

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 truth about UFOs and radar over New Zealand

Dear Sir, — I have been reading an article in your magazine [FSR Vol. 26, No. 2, 1980] by Kevin Berry on *The Kaikoura Controversy* which, unfortunately, perpetuates some inaccuracies that were introduced during the initial reporting of the incident in the newspapers.

The true facts of the "happening" on the night of December 21/22, 1978 (somewhat abridged) are as follows.

At 0025 the flight service officer at Blenheim airport rang the Air Traffic Control Centre at Wellington to enquire if they knew of any aircraft in the vicinity of Cape Campbell as they could see lights in the sky in that direction.

Wellington knew of no aircraft — (NOTE: at night all aircraft are required to notify Air Traffic Control of their intention to fly) but had targets on the radar in that direction.

Wellington checked for weather balloons, ships — some targets were positively identified as ships — but the unknown echoes still remained.

At 0050 Wellington's attention was drawn to an echo tracking S.E. from Wellington at a constant 120 kts to a position 65 miles out, where it stopped but remained "painting" on radar — even with MTI switched in.

MTI — moving target indicator — eliminates all targets from the screen except those having a radial velocity of less than 15 kts: hence puzzle number one, for the object was holding its position on radar: therefore if stationary it should not have shown, so — was it spinning maybe?

Argosy SAE piloted by John Randle took off from Blenheim for Christchurch at 0110 and on the way South saw some unusual lights in the Clarence area, which they described as single lights about the colour and intensity of a car's headlights pointing downwards, they did not see the target at 65 miles from Wellington, although this moved towards the aircraft to about 15 miles East of its position, but **did** see it on their radar.

Argosy SAF piloted by Vern Powell left Blenheim for Christchurch at 0314. The aircrew were asked by Wellington to look for the objects in the Clarence area, and saw these, but then Wellington saw the "large" target move 20 miles West towards the aircraft at 0325.30 secs. It

was seen by the pilots who described it as a massive big light — sometimes red, but mostly a brilliant white — about 2-3,000ft above them.

The aircraft levelled at 10,000ft and the light then appeared level with them. Then for the next 10 or so minutes during which the Argosy flew straight and level at 210 kts the object "paced" the aircraft 25 miles to the East of it.

Then, when 60 miles out of Christchurch, the crew saw a return on the aircraft's radar which left a trail (which when seen visually by the crew was described as intense blue-white like deep ice light) and which crossed 15 miles on their screen in 5 seconds = 180 miles per minute.

Argosy SAE left Christchurch at 0310 bound for Auckland flying the reciprocal of the Southbound route in order to "have another look."

Between Kaikoura and Clarence several radar and visual sightings of lights were made, some of which may have been fishing vessels, but some were moving at speeds of up to 130 knots.

Then at approx 0400 Wellington advised the Argosy of 5 strong targets in a line behind the aircraft, whereupon the aircraft did an orbit, and saw the lights — again described as being like car headlights — and also a powerful flash of five seconds which lit up the sea.

And that is, of necessity, a brief summary of EXACTLY what happened on the night of December 21/22, 1978.

Should any of your readers wonder about my qualifications for correcting Mr. Berry's article, I can only say that I was the Senior of the two radar controllers on duty in the Wellington Air Traffic Control Centre that night, and I must say the mood that night was such that after a while both my colleague Andy Herd and I felt "I wonder what's going to happen next!"

Should any of your readers be interested in a full narrative of both these events and those of December 31 when the UFO seen was filmed may I refer them to the book *The Kaikoura UFOs* by Neil Illingworth and Captain Startup, published by Hodder and Stoughton, which is a description of the events taken from the recollections of all of us involved, from Air Traffic Control Logbooks and radio tapes — both of which are legal documents.

It can be obtained from:—

HUYSER BOOKSHOP,
THE WILLIS STREET VILLAGE
COMPLEX,
WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND.

at a cost including surface mail of NZ\$18 (add another NZ\$7 for airmail postage).

Thank you, Best wishes
Yours sincerely

John Cordy
50 Strathmore Avenue,
Strathmore Park,
Wellington 3,
New Zealand.
November 14, 1980

P.S. I have no connections with the Huyser bookshop other than that of a customer.

Zanfretta's contamination?

