

we objectively see now is a vague shape in the sky behind the girl's head. With subjective vision this becomes the top half of a spacesuit-clad figure.

Such a wish to believe pervades this book. It also contains some small but niggling errors in names and book titles, even foreword-writer Colin Wilson is not free from error. The Reverend Donald Omand was **not** trying to rid Loch Ness of the monster when he carried out an exorcism there (p. 13). As he wrote in a letter to us: "I never exorcised the monster, as is supposed, but Loch Ness and the land immediately round it. My reason was to overcome the spirit of evil. . ."

From these criticisms it might be supposed that we do

not favour Roberts' and Gilbertson's basic belief in the existence of UTs and the evil they engender. On the contrary, we feel that there may be more than a grain of truth in the idea. But this book fails to provide convincing evidence. It is also difficult to read in parts, Anthony Roberts being a supporter of "a rich and expressive use of literary flamboyance" (p. 53), whereas simplicity in writing, whether fact or fiction, should always be a writer's aim, if only for the sake of his readers. Paranoia is a state of mind to which the unwary ufologist can easily succumb, and this book is a lesson to UFO students to mix their studies with less heady pursuits and thereby retain a balanced outlook on life.

---

## RESEARCH REPORT — 4

### Close Encounters of the Fourth Kind

*Jenny Randles*

WHEN the movie *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* hit our screens in 1978 many people relatively unfamiliar with our subject saw the experiences epitomised therein as the ultimate in Ufology. That that is not the case, is illustrated by the recent emphasis on study of the next (and at the moment, the ultimate) kind of close encounter — code named the CE4. As an aside I might note that in my opinion the title of Mr. Spielberg's movie was a misnomer, as none of the events within it were a third kind encounter. Any sequel (and I gather one is in the pipeline) must surely not be CE3K (or 2) but CE4K. We shall see!

The Close Encounter of the Fourth Kind has several different interpretations at the moment. Coral and Jim Lorenzen use it purely for abductions, which seems fair enough. However, this definition is hardly commensurate with the true nature of the phenomenon. Abductions in reality are but a sub-class of the CE4 phenomenon. In Britain it has certainly become customary to refer to events where entities manifest inside the house (e.g. the famous Cynthia Appleton encounter . . . see *The Humanoids*), along with similar related incidents, as CE4s. Indeed I have come to utilise this terminology to apply to any case of direct interaction between witness and apparently alien entity. This distinguishes such events from the CE3, which would merely involve the *observation* of entities. I feel that such a division is the most logical in view of our growing conception of the phenomenon. Mind you, in the process I have come to discover that the CE3 is consequently much more rare than might otherwise be thought! Most sightings of entities *do* involve some degree of contact, and appear not to be accidental.

Be that as it may there is a growing trend to study the CE4 in isolation from other facets of the UFO phenomenon. This is fine, provided any possible correlations are not forgotten, since specialisation of this nature is of value in such a complex field. In physics, for example, light,

and radio waves, are in different parts of the electromagnetic-wave spectrum, as we now realise. However, there was ample justification for studying them separately, not simply because their effects and consequences are different, but also because such a breakdown facilitates overall understanding. Hence I find the modern approach worthwhile.

On October 11, 1980, NUFON sponsored a conference, on the theme of the CE4 experience, at Dr Johnson's House, Birmingham. The hosts were the local groups UFOSIS (West Midlands) and PARASEARCH (Staffordshire). I would like to discuss some of the implications of that day's events, which it seems were well appreciated by all those who attended. Indeed the crowded hall included many of the leading researchers in this aspect of British Ufology, such as Paul Deveraux, Hilary Evans, Bob Rickard, John Rimmer and Roger Sandell, in addition to the NUFON and UFOIN teams.

There was a packed programme, which is always an understandable failing at such events. One seemed to be constantly under siege from a barrage of faces, and the process is exhausting although usually quite rewarding.

First off was Kevin McClure, a principal organiser of the UFO study team of the Society for Psychological Research. His breadth of appraisal was illustrated by his study of a variety of paranormal experiences during a wave in 1904-1905 which accompanied the Welsh religious revival. Incidents which his extensive research has dug out include many typical UFO sightings, which seemed to be central to a catalytic witness (the woman who led the revival), and even featured what may be the earliest MIB experience on record! Such work unleashes a whole new dimension of the UFO mystery and makes one wonder just what else might be discovered if we widened our sights a little and dug deeper into past events. The correlation between the religious manifestations, where visions and auditory contacts occurred, and the UFO

phenomena of the time might be spurious, but the evidence that it is not is strong and certainly suggests the need for more work.

