Force did not know where UFOs originated. Werner also said that the Air Force believed that the UFOs were interplanetary vehicles but that they did not know how to handle the situation. They did not want to create panic.

Comments Fowler: There were some inconsistencies in Werner's story, but most of them appeared to be in the realm of memory lapses and exaggerations by the witness. Former employers that were checked held him in high esteem, and all described him as a highly competent and moral individual. Having published a number of technical papers, Werner also holds membership in the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

In Fowler's continuing evaluation he cites one piece of evidence which seems to give a strong element of truth to Werner's account. In an attempt to pin down the exact date of the alleged incident, Werner agreed to show his diary he kept in those days. On its aging pages, for May 20, 1953, it read in part: "Well, pen's out of ink. Spent most of day on Frenchman's Flat surveying cubicles and supervising welding of a (one word illegible) bridge which cracked after last shot. Got funny call from Dr. Doll at 1000. I'm going on a special job tomorrow." On May 21st, the diary read: "Up at 7.00. Worked most of day on Frenchman with cubicles. Letter from Bet. She's feeling better now — thank goodness. Got picked up at Indian Springs AFB at 4.30 p.m. for a job I can't write or talk about."

#### Comment:

In my book *Situation Red*, I cover the Werner story in full, based on my conversations with Ray Fowler. Said Fowler, "With more substantiation, it could blow the lid off secrecy." I agree. One final note: the name Fritz Werner is fictitious, but I feel that his story, although embellished, is basically true. One Intelligence source commented: "A lot of it is story."

#### ABSTRACT VII: Air Force metallurgist analysed metal of crashed UFO

Finally a name of a witness surfaces — an Air Force Major named Daly, who was a metallurgist stationed at Wright-Patterson AFB in 1953 — who relates his adventures with a crashed UFO.

The source for this information comes from fellow Cincinnati-based researcher, Charles Wilhelm. He related, in 1968, how a friend of his father was flown to an unknown destination in April 1953. The place was hot and sandy, and he was to examine the

crashed UFO. He was blind-folded and driven to a point about 30 minutes away from a base of operations. There, inside of a tent standing in soft sand, his blind-fold was removed. From there he was taken to a location where he saw a silvery metallic craft about 25 to 30 feet in diameter. The exterior of the craft, he said, was not damaged, however, his on-the-spot two-day analysis of the ship's metal, using the equipment he carried with him, showed that it was not native to Earth.

Major Daly, although he was not permitted to enter the craft, observed that the craft's entrance measured four to five feet high and two to three feet wide.

#### Comment:

Major Daly's blindfolded trip to the crash site, similar to that of Fritz Werner's, indicates that it was

common procedure for the military to use extreme security measures relative to UFO retrievals. It is to be noted that Major Daly's experience takes place in April, a month shy of Fritz Werner's which was in May of the same year. Also, to be noted is that Daly did not see any dead alien bodies. Maybe they had already been removed, or, if the craft was found undamaged, as he attested, it is possible the occupants managed to evade capture. Or, perhaps there were two crashes in a desert area in the Spring of 1953. If, however, the reports of Werner and Daly describe the same crashed UFO event, it is possible that Daly gave the wrong month.

\* \* \* \* \*

To be continued in the next issue of *Flying Saucer Review*.

## THE SUNDERLAND FAMILY ENCOUNTERS Part 2

*Jenny Randles & Paul Whetnall*

This is a UFOIN report. Classification data: July 1976 Oakenholt, Clwyd, N. Wales CE3 A Psycho, TR Level A.

IN PART 1 we related the accounts of Darren Sunderland (aged 8 in 1976) and his sister Gaynor (aged 9 in 1976) of events stated to have taken place in Clwyd in July 1976. We also gave details of the investigations — including hypnotic regression of Gaynor — and of the parts played by the *Liverpool Post* and the BBC Radio in publicising the case which only came to light in 1978. It also transpired that the Sunderlands were "repeaters."

#### Other encounters

Details of other encounter experiences came to light slowly. Gaynor, in fact, was frightened of telling about hers because she said she thought they would make her sound less believable. It was, therefore, early in 1979 before she began to talk about them. The other members of the Sunderland family were also hesitant, but then, after a couple of events had occurred, began to feel that a pattern was unfolding and began to speak about them to investigators as they happened. There are so many that little more than a brief chronology can be given here:-

**March — April 1976:** On three occasions (around 6.30 p.m.) Gaynor saw strange "stars", twice in the SE, once in the SSW, close to the area of her subsequent CE3 encounter. Basically these were orange and red lights, once spinning round. They came overhead and just vanished suddenly. The first is the most

interesting, consisting of a circle of 7 coloured lights (red, orange, green and white) that merged, hovered for 5 minutes, split apart and flew off in different directions.

**Late Sept. 1976:** Huge orange light hovering over the Dee estuary for several minutes. Gaynor glanced away for a second and when she looked back it had gone.

**July 1977:** A year after the encounter in the fields, at 9.00 p.m., Gaynor saw a large orange light, apparently over the same field. Her mother called her in, and as she started to wind up her skipping rope it just "melted away."

**Late Sept. 1978:** Two orange lights joined by a black bar over the Wirral. Moved towards her and then just vanished. Her schoolfriend nearby claims to have seen the same thing.

**Mid-Oct. 1978:** Mrs Sunderland whilst outside at 10.00 p.m., observed a pale yellow light moving slowly over the Dee towards the Wirral. She called her husband out. At first he said it was an aircraft, and then stood amazed as it split into two distinct yellow lights that flew on a parallel course for a time, then merged and sank down to land, apparently, in open country near Neston (there are no airfields anywhere in that area).

**Oct. 29, 1978:** This was a remarkable night since two encounters took place, but neither was related immediately to the other witnesses. At 9.15 p.m. Gaynor was returning from a disco with her elder

brother Carl. She saw a large orange light hovering in the SE, seemingly dancing on the hedgerows. She pointed it out to Carl, who said it was just a funny firework and turned away. She continued to watch for several more seconds before it shot off over fields.

