

GROUPE DE TRAVAIL EUROPEEN
EUROPEAN WORKING TEAM
NOTICE

1982. Volume 1 - n° 3.
MARS 1982.

GESAG production - Edition Jacques BONABOT. Leopold I laan, 141. BRÜGGE, Belgium.

- * Vicente-Juan BALLESTER OLMOS.
Espana.
- * Jacques BONABOT.
Belgique.
- * Michel COSTE.
France.
- * Michel FIGUET.
France.
- * Alain GAMARD.
France.
- * Anders LILJGREN.
Sverige.
- * Jean-Luc OVERYAL.
Belgique.
- * Jenny RANGLES.
England
- * Peter ROGERSON.
England.
- * Jean-Pierre TROADEC.
France.
- * Maurizio VERGA.
Italia.

With this NOTICE we welcome Michel Figuet in our team.*
Michel is author with Jean-Louis Ruchon of Le Premier Dossier des Rencontres Rapprochées en France

Avec la présente NOTICE nous souhaitons la bienvenue à Michel Figuet.*
Avec Jean-Louis Ruchon, Michel est l'auteur du livre Le Premier Dossier des Rencontres Rapprochées en France.

- * Michel Figuet.
"Le Potier d'Étain"
Allée de Savoie ZI
F-26300 Bourg-de-Péage.
France.

Restricted diffusion. Reproduction with the author's acknowledgment.
Diffusion restreinte. Reproduction avec accord de l'auteur.

LISTING DES CAS FRANCAIS AVEC ENTITES

275 cas français avec entités sont réunis dans le présent listing. Les informations suivantes sont mentionnées:

I: type selon la classification HUMCAT*

X, cas ne répondant pas à la classification HUMCAT

?, données insuffisantes

q: qualité du cas: n négatif

d douteux

e haute crédibilité

DATE : jour, mois, année. Quand le jour, le mois ou l'année n'est pas connu avec précision, l'indication de date est précédée de la lettre A.

HOUR : heure de l'observation

LOCATION : lieu d'observation

DT : numéro du département (numéro minéralogique)

WITN.S NAME : nom du témoin principal ou nombre de témoins lorsque les noms ne sont pas connus. Le signe + signifie plusieurs témoins.

<u>Iq</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>HOUR</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>DT</u>	<u>WITN.S NAME</u>
E	- 1906	22:00	La Celle-sous-Gouzon	23	1
E	10/3	ev.ng	Chevroux	01	1
G	1921	aft.n	Canal du Nord		G.B.
E	Summer30/2	ev.ng	Valence	26	R
E	1930	21:00	Toulx-Sainte-Croix	23	B
B	03.1931	15:00	btwn Cannes & La Bocca	06	Blanc
E	1936		nr Dourdan	91	1
C	Summer1944	15:30	Toulon-sur-Arroux	71	Mme Arnoux
E	04.1945	aft.n	Renève	21	1
E	1947	day	La Javie	04	1
B	07.1947	15:00	Amfreville-la-Mi-Voie	76	Mme M. S.
C	17.02.1949	night			Bérard
Xn	20.05.1950	16:00	Cours-les-Barres	58	Melle Girard
Bn	23.07.1950	23:00	Guyancourt	78	Blondeau
C	1951	01:00	Dugny-sur-Meuse	55	+
En	1951		Lasteil	66	Bley
A	Summer1951	21:00	Beausoleil	06	S. +
C	07.1951	01:30	Courthézon	84	Monnet
B	10.04.1952	21:30	nr Nîmes	30	Rose C.
E	08.1952	06:00	Le Fauga	31	Nespolo
X	Summer1952	ev.ng	Le Vieux Moulin	03	Mme Petitjean +
C	04.09.1952		nr Autun	71	Sibranoscian
D	05.53/4	00:30	Cagnes-sur-Mer	06	Cavallo
X	25.08.1953	21:00	nr Allaire	56	Hemery +
B	04.09.1953	21:30	Tonnerre	89	Mme Deshais
?	A	1954	Nancey	71	1
A	A	1954	nr Marseille	13	4
?	A	1954			1
?	1954		Solesmes	59	1
A	02.1954	14:00	Lombez	32	Mme Jandot
B	Spring1954	02:40	nr Menton	06	B
B	Summer1954	12:45	nr La Basse-Gorce	87	Mme M.
E	Summer54/6	15:00	Château de Buron	63	D. L. V. +
B	Summer1954	21:00	Bette	23	1
C	08.1954		Galfingue	68	1
Bd	08.1954	mo.ng	nr Saint-Sauveur-la-Sagne	63	Carrière +

