



**THE
LEY
HUNTER**

HAWKINS IN PERSPECTIVEBy JOHN RICHARDSON

On October 26, 1963, "Stonehenge Decoded" appeared in NATURE. It is written in true Hawkins style, for in the opening paragraph he praises R.J.C. Atkinson's book STONEHENGE and then proceeds by stating the the Helestone and the four station stones belong to period I, which is unproven, and disagreed with by both Atkinson and Newall. In paragraph two he says that Lockyer's attempt to date Stonehenge had met with much criticism which he thinks is totally just because, "we have no record of what the ancients took to be the instant of sunrise. Was it the first gleam of the moment when the whole disc stands on the horizon?" In the next paragraph, having explained how he sets about his task of taking measurements of sighting lines where the four positions of the moon were examined, he states: "Rising and setting was taken as a point where the disc stands tangent to the horizon." A flat contradiction, because surely nowhere is there any record of this being the instant the ancients were interested in, so Prof. Hawkins appear to lay himself open to "justifiable criticism" to use his own words. In this article he says that the positions of the rising and setting of the sun and moon were calculated by computer before the establishment of important alignments. Then working from what Miss Hawkes called "small scale" and Prof Atkinson "now obsolete" plans of Stonehenge he joined up what he considered to be important alignments between centres of stones. From these he produced two table of sighting directions one entitled "station stone directions" and the other "trilithon and sarsen directions". From this he concluded that Stonehenge was nothing more than a calendar.

Hawkins had also been wildly excited by reading the well known passage, in which Diodorus describes an island of the Hypoboreans (probably, but not certainly Britain) that possessed a magnificent temple of the Sun God and which was visited ever 19 years by the god who played and danced nightly, and played the cythara. Having been looking for an explanation for the 56 Aubrey holes, this passage reminded him of the fact that 19 solar years almost exactly corresponds to 235 lunations. Relating this to the Metonic cycle with the lunar eclipse cycle of 18.61 years. From this he claimed that priests kept count of the cycle by using the 56 holes ($56 = 3 \times 18.61$). These holes were split into what Miss Hawkes calls his "tripartite eclipse cycle", three sections of 19 years, 19 and 18 years. This would work by placing three stones in the Aubrey stone circle, 19, 19 and 18 holes apart and moving them all around one space every year. Furthermore he claimed that, by using six stones one could predict every important moon even for hundreds of years. The six stones would include the original three, which would be coloured black and set at the intervals described above, and the other three would be white, so that the end result spacings would alternate black, white in spacings of 9,9,10, 9,9,10, holes.

These findings appeared in another article in NATURE -- "STONEHENGE: A NEOLITHIC COMPUTER", in June, 1964. He then incorporated them with some of his earlier work, plus some account the history, legends and archaeology of Stonehenge in a book "STONEHENGE DECODED", published in 1965. This book, written with the collaboration of J.B. White, is no more than an elaboration of the facts of the two articles mentioned above, which appear as appendices in the book, and five chapters of history, etc., which appear to be full of inaccuracies.

Prof. Atkinson points out that these chapters, which he presumes were written by White, are, "marred by a disregard for accuracy and by a taste for bizarre interpretation which characterises the book as a whole." Atkinson draws attention to some of "Hawkins" so called facts: "We are told for example, that Beaker graves contain swords and spears; that Stonehenge I was orientated by its entrance towards midsummer sunrise; that the axis of Stonehenge II points to the Hele Stone; that stone holes B and C may belong to Stonehenge I; that the Avenue follows 'contours of altitude'; that the Y and Z holes seem to have been filled again soon after they were dug; that there seems to be a strong possibility that the Stonehenge sarsens had previously been erected at Avebury:" and concludes "That neither Professor Hawkins nor his coloborator are archaeologists is clear enough; but this is all the more reason for expecting them to have taken competent advice on these matters before publication, and for regretting that they have not. This book appears to be only written for the popular press who would accept the facts which Mr Hawkins and Mr White use. However I think Mr White sums up the situation perfectly with the word 'imaginary' in the 'Collaborator's Note' in the preface which reads: "Being neither astronomer nor archaeologist, I was able to contribute to this book only an intense, amateur interest in Stonehenge and some research into its history -- real and imaginary." As the archaeological facts show, his imagination ran riot.