At 10.00 p.m. Mrs Sunderland took their dog for a walk near the house. As usual, on clear nights such as this one, she took her binoculars to look at the stars. Suddenly in the SSW, near the location of Gaynor's CE3, she saw a large light. She tried, but failed to dismiss it as aircraft or star. Through binoculars it appeared as a white circle with a smaller orange circle inside. A red band, about quarter the width of the orange circle, was lying across the middle, with a break in the centre. The whole thing rotated anti-clockwise at a moderate but consistent rate. She felt isolated and hypnotically attracted to it. Eventually she broke free from the spell and rushed home, taking out her loaded camera. As she fumbled to photograph it, the sphere climbed at a 45 degree angle, hovered briefly, and as she was about to take the picture, shot away at an unbelievable speed to disappear almost instantly.

Where the object had been there remained a very faint, circular green luminescence. Twenty minutes later she went out again and it was still there. At 2.00 a.m. she got up to look for it but it had gone. Next day she contacted nearby RAF Sealand, (10 miles to the East), and she was told they had had dozens of other reports of it, but they had no idea what it was. Wishing to give us the addresses of other witnesses, she called RAF Sealand again next day. They denied all knowledge of the UFO and of other reports!

**Feb. 21, 1979:** Gaynor is very fond of animals, and they respond well to her. At 6.15 p.m. she was out walking Shep, an intelligent Welsh Border Collie owned by some friends. Suddenly he lay down, face on the floor whimpering for no apparent reason. Gaynor looked ahead and saw a bright orange ball in the SE, hovering and spinning. She glanced to the side and says she saw two entities in the gloom by bushes some 25 yards ahead. They were dressed as before, and were smiling. Shep was still whining, so thinking he was hurt she glanced down at him. When she looked up moments later the entities were gone. The light hovered for two minutes and Shep remained on the floor. Then it vanished suddenly and the dog immediately leapt up and ran home barking. Gaynor went after him, but did not tell the owners about the sighting.

**March 7, 1979:** At 10.00 a.m. Mrs Sunderland excitedly called Jenny Randles to relate an incident she said occurred at 1.50 a.m. She had awakened suddenly, for no obvious reason, and then noticed that the street light outside the window had gone out. Within seconds she heard a low rumbling noise and a brilliant white light appeared, moving slowly across her curtains, in the direction of Gaynor's bedroom. She was terrified and unable to move. Then, after only about 20 seconds, the light vanished, the noise stopped and the street light came back on. Next morning Gaynor said that she had had one of the best night's sleep she could ever recall, but had no



**Gaynor Sunderland's July 1976 encounter as illustrated on the cover of FSR Vo. 25, No. 3.**

unusual incidents or dreams to relate.

We could go on, because there are many associated encounters reported by other villagers, including a 16-year-old girl who is terrified to talk about an object she confronted on the ground one night in August 1978. This was in a field by Coed-On road. At the time of when she told this story, via a friend, there was no local knowledge of any of the Sunderland's encounters.

We also have a report, from early 1979, of a man in Shotton who was suddenly confronted by a man in a silver suit. Shotton is just 5 miles east of Oakenholt. The case is being pursued independently. We also have on file an unpublished case from July 1975 in which a couple driving in a car at a similar time in the afternoon as Gaynor's experience, and again on a sunny day like Gaynor's, were confronted by a figure in a silver one-piece suit and helmet. This creature clambered down an embankment in awkward steps. This is said to have happened at Ewloe, 4 miles east of Oakenholt!

#### Other paranormal experiences

Mrs Sunderland admitted, reluctantly, that she has had psychic experiences. These seem to be low key events involving precognitive dreams of a family nature. She said that neither Gaynor nor Darren exhibited such traits. However, we were interested in the mental picture Gaynor said she had to tell her mother, and on further questioning it was revealed that she could have potential for paranormal experiences.

On several occasions since the main CE3 she had seen mental pictures of the entities smiling (as with the February 1979 sighting). These occur when she is under stress, and she cites an instance where she was chased across a field by a strange boy. They always seem to calm her down.

She also claims to have had strange dreams on a number of occasions. These sometimes involve her being inside a UFO, with a high back chair and a row of buttons, plus the "aliens." Once she dreamed of walking past the field of her experience with her mother. She turns around to see the entities smiling and beckoning her. Beside them was a squat black "thing." At which point she awoke.

On March 24, 1979, she was babysitting at a friend's house. At 9.30 p.m. she called her mother and asked her to come over. She could only do so at 10.30. From time to time Gaynor glanced anxiously around the room, and she seemed uneasy. Suddenly, while they were talking about something else, she leapt up and sat by her mother. She regained her composure and mentioned that she had never felt happy in that house. She sensed a presence there. Then she added: "I think they are important people. Leaders, or scientists — something like that. They are important in their world. They are beautiful to their own kind. They think they are pretty. I don't think all their kind look like that. What they were doing was important to them. Do you understand?" Mrs Sunderland, was shocked but nodded in the affirmative. Gaynor instantly returned to her "old self" and never mentioned anything more about it, or them, again. She seemed as if "a weight was lifted from her mind."

In addition it should be noted that Gaynor has always had the feeling that the entities would return. However, initially she said "I am not sure if I will ever see them again." After her February 1979 sighting (the only one, incidentally, which she feels was a UFO — the others she just calls "pretty stars") she announced that she would see them again, and it would not not be long. She says that she accepts this and is not afraid, but she would like someone else to be with her to see them as well.

### Conclusions

How does one conclude a case such as this? To the investigators it has been the most fascinating case with which they have ever been involved, and indeed they are well aware of the possibility that it is not yet concluded. We think we must summarise it in three ways: 1) Darren's sighting; 2) Gaynor's sighting; 3) Other events.

### 1. Darren's sighting:-

We believe that the comments we made earlier in this report are self conclusive. There is little evidence that points to the objective reality of Darren's story. It is in an entirely different league to Gaynor's, and bears no correlation with previous UFO phenomena reported elsewhere. There are clear indications of childish fantasy and exaggeration. It is always possible that he did have a genuine experience, but there is so much of an overlay of data that can be readily explained in psychological terms that, in the realm of valuable evidence, it is really a none-starter. It should be added that Mrs Sunderland does believe Darren's story, while he still insists it is factual. However, we feel that it cannot be argued that the

stories are remotely similar (as she does) except in points which Darren has seemingly adapted to fit his sister's story. The similarity of dates may also be an illusionary thing. It is impossible to unravel the complex events that took place between the telling of the stories and their release to Terry Bellis about a month later.