B	08.1954	22:30	"Montagne des Alouettes"	89 S. +
B	23.08.1954		Lugrin	74 Mme Blanc
B	10.09.1954	20:30	Mourieras	19 Mazaud
C	10.09.1954	22:30	Quarouble	59 Dewilde
A	12.09.1954	aft.n	nr Quarouble	59 1
? A	15.09.1954	night	Feurs	42 +
Bn	17.09.1954	08:30	Omont	08 Delvenne
Cn	19.09.1954	22:00	btwn Cenon & Vouneuil-sur-Vienne	86 David
Bd	19.09.1954	21:15	Oberdorf	57 Moll
B	23.09.1954	03:00	nr Moussoulens	11 Rouzeaud
Cn	24.09.1954	09:00	nr Diges	89 Mme Geoffroy +
Bd	25.09.1954	21:35	Joinville-le-Pont	94 Perret +
C	26.09.1954	14:30	Chabeuil	26 Mme Leboeuf
Cd	27.09.1954	08:40	Figeac	46 +
B	27.09.1954	aft.n	Perpignan	66 1
Dd	27.09.1954	20:30	Premanon	39 Romand +
C	28.09.1954	22:30	Saint-Amand-Montrond	18 Mercier
C	A30.09.1954	13:30	Toulouse (south suburbs)	31 1
Cn	30.09.1954	16:30	Marcilly-sur-Vienne	37 Gatey +
C	09.1954	24:00	Albias	82 Dumont
Cn	10.1954		Sinceny	02 Faisan
Bd	10.1954		Villeneuve-sur-Lot	47 Moleaner
En	10.1954	night	Walscheid	57 +
E	10.1954		Livry-sur-Seine	77 2
En	10.1954		Binic	22 +
En	10.1954		Creil	60 +
B	10.1954		Scissons	02 2
Em	10.1954	05:00	nr Metz	57 Bardou
B	10.1954	07:00	Dommartin	01 Melle Manigand
B	10.1954	19:15	Corbières	04 Pignatelli
Dn	10.1954		Melle	19 2
C	01.10.1954	18:45	btwn Crécy & Ligescourt	80 Devoisin +
B	01.10.1954	19:00	Jussey	70 2
C	01.10.1954	19:50	btwn Lormaison & St-Crépin-Ibouvillers	60 Delattre
E	01.10.1954	20:00	nr Saint-Jean-d'Angély	17 Estier +
Dd	02.10.1954	18:45	Jonches	89 Cuffaut
B	02.10.1954	22:00	Bergerac	24 Labonne
C	03.10.1954	00:15	Nivelles	59 Sénénchal
Cn	03.10.1954	05:45	Bressuire	79 Girardo
?	03.10.1954	night	Marcoing	59 Pochet
Em	04.10.1954	08:00	Saint-Perdoux	46 Lacambre
B	04.10.1954	18:00	Villers-le-Tilleul	08 Bertiaux
Bn	04.10.1954	ev.ng	Chaleix	24 Garreau
A	04.10.1954	22:00	Mégrit	22 Leherisse
B	05.10.1954	04:00	Loctudy	29 Lucas
Bn	05.10.1954	07:15	Mertrud	52 Nancy, Oldut
Cn	06.10.1954	00:30	nr Isles-sur-Suipe	51 Roy
B	06.10.1954	23:30	Cozes	17 1
Bn	07.10.1954	mo.ng	Mendionde	64 Guesurtia
B	07.10.1954	18:30	Hennezis	27 Lansselin +
E	08.10.1954		Bois de Boulogne	Bordet
E	08.10.1954	11:45	Scissons	02 4
D	08.10.1954	23:00	Saint-Claud	16 Puygelier +
A	09.10.1954	16:00	nr Carcassonne	11 Bertrand
Bd	09.10.1954	18:30	Pournoy-la-Chétive	57 Calda +