Although the archaeologists were irritated by the overall crudity of the book, when the annoyance had subsided they began to nibble away at its astronomical core. Hawkins, between his articles and book, had changed a few major ideas. In his "Stonehenge Decoded" article he said that the positions of rising and setting of the sun and moon were calculated by computer, before the establishment of the important alignments, but in the book of the same title, the procedure was reversed. Another brave step he took was to change what he called "the station stone alignments" and "trilion alignments" to being "Stonehenge I alignments" and "Stonehenge III alignments". This, Atkinson was quick to point out, was mixing stones of different periods, because excavation had shown that the station stones more than probably belonged to a later stage than Stonehenge I because the ditches around the stone holes 92 and 94 show little regard for the Aubrey circle and that in fact one Aubrey hole has the ditch running right through it. He also pointed out that Hawkins had mixed up building periods in his alignment points; that the plans he was using were not reliable, and that many of the stones had been disturbed; that the horizon selected was a crucial factor in deciding the direction of a rising or setting object in the sky, and yet the bank around the monument may have stood high enough to provide its own horizon. He also pointed out that some of the stone holes that Hawkins used were thought to be of natural origin. He could not understand why Hawkins should think that out of four "A" holes that only one was dug for astronomical purposes. Between the 14 points used by Hawkins in his Stonehenge I tables he claims that there are 24 significant alignments out of 50 and shows that the probability of these alignments happening by chance is 0.00006 i.e. 1 in 10,000. Atkinson points out that from the 14 points there are 182 possible alignments and if the other "A" holes were incorporated there are a possible 272 alignments. Even with the elimination of unlikely alignments there would be '111' and '159' respectively. The probability of there being 23 (Atkinson finds even one of Hawkins' lines to be outside even Hawkins' limits of error) is 0.46 and 0.97 respectively, which is wholly inconsistent with the hypothesis which Hawkins uses. On page 97 of Atkinson's "STONEHENGE" he mentions that the F, G. and H holes were excavated by

Col. Hawley and that Hawley's description of the filling of F, from his unpublished diary, Aug. 8, 1923, records as "very hard yellow clayed chalk for a foot below the surface, then dusty and powdery with humps of chalk at the bottom." In ANTIQUITY in 1967 Atkinson stated in reference to the above "this reads like that of a typical tree or bush hole rather than a stone hole" and continues "holes G and H were both thought to be of simialr natural origin by their excavators. But because the holes fall in a line with Mr Hawkins' alignments (or should I say within his limits of error plus of minus 2°) he states that they were stone holes of period I. If he had said that because of his argument, the natural origin of these holes seems doubtful, fair enough, but he dismisses the natural origin theory bystating that there is no record of trees ever having grown there."

Prof. Atkinson also points out that the limit of error plus or minus 2° is quite unrealistic and is about 24 times longer than errors actually obtained by experiment in sighting on a rising or setting with a pair of sticks. "Translated into practical terms, it means for instance, that the Hele Stone could be moved 12 feet to the north east without affecting Hawkins' claim (itself unacceptable))-- that it marks midsummer sunrise for an observer at the centre of the circle."