Martin Keatman, another UFOIN member, whose work has often appeared in *Flying Saucer Review*, then discussed his concept of "Acceptance Levels" as applied to the CE4. This is something other researchers have noted. Ann Druffel in a recent FSR article, for example, wrote of what she called "detail reflectivity".

Martin proposed that the UFO phenomenon (whatever that is — although he appears to suspect it is external and alien) makes contact with selected witnesses in a specific manner. It uses their own inner concepts of what alien intelligence should be like to cloak itself in a format that becomes acceptable to that person. Consequently, Martin suggests, it is not the actual sighting itself that counts. It is a waste of time to compare UFO entities by virtue of hair colour or height. Each case is unique and related to the personal concepts of the witness, although there may well be basic themes that are common to us all — just as Dr Carl Jung suggested in his work. What we ought to be looking at is the underlying message that exists within the cases. The phenomenon is apparently transferring data. How it is doing so does not matter. It may well use other methods apart from UFO CE4s, e.g. spirit messages through mediums. What does count is just what that data is.

The next paper came from Andy Collins. UFOIN member and noted researcher on cases such as the Aveley abduction.\* By speculative and controversial arguments he tried to suggest what this underlying theme might be. He explained how attempts to draw together many divergent — or seemingly divergent — "new age" revelations such as prophecies, UFO contactee messages, seance utterances, and so forth, hint at a coming world crisis and a golden age to follow. He suggested that this was the purpose of the CE4 experience (and all the others. . . the CE4 being just a modern format for a longer standing phenomenon). Naturally he was not in a position to say whether there was any objective reality behind these communications, or what their initiating source might be, but he built up a reasonably convincing argument that this "new age" philosophy had something to do with the answers.

Andy went on to introduce what for many was the highlight of the afternoon. John Day, primary witness in the Aveley abduction, had agreed to speak in public for the first time, and to be cross-examined by the audience. He related the basics of his, and the rest of his family's 1974 alleged meeting with aliens. He explained what he thought it all meant. In question time he dealt confidently with the various points put to him, and affirmed his conviction that the experience had seemed totally real. Attempts were made to draw out subjective aspects but these were not successful. On the whole it was difficult to conceive that John had not physically been taken on board a UFO — although he was just as aware of the paradoxes in his situation as were most of the audience.

---

\*[The account of the Aveley abduction will be found in FSR Vol. 23, No. 6, and Vol. 24, No. 1, of 1977 & 1978, both of which are still available — ED.]

Next came Frank Johnson, whose book *The Janos People* was published by Neville Spearman that day. This book will be reviewed shortly in FSR and as the talk was basically just a presentation of this complex CE4 case (which has considerable parallels with the Aveley abduction) I will not say other than it provoked many questions and some lively controversy.

It was my task to round off the proceedings. My paper was based on a statistical analysis of seventy CE4 cases, which I had subdivided into four categories. TYPE A involved contact which was immediately recalled; TYPE B was similar except that the contact occurred within the witness environment without standard UFO behaviour (e.g. bedroom visitor contacts) TYPE C was a typical abduction (i.e. contact which involved repressed memory), and TYPE D concerned contact by non-standard means (e.g. telepathy, or through automatic writing).

The number of cases was limited and conclusions on such a basis must be just preliminary. Of course it should be recalled that collecting seventy CE4 cases took quite a bit of effort, due to their comparative rarity, but I think that the results were most illuminating. Just a few major points were as follows:

\*The average number of witnesses per case for the CE4 was 1.30 as compared with 2.19 for a random sample of Medium Definition UFO experiences. Of the types the one with the lowest total (i.e. most subjective) was the bedroom visitor (1.16), whereas the Type C abductions had 1.62 witnesses per case.

\*There was predominance of young witnesses and 69% of the Type C abductees were in the 16-25 age bracket.

\*Type A events were evenly distributed time-wise, with significant numbers of events during the day (in contradiction to Vallée's time-law). Type B events peaked very markedly indeed at about 02.00 to 03.00 (deep sleep stages) and Type C (the abductions) occurred almost exclusively late at night (around 23.00).

There were many other points that emerged which have certainly led me on to further ideas for research, and some useful suggestions came from the audience.

On the whole I think the day was an important contribution to our understanding of the CE4 experience and, by virtue of this, our understanding of the UFO phenomenon as a whole. I would personally like to see more conferences devoted to specific topics, gathering together all the latest ideas for consideration and discussion. This is the only way we are going to progress.

\* \* \* \* \*

The proceedings of the conference are to be published; it will be announced in FSR when they are available.

\* \* \* \* \*

: If you have any research projects or results you would like promoting in this column please contact me at:

8 Whitethroat Walk, Birchwood, Warrington, Cheshire. WA3 6PQ.

# 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 if 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