Em	09.10.1954	19:00	Lavoux	86	Barrault
A	09.10.1954	19:30	btwn Cloyes-s-le-Loir & Montigny-le Gannelon	28	Legeay
Cd	09.10.1954	20:30	Briatexte	81	Mitto +
Em	10.10.1954		Toussac	89	+
A	10.10.1954	06:15	Marville-Moutier-Brulé	28	Toutain
Gd	10.10.1954	11:45	Quarouble	59	Dewilde +
Em	11.10.1954		Oléron	17	Martin
?	11.10.1954	02:25	Monteux	84	Arlanne
Cn	11.10.1954	04:00	"Le Fassié", Clamecy	58	Gallois +
B	11.10.1954	19:30	Taupignac	17	3
A	11.10.1954	night	Montbazin	34	Mevoltry
Bn	11.10.1954	22:30	Saint-Alban	31	Stamare
A	12.10.1954	06:20	Vernosc-en-Annonay	07	1
Cn	12.10.1954	ev.ng	Montluçon	03	Laugère
B	12.10.1954	21:00	Orchamps-Vennes	25	Beuc
B	12.10.1954	22:30	Erbray	44	Lelay
B	13.10.1954		Chatellerault	86	+
Bn	13.10.1954		Saint-Ambroix	30	+
Bn	13.10.1954	19:35	Toulouse	31	Olivier
B	14.10.1954		Perpignan (Saint Assisole)	66	Figuères
A/B	14.10.1954	20:00	Brienne	10	1
A	14.10.1954	20:00	Méral	53	Duvivier
C	14.10.1954	21:00	btwn Domart-en-Ponthieu & Condé-Folie	80	Dumeige +
Bn	15.10.1954		btwn Hyères & Toulon	83	Ottaviani +
A	15.10.1954	19:00	btwn Le Vigan & Valleraugue	30	+
A	15.10.1954	19:00	Nîmes-Courbessac	30	Fize +
D	15.10.1954	19:45	Bailleul-Neuville	76	Robert
?	16.10.1954	05:30	Malvezy	11	+
A	16.10.1954	24:00	Beaufort	59	Mozin +
B	16.10.1954	night	nr Lesparre	33	H.G.
B	17.10.1954	ev.ng	Reims	51	1
B	18.10.1954		Pons	17	
Ad	18.10.1954		btwn Andigné & St-Martin-du-Bois	49	Gerault
D	18.10.1954	10:00	Moutier-Rozeille	23	Mme Paquet
?	18.10.1954	ev.ng	Louvigne-du-Désert	35	1
D	18.10.1954	20:40	nr St-Samson-la-Poterie	60	Lherminier +
B	18.10.1954	21:00	btwn Royan & Saintes	17	Labassière +
D	18.10.1954	22:45	Le Vezelay	25	Melle Bourriot
Cn	19.10.1954	15:30	Ygrande	03	Rivet +
Cd	20.10.1954	02:30	Raon-l'Etape	88	Ujvari
D	22.10.1954	15:30	Lewarde	59	Stawski
B	22.10.1954	19:15	nr Lewarde	59	Szimura
En	23.10.1954		Wittenheim	68	Muller +
Bd	24.10.1954	17:30	Les Egauts, nr Ste Catherine-s-Rivière	69	1
Em	26.10.1954	22:30	Alleyrat (La Badière)	23	Boussard
C	27.10.1954	21:30	Les Jonquerets-de-Livet	27	Chéaradane +
Bd	11.1954	06:00	Fréjus	83	Zopina +
Cd	05.11.1954	10:10	La Roche-en-Breuil	21	R +
C	18.11.1954	06:00	Bomel-en-Saint-Maudan	22	Ponner

(Alain Gamard - 820116)

Ceci est la première partie des cas français avec entités que nous présente Alain Gamard. L'auteur apprécie toute remarque concernant l'un des cas présentés ci-dessus: correction, erreur de date, autres données. Prière dans ce cas de donner à l'auteur les références justifiant les dites remarques. Merci. La seconde partie dans notre n°4.