Hawkins' second principle contention is that the 56 Aubrey holes served as a computer also came under fire, but not only from archaeologists. The theory of six stones being rotated one hole per year looks alright when you look at a plan of Stonehenge. As Miss Hawkes points out: "I believe that it is only the neat work of the Ministry of Works in marking the centre of these ragged pits with turf free discs, and their transfer to the plans, that has made such a fantasy appear credible." I personally agree wholeheartedly with this, after finding that the dimensions of the Aubrey holes vary from 30 to 70 inches in width and 24 to 45 in depth. They would have to be a peculiar six posts if they were going to be able to stand in every hole in the circle as they were rotated. Atkinson and Hawkes both point out the problem of why prehistoric man would have dug the holes of such varying sizes and fill them again if they were for stones to be used over centuries as eclipse predictors. Prof. Hoyle, who wrote a follow-up article in NATURE and later one "SPECULATIONS ON STONEHENGE" in ANTIQUITY, agreed with Hawkins' theory about eclipse prediction, but pointed out that there was no need to set out such a large circle to keep tallies of 56 years and that Hawkins' counting system could not be callibrated by prehistoric builders (Hawkins himself having established it by using tables of known eclipses) and that the predictor at Stonehenge could only foretell a small fraction of eclipses out of them all. Hoyle also thought that there must have been a "veritable Einstein or Newton" at work at the time of the building of Stonehenge I (Hawkins' period I) and that there may have been a Neolithic pool of intelligence and that with invading peoples this high standard was lost by the time of building Stonehenge III. However, this seems strange to me, as far as I can make out it is the very advanced building structure of Stonehenge III that has caused the monument to be the centre of all speculative movements and interest. Mr Sadler thought that eclipses could be predicted more simply with 47 holes and Mr Cotton and Mr Martin demonstrated that Hawkins' 56 year eclipse cycle is unsatisfactory for longterm use.

Mr Newham, who has worked for years on the astronomical interpretation of Stonehenge, was judiciously critical in his reply to Hoyle's article in ANTIQUITY, and declared that, "if Professor

5.

Hoyle had been made aware of all the facts, his approach would be entirely different." As for Mr Newall, he was convinced that all alignments using the F.G and H holes must be discounted and he was equally sceptical of most of the sarsen alignments. Altogether he questioned 11 out of 23 readings in Hoyle's tables. The tragedy of the Hawkins affair is that he has something worth saying, and by refusing to refine it and sort it out from the melodramatic, filled with misunderstandings, halftruths, irrelevancies and the condescending tone aimed at the popular press, he is failing to communicate with those whose judgment is worth having. Even acknowledging the discrepancies on the mathematical side (which I have tended to avoid because I don't know enough about that side and I have to accept figures as they stand), almost everybody who has written about Hawkins and Hoyle has pointed out, especially Atkinson who revealed many errors in his review of STONEHENGE DECODED - "MOONSHINE ON STONEHENGE" - and a small reply to Hoyle's article "SPECULATIONS ON STONEHENGE", no can be really said to have demolished the general thesis that Stonehenge incorporated some astronomical alignments.

666---***

{ Editor's note: The above is taken from a thesis written by Northumbrian student John Richardson. It brings into perspective the achievements and failings of Hawkins. The thesis covers more ground than the extract published above and a few other points raised are worthy of mention.

1. The writer draws attention to Prof Thom's "studious avoidance of Stonehenge with all its uncretainties." What does Thom think of this circle?

2. He summarises the findings of Thom, Marshack, Critchlow, Guy Underwood, Michell, and Watkins on ancient man. He concludes: "Michell uses inside diameters, centre of stone diameters and even external diameters in his arguments, which appears to be rather a wide area to take one's figures from. Apart from Thom and Marshack, and possibly Watkins, it would appear that the remainder of the non-orthodox have misused the facts to suit their own ends, and have tended to ignore the basic archaeological facts; but the archaeologists themselves sometimes appear to be as bad themselves. For example, when Mr Kelloway, a geologist, was interviewed on TV in connection with his theory that all the stones of Stonehenge were probably deposited by glaciation, Dr Glyn Daniel used the argument that Geoffrey of Monmouth had recorded that they had been brought from the west, therefore they must have been. However, what he didn't say was that Geoffrey also stated that the stones had come to Ireland from Africa and had been brought by Merlin's art to Salisbury Plain. However, this interview was really a non-event in as much as two archaeologists were set up to answer a geologist's views. Mr Atkinson showed with the aid of a film how a model blue-stone had been brought from Wales by schoolboys and thus acquitted himself. Dr Daniel argued as stated above, by Kelloway was talking about a different matter. He was saying that the stones had been brought by glaciation and couldn't disprove Atkinson, or vice versa, but had another geologist been on the programme that Kelloway would have had a fair trial."