Dear Sir, — May I refer to the article "Italian night-watchman kidnapped by UFO," which was published in *Flying Saucer Review*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (Spring 1980) and Mr. A. Ryan's related letter (Vol. 26, No. 3, p. 21). It is indispensable to specify that the "Zanfretta case" is still under inquiry by some Italian researchers, although the case is maintained as "egoistic" cover-up by some local ufologists. At this time, in consequence of the "delicacy" and complexity of the case, it's impossible to express any judgement on the objective reality of Zanfretta's experiences.

After the first encounter referred to by FSR in the Boccone article, it seems that Zanfretta has experienced other incidents of abduction, but very few particulars are known to us in consequence of the above-mentioned cover-up. It is true that Zanfretta's entity is quite similar to the "monster" that appeared in the old film *The Creature from the Black Lagoon* (1954), and this had already been remarked upon by some Italian UFO researchers.

It is almost certain that Zanfretta was really sincere when he related his "experiences" (even if it is really difficult to estimate the role played by "subjectivity" in his "encounters"), but there is the possibility that he has been, unconsciously, plagiarized* by the persons who have taken an interest in the case for various motives.

As already said, it is impossible, for the moment, to express any judgement on the case. I think that these exact statements are necessary to avoid

creating easy enthusiasms or wrong interpretations by the foreign researchers who cannot know the entire story of this complex and atypical abduction case.

Yours sincerely,

Paolo Toselli

Via J. dal Verme 7

15100 Alessandria, Italy.

November 10, 1980.

*[Does our correspondent mean "contaminated"? — ED]

Omission corrected

Dear Mr. Bowen, — A footnote was added to the manuscript for my article on "UFO Odours and Origins," FSR Vol. 26, No. 4: Angel's hair cannot be Nitrogen pentoxide. The vapour pressure of N_2O_5 increases from about 51mm at $0^\circ C$ to atmospheric pressure at about $30^\circ C$. Thus, N_2O_5 disappears rapidly near room temperature. Moreover, it is extremely reactive with atmospheric moisture, changing over to liquid nitric acid.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Olsen

9652 N. 31st Avenue, G7,

Phoenix, Arizona 85021,

United States of America.

December 15, 1980.

World Round-up item: "Did UFO attack oil plant?" (FSR Vol. 26, No.4)

Dear Editor, — The report [which FSR reprinted] was quoted in many Australian newspapers. A copy of the original *New Straits Times* account is enclosed, together with a Reuters statement saying that the report is a hoax.

The last line of the *New Straits Times* reads "Datuk Alagenda was not available for comment. He had previously stated that the fire was caused by a mosquito coil" (or words to that effect)*

Keep up the good work.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Hough

UFO Research,

P.O. Box 6 Lane Cove,

New South Wales 2066, Australia.

December 20, 1980.

*[I confirm that the photocopy was indecipherable at this point — ED]

The Reuters statement referred to in Dr. Hough's letter was signed by Mr. David Skinner, Chief Representative for Malaysia, and was in reply to a Mr. J. M. Brill who, presumably, had written on behalf of UFO Newsletter Service (Farish and Dyke) of Arkansas, USA who — again presumably — had sent a copy to Dr. Hough.

"... This was not a Reuter report but came from another Agency.

"I did some checking today and found out, by accident, that this story was a hoax inflicted by a person of my acquaintance on a gullible reporter that this particular person had found to be irksome. There was a fire but the UFO attack story was a definite hoax..."

On classifications of phenomena

Sir, — Lade's new definitions (FSR., Vol. 26, No. 4; p. 26) are less than helpful; moreover, he fails to give references to Hynek and to what he calls "the recent attempt" (by whom?).

"Extraterrestrial": as used by Lade begs the question; these "objects" (?) suggest different things to different people.

"Illusion" is a psychological term meaning "false perception" (forget about conjuring). A hoax is something different; namely, deliberate chicanery.

"Supernatural": a theological term misused by the ignorant to refer to paranormal phenomena. By Lade's unacceptable definition all UFOs and "Saucers" could be called "supernatural."

"Obfuscator": e.g., LADE, John M.

Yours etc.,

Manfred Cassirer

(Formerly Chairman, Physical Phenomena Committee, Society for Psychical Research.)

December 10, 1980.

