the *Tonina,* the mystery object was flying at a height of only 427 metres above the surface of the sea and, as stated above, at its closest point it passed at only 1.8 miles from the submarine. Not only could nobody aboard the surfaced submarine see anything, they could likewise hear nothing from the "target." At such a short distance as 1.8 miles the sound of any sort of aircraft, be it an airliner, or a jet plane, or a light aircraft, would have been loud and clear. It only remains to add that the weather at the time was fine, with clear visibility up to ten kilometres, rippling sea surface, wind five knots, and everything smooth and calm.

2. Report from the Spanish submarine *Delfín.*

This second case (and there have been others since) happened on June 11, 1980. The *Delfín* (S-61) was travelling between 4.00 and 5.00 p.m., submerged to "periscope height," and the coordinates for her position were 37° 19 N., 1° 15 W.†

She had just come up to "periscope height." Peering through the periscope, her officers and crew observed an object of ovoid or ellipsoid shape, and estimated at about 100 metres diameter. To their great astonishment, this mysterious object (seen not on radar but by the naked eye) was suspended at a height of 200 metres or so above the surface of the sea, and at an estimated distance of some eight to ten miles from the submarine. The object appeared to be metallic, shining silvery-white in the sunlight.

At the level of submersion at which the *Delfín* was operating, all that was visible of her above water was the periscope, the snorkel, and her aerials.

Official silence still maintained

Naturally this case of the *Tonina* is not the first in which a UFO has been seen on a radar screen while nobody has been able to observe it visually. The same thing has already happened to jet airliners, fighter planes, and to observers situated on the ground. It looks as though the UFOs — these "machines" . . . if "machines" they be — are simply endowed with a technology that permits them to be "camouflaged" against human sight, though not against the cold eye of the radar. On the other hand there have also occasionally been cases in which they *have* been perceived by the human eye, and in these cases — such as the case of the Spanish submarine *Delfín* — the features revealed, such as the bright metallic gleam and the absence of sound, are quite typical.

In a word, the presence of the UFOs here among us is patent, not only in our skies, and over our fields and mountains, but also over our seas.

Meanwhile, the official silence continues . . .

---

† This would put the position of the *Delfín* slightly to the east of the Cape Cabo de Gata, and about half-way between Almería and Cartagena. — G.C.

MAIL BAG

Correspondence is invited from our readers, but they are asked to keep their letters short. Unless letters give the sender's fullname 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.

Straightening the Cosmos record

Dear Sir, — Is it possible that eminent scientists are not under so strict an obligation as the rest of us to be scrupulously careful about the reported facts of a situation when it is being debated?

For example, Television viewers who recently saw Dr Carl Sagan's *Cosmos* series will have noticed that, when he came to the problem of discussing UFOs, he did so as fleetingly as one might have expected, using — if I remember correctly — only one of the much debated Heflin photographs, and the Betty and Barney Hill abduction story. (None of which, by the way, is in Sagan's book of the *Cosmos* series, so their inclusion must have been an afterthought.)

If we consult the only published version of the experiences of Mr and Mrs Hill, John G. Fuller's *The Interrupted Journey,* (British edition by Souvenir Press, London, 1980) we will see — on page 5 — what the weather was like that night:-

"It was a bright, clear night, with an almost full moon. The stars were brilliant, as they always are in the New Hampshire mountains on a cloudless night, when starshine seems to illuminate the tops of the peaks with a strange incandescence."

So it was a fine, clear night. The night of September 19, 1961, in New England.

How then does Carl Sagan show it, in his filmed re-enactment of the Betty and Barney Hill story?

He shows it all happening in a blinding, driving rainstorm, accompanied by thunder and lightning!

How would ufologists fare, I ask, if they dared to play ducks and drakes in this fashion with the reported facts?

Is it that when you are Carl Sagan, trifling considerations of this sort don't matter?

As one of France's top two or three astronomers, Dr Pierre Guérin (Maître de Recherche at the Institut d'Astrophysique and at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris) pointed out in his interview with Jean-Claude Bourret in the best-selling book which I have translated as *The Crack in the Universe* (Neville Spearman), when scientists don't want to accept the facts about UFOs they

simply refuse to look at the evidence — and that is that. *"When people don't want to accept the reality of something, there is nothing, absolutely nothing, that will convince them: every time you produce a proof, they ask for ten more."* And any sort of manipulation or distortion of the facts is quite legitimate. For *them* — but not for us.

Yours faithfully,
Gordon Creighton,
Rickmansworth,
Herts.
October 26, 1981

Birth of a new theory?

Dear Sir, — Since UFO occupants are often reported to have the appearance of young children, or, more often, foetuses, has anyone ever looked for a correlation between CEIII experiences and miscarriages or stillborns in the family of the contactees?