3. John Richardson calls on all factions to cease arguing with one another and combine to research the problems; also to stop thinking of megalithic man as a hunter and warrior.

4. Remember Thom's words -- "We must no longer assert that these people could not possibly have known this or done that." }--

ANCIENT DORCHESTERby MOLLIE CAREY

I have received many requests for information about the ancient centres from people who are interested in the old leys, so I thought that I would write a few articles about them, and as Dorchester seems to be one of the lesser known areas, this is a good place to start with. The area around and including Dorchester was of some importance in those far-off days of the megalith builders, and there are many sites scattered around the town and to the west of it.

A friend of mine who visited Maiden Castle, which is just south of the town, told me that she was surprised to find that it was strangely "dead" when she tried to pick up impressions of the past. She is psychic and as she stood on the low mound she had a very strong impression that she was in the wrong place, rather like being in the Stonehenge area and only finding Woodhenge. How right this impression was!

The Neolithic enclosure on top of the hill has a very long mound built across it, and three burials were found at one end of this. There is no evidence of permanent occupation in the area, but rather supports the theory that this place might have been where they rounded up cattle, as plenty of animal bones were found in the ditch. If only three bodies were buried in the mound then it is possible that there was very little ceremony practised here.

The Iron Age ramparts were built around the whole top of the hill in much later times to make it a very impressive fort, and it was here that the Britons were massacred by the Romans when they stormed the place, and bodies were found hurriedly buried inside the fort.

It is the town of Dorchester itself where two important sites are to be found. One of them, Maumbury Rings, is situated between the two railway stations, and was a Neolithic henge that was made into an amphitheatre in Roman times. In the 18th. Century one stone was still standing inside the entrance. There was a massive bank that was more than 15ft. high, and the henge was 350ft. in diameter. There were pits as deep as 35ft. in the ditch.

To the east of the town, and just on the outskirts, is another henge known as Mount Pleasant, and this is a huge circular site or rather slightly oval in plan. There is not much to see there now as it has been under the plough for a very long time, but this was a place of some importance in prehistoric times. It compares with Durrington Walls near Stonehenge. It has a max. diameter of 1200ft., the ditch lies within the bank. On the west side, a large round barrow, presumably of the Bronze Age lies on top of the bank of the circle (Conquer Barrow). Built in Neolithic times, this henge was partly excavated in 1970. Sited on a low but prominent hill, it had a palisade fence around the hilltop, and the postholes show clearly that the posts were placed side by side to make quite a sturdy stockade.

Near the middle was found the remains of a huge timber-built structure surrounded by a ditch and bank, with the bank on the outside of the ditch. The timber building had a diameter of 38 metres. After the building had been standing for a considerable time, it was replaced by a stone structure built of sarsens. At the centre of what had been the timber building four pits were dug at the corners of a square with sides exactly 6.5 metres long. Along the sides of this square was erected a three-sided structure of sarsen monoliths, of which four sockets had survived the ploughing and in one of which were found the stump of the original stone. The open side of this structure faces

south and was surrounded on the north, west and east by three out-lying stones which were placed approximately on the line of the outer wall of the old timber building. Also they found a bronze axe in the Neolithic layer, and this was a thing that archaeologists have dreaded, for the Neolithic was supposed to be a non-metal era!

Now, this henge, I feel, could well be the key to all the others in the area. This is only a brief description of it; anyone wanting to know more about it should try Dorchester Museum, for they will surely have a full report on this, and any other site around.

Some miles to the west of Dorchester is Eggardon Hill, and though the fort on this hilltop is Iron Age, I feel that it was used in some way at least in the Bronze Age, apart from the two round barrows on the top of its summit. Is it a Dragon Hill?

To the S.E. and not far away is a probably henge, and further S. at Litton Cheyney are two circles, one which may have contained at least four stones, and the other has one stone still standing. To the S.W. from these circles, at Kingstone Russell is another circle; the stones are all recumbent now, and are best seen in the winter when the grass has died down.