Speculations on the UFO phenomenon and the Vatican

Dear Mr. Bowen, — Many UFO buffs have accused the American authorities, especially the CIA, of concealing the truth about the UFO phenomenon. Such accusations are groundless and smack of paranoia. The U.S. government is saddled with a host of other far more pressing problems. The job No.1 of the CIA is to fight its Soviet counterpart, the KGB, and not to waste its precious time and American taxpayers' money chasing an elusive parapsychical phenomenon such as the UFO which, moreover, does not constitute any danger to the United States.

It is the Vatican that maintains the ostrich-like attitude toward the UFO phenomenon. The Fatima affair (the joint appearance of the Virgin Mary and a UFO on October 13, 1917) and many other similar apparitions to date have demonstrated beyond dispute that the Marian apparitions and the UFO phenomenon are caused by one and the same Immaterial Entity which the Vatican calls "God" and I call "Parapsychical Intelligence." The Vatican must know quite a lot about the

UFO phenomenon but keeps mum for understandable reasons. The disclosure of the truth about the UFO phenomenon will deal a death-blow not only to the Catholic dogmas but to Christianity as a whole.

We must discard the false idea that the Marian apparitions symbolize something holy or sacred. Just like the UFO phenomenon, they are nothing more than a metaphysical farce staged in a masterly manner by the Parapsychical Intelligence which amuses itself by manipulating us at will. This Intelligence also entertains us with lake monsters (such as the famous Loch Ness monster), humanoids, gnomes, leprechauns, ape-man (such as Bigfoot or Snowman), men-in-black, ghost airplanes/helicopters/ships and all sorts of so-called paranormal phenomena: mediumism (Jesus Christ, Muhammad, Buddha, Uri Geller, Matthew Manning, Edgar Cayce, etc.), haunted houses, poltergeist, possession, spontaneous combustion, vampirism (such as animal mutilations), the Bermuda Triangle, miracle healing (at Lourdes, Fatima, etc.), stigmata, reincarnation, pseudo-coincidences, etc. But we humans are just too stupid to understand all these parapsychical jokes.

All religions thus rest upon very shaky foundations and will collapse like houses of cards at the slightest revelation of the Truth. Hence the sheer absurdity of religious fanaticism such as the one that convulses Northern Ireland and animates Ayatollah Khomeini as well as the born-again evangelist/creationist movement in the United States.

Your sincerely,

Julian H. Kaneko

18 rue Le Corbusier,

CH-1208 Geneva,

Switzerland.

October 2, 1980

Queries on the Theory of Relativity

Dear Sir, — With reference to Mr. Julian H. Kaneko's letter in Mail Bag. (FSR Vol. 26, No. 3), concerning his disbelief in "Retrievals of the Third Kind," I feel that the point he raises concerning interstellar travel difficulties by "nuts and bolts" spacecraft, because of Einstein's Theory of Relativity, may be worthy of further discussion. Although I am no expert in the field of physics, I would like to raise a question about the theory that, to me, does not seem to make sense. As far as I understand it, the theory implies that the closer an object approaches the velocity of light, (3×10^8 m. per sec) The greater will become its mass, until, at 3×10^8 m. per sec., this would become infinite, thus rendering it impossible to exceed, or even reach, that velocity.

I seem to recall reading some years ago

that it had been calculated that the total amount of sunlight photons falling upon the Empire State Building in New York on an average summer day would be equal in mass to about three sheets of typing paper, (approx. 10gm.) which is a very small amount. Yet, according to the Relativity Theory, it should be infinite, since the light has struck the building at the critical velocity.

Does this not mean that the theory is invalid on that point, and that the alien spacecraft could, if necessary, exceed this velocity after all?

If so, this might put it into the category of "paraphysical" phenomena, as Mr. Kaneko believes, since the time dilation effects of near-light velocities predicted by Einstein have been proved correct by the study of comparative half-life measurements of identical radioactive substances, using a centrifuge technique.

Thus, what might seem like ten thousand years on earth might seem a matter of hours or days to the interstellar astronauts, so they would, almost literally "have all the time in the world" to reach us. Maybe, if there is a flaw in my argument, Mr. Kaneko or another reader will be able to enlighten me as to what it is.