SOME PRELIMINARY NOTES ON A STUDY OF PHYSICAL TRACES IN ASSOCIATION WITH UFO EVENTS

Traces (ie imprints, marks and residues, on the ground and vegetation) ought to provide physical proof of a tangible phenomenon interacting with our reality. Indeed it is probably the one aspect of UFO study (with the possible exception of photographs) which has enabled the ufologist to refute an interpretation in psychological terms. For traces imply that the phenomenon is not something perceived subjectively (belonging only to the senses of the witness), but truly something with physical attributes.

This physical "proof" has been expedited by the "extraterrestrialists" as support for their contention that material UFOs (ie "spacecraft") exist. The ETH (as belief in extraterrestrial origin is called) is plainly on the decline, and its proponents rely heavily on physical traces evidence to keep its tenets alive.

Physical traces are often a very difficult problem for any conceptual theory. We have had, for example, propositions of an "interdimensional entity", able to assume physical characteristics, and the adoption of paranormal phenomena, such as poltergeists and psychokinesis, to explain the mechanics of trace creation. It is almost impossible to consider the phenomenon in terms of a hypotheses without taking account of the physical evidence.

Trace evidence is one of many aspects of the phenomenon with a clearly contradictory nature. These contradictions may be used as a basis to propose a plural origin for the phenomenon; that is several different manifestations as a specific function of specific conditions. It is enough in this context to consider those cases where a UFO is seen on the ground and yet apparently leaves no traces. In practice, certain UFOs leave physical traces, others do not. Even when we bear in mind that we are always dealing with witness accounts, often poorly investigated and without recourse to psychology or perception, it would still seem that the phenomenon (if objective) does not display strict or consistent criteria. On the contrary its criteria are highly changeable, probably because of a completely unknown "something" (which may well be linked with individual characteristics of the witness).

Of course, if UFOs did have an entirely subjective origin, then the problem would immediately take on new dimensions. Aside from outright hoax traces, the remainder would presumably be made unconsciously. Absence of traces would be explicable in terms of a witnesses inability to manufacture them, perhaps because unconsciously he is aware of his need to give evidence of his subjective experience. This hypothesis is admittedly improbable, although the belief that UFOs do produce traces is deeply rooted in the popular belief.

We can question the opinion that traces provide proof of the material nature of the UFO phenomenon in two ways. Firstly, by considering natural phenomena capable of producing traces. Secondly, by considering the facts and figures, as well as the standards in practice, of present day field investigators.

In nature there are several causes able to produce strange trace marks under certain circumstances. These include fungi, plant and grass sickness, lightning, animal habits whirlwinds, tornadoes, rain helicopter slipstreams, exfoliation and so on. Furthermore, the action of man on the environment can also result in traces... for example, cars, carts, mowers, fires etc. Discovering such a trace after a local UFO sighting can easily lead to their connection with "alien activity". Even in situations where no UFO was seen, the appearance of a trace (especially when circular) can reawaken distant memories in the conscience of stereotyped flying saucers and their alleged effects. Both material (eg. notoriety) and psychological (stimulation by a flap in the vicinity) factors may come into play. The existence of concrete evidence tends to make any case more credible, no matter how spurious it may be. Traces often are unusual, even if explicable. The cultural belief systems and possibly emotional states can soon lead to the creation of abstruse hypotheses and speculations, on the basis of natural or artificially

produced explicable phenomena.

