

The Great UFO Debate rages on with authors John Pinkney and Leonard Ryzman continuing to defend their claim that a UFO was responsible for strange wreckage found on a Queensland property. UFO researcher Bill Chalker believes the wreckage is man-made.

THE GREAT

THE CASE AGAINST

By BILL CHALKER

THE "Alien Honeycomb" affair (see previous article) was discussed in detail at the fifth national UFOCON conference, organised by the Australian Centre for UFO Studies and held at Canberra late last year.

All researchers there agreed that the book, "Alien Honeycomb", had them staring into a void of "evidence".

If the following points cannot be answered satisfactorily, the 16 leading UFO researchers present agreed that "alien honeycomb" must be mundane and irrelevant to the UFO subject.

University of NSW "UNISEARCH" analysis of material specifically identified as

"alien honeycomb" by Mrs Jean Fraser (the book author's source of the material), resulted in it being positively identified as terrestrially produced woven fibreglass honeycomb and fabric. The following elements were identified: silicon, calcium, aluminium, magnesium, iron and titanium, with indications of trace amounts of potassium, sulphur and chlorine.

The analyst, Dr T.S. Hickie, emphasised that there were *no* unknown elements found. The honeycomb and fabric had entirely explicable patterned weaves. The honeycomb was a plain weave and the fabric consisted of a common weave pattern — a four-end sateen or one-third transposed twill.

Filaments extracted from the samples were consistent with DE quality glass (ASTM — DS78 — Standard Specification for glass yarns). The physical and chemical properties of the material (reactivity, temperature resistance, softening temperature, density, etc) were all typical of glass.

The American "analysis" claims that "unknowns" were found — that the "alien honeycomb" is "unidentifiable" — or specifically "unknown elements and configurations" were present. Unless the authors of "Alien Honeycomb" can detail the exact nature of the analytical results which lead to these conclusions, then the claims cannot be taken seriously. The American "analysis" described in very spartan terms in the book, tells us virtually nothing about the material. It is in complete contradiction to the University analysis.

The authors cry cover-up. However, they seem to indulge in it themselves by not allowing their readers the benefit of seeing the complete details of their anonymous American "results".

No solid evidence is provided for a UFO origin of the Greenbank material. Mrs Fraser's 1966 observation cannot be seen as relevant. An absolute correlation between the Greenbank fragments and UFOs is pivotal in significance to the authors' case. None has been established!

Unless the authors can detail the exact nature of their American "analysis" and the "UFO event" which they claim precipitated the discovery of the Greenbank fragments, the "alien honeycomb" cannot be considered as "the first solid evidence for UFOs".

The burden of proof is on the book's authors. So far their "proof" has been found wanting and sadly inadequate. ■

UFO DEBATE

THE CASE FOR

By JOHN PINKNEY and LEONARD RYZMAN

MR CHALKER must imagine we, and our scientific advisors, are extremely naive to have devoted two years of intensive research to something which he considers to be fibreglass.

The honeycomb material which the RAAF described as unidentifiable, and which the Brisbane press and TV dubbed a mystery is, of course, *not* fibreglass.

Our US tests reports on the material are correct, unassailable, and freely available to the special committee of the United Nations which we specified in the book.

We are not fools, Mr Chalker.

We would not go to all this bother for a piece of glass.

But in our book we did foresee the present attempts to denigrate our material. This is why, in "Alien Honeycomb" and now, we seek that open UN inquiry.

Mr Chalker can come up with 100 fibreglass analyses. These will forever remain irrelevant to our findings. Nor will his attempts at detraction deter us from continuing to investigate the powerful parallels between honeycomb patterning and UFOs — parallels which Mr Chalker prefers to ignore.

Here are just a few of the honeycomb link reports we have collected so far:

• On page 117 of "Alien Honeycomb" we describe how Japanese TV producer Ju Ichi-

ROUND TWO

Yalo gave one of his books on UFOs to Pinkney — a book which contains a photograph of a piece of wreckage said to have come from a UFO which crashed on Shokoku Island, Ehime Prefecture, near Tokyo. Quote: "The fragment's shape was familiar. It was patterned with cells. It was a piece of honeycomb";

• On page 105 we quote Bruce Cathie's book "Harmonic 33" (published 1968), which describes how New Zealand witnesses sighted a UFO with a *honeycomb* pattern of light and shade;

• On page 162 we quote a story from "The Advertiser", Wagga, published February, 1979, 16 months before "Alien Honeycomb" appeared. The article describes "a honeycomb formation of UFOs in the skies over Wagga";

• Two weeks before "Alien Honeycomb" was released, Adelaide's "Sunday Mail" ran an interview with a motorist, who, in a valley east of Nairne, had seen a UFO the size of a semi-trailer, "with lights in a honeycomb core";

• We have just received a copy of the book "The Andreasson Affair" by Raymond Fowler, with an introduction by Professor J. Allen Hynek, former astronomical advisor to the US Air Force. This book, first published 1979, also refers to honeycomb patterning in a UFO. Professor Hynek describes the book as a "high-strangeness case". On page 33, a picture caption says: "The (UFO) hatch was pulled out a short distance. It had a honeycomb design to it."

The open international inquiry that will be held into our honeycomb material will add even further weight to the findings we have already made public. That inquiry, and the links we will continue to collect, will prove that the honeycomb-UFO connection extends far beyond the parameters of our book.

We both regard "Alien Honeycomb" as the most important work we have done in the field of UFO studies. We knew, even while writing the book, that an encounter of the Chalker kind would occur.

• For our point-by-point rebuttal of Mr Chalker's original argument, see last week's PEOPLE magazine. ■