However, we should remember that Darren told his story first, and it would be quite a coincidence if it were imaginary. One can always invoke the possible, but non-provable argument, that the story was implanted in Darren's mind to act as a trigger for Gaynor to release her account.

### 2. Gaynor's sighting

Gaynor's story is completely different. She was a different type of witness, one who appeared to the investigators to be a truthful and reliable girl. Six months of follow-through work did nothing to minimise their opinion. Also she maintained consistency in her account.

Apart from these points there are comparisons with other UFO events of which it is unlikely that Gaynor had any knowledge, and she brings out minor, but significant details such as the object which departed into a cloud and apparently used it as a camouflage route for escape. The hypnosis testimony, and the opinions of Joe Keeton, only strengthened our firm conviction that she has really experienced a lengthy and detailed CE3 event.

As for the dream hypothesis of Mr Keeton, we find this untenable for several reasons:-

- i) The story has no dream-like elements; there are no time breaks, contractions etc.
- ii) Under hypnosis Gaynor recalled no new data. If it had been a dream it would be unlikely she would have total waking recall of it.
- iii) The "dream" did not begin after, but *before* she laid down in the bush. She has clear recall of events prior to this, such as riding her bicycle, and the events began whilst she was still doing this.
- iv) The events did not end when she gashed her leg (which *was* a real event) but continued afterwards. She did not awake.

The investigators can propose no logical explanation for this experience, and feel that it is one of the most evidential cases of its type with which we have dealt.

As a matter of interest it should be pointed out that Gaynor's entities are of a fairly standard, but detailed, type. There are consistent factors there that she could not have "conjured up" without a major background in ufology and this she does not have. Two highly important consistencies concern both the craft and the entity's eyes, since both are mirrored in UK cases within four months, and Gaynor's unpublished story predated these. The craft, or one remarkably similar in many details, was seen by a family in Irlam, Greater Manchester, in September 1976. This was initially landed, and even the underside seen on take-off was similar. Finally the entities

# CREATING ONE'S OWN UFO

CRITIQUE OF A NEW BOOK... *UFOs: A BRITISH VIEWPOINT*

*Charles Bowen*

THERE was a time when almost everyone who paused to think positively about UFO reports finished up thinking that flying saucers, UFOs, or what you will, were machines bringing visitors from afar. Could they be travellers, explorers, from those other — suspectedly inhospitable — planets of the Solar System or, less hazardously, from inhabited planets of far-flung star systems of the galaxy, or beyond? Back in the 1940s and through to the 1960s, during the time when we all guessed we were living on the threshold of the space age, many of those who liked to consider the UFO reports wondered if the objects were space ships. After all they were reported as performing astonishing manoeuvres and — so it was whispered, when security was "leaked" — occasionally giving returns on electronic surveillance (radar) and counter measures equipment. The inference from all this was that they were metallic objects, held together with nuts, bolts and welds, and driven by sophisticated power units at present beyond the grasp of earthmen. Indeed, if some of the letters and unsolicited articles submitted to *Flying Saucer Review* are anything to go by, there must be thousands who still cling to such beliefs.

With regard to such matters *Flying Saucer Review* has always endeavoured to keep an open mind and, as we are in effect a platform for the UFO debate we have not shirked the responsibility of pointing to new channels of thought when the old ones have apparently fallen flat.<sup>1</sup> However care needs to be exercised in this process, for we dare not commit ourselves lest we find ourselves "out on a limb." Dr. Pierre Guérin's law on ufology states quite simply: "In ufology, any law is immediately falsified by subsequent sightings just as soon as it is formulated."<sup>2</sup> The authors Jenny Randles and Peter Warrington of UFO Investigators' Network (UFOIN), seem to be uneasily aware of this inescapable law in their new book *UFOs: A British Viewpoint* (published by Robert Hale, London, 249 pages, hardcover, price £5.25 net) although they seem to be unaware that it was put forward by Dr. Guérin more than 20 years ago. They appear to have committed themselves to a radically new theory although in the final chapter they belatedly push the door ajar as an escape route:—

"Perhaps real UFOs exist in addition to the... UFOs we have just postulated."

The book is a brave new work in which the authors summarize the subject, outline its position in society and the efforts made here and there by

amateurs to present ufology in a responsible manner:—

"The great problem is that UFO investigation is the province of anyone who wishes to do it. There are no qualifications in the subject, and experience is the only means of becoming proficient."

There is an excellent summing-up of media relations in which the possibilities of working together with the local press and local radio stations are discussed. These of course are rapidly growing outlets with a keen interest in items of local human interest and, as a by-product of the dissemination of news, could promote the collection of fresh information. This is, healthily, a far cry from the frantic "publicity seeking" against which FSR has railed for so long.

The authors then present their classification of UFO cases — a system extended and developed from that proposed by Dr. J. Allen Hynek — which is used in classification of UFOIN investigations. They present copious examples from their own and UFOIN's work, and from a number of other sources, all carefully referenced. Some of their re-classifications are interesting, particularly the "transient effects" of CEI. However, when we moved on to CEII I feel I must take issue with one statement. This is in Chapter 8 ("Close Encounters: 2, with Semi-permanent Effects — CEII") where, deplored the dearth of cases involving major physical effects they complain "... there are reports on record, although few seem to be of unquestionable veracity — though one or two from abroad are certainly interesting if nothing else..." That curt dismissal closes with a reference to *The Strange Case of Dr. "X"* in FSR Special Issue No. 3 of 1969 as an example. It so happens that the case of Dr. "X" (his name was withheld because he is a medical officer of health in the district where he lives in South Eastern France) involved UFO encounters for his baby son and himself, stigmata-like physical effects, spectacular healing of serious disabilities and subsequent poltergeist effects and so on. The case was investigated by that doyen of the world's researchers and thinkers on UFOs, Aimé Michel, aided by Dr. Pierre Guérin and a number of scientists of various specialities. These responsible researchers were convinced of the veracity of the case which was of the utmost interest — one of the most interesting and detailed cases ever published by FSR — and in which the after-effects on the witnesses were under surveillance for several years.<sup>3</sup>

The book thereafter progresses interestingly enough to the hub of the UFO problem by way of CE III 1 (Entity cases) and CE III 2 (Contact cases): are a number of the incidents caused by objective stimulus which creates subjective effects in the witnesses? The question remains... What is this stimulus? Randles and Warrington suggest that the studies seem to omit one factor — the percipient. Researchers, they say, have overlooked the witness, and they pose the question: Do some people have the special attributes needed to see a UFO?