These points are critical and must be carefully born in mind. The discovery of a "trace" tends to set the witness thinking in terms of a UFO. And, of course, if there is a Type-1 sighting at the root of the discovery, he will often go to the area where he saw the UFO (either on the ground or passing low-down) with a view to finding evidence of the reality of the experience. This is not only to prove what happened to others, but often to prove it to himself. This intense desire to find proof can easily lead to him discovering a myriad of insignificant anomalies (eg. a broken branch, an animal mark, the remain of a fire, and so on) and relating them to the UFO. This is a typical scenario for a UFO seen in the distance (where often the exact location of the landing or near-landing is not known anyhow). Less common is the deliberate false linking of spurious traces with a genuine UFO (in order to make the sighting more believable). Even so, in my view, this latter scenario is feasible for many rational people who would normally not behave in this fashion.

The above considered possibility must be taken seriously when investigators do not follow-up the "traces", on site, and we merely rely on the word of the witness. When investigators do visit the site we should expect them to validate or invalidate the traces, but the reality of the matter is often rather different.

Unfortunately, an investigator is usually on the same level as the witness, having the same unconscious needs and beliefs. He is usually unprepared in terms of scientific methodology. He may well strongly desire to present a "classic" case to his colleagues. He may have a belief system which include the material reality of the UFO phenomenon, thus anticipating trace evidence. All of these things lead him into frequent and serious errors. The investigator is lead desperately in search of traces to support his "ambitions" and "needs". Any sufficiently strange mark at the site (or thereabouts) will be seen in terms of alien activity. In this way we end up with a vast range of different traces, almost always truly explicable in conventional terms. But he will quickly dismiss all these possible explanations - for that is not what he seeks.

Obviously there are some truly strange and apparently unidentifiable traces, but their percentage is fairly low (even if its cannot be termed negligible). In any case, a number of doubts must remain. Natural phenomena, or human activity under unusual circumstances, could precipitate apparently unexplained traces. If this circumstances is rare enough the possibility of identification is, to tell the truth, close to impossible, except in a few lucky cases. These possibilities are too important to overlook. The so much extolled "physical evidence" is based on a small number of baffling cases; and those which are investigated is enough depth form but a fraction (perhaps 25 %). Most "incontestable proof" actually stems from newspaper articles or nothing more substantial than the witness's say-so.

In others words, what we term the "trace phenomenon" is but a small residue of well investigated reports; about 3.6 % of the total volume of reports according to data passed to me by Ted Phillips (Phillips' TRACAT - an international catalogue of trace cases actually now having more than 2100 entries).

We must also not forget the outright hoax - fake traces accompanying fake UFO sightings. Such frauds may be perpetrated for many reasons; economical, psychological, advertising, or merely as a joke. The number of trace cases determined to be fakes is actually quite remarkable, although not excessive (perhaps because of the inherent difficulty of proving a hoax). Some "magical" substance placed at the site, coupled with a good recitation of a fabricated tale and the gullibility of both journalists and ufologists can only produce one result... fake evidence presented as proof of an alien technology. Only the exceptional skilled or rational investigator (often with the aid of lady luck) can rescue the situation at a later date... but this certainly does not happen in many cases.

I believed I have discovered two fundamental aspects of the traces question; giving us much cause to rethink our attitude towards it:

- 1) The explanation of most trace reports is to be found in terms of both natural and artificial origins. The range of these is so broad that their identification is often next to impossible.
- 2) It is impossible to accept some investigation reports as a basis for scientific data. Investigators too often are guilty of extreme subjectivity and emotional involvement. This makes identification of trace very difficult. Not being of the site oneself one can only assign "possible" or "probable" identification, which is to the detriment of serious research; even though UFO fanatics can easily turn it to their advantage by distorting the true situation.

This means that practically all of the so-called trace data is useless in terms of scientific evaluation. We are left with residue which seems to be small, but not negligible and this seems to show the apparent physical reality of a seemingly unknown phenomenon (although unknown most certainly does not necessarily mean alien). But, even so, we must realise that the best of our investigation and research does not allow strict scientific determinations to be made. We can never totally exclude rare kinds of natural explanation.

My future research will base itself upon this selected sample of high strangeness reports - the apparently unknown residue. This is essential if one is to study the subject scientifically.