The nine stones circle near Winterbourne Abbas is railed off and there are numerous long and round barrows in the area, and maybe the occasional standing stone, and we may have found quite a strange measure between all the barrows. All these sites should be seen as one big complex that in its way was as important as Stonehenge or any other of the better known areas.

There must be many leys passing over this area, and there is the Cerne Giant to the north of Dorchester. I have not yet visited any of these sites, but at least I have done some homework for when I do, and I shall not fall into the trap of going to Maiden Castle to get impressions of the Neolithic and Bronze Ages, although I shall go there, for I love the old forts, and the Iron Age will have something to tell us I'm sure.

Since starting this article, the post has brought me a letter from a man who, when standing on one end of the long mound at Maiden Castle, says he felt that he could see someone being chopped up, and he had a moment of real fear, and had to leave the spot. Well, the archaeological account goes that one of the bodies in the long mound had all its limbs chopped off, and seems to have been cooked! It was a young man, and the other two bodies were children. No wonder this man had sensations of fear! Were these bodies sacrificed? There is an element of primitive tribes and more advanced people in the story of this area, and though it is a puzzle I can see a glimmer of light, but I haven't got all the answers by a long chalk! It is only when you know about all the sites that you can see how insignificant Maiden Castle was in Neolithic and Bronze Age times. No wonder my friend had the impression of being in the wrong place!

Books to read for further information:-

A Guide to Prehistoric Britain -- Nicholas Thomas (Batsford)
 Discovering Regional Archaeology: Wessex -- Leslie Grinsell and
 James Dyer (Shire). Handy little guide at 30p.
 Archaeology of Wessex -- Leslie Grinsell (Methuen).

Dorchester Museum for more information.

*:*****

GURDJIEFF & LEY CONSCIOUSNESS?

{ David Hall drew my attention to this extract from "Our Life With Mr Gurdjieff", by Thomas de Hartmann. Gurdjieff and a number of his pupils were travelling through the Caucasus between Essentuki and the Black Sea town of Sochi in order to escape the Bolsheviki, in the waken of the Russian revolution. The passage reveals an aspect of Gurdjieff's extraordinary knowledge, which he discovered among the Dervish and Sufi orders. }

Before leaving Essentuki, Mr Gurdjieff had said that we would find dolmen\$ in the mountains; now from conversations with the peasants, he learned that hunters knew how to get to one. The next morning Mr Gurdjieff and some of us went with these hunters and soon came to a dolmen. The area looked as though it had been inhabited many years ago; the hunters said that the peasants once had used these stones as a chicken house. This dolmen was a heavy stone box, seven or eight feet square, hollowed from a single rock. The cover was one great flat stone. In one side of the dolmen, there was a perfectly bound hole ten or twelve inches in diameter. With difficulty, my wife managed to get through this small hole, but she found the dolmen completely empty. I remember that this opening was toward the south-east. There was a theory that the dolmens were altars, but this is very doubtful. Mr Gurdjieff said that they might have been road signs, showing the way to places of initiation. He asked the hunters whether they had found any more dolmen\$ in the woods - even broken ones - but they said that they had not seen any. Then Mr Gurdjieff took some measurements and determined a direction for us to take. He told us to mark it with thin sticks to which handkerchiefs were attached. We had to make our way with axes through the heavy, virgin woods. Soon we came to another dolmen, quite covered with grass and bushes, but intact. Then a third was found, but the stone cover of this one lay broken nearby. Again there was nothing inside. This discovery of Mr Gurdjieff's was the result of calculation and astonished us as much as it did the hunters, who thought they knew the country perfectly." (p.69 Penguin paperback, U.S. edition; not believe published in U.K.).

READERS' LETTERS:

Philip Jones writes:-- "I have just obtained issues 32-35 and my attention was drawn to certain articles which I think need a little more expansion.