To my knowledge quite a number of researchers have shown themselves to be aware of the inherent importance of the witness: the names of John Keel, Dr. E. U. Condon and Aimé Michel spring readily to mind — the latter particularly evidenced in the investigation, along with Dr. Pierre Guérin and others, in the long-continued investigation of M. Maurice Masse of Valensole. As for the "special attributes," the question as to whether or not UFO witnesses are clairvoyants (for example) was posed in FSR nearly ten years ago.<sup>4</sup> It is the authors of *UFOs: A British viewpoint* who have tried to draw all these ideas together, and have proposed a startling theory wherein they suggest that UFOs are created by the witnesses themselves, and that once created they are controlled by telekinesis. How this could be achieved is put forward in the final chapter.

Perhaps it is as well the authors leave that door ajar to ensure an escape route. I have uneasy feelings about this idea of creating one's own UFO, and must hark back to the classic case of Dr. "X", the case which the authors found "...interesting, if nothing else." In that case the prime target of the "stimulus," the controller(s) of the UFOs, the entities, or what you will, was Dr. "X" and it was he who was cured of severe disabilities. Yet he was "got at" via his baby son who was only 14 months old. It would appear to be beyond the bounds of possibility that the child could have *read* about UFOs, or even have understood anything he'd heard. (After all, the incomparable musical genius W.A. Mozart — for whom 30 of his 35 years were working years — only began to read music in his fourth year). But it was Dr. "X"'s child who, aware of the bright lights outside, called out *rho! rho!* — indicating something bright — to awaken his father. Dr. "X", aware of the bright flashes, but thinking they were lightning, decided that his baby son wanted a drink. He got water from the bathroom, settled the child and then went in search of a rattling window. Aware by then that the flashes were not lightning, he emerged from the kitchen on to a terrace, whereat two UFOs swooped down and merged into one in front of him. Thus was the encounter made, Dr. "X" was healed of a deep cut, and of partial paralysis caused by a war wound; both he and the child were afflicted thereafter by a triangular, stigmata-like rash around their navels. I cannot believe that either of these percipients created the UFOs for the other to see.

Although some of the ideas put forward will be targets for criticism, it must be stated that *UFOs: A British viewpoint* is a book in which the UFO problem is tackled boldly. It is essential reading, and its ideas should be studied in depth. There remain

a few quibbles, like the minor irritant of careless writing here and there — surely the fault of inadequate editing. Again there is the feeling that some parts have been too hurriedly prepared, and there are strange versions of the discovery, by Aimé Michel, of orthoteny, and of the nature of angel hair. Furthermore, it was unfortunate that Dr. J. Allen Hynek of "North Eastern University" should be described as astronomical consultant to the U.S. Air Force when, in fact, he was Professor of Astronomy at Northwestern University, Evanston, and Civilian Scientific Consultant to the U.S. Air Force on UFO reports.

To close, I venture to suggest that a few eyebrows will be raised by the story of contactee Gary.

#### Notes and references

1. See, for example, the Editorial article "More Beliefs" in FSR Vol.20, No.6 (1974 series), the main part of which was reprinted in the paperback book *Encounter Cases from Flying Saucer Review* edited by Charles Bowen (published by New American Library).
2. See Aimé Michel: *The Mouse in the Maze* in FSR Vol. 20, No.3 (1974)
3. See Aimé Michel: *The Strange Case of Dr. "X"* in FSR Special Issue No. 3 *UFO Percipients* (1969); also a sequel, Part 2, in FSR Vol.17, No.6 (Nov.-Dec. 1971).
4. See Charles Bowen: *UFO seen from East Ham* in FSR Vol.16, No.2 (March-April 1970).

## BOOK REVIEW: UFOs OVER LEYS?

**THE LEY HUNTER'S COMPANION** Aligned ancient sites: a new study with field guide and maps, by Paul Devereux and Ian Thomson published by Thames and Hudson 1979, £6.50, ISBN 0 500 01208 3

SINCE the concept of leys was first published in Alfred Watkins' books in the 1920s, the subject has experienced ups and downs in popularity. During the last 10 years, however, leys have caught the imagination of many, and great effort has been expended in order to upgrade the data and thus prove to the sceptical archaeological world that such an unlikely idea as aligning ancient sites should be taken seriously. Much of the credit for improving the status of leys is due to Paul Devereux, editor of *The Ley Hunter*, and now he and co-worker Ian Thomson have produced the definitive guide to leys, *The Ley Hunter's Companion*. This book not only tells you how to plot leys and study them in the field. It also gives a full, 80-page, introduction to the subject and describes 41 English leys in detail.

In case readers are wondering why a book on leys should be reviewed in FSR, the answer is that a UFO-ancient sites link is postulated in the book. As yet, the evidence linking the two is not strong; and there is no evidence to link UFOs with the actual leys. In fact my only real criticism of this book is that in the ley descriptions, the frequent references to UFO sightings might lead the reader to think that a link

between leys and UFOs is proved, whereas the sightings mentioned are sometimes not even over the ancient sites on the ley, but just in the general area. As there are so many reported sightings of UFOs in Britain each year, it is unlikely that some UFOs will pass over ancient sites; but whether this is by chance or design is as yet not known. Recent work by the Dragon Project, which is studying energy patterns at ancient sites, is providing new evidence which is exciting all who believe that UFOs are somehow connected with terrestrial energies, natural and manmade, and future publication of the Project's findings may provide more positive proof of a UFO-ancient sites link.

## BOOK REVIEW: SWIMMING AGAINST THE TIDE

*Lifetide* by Dr. Lyall Watson, published by Hodder & Stoughton, London 1979.

LYALL WATSON is an eloquent writer, a fact proven by the phenomenal success of his first book on the paranormal, *Supernature*. Fourth in this series, *Lifetide* presents what he suggests is a "more mature look at marvels." It is certainly that.