The concept I wish to raise is that perhaps "other-dimensionals" begin entry into our realm during the process of birth, and those that abort for some reason or another end up participating in a reality that is closely tied to the physical realm, both with regards to their own personal form, and with regard to the desire to interact with us — sort of "half-made-its," as it were. (This idea has some parallel to the catholic tradition that unborn or stillborns go into limbo.)

A simple question added to debriefing questionnaires as to recent occurrences of such an event would provide the needed statistical base to determine whether such correlation as hypothesized above exists.

Yours truly,
H. E. Puthoff, PhD,
197 Hillside Ave.,
Menlo Park, CA 94025
U.S.A.
October 5, 1981

On Dr V. Azhazha's standing

Dear Editor, — In his letter published in Vol. 27 No. 3, Mr Beck states that Mr Azhazha is an unknown on the UFO scene. Coincidentally, a friend in Canada sent me some newspaper cuttings including one from the *National Enquirer* of September 11th, 1979, which would seem to show otherwise. I quote extracts from an article on page 25, entitled:

"Scientists Reveal . . . Alien UFOs Watched Our First Astronauts on Moon," followed by ". . . A former top consultant to NASA has admitted the mind-boggling event took place during the historic mission — and was covered up.

"When the (Apollo 11) module landed at the bottom of a crater, two alien spacecraft appeared at the crater rim," revealed scientist Maurice Chatelain, formerly under contract to NASA.

"The encounter was common knowledge in NASA. But nobody has talked about it until now."

Incredibly, NASA's cover-up was so massive that the news has taken 10 years to reach the American public — and had to be first disclosed by Soviet scientists, who found out about it two years ago.

"'I am absolutely certain this episode took place,' said Dr Vladimir Azhazha, a physicist and professor of mathematics at Moscow University.

"According to our information, the encounter was reported immediately after the landing of the module.

"Neil Armstrong relayed the message to Mission Control that two large, mysterious objects were watching them after having landed near the moon module. But his message was never heard by the public — because NASA censored it.

"Buzz Aldrin even took moving pictures in colour of the UFOs from inside the module — and continued shooting after he and Armstrong went outside, according to another Soviet space scientist, Prof. Aleksandr Kazantsev.

"Dr. Azhazha says that the UFOs flew away just minutes after the astronauts came out on the moon's surface. Aldrin later carried his incredible movie back to earth — where NASA immediately put it under wraps, the professor charged.

"Dr. Azhazha — aware that his telephone interview with the *Enquirer* was being monitored by Soviet security agents — refused to identify the source of his information. But he and other Russian space experts say the encounter has been common knowledge among Soviet scientific circles for the past two years."

There is a good deal more about this event in the article, which appears over the names of Eric Faucher, Ellen Goodstein and Henry Gris, but I have quoted only the part concerning Dr (not Mr) Azhazha.

Yours faithfully,
John M. Lade,
FSR Publications Ltd.,
West Malling,
Maidstone,
Kent
November 18, 1981.

On comments by the Royal Observatory

Dear Sir, — I enclose a cutting from a local free paper. Alleged sightings in this immediate area seem extremely rare, so I am sending the report to you.

To be fair to the people at the Royal Observatory, they do not always dismiss reported sightings out of hand — I remember one some years ago that they took quite seriously, and admitted being quite unable to identify the object, or objects, seen at about 3 a.m. from the area of Battle. One theory was that the group of stationary lights was a refuelling exercise, but that was denied by the Air Force authorities. I cannot recall whether it was supposed to be R.A.F. or American Air Force planes involved, but that is probably not important.

I am sorry the cost of FSR is going up, but quite realise the necessity, and shall strive to keep up my subscription in the future.

Every good wish for increased success,

Yours truly,
(Mrs) P. M. Tustin,
Hastings,
East Sussex.

Thank you for your help, and your kind wishes, Madam. An extract from the news cutting is included in our World Round-up *feature. The incident you recall occurred during the 1967 "Flying Cross" wave, and was described briefly in FSR Vol. 13, No. 6, November-December 1967, page 3. The U.S. Air Force refuelling exercise took place elsewhere in the country. The date of the important Hastings sighting was October 25, 1967. — EDITOR.*

Azores incident: a correction

Dear Sir, — In footnote no. 3 to my article "A Gigantic 'Cigar' over the Atlantic," (FSR Vol. XXVII, No.3) I ventured to suggest that our lady reader who was once on the staff of NATO might possibly have been at fault over her dates, as our records indicated that the large "cigar" flew over Santa

Maria in the Azores on July 9, 1965, and not some years earlier than that, as she stated in her letter.

She has now contacted me again to say that our report is excellent and correct in all other details, but that her memory was not at fault, *for she was referring to a different case.* She says the event she has in mind is No.14 of the 200 cases listed by Dr. Jacques Vallée's in his study, "The Pattern behind the UFO Landings," which forms part of *The Humanoids,* edited by Charles Bowen.

Jacques Vallée's entry reads as follows:

September 20 (1954). A guard on Santa Maria Airport (Azores Islands) witnesses the landing of a craft from which emerged an individual who talked to him, but was not understood. The object took off very fast.