1) To begin, I wish to take up the alarmingly blinkered editorial in issue 32 which appeared to dismiss the conventional approach to archaeology in entirety, ignoring our debt to such processes however grudgingly we accept their worth. It seems it is not enough to be deemed a part of the "lunatic fringe of archaeology", I am now also a rapist because I dig sites in an attempt to learn all that is possible from material remains. Mr Screcton thinks that whether the Iron Age follows the Bronze Age is irrelevant and of course it is if one is only interested in romantic speculation and the perpetuation of myths. But if, as I do, you think that not only the occluded knowledge of man, but his culture and society could hold models for the future, then it is essential that we learn all we can about man's evolving relationship with his environment and also the degeneration of successive cultures, as seen through their artefacts. These are questions that can only be answered by digging, whilst realising at

the same time the limitations of the method and the aims and ideas that cannot testify. Surprisingly, conventional archaeological techniques have been employed as the key to problems other than those directly concerned with artefacts and sites, witness the work undertaken at Glastonbury by Sir Frederick Bligh Bond, who I feel sure does not fit into the vast generalizations of Paul Screeton. (← Paul Screeton writes: Digging has, I repeat, done more bad than good for these sites should not be tampered with as they are precision instruments. Our real knowledge has not come from pottery and tool hoardes, but the precise measurements of people such as Bond; the geometrical analyses of Thom; the intuition of John Foster Forbes; psychic investigations of Iris Campbell; and vision of those like Lothbridge and Michell.→)

2) A recommendation in issue 35 for E.O. Gordon's "Prehistoric London" made me wonder if it is possible for readers outside London to follow up any of the key points in the book. The theory of the book revolves around a Pythagorean triangle with corners at Tothill near Westminster, Parliament Hill near Hampstead, the White Mound of the Tower of London and Penton, a mound between the last two. Together with barrows on Primrose Hill nearby, they comprised a series of open air sanctuaries dating back to the Trojans.

a) Parliament Hill - probably an Early Bronze Age barrow known by Gordon as Llandin or Llyn-din, names that go back to Tom Pennant in 1793 who postulated a Celtic "city of the lake." The barrow was excavated 1894 with a considerable amount of charcoal in the centre.

b) Tothill - first mentioned in 979 as "Pan Llawe" meaning a Saxon burial mound. In Mediaeval time it was referred to as either Tothulle or St Hermits Hill, crowned with a chapel dedicated to St Armine of Brittany and surrounded by the Beacon fields. Later history saw it as the execution platform for necromancers and the site now stands near St James's underground station.

c) Penton - this "prehistoric sanctuary" in Gordon's words dates from 1773 when Henry Penton, M.P. for Winchester, bought land here in Islington and developed a housing estate on it.

d) White Mount - the Tower of London and its surrounding hexagonal moat is the obvious choice of the Bryn Gwyn but all archaeological evidence other than geomantic have been unobtainable. Most writers prefer Cornhill or St Paul's as the site.

e) Primrose Hill - together with adjacent Barrow Hill, must have been the sites of sacred mounds according to Gordon. In the Hampstead boundary charter of 959, mention is given here to "baerue", a word derived from "bearu" meaning grove or wood and not from "beorg" which would imply a barrow or mound.

Whilst not wishing to underestimate the important geography of all the above sites, it is obvious that Gordon indulged himself within a linguistic morasse and tended to ignore the greater amount of important sites in and around London to suit the particularly rigid approach of the 19th Century druidism.

3) With dererence to John Bradley's article on Salt Hill and the Chalvey Monkey in issue No.35, it is almost certain that the effigy which has now vanished represented a carved figure of the infant Dionysus Sabazius with a calf's head, lying in a crescent shaped winnowing basket; but there is no evidence to suggest that it was carried in the Eton Montem procession. That particular festivity seems to have been instigated in the religious upheavals of the 16th. Century, although it might have remembered the meadiaeval processions at Windsor and Chalvey (the latter of which was based on the geometry of the village being laid out around a

cross). Without going into lengthy details, the sequence of events at the Chalvey procession, maintained in an oral tradition, seems to be paralleled in the cult of Diouysus in Rome who shared the same festival as Ceres - thus establishing the general theme of a fertility cult.

Its hard to believe that such a ceremony would have maintained its identity through from the Bronze Age (speculative date for the Montem) considered the amount of subsequent activity in the area; it could have survived from the native Belgic population of Roman Britain, but is more likely to have been generated from nearby monastic institutions such as Burnham Abbey in the mediaeval period.