This new work is an honest attempt to examine the reason why man is a conscious animal. As usual this is written from the author's botanical and zoological background — providing illuminating insights into why man is *not* unique as a thinking, reasoning creature.

After one's ego has been shot to pieces by stories like that of 'Washo' — the chimpanzee who has been taught to speak in sign language so that it can now actually use colloquialisms — one finds that later in the book it is demonstrated that man still has more to offer than most other animals. While not denying the possibilities of "God" or "reincarnation" as fantastic explanations for weird phenomena, Dr. Watson sets out in search of explanations based more upon his own theory of consciousness development (the Lifetide), in the meantime leaning heavily on the ideas of Professor Carl Jung — whom he obviously regards as a prophet out of his time.

This approach seems laudable, and in many instances is quite successful. At the very least it sets one to thinking: "Does it have to be an exotic or incredible thing that causes paranormal occurrences?" That cannot be a bad thing.

Apart from being an illuminating book for all who are interested in the paranormal, *Lifetide* has singular interest for ufologists for Dr. Watson sets down for the first time his opinion of the UFO phenomenon. In a section, either aptly or ironically headed "Delusion," he presents a well-researched and concise summary of modern thought on the subject. For example there is this perceptive passage: "...It was probably inevitable that the inability of even the most dedicated and objective researchers to provide final, unequivocal proof of the physical existence of

Apart from UFOs, other intriguing facets of 'earth mysteries' are explored in the book, such as astro-archaeology, cosmology, folklore, dowsing, earth energies, and even evidence from the American continents. The highly readable text is enlivened by over 200 illustrations — engravings, plans, ley diagrams, maps, and photographs, including some aerial views of leys. This book is a 'must' for all who are intrigued by Britain's ancient past, and especially for those who have heard of leys and want to know what they are all about. Highly recommended.

JANET BORD

UFOs, would engender disillusion; and logical that this failure should produce a pendulum swing to more psychic solutions. But there has been the usual mindless rush for easy answers and two rival schools have come into existence, each latching onto one of the two oldest scapegoats in the mystery business, God and the Devil."

Dr. Watson appraises the work of many leaders in the field (including Gordon Creighton of FSR), and comes out with considerable favour for the views of Jacques Vallée, whom he says "rises clear and clean from the morass of ufology." It is not clear which precise solution he is proposing for UFOs. He recognises that "it is not enough to fall back on basic biological dreams and cultural clichés," since he accepts the existence of some degree of physical evidence. Evidence which, as he points out, is "never quite enough to satisfy critical scientists, and yet often just enough to keep some of them coming back for more." He feels that "this elusiveness of all the relevant phenomena may be the best clue we have to their true nature."

I was fortunate to be invited to participate in a television programme debate which coincided, early in 1979, with the publication of Lyall Watson's book. Here it was possible to find out more clearly what he thought about UFOs. I found, to my surprise, that his thoughts did not differ very markedly from my own, that the phenomenon may well stem from our own consciousness and its presently misunderstood ability to externalise into transient physical reality what is in essence a deep rooted, and much needed, human myth.

*Lifetide* is an impressive and thought-provoking work. I feel that Lyall Watson is on the track of a great truth, and is approaching ever closer to his goal with each new book. Yet I wonder whether the typical ufologist — fuelled by this very trigger for the existence of the phenomenon, human subconscious need — will accept these concepts willingly or fight bitterly against their challenge to the exotic, external reality of UFOs. The answer to that should prove very interesting.

JENNY RANDLES

# UFO "SPIES" ON A TRAFFIC JAM

Tony Faulkner

Our contributor is a police officer in Hertfordshire who came into contact with UFOIN over an investigation two years ago. He now investigates cases for the network in the local area.

Classification: March 17 1979 Hertford, Hertfordshire CE1 EM, Physio Level A

ROSINA KIRK is a 42-year-old housewife who lives in the village of Puckeridge, about 7 miles north of the county town of Hertford. It was 7.00 p.m. on a cool, dry evening with scattered cloud, and she was being driven along the A10 by-pass towards the town by Miss Valerie Wilsher, the 22-year-old girlfriend of her son. Also in the car, in the rear passenger seat, was the 20-year-old married daughter of Mrs Kirk.


They had just passed the Foxholes roundabout, not far from the centre of the town, and had hit rather a lot of traffic. In fact a bit of a jam was building up with movement rather slow. Mrs Kirk happened to glance out of the left hand window (looking WSW) and saw, to her surprise, a very strange sight at about 60 degrees elevation.

At first it just looked like a very bright star, but she was well used to seeing stars, meteors, and both aircraft and helicopters (Luton airport is ten miles to the West and this has a great deal of holiday jet traffic, especially during the Summer months). Really puzzled by the extraordinary brilliance she watched

early direction, thus passing from Mrs Kirk's left coming almost directly towards her. Seconds after this motion began she noticed that it had started to rotate. The whole object was turning in an anti-clockwise direction, as evidenced by the white lights, at a speed that she likened to a second hand sweeping around a watch.

By this time her daughter had seen the object too and was impressed. Valerie, the driver, only saw it through her mirror since she had to concentrate on the traffic, but she still saw it for some time after it had passed over and behind the car, moving off northwards. By that time it was apparently low and at an elevation where it could be seen in the mirror.

The object was coming closer and seemingly moving faster as it descended. Mrs Kirk was leaning out of the side window to watch. Her daughter in the back seat had a less clear view, but she cried out in fear "Oh, my God, it's going to come down on the car." Mrs Kirk estimated that it was not, although it



The object as seen by Rosina Kirk

it as the car crawled forward. It was definitely hovering for some time.

The outline of the light was sharply defined, and the brilliance estimated as that of a sports stadium floodlight. Apparent size was that of a ten pence piece at arms length (when asked to compare it to an artificial satellite she said "Nothing like it...this was a gigantic ball"). However, the next phase was the sudden appearance of what Mrs Kirk calls "smoke," which encircled the ball. This occurred virtually instantaneously. Although the smoke was quite distinct from the central ball this now faded, and was replaced by the appearance of four ordinary white lights.