The conclusion I must reach, then, is this. We cannot be certain that the UFO phenomenon has a physical basis. It is naturally difficult to accept this conclusion. But if we wish to develop a serious field of research then we must learn to accept the destruction of deep-rooted dogmas and common illusions (or delusions). We need courage to rethink our basics and understand what is wrong with them. Above all we must search for understanding and not cling to belief.

POSTSCRIPT

This is just a preliminary of the problem. The real work must come now. In order to obtain valid results I need help from all members of the team, both in terms of their data and with their ideas and opinions. Suggestions on how to plan this study would be welcome. I will close with a series of questions which aim to seek your personal thoughts and stimulate an EWT discussion: This is all crucial to my project with EWT... so I urge you all to answer my questions.

- 1: What do you know (in practical terms) about the appearance of physical traces ?
- 2: Do you believe that what you do know is enough to ensure the significance of trace data in the overall UFO phenomenon ?
- 3: Do you believe this physical evidence is capable of proving the physical reality of what we usually term the UFO phenomenon ?
- 4: Do you believe that traces, if point 3 be affirmative, can fall within a traditional interpretative model for the phenomenon (eg. the EHT)? Why ?
- 5: Do you think it likely that the entire traces phenomenon can be explained in terms of little known or unknown natural/artificial (but explicable) phenomena, as well as hoaxes by the witness and/or a third party ?
- 6: What do traces associated with a presumed UFO mean, in your view ?
- 7: Have you personally investigated a trace case? Have you attempted, to the limit of your abilities, the identification of those traces? Please tell me the conclusion you have drawn from this experience.
- 8: What role does the physical trace phenomenon play in the overall UFO enigma ?
- 9: In your view, what methodology should be used in trace case investigation ?
- 10: How should trace effects be studied (in research terms) ?
- 11: Do you think there is a single cause to explain the wide range of trace effects and

the phenomenon on the ground apparently responsible for them ?

Maurizio VERGA

* The author as the editor are grateful to Miss Jenny Randles for the english redaction of the above document.

COMMENTS REGARDING PHYSICAL TRACE CASES

I wish to discuss physical trace cases by referring to some of my personal experiences. I have reviewed for the purpose of this article, all the many such cases with which I have had direct involvement (although not necessary as the chief investigator), during the period 1974-1981, and in this way discovered the following interesting points.

In this period I came across 14 landing cases (of type 1), almost all of them within 30 miles of my own home. 8 of them (ie. more than 50 %) resulted in no apparant traces whatsoever,, and three of these cases were explained as landed helicopters misperceived. The remaining 5 cases which did not leave traces were not explained, although many are of what I might term "low value". Nevertheless three of these remaining five (unexplained) cases involved some other form of direct effect... on the witness (burn marks, etc.) on the environment (eg. radio equipment being destroyed, or on both).

Perhaps the best of these cases is the incident at Risley, Cheshire (see FSR vol 24 n°2) This is peculiar in that no UFO was involved (although UFOs were seen in the area that night). The case is, however, unquestionably part of the UFO enigma, in my opinion, as it contains numerous features which are consistant. In this event a white amorphous figure was seen to descend a bank in front of a lone motorist, stop and then send two beams of light towards him and his van. It then proceeded to walk through a security fence surrounding an experimental nuclear reactor, without leaving any hole. The witness suffered burns to his hand. His watch stopped at the time of the encounter. He lost memory (probably lost consciousness) for half an hour or more. He suffered subsequent ill effects when revisiting the site. And his expensive radio transceiver within the van he was driving was found to be totally destroyed, through a power surge picked up by its diode circuits.

I regard this case as impressive, and have declined all attempts to conduct regression hypnosis on the witness. The reason for this was to use the case as a control against other cases where regression is speedily used. To date (4 years on) no memory of the missing time has emerged, although the witness memory of the primary event is excellent. I have kept a constant low level monitor on the witness. The one significant fact to emerge from this study is that the witness contracted cancer of the kidneys (and a cyst on his vocal chords) which resulted in several operations and lengthy medical treatment to cure. This began within months of his being struck by the lightbeams. Witness makes no connection between these facts... but the possibility that ther is one (ie. the beam radiation causing the disease) must remain.