The whole of this area around the Winsor reaches of the Thames is alive with folklore and legend and work needs to be done to correlate the pattern of such diverse traditions as the Sidehill Winder, Hermes the Hunter, the Blue Mist of Bisham, St Anne's Hill, the Grey Lady and others.

CHALVEY - First mentioned in 1227 as Chalfeye, which is the Saxon name of the village meaning "calf island."

STAB MONKEY - The possible derivations of this name may be from "Sab-azius" meaning monkey, or the Welsh word for young kids' flesh, "myn-cig."

4) I read the Al Cohen/John Michell exchange with deep interest as I was also dissatisfied with the conclusion of "City of Revelation" that broadly stated that man could only have received the Canon whole and at one time, because he could not have known the precise dimensions of the earth and the solar system that seem to have been the basis of that Canon. I would like to continue this conflict because so many of the puzzles that are unravelling, hinge on this important idea and Mr Michell's own ideas seem to be a little too dogmatic.

Although the material remains of the stone monuments open to the sky suggest to us that men in antiquity reached out into the relative macrocosm of the solar system to verify their cosmology, that does not necessarily mean that the Canon was received through the teachings of visitors from the sky. It is precisely in those artifacts that do not survive - the organic and living textures of wood, cloth and skins; that man would have employed and depicted the Gnosis, as derived from his observations of the flora and fauna of his environment. John Michell says on page 62 of "City of Revelation" that "the cosmic Canon, inherent in the solar system as in every other department of nature, was revealed to men, not invented by them." But is it not as likely as any other theory that man obtained his canon through diligent observation of his earthbound environment, and could apply a relative numerology to the solar system because of his concurrent interest there?

There are only two indications that spring to my mind that at least proves the plausibility of this theory. The first is from Prof. Thom's observations on cup and ring markings at megalithic sites (Transactions, Ancient Monument Society, 16, 77, 1969) that suggest that man was at that time able to translate the knowledge down to a size that in the physical sense was much smaller than himself; and the other is seen in the Bronze Age ox horns that originally were used as musical instruments just as they were, but later copied and made them in bronze. It is to be realized that the understanding of the logarithmic proportions inherent in an ox horn belies just such a close observation of the microcosmic order.

John Bradley writes:-

"On your advice I bought a copy of 'Prehistoric London'; it is certainly a most remarkable book, and at 75p it is excellent value. As far as the sections on Salt Hill are concerned there are a few errors of fact. i) The location is given as "the marshy environs of Eton" -

in fact it is in Chalvey, a village in its own right, a few miles away. ii) The print showing the hill is a lot smaller than shown. iii) The relationship between the Montem Festival and "Hilles" at Winchester is not as straightforward as Mr Gordon suggests, and needs further investigation.

Mary Stanton writes:-

"With regard to your mention of my book "The Resurrection of the Dead" it is not British Israelite literature as such. The official bodies of the British Israelites are opposed to what I say; such as BWIF and BRITH. The publication is independent. The final reference, the ultimate standard of all knowledge and study is the Bible in the original languages in which it was written. On the basis of the Bible all activities may be pursued with profit; without it all activities ultimately come to a dead end.

Wishing you all prosperity, I am Ever the same,
Mary Stanton.

* * * * *

REVIEWS-REVIEWS-REVIEWS-REVIEWS

"THE ETERNAL MAN"

Louis Pauwels & Jacques Bergier
(Souvenir Press, £2.50)

"MYSTERIES FROM
FORGOTTEN WORLDS"

Charles Berlitz,
(Souvenir Press, £2.50)

If ever a theory was taking a hammering it is evolution. Readers of this magazine are hardly likely not to accept that today's "civilization" is not the first, not necessarily the most "advanced" or "perfect", and that there has been since historic time a conspiracy of deviousness supported by gross ignorance upholding the dogma of upward progress and creed of materialism as the ultimate goal. Philosophers and writers, brilliant and banal, have focused their intellects and produced views contrary those perpetuated for generations. John Michell has produced a mature picture of ancient man's capabilities in "City of Revelation", while von Daniken's books are by comparison infantile, sensationalized, wild speculations.