These new lights were on the four points of the by now dim ball, with the vapour surrounding them. At this point the object started to move in a north-

Artist's impression of object seen by other witnesses

was certainly descending appreciably. Whilst leaning out she could hear no sound of an engine. It is true that they were on a busy road with their own car engine running, but she feels that due to the proximity of the UFO (and the virtual absence of wind) she would have heard a noise from an aircraft or helicopter. In any event she was as convinced as she could be that this was like nothing she had ever seen before in her life.

As it approached, two red lights appeared together on the underside. These were appreciably dimmer than the other lights, and like all the others remained steady (unlike aircraft navigation lights). As it passed over and behind the car she noticed a further feature. On the underside were four protrusions that she calls "legs." These were short and thin and coloured black. They rotated around the object with the lights.

It was at this point that the physical effects became noticeable. Mrs Kirk says that as she looked at the object flying over, her eyes "went very funny." She finds the symptom hard to describe precisely. I asked her if it was like the effect one experiences from looking at a strobe light in a disco (she was a frequenter of clubs), but she added that it was not the same. As she looked at the light all manner of different colours flashed in front of her eyes. Since this was only transitory it does not seem that it could have been an induced migraine attack. Her daughter also complained that she felt unwell, although she did not experience the lights. Valerie, the driver, could not watch for any length of time, even through the mirror, because she felt sick and dizzy. Mrs Kirk states that Valerie turned white in the face. None of these witnesses experienced any lasting effects.

The last sight that they had of the object was as it faded away — perhaps into cloud, or just the distance. All the lights had disappeared and the dim central ball faded into a small light before vanishing. Total duration of the sighting was estimated as five minutes.

A further interesting point to note is possible interference with the car. Apparently, when they were two or three miles back down the road (a few minutes before seeing the object) Valerie remarked that her headlights had dimmed appreciably. There was no actual defect, and there were no

more noticeable effects when the object came into close proximity, but the dimming may well be relevant.

Since there was a deal of traffic about Mrs Kirk felt sure that other people must have seen the object. There was some interesting support for this with a report which appeared in the *Hertfordshire Mercury* of April 6. This refers to an unnamed family who were travelling by car, and who saw an object that appears to have been very similar to that seen by Mrs Kirk. It was described as a yellowish ball that hovered at first and then moved across the road. As it passed over, a partly obscuring vapour was seen, and four red lights and two legs on top, and two on the lower part. Apparently the two women passengers in the car felt sick and experienced "misty" vision, although no effects were noticed by the two males in the car. Just before the object was sighted they apparently noted that the car lights went dim while the music faded from the cassette player that was being used at the time.

The newspaper report refers to a BUFORA investigator, Anthony Steel, who was said to be investigating this case and he likened the physiological effects to "electro-magnetic energy" and said that the women felt "heavy" as when a thunderstorm approaches.

Certainly something odd was seen by those people caught up in the traffic jam that March evening.

## SUNDERLAND FAMILY (From page 22)

bear close relationship in several respects, with those allegedly seen by Joyce Bowles and Ted Pratt at Winchester, Hants, in November 1976 (FSR Vol. 22, No. 5). The main features of comparison are the pink pupils, sandy wisps of hair, and the one-piece silver suit — there are major differences too. We should add further that there is no doubt that Gaynor's experience was in July 1976, and indeed via hypnosis we have narrowed it down to either July 17 or 24 (probably the former).

### Other events:-

One must accept that there was some involvement of psychology. Mrs Sunderland unconsciously transferred a feeling — that Gaynor says she had anyway — that more was to come, and Gaynor was under a lot of pressure during this period. Some of the subsequent events may well have been responses to this, and possibly exaggerating conventional

events. Some of the "funny stars" may well be attributed to air movements from Hawarden (Chester Airport), 9 miles East, where no service routes operate, but where the HS 125 jet is built and test flown.


Nonetheless there are encounters that are by no means easy to explain, and there is a prospect that this is only the start of a chain of events, a fact that the witnesses realise themselves. We intend to monitor progress, but to try to allow Gaynor freedom from investigators so that she may pass relatively unhindered through this important development stage of her life. The last thing she needs now is to be plagued by UFOs. It may be inevitable, but we must try not to be a catalyst at this time.

All in all the investigators found this case one of the most complex, most fascinating and probably most significant they have ever handled. It appears to offer a lot of information about the nature and operation of the UFO phenomenon.



£84  
S.A.E.  
for  
details.

ELECTRONIC FLY KILLER



PIECE FOR A JIGSAW  
by LEONARD G. CRAMP —UFO PROPULSION £5.95

HILTONS, 9 WEST HILL, DARTFORD, KENT.

UFO BOOKS  
OUR UFO  
VISITORS BY  
JONH MAGOR  
£5.95



£105  
SAE

Range or Models  
Available

# THE UFOIN CONCEPT

Jenny Randles

FLYING SAUCER REVIEW announced the formation of the new team of British Investigators, *UFO Investigators' Network* (UFOIN), in its editorial leader in the issue Volume 23, No. 2, and several times since then the magazine has carried notes about developments and progress. Each issue has also featured a number of UFOIN investigation reports (or, more correctly, summaries thereof). I welcome this opportunity from the Editor for putting into perspective the concept of UFOIN, and explaining what we are setting out to do, and why. I feel that it has merits on a wider scale, and hope that perhaps like-minded individuals elsewhere might be tempted to consider its applications in their countries.

The problem with UFO investigation, and with UFO investigation groups, is a universal one (no pun intended!). Ufology is of great interest to a wide cross-section of the populace, and beliefs, levels of involvement, and commitment vary enormously. UFO groups, and UFO publications to some extent, have to cater for this variation, and problems ensue. Through no fault of its own an organisation ends up establishing a bureaucracy to proliferate the needs of its mass membership, and valuable time and money has to be channelled into catering for these people. The result not only leads to reduction of concentration on the aims of the organisation, but also to considerable waste of effort and potential.

Another problem is that UFO investigation is a skilled job, which basically is learned by experience. Most UFO groups have to rely on a member or members investigating a case, and thus standards swing about from one extreme to the other. Many brave attempts have been made to overcome this problem, but it is one inherent in UFO group systems.

It has been suggested by several ufologists — John Rimmer, the editor of MUFOB magazine is one — that the only solution is to "disown" groups altogether and work as individuals; However, in the United Kingdom we had seen the success of a couple of local groups who had selected their membership and concentrated purely on UFOs." So late in 1976 a number of us got together to ponder whether or not we could make a similar thing work on a national scale. It was also known at the time that discussions were under way that have led recently to the formation of the Institute for UFO Studies, and that a much-needed prerequisite of this would be *consistent* and good quality data, and not a hodge-podge of material.

