

Looking at them yesterday, and we shall be spending more time up there as soon as we have detached 1215, so that we have something going for next year. I'm really looking forward to going up to Top camp again, but I don't think that anyone who has been down to the 1215-Xiru connection would begrudge the two weeks that we have spent on 1215.

2 Science.

Most of the argument here seems to have been the result of lack of communication ~~on both sides here~~, and I think that both sides are probably at fault. I do think that it is reasonable that people should expect to be told the purpose of taking wet readings etc., when they are asked to take them. On the other hand if you are going to attack the wet stations as being a senseless waste of time, maybe you should ask what they are for first.

Pursing from the non scientific side it

(72)

seems to me that it is worthwhile doing proper surface surveys and rainfall readings so that we know where to look for new caves, and don't just wander vaguely round places that we have been before.

The main point where I disagree with Dave is about John Hurren's project. I think that we should look at both sides of his argument, and balance what the rest of the expedition has gained from his project, and what we have been asked to do in return.

Firstly of course having a serious scientific project on the expedition does increase the standing of the expedition in the eyes of important people, sponsors, the University, etc, and has resulted in considerable financial gain for the expedition.

Secondly John has put a hell of a lot into this expedition personally. He has been in charge of all the expedition finances. (Kitty not included)

He has done a lot of driving, gathering base camp and dogsbodying which seems to have been done by a relatively small proportion of the expedition.

You may not be particularly interested in the verification of the sexual habits of snails with rainfall, (or whatever it is that he is studying). I certainly am not, but considering everything that John has put in I don't think that it's unreasonable that we should be asked to take a few more readings.

The only part of the argument left seems to be a personality clash. Dave has ~~said~~ admitted that he lost his temper, and said things that were unjustified on the spur of the moment. I feel that his point about people w/ bulging jokers is valid. It seems quite often that you cannot make a ~~casual~~ casual, offhand, funny remark around ~~the~~ here without it being pounced upon.

(74)

and ~~also~~ diseased. The other thing is just a general lack of communication, which I suppose is partly to be expected with three widely spaced camps.

The last point that I want to make is one that I touched on earlier. Base camp does have to be guarded against cows and people.

So far we have had two nights when cows have got into the food tent, and £40 of travelers equipment and a rain gauge have been stolen. ^{+ a camera & accounts book} The cows etc always enter, and could attack unguarded tents any time, and there are often people poking around in our tents as well. It is making this miserable hanging around by your self at base camp in the wind and the rubbish without being able to even so far as shit. This task seems to have been taken by relatively a few people. It's all

very nice to conveniently forget about
'base camp and go off and be a
humble dingo at Aino or Top. It would
obviously be very childish and officious
~~to~~ to have a a rick or anything like
that, but I think that there are a lot
of people on this expedition that
need to think about doing their stint
at base.

Well that's all that I've got to say
really except that I think that this
is a bloody good expedition, we have
got a hell of a lot of F leaving done,
and I have had a great time

PPSD

11 August 1984 Philip Sargent 20-30

Re the above - I have nothing to add except
that Riley should know better than to believe anything
Dave says. I do have a modest
my own thought:- when the base camp is
left unattended, could the keys to the van
please be left behind. This is the second time

(26)

this has happened and someone wants something. This time it is MY WETSOX in Phil Rose's rucksac.

Phil: they are light blue/dark blue, double-lined, medium, and I put them on a rock to dry when I came down from Juktayu - after you had gone they were no longer there and a careful search revealed a total absence of Sargen wetsox. Please, Please unhook your gear & leave them behind at base. Yours will be found + forwarded to you but those on the rock were definitely MINE. Either you have them or a goat took a fancy to them. [To help you remember; either side of the sox were a couple of gloves wedged in cracks - these were still there when I looked]. Could you give them to someone going to Anis ^{this} ^{tomorrow} morning?

Have taken 2 birds, 2 pencils + a rubber, some tomatoes, but no petrol because van locked etc. Ow, my feet hurt. Also taken Xokn Proc.

At end of the expedition, please send me a postcard to tell me what has happened to:-

Philip Rose.

Poste Restante

Gavarnie

Haute Pyrenées

France.

12 August 84 Phil Fred Richard and Sara at base camp. Yesterday evening we drove to the Frente Romana in my car which started! Got only moderately drunk and awoke to a truly superb morning - no clouds much so. Today we need to climb the mountain again to de rig Cistra. I suppose this will be fun. Unconvinced.

Yesterday Sara and I climbed Fultayo and came across a large shaft half way between Fultayo and Curicente. A four second free fall is followed by much rattling. It was marked thus:

00cc 81
3/7 0

Back at Ario everyone said 'on its 'Pogu del 30 meters below eyehole' for indeed it is 30 m below the eyehole. Said pogu goes nowhere in two pitches.

Down here at Ario today however, we read Phil's 1981 Proc - now pinched - by Phil S - and find that Pogu del 30 m below eyehole is 2/7. The entry for 3/7 is roughly - 'lying a little lower than 2/7 if it is an obvious open shaft down which stones

48

fall for 2 seconds to the snow. The snow is presumably on a ledge for stones skinned pass this rattle on for a further 12 seconds?

This shaft 3/7 is going to be over 100m deep and has never been pushed. We will remedy this asap.

I find Andy's arguments interesting and drunk as he was they can't be dismissed out of hand. Caring 'ethics' are not the same as drinking. The key is that in caring you descend the cave any way you can and in a way designed to give as much fun as possible. Discussions of 'ethics' get too metaphysical for me, and I think the sense of fun and of proportion becomes lost. Does Andy forget that twice in Poyu Sorcoda Blanca Dave and I had to artificially enlarge the passage. These constrictions are put there by the cave as an obstacle to be passed, in the same way as a bolt needs to be put in when the obstacle is a pitch with no natural belays. There is no dividing line however - in Bull Pit Kingsdale the 4th pitch can be

rigged from two huge naturals with a Y belay to give an easy take off and a free hang. Below the naturals I counted 15 bolts in various stages of decrepitude. Another example is Craig-a-Ffynnon. NOT just the hammering of a crack into a squeeze this - in C-a-F they blew up the cave kind of twice a day for 6 months. Roughly 1/2 of the entire cave is man made and the rest really isn't worth the effort. I really do despise the attitude of those pushed.

Briefly about the science: this argument is one which is as old as our cave expeditions. The 'experiments' fall into two categories - fun topics like dye testing, surface surveys, cave surveys measuring altitude etc which tell us a little more about the caves we are discovering. I ~~also~~ enjoy these (and think it really v. sad that in all their years of pushing Cabeza Muxa the SIC haven't managed to get a positive dye test). The other sort of 'experiments' are ones designed to get people to give us money to come here and go caving. In the past I know that the Ghar Parau committee has been presented with

(80)

elaborate pieces of fiction, and, they knowing that to be the case, have given us a lot of money. I ~~still~~