At any rate, is it really logical to automatically assume that, just because a few of these craft have crashed, they would be incapable of interstellar flight?

It is a bit like saying that the American-manned lunar flights of the late sixties and early seventies were completely foolproof. But we all recall, surely, the hazards that were faced by the crew of Apollo 13!

Yours sincerely,
Maurice G. Jackson
26 New North Road,
Attleborough, Norfolk.
October 8, 1980.

CIA cigar?

Dear Sir, — I wonder if any other FSR reader noticed an interesting article in the *Sun* newspaper a few weeks ago? Apparently the CIA admitted that the U.S.A. had a 50 to 60ft. long aircraft, which is invisible to radar, and which had flown operationally over the U.S.S.R. This left me with three interesting thoughts.

1. No longer can the USAF debunk visual sightings of UFOs should there be no radar traces to back them up;
2. Did the technology for this evolve from a crashed UFO retrieval?
3. The "Philadelphia Experiment" must surely be seen in a new light with the disclosure of this information.

Yours faithfully
I. M. Hammond
7 Eaton Road,
Boston, Lincolnshire.
October 5, 1980.

A "bash" back at Mr. Clarke

Sir, — No doubt many UFOlogists (me included) would have, with great interest tuned in to ITV on November 4, 1980, for Arthur C. Clarke's "bash" at UFOs.

Mr. Clarke's conclusion was that UFOs don't exist on the evidence that earth's radar, monitoring the skies, doesn't detect them leaving or entering our earth's atmosphere.

May I comment on this conclusion: earth's radar is not programmed to pick up such objects or else it would pick up every piece of space debris, and meteors, and the screens would be full of unwanted information, so hindering the

monitoring of the all important satellites.

Having said that, it's still possible the UFOs might not even come from outside the earth (as goes the Extraterrestrial Hypothesis — ETH); they could come from inside the earth or from secret bases on it.

Many UFOs are seen entering or leaving the water (¼ of this planet is water and who knows what goes on down there). These craft are often referred to as Unidentified Submarine Objects (USO) and it should be remembered the famous Hickson and Parker abduction took place near water.

They could even come from other dimensions or from the future, who knows.

So come on Arthur C., don't dismiss UFO's on such flimsy evidence; remember the witnesses (many of whom are highly technical people — scientists included) and the photographs and films of these objects in flight.

After all that I must say that, apart from our friend's narrow-mindedness, I found the programme interesting and enjoyable — especially the report on the Livingston, near Edinburgh, incident, involving Bob Taylor, who encountered a UFO and occupants (??) in a lonely wood.

Keep up the good work on your interesting and informative magazine.

Yours sincerely
S. Leadbetter
16 Beach Road,
Fleetwood,
Lancashire, FY7 8PT.
November 29, 1980.

THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC ENTITY AT VILLA CARLOS PA2 (Continued from page 17)

his gestures in any way feminine.

g) In the opinion of María Elodia, the entity was a "being of flesh and bone." There was nothing about him to suggest that he was a mechanical doll or a robot. He did not resemble a TV image, but something completely material that was walking along in contact with the ground.

h) The fingers of his right hand and his toes emitted small beams of light of a sort of pale blue colour. The beams did not produce a luminous aura around the end of his arms and feet, but seemed to come from his fingernails and toenails — if he had any. (If he had toenails they were of course not visible, being hidden by the one-piece garment.)

These beams of light were of a pale blue shade for a distance of up to two or three centimetres from the end of each hand or foot, i.e., in the area closest to the fingers and toes, but then assumed a whitish tinge, until at about a distance of ten or fifteen centimetres the beams were

dispersed. These light beams were permanent, not intermittent.

The left hand of the entity, which grasped the sphere, did not appear to produce these beams. For when the light of the sphere was extinguished María Elodia did not see any beams coming from that hand. But the beams of light from the feet and from the right hand remained visible right up to the entity's departure from the room.

i) On the back of the right hand the entity was wearing what looked like a sort of gauntlet covering the four fingers, leaving the thumb free (Figure 15). It was of a dark brown hue and seemed to be attached to the fourth finger by a sort of ring or handle. It looked as though made of leather and was about 10 cms wide and about 2 cms deep.

j) The entity never ceased for a single moment the to-and-fro swinging movement of his left arm bearing the

(Continued on page 30)