Consequently, UFOIN came into being. It must be pointed out that at first there was no desire to give the body a name, since it was our wish to avoid group connotations altogether. However, a majority felt that a name was necessary and this has lead to

false conceptions about the team. I will try to correct these now by explaining how the idea has functioned in its first two-and-a-half years of operation since Spring 1977 — the fruits of which have been seen in FSR.

Firstly UFOIN decided to discard *all* group attributes. In other words nobody was elected to form a committee, and every member was given equal status. It is true I was asked to be secretary, but this is purely an honorary position that involves administrative "Interim Reports" which update members on developments and new cases) and I have no authority whatsoever by virtue of this position. Not only this, but we also dispensed with cumbersome rules and regulations. In fact there is really only one rule and that is that every investigator must act objectively and in the best interests of ufology. If a majority of the membership feels that someone has brought ufology into disrepute then that person will be asked to leave after such a vote is taken at one of the twice-yearly meetings of all members. So far this has not happened, and it is to be hoped that it will not.

The second important proposal that UFOIN insisted on was that membership should only be open to capable investigators. Initially this meant inviting participation by any experienced investigator with a proven track record. Inevitably this involved many of the well-known names, like Peter Johnson, Omar Fowler, Randall Jones Pugh and so on. Several had involvements with the national groups BUFORA or CONTACT UK, being prime elements in the investigator systems. The aim was never to supersede these organisations. Principally it was to bring the "best" people together in an informal system which overcame any artificial boundaries imposed by group allegiances. This has worked well, and few found it necessary to leave their parent association or to diminish their involvement with their individual motivations. Not surprisingly, however, the groups themselves were suspicious, and viewed this concept as a "take over" of their better investigators. Co-operation was, therefore, virtually nil. However, now that suspicions are being placated by the reality of what has happened there is hope that the groups might see the advantages of the system and come formally to recognise it. There is undoubtedly scope for fruitful co-operation.

As for newcomers to the team, it was decided that we should base this on their ability to prove that

## UFOIN ADDRESS:—

Jenny Randles Secretary UFOIN,  
23 Sunningdale Drive,  
IRLAM,  
Greater Manchester M30 6NJ, England.

they could produce a detailed and unbiased report on a case. They do not become a fully-fledged member until they have provided such a report and it is published in a reputable journal, such as FSR. The standards of the work of all members are reviewed by all other members at the six-monthly meetings, and each area of the United Kingdom (UFOIN is split for this purpose into five areas) has as a co-ordinator the most experienced investigator within that region who simply acts as a guide to any newcomers. Again no authority whatsoever is invested in these positions, and the co-ordinators do not distribute news of sightings, since all members are considered equal and self-sufficient.

The third proposal that we made was that we should *concentrate* on high strangeness cases. In other words, so far as the UFOIN files are concerned, investigators are only asked to supply reports on cases that offer potential for adding to our knowledge (i.e. LITS, or medium definition cases of ordinary status, are not involved). Obviously the investigators often work for BUFORA, CONTACT, NUFON, or a local group and therefore they, or colleagues of theirs, do investigate other cases. These are therefore collated by their respective organisations. The purpose of this UFOIN specialisation is twofold. It means that we can collate detailed reports on these interesting cases, *and* it means that the UFOIN files contain just high interest material perfect for research purposes, and no "padding."

Of course there have been problems. Not everyone investigates in the same way. Some use standard report forms as a basis. Others consider these to be a restriction and prefer to take each case as it comes. However, standards have been pleasingly high with reports often made in great depth — a 30-page A4 text on one case is not unusual, and several have gone well above that level. Consequently *do not* take what you see in FSR as the UFOIN report. This is always a summary, compiled usually by the Editor or by myself from the greater detail of the report that is on file.

More recently we have decided to adopt a standardised report format, formulated by Irish researcher, John Hind, and agreed by the membership. This does not dictate how a report should be investigated, but sets out a standard method of supplying the data so that it is more amenable to research.

All the files are presently stored at the HQ of the network, which is run by the local UFO Investigation Group in Nottingham (NUFOIS).<sup>\*</sup> This is a converted house that has files neatly and individually located, with cross reference indexes. At present about 100 UFOIN files are there, and the NUFON files (well over 1000 cases) are also stored in the same room. The building also contains accommodation facilities for researchers so that, provided arrangement is made in advance, they can stay there and utilise the facil-

ties. Be warned it is no five star hotel — far from it — but that is not the aim!

As for future developments the most important one is to expand the HQ. We have set as an urgent priority the purchase of a plain paper copier (rather than a cheaper photocopier). This will enable copies of *all* UFOIN cases to be made available to any researcher at *minimum* possible cost. At present a 30-page report costs about £1.50 (plus postage) to copy, but with the copier we seek, this could be reduced to about 50p. Following this we intend to employ someone (at least part time) to run the HQ, which also has a library of books and magazines for research. A further long-term aim is the installation of computer facilities there.

One problem of aims such as these is that of finance. UFOIN is *not* a membership organisation and, other than a £5 initial "token of faith" no membership fee is requested from the participants — just their hard work! FSR do, very generously, provide a small fund which is used to cover any extraordinary expenses incurred in an investigation. The aim, of course, being to ensure that all that is possible is done on a case. In return UFOIN uses FSR as its chief vehicle for publication of the more interesting reports. Methods of raising funds are being devised, but the HQ has set up a development fund and if you feel that you are able, or would like to contribute something towards this, please contact the HQ address (see below). We are also very keen to acquire any material for the library that you might be able to spare for a wider ufological use. Particularly, of course, rare journals or books would be useful. Ultimately, where they are not available, indexes will be prepared and a project to index FSR in a *very* comprehensive fashion is already under way. (Your help would be gratefully received on this if you have older issues of FSR at your disposal.)