Paul Whetnall and myself investigating this case found a flattened patch of grass near to the spot where the figure was said to have descended to the road. It would have been easy to connect this roughly oval area with a hypothetical UFO, but Paul and I refuse to do this. The general vicinity was used as a rubbish tip and we are certain that the marks were associated with this. However, we are also sure that less scupulous investigators would have search for evidence of a landing and found it, in the shape of these probably irrelevant markings.

In the remaining 6 cases there was evidence of "traces". At Rainhill (May 1975) footprints in a copse were discovered at the site of an interesting UFO landing. I am sure that the UFO was real (it was seen independantly by witnesses 15 miles away)... but the footprints could have been anybody's. Their link with the UFO is highly dubious. At Leigh (May 1976) a patch of cut grass was found beside where an entity was observed with his "landed" craft. Diligent checks proved this to be the result of a lawnmower

from the local council. (Both these cases, refers to UFOs: A British Viewpoint). In one case at Oakenholt (July 1976) the witness claims to have seen traces but when we got there we could find none, except vague indications (which in any event were not at the same place in the field as where the witness said she saw the UFO) - refer to Alien Contact. At Wallasey (November 1979) an UFO was seen in a garden and a substance found on leaves there afterwards. On analysis this proved to be fungus and I am sure this predated the UFO. The witness memory of the "landing" probably altered subconsciously to fit in with the discovered "traces" (Refer to UFO Study). The only trace case with actual solid evidence is the one at Meanwood (February 1979) where an UFO landing on a slope left inprints in snow and crushed local carbon deposit, indicating quite strong pressure (refer to UFO Study).

All above references are to my three published books... UFOs: A British Viewpoint(1979) & UFO Study (1981), Robert Hale Ltd London. Alien Contact (1982) Neville Spearman, Suffolk.

For my present book (to be published by Robert Hale in 1983), UFO Reality, I have been using a sample of UK cases between 1975 and 1979 which I call the JR SET (because I have personally evaluated the data). There are over 1100 cases in the sample but only SEVEN involving ground traces (ie. less than one percent). Essentially, I conclude in the relevant chapter almost precisely as Maurizio Verga does in his piece. Since my chapter was written before I saw his paper then our two opinions are independant and based on differing sets of datas. Indeed I conclude with..."Experience shows that we might well find something at a site, but its relevance could be wrongly assumed. It may be better to examine only traces found when the witness quite clearly spots the UFO causing them".

This is, I realise, a highly controversial point. But I think an important one. In my opinion there must be a very reason why there is such a paucity of good trace evidence. It may not be unconnected with the lack of photographs of type one events (eg. objects on the ground) - My suspicious mind says because they they are much harder to fake! - The answer could be that the phenomenon is primarily psychological. However, we should not overlook that many real phenomena which can produce traces are very rare. For example, I have never seen marks on the environment caused by lightning... although I know they exist and are probably rather more common than UFO landings. I remain pretty certain that some cases do involve physical energy transfer (eg. Microwave radiation) and that a decidedly real, material phenomenon (beyond which I will not specify) is responsible for some reports, and so must at times leave traces. There is an enormous gap between a phenomenon being real and it being alien (although too many ufologists see these words as synonymous). On the strength of the evidence of traces alone I see no reason to bridge this gap. However, trace evidence should not stand alone. It's study is valuable. But I do not expect it to prove one way or another whether UFOs are in any sense alien. This question is obviously so confusing, and quite possibly deliberately misleading, that I would never be so naive as to proclaim optimism about anything we might or might not prove. Ufology does not work that way. If you want a simple scientific mystery stick to the intricacies of subnuclear quantum mechanics!

Jenny RANGLES

Document for E.W.T. and NOTICE - JRS 820131.

Free donations with a minimum of 250 Belgian Francs are welcome to assure the edition of NOTICE.

See the BULLETIN GESAG for payment to Mrs Jenny Deduytsche.

Les donations d'un minimum de 250 Francs Belges sont les bienvenues. Elles permettent l'édition des NOTICES

Voyez le BULLETIN GESAG pour le payement à Mme Jenny Deduytsche.