The two books which are the subject of this review lie midway in the spectrum, being solid, reasoned factual accounts of enigmatic ancient sites and writings on the subject. Paradoxically, I suppose, this is what disappointed me, for they lacked original, challenging ideas.

Pauwels and Bergier, whose "Morning of the Magicians" was a fantastically brilliant book, are erudite researchers, who in many ways paved the way for the best and worst in this form of scholarship. They are here on familiar ground, ploughed by such a B. le Poer Trench, Raymond Drake, Kolosimo, Churchward, Velikovsky, the Atlantologists, Prof. Hapgood, &c. We have old faithfuls such as the Piri Reis Map, Stonehenge, pyramids, extraterrestrials, and so on. Berlitz takes us sightseeing at Bimini, Mystery Hill, Stonehenge, show us pre-Columbian voyages and Piri Reis's map.

What then are the reasons for buying and reading these books?

1) The lesson that orthodox archaeology is a fraud cannot be impressed clearly enough - and by now all the textbooks should be at Fahrenheit 451 and new ones being commissioned, and such books as these acting as stop-gaps.

- 2) The belief that Rome and Greece were the earliest "civilizations" is monstrous, and these authors make this explicitly clear.
- 3) The books are good syntheses of the 1,000,001 anachronisms upsetting the steady march of progress, and rebutting evolutionism.
- 4) That the presentation is sane and sound.
- 5) That the writing is not sloppy or self-opinionated.

For Atlantis freaks' information Berlitz goes for Bimini and the Azores; Pauwels & Bergier favour Santorin. Egerton Sykes called the latter theory "heresy". Berlitz calls him EDGARTON Sykes.

"/"/*"/*"/*"/*"/

"JOURNEYS OUT OF THE BODY"

by ROBERT A. MONROE (Souvenir, £2.50)

Before my wife and I were married we were walking across fields when she saw "herself" cross a stile several yards ahead of her "real self." A friend also claims to have frequent astral body trips -- including visits to various near planets.

Robert Monroe tends to move - astrally - between these two poles of experience.

The notion of astral projection, travelling clairvoyance, or out-of-the-body experiences has long held a fascination for many people. But like all theories which lay claim to the imagination it has been fraught with extravagant claims and resulting disbelief. This book is a milestone in this field - far from making wild or incredible claims, this is a serious and practical study by a man who has subjected his own experiences to scientific analysis.

The author is an American businessman who almost 15 years ago had his first out-of-the-body experience. He found he was able to verify that the experience was not a dream -- afterwards he could recount what people had been doing at a specific time in place X, while his physical body had, at the same point in time, been miles away at point Y. Quite naturally his first reaction was one of resistance and fear, but as time went by these fears were alleviated by his discovery of a long history of these experiences both in the literature of the East and amongst people of the West. Much later he found he could occasion these experiences at will and in this book he gives step-by-step instruction of how they can be achieved.

Dan Butcher has written several articles for "The Ley Hunter" on possible links between the astral vehicle's perambulations, UFOs and leys. Altogether a stimulating book.

////////////////////

THE VIEW OVER ALBION --- a column by the Long Man of Wilmington

Paul St John believes in UFOs and was inspired to write his first solo disc for Pye around the theme - "Flying Saucers Have Landed" His interest was generated by von Daniken's "Chariots of the Gods?", and he was interviewed on the Box's "Man Alive" prog. in February on the subject.....Steve Allen's new record is in the same vein - "Life On Mars"....and still on the disc scene lovely Marsha Hunt (remember Walk On Gildeed Splinters?) has a new group 22 (22 is THE number of POWER)...see Penthouse magazine has a picture in latest issue of friend Cerne Abbas Giant asking the question -- "the first full frontal?.... Bill Elmhirst of Dartington Solar Quest interviewed by Daily Express recently - "Millionaire:I was banished"....what happened to Harlech TV's leys film project??.cheerio.