The UFOIN concept is still a young one, but it seems to be worthwhile. Of course it succeeds not only because it specialises, concentrates, and allows complete freedom for its members, but also because it has one *simple* aim. It does not set out to reach the public, or interest the masses, or hold meetings. It just sets out to investigate reports culled largely from local sources by its members, as well as from contacts with police stations, weather centres and such like. This is no mass membership group, and anyone who is thinking of writing to me to find out more about it should *only* do so if they feel they have the ability and dedication required. Otherwise there are two excellent mass membership organisations that do exist in Britain and you would be well advised to get in touch with them.

\* UFOIN HQ, c/o Dr Robert Morell, 443 Meadow Lane, Nottingham NG2 3GB. Any cheques, postal orders etc., should be crossed and made payable to UFO INVESTIGATORS NETWORK.

**With our magazine in its 25th year your support is as vital as ever!  
Please tell your friends about FLYING SAUCER REVIEW**

# 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 Défi 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 acrually 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 disencourage 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 CR0 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 McLeish, 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

certain this episode took place but it was censored by NASA.'

"Another Soviet space expert, Dr. Sergei Bozhich said: 'It is my opinion that beings from another civilisation picked up radio signals from earth and then spied on the Apollo landing to learn the extent of our know-how. Then they took off without making contact.'

Credit: Gordon Creighton

### Chile

#### Pilot relates sighting of UFO

This report is taken from the Chilean newspaper *La Tercera*. We are indebted to Mike Da Silva of Caracas, Venezuela, for sending the news item, and a translation thereof. Mr. Da Silva writes: "The clipping was sent to me by a friend in Santiago. Unfortunately she cut the article from the paper without realizing there was no date on it. However it must have been published sometime in June 1979." Here is the text of the report,—

"Chilean Air Force Squadron Leader Capt. Danilo Catalan Farias, Flight Instructor of area F.5.E at the Cerro Moreno Base at Antofagasta, who affirmed having seen a gigantic UFO, has now added further details about the sighting he had while on a flying mission.

"Capt. Catalan has been flying combat aircraft for 11 years, and has a brilliant service record. He says:

"We were about to conduct a flying class, and took off normally round about 12.00 noon near the coast of Antofagasta in a south-westerly direction, and going through all the routine procedures, when ground

control called to warn that a UFO had appeared on their radar. In this area there is traffic whose "fly-over" permission usually arrives later, so we are quite used to referring to these as "UFOs" or "unidentified aircraft." When we received the communication, my companion in another plane was ordered to separate from us and head north. We calculated the object was doing a good speed, about 0.92 mach, which is near the speed of sound. As my companion to the north could not overtake the object, I, who was a bit more to the south, was ordered to pursue. I accelerated to 1.3 (above the speed of sound) at a height of 37,000 feet, then on the radar I had it at 20 miles distance, and its blip was a bit bigger than a normal plane's. I continued accelerating and at some 10 miles to the south I made visual contact, but suddenly there it was — only 2 miles away. I looked and saw a cloudy form.

"A pilot, at two miles distance is accustomed to identify a plane perfectly, even at 10 miles weather conditions permitting. I began relaying to ground control what I was seeing. I was very excited as this was an unexpected experience. I was unable to define what type of apparatus this was. I tried positioning myself parallel to it and so was able to make out some kind of black triangle with two small tails. When I came to within a mile and a half of it (which was quite near) the UFO veered off and accelerated violently.

"This manoeuvre was observed on radar by ground control. I calculated that it deviated at a speed more than 3 times that of sound. At this moment I thought this must be something unreal. I used to be a disbeliever — not now."

Credit to: Sta. Maria Elena Peroni of Santiago, Chile.

### Malaysia Mysterious Prowler

From the *Bangkok Post* of August 21, 1979, we learn, in a report from Kuala Lumpur that — "ABOUT 300 students of the government-run 'Mara' Vocational Institute at Lumut, about 200 miles from here, are on an enforced holiday, because of strange happenings at the institute.

"The students were to leave for the 'Hari Raya' (Ramadan) holidays next week, but were asked to go last Friday, because of baffling occurrences during the past week.

"Some students and workers at the institute claimed that a 'hairy gorilla-like figure' had been disturbing them at the hostel.

"About three to four such cases each night between 10 p.m. and 5 a.m. have been reported. Some of the victims said they were ordered to leave the place or they would continue to be harassed.

"Some students reported that the 10 ft figure pinched them while others complained that they were also choked. The girl students were not spared either.

"When the happenings became a regular feature, the authorities requested the Government's permission to send the students home earlier.

"Sources at the institute said a 'bomoh' (indigenous medicine man) was called Sunday to 'chase' the strange figure away. He is expected to perform another ritual just before the institute reopens."

Credit: Jonathan Caplan

### FLYING SAUCER

The flying Saucer necktie was introduced in 1962 to indicate (1) a serious interest in the subject and (2) a willingness to discuss it. After a few years the tie was allowed to lapse because it was felt the subject required scientific study rather than club enthusiasm. However, now that the study of UFO reports has become worldwide we have successfully revived the tie as a token of serious scientific study for all mankind.

In 100% polyester reppe weave, with a motif of small silvery saucers, the tie is available at £2.50 (\$5.50) post free by surface mail.

LADY READERS may find the adjoining advertisement of interest

## UFO PENDANTS ULTRA FINE OBJECTS!

No sightings or close encounters? You might, when you wear the uniquely crafted **Ultra Fine Object Pendant** with genuine rhinestone settings!

18" Chain and UFO in 24KT Gold Electro Plate    18" Gold Filled Chain and UFO in 14 KT Gold  
\$10.95 ea.   **Really Special ... priced at \$111.95**

UFO and 18" Chain in Sterling Silver ... \$19.95   **Calif. Residents Add 6% Sales Tax to order**  
Please add 75c for postage and handling. \$1.00 for 3 or more items. All pendants come gift boxed!

**30 Day Satisfaction Guarantee!** Mail order to:  
**HOUSE OF GOLDEN NUGGETS** / Box 1081, Pico Rivera, CA 90660  
(Home office 8824 Mines Ave., P.R., CA)

Amount Enclosed: \_\_\_\_\_ (Check or M.O. no C.O.D.) or charge on B/A VISA or M/C

Mail your Order Today!

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. \_\_\_\_\_  
 VISA    M/C Date. \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ Card No \_\_\_\_\_

City/State \_\_\_\_\_ Interbank No. \_\_\_\_\_

Zip. \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_