Our lady from NATO tells me that she was in the Azores at that time and heard a good deal about this case from the local people. Although Dr Vallée's brief account makes no mention of the size or shape of the UFO that touched down briefly at the Santa Maria Airport, she says that in fact it was tubular or cigar-shaped, but probably a great deal smaller than the thing she saw over the Atlantic, as the local press reported that the airport guard who saw it said it seemed to be about 20 or 25 metres long.

Yours truly,
Gordon Creighton,
Rickmansworth,
Herts.

Project UFOMD

Dear Sir, — I have begun a national investigation of medical injuries associated with alleged UFO close encounters in the United States. Because I expect a paucity of reports, I have decided that international invitation to other countries would secure more data.

I invite FSR to participate in this project following the guide lines enclosed. I trust you will advise your subscribers to use the address and telephone number as stated. In order to ensure a high quality of information I request that all witnesses who claim any medical "injuries" be examined by their physician. I encourage their physician to contact me accordingly. Because I am a medical doctor in the U.S. Air Force, I have (by legal advice) established a private 24 hour telephone and mail forwarding service to clearly separate myself from the Air Force. This is absolutely a private study and no address or phone number reflects the name of my employer.

Yours sincerely,
Richard C. Niemtzow, M.D.
532 Merchant Street,
Vacaville,
CA 95688
U.S.A.

Dr Niemtzow's guidelines for Project UFOMD

1. TERM: October 1, 1981 to October 1, 1983.
2. INVESTIGATOR: Richard C. Niemtzow, M.D.
3. TITLE OF PROJECT: National Investigation of Medical Injuries Associated with Alleged UFO Close Encounters.
4. RATIONALE: Following the United States Air Force Project Blue Book and the Condon Report which essentially negated the existence of unidentified flying objects, reports still continue of this phenomenon. In the majority of cases, an intense light is observed with variable geometric configurations. Curiously enough, associated with these observations are medical injuries and apparently related sequelae.

These injuries may be classified into three categories. The first category is of a temporary nature dealing with paralysis, dizziness, temporary blindness, headache, perception of odours, audio frequency sounds, and parapsychological activity. The second category deals with the more chronic effects usually associated with skin lesions, gastrointestinal disturbances, and abnormal psychological manifestations. The third category is slow healing and a return to normal health. The stigma of the experience may cause long-term life style and socio-psychological changes that may or not be tied to the medical injuries.

As a private citizen, I feel justified, based on the frequency of pathological reports associated with close encounters and the existence of excellent investigating media and experts, to undertake the acquisition of serious medical data. This information, respecting the privacy of the individual, would be evaluated and placed at the disposition of the scientific community.

Hopefully, this study will assist in a better understanding of the phenomenon as it interacts both physically and psychologically with man. It may be feasible to describe physiological mechanisms that are repetitive with the phenomenon.

5. PLAN OF RESEARCH:
SPECIFIC GOALS:
A. Investigate and assess a minimum of twelve (12) cases dealing with medical injuries as a result of UFO close encounters.
B. If possible, produce a catalogue correlating injury and the UFO mishap.

6. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND METHODS OF PROCEDURE:
A. A medical doctor of the patient's choice will interview and evaluate. Dr Niemtzow will act as a consultant to the primary physician.
B. The existing UFO organisations have the needed expertise to evaluate the non-medical data.
C. Medical Guidelines:
CLINIC EVALUATION:
Complete medical and psychiatric history.
Physical Examination (include weight)
LABORATORY TESTS:
complete blood count with differential
serum and urine electrolytes: sodium, potassium, chloride, calcium and phosphorus.
serum glucose
serum cortisol to determine 24 hour peak
urine ketones
chest x-ray
biopsies of skin lesions
photographs of external injuries

7. COMMUNICATIONS:
A. The witness must be examined by a physician of his choice immediately.
B. The "patient" must have his physician call Dr Niemtzow.
Telephone: (707) 446-5050
Mail: Richard C. Niemtzow, M.D., 532 Merchant Street, Vacaville, CA., 95688. U.S.A.
C. Please respect the anonymity of the patient in all reports. Otherwise medical legal problems will forbid the publication of medical information and the case will be excluded.
D. All cases may be published in any journal at the discretion of the field investigator.
E. Medical data will be published in the journals of organizations that endorse the study.

8. RESULTS TO DATE:
A. UFO organizations and private investigators have generated data sufficiently useful for this study.
B. No thorough medical investigation of injuries produced by the phenomenon has been attempted on a national scale.

9. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT:
This investigation may prove very fruitful in identifying the phenomenon and determining its possible detriment or benefit to the American population.

10. REPORTS:
Every three months or at the instance of a case.

11. PUBLICATIONS:
Medical information to be published in the journal of supporting UFO organizations.

12. INTERNATIONAL PARTICIPATION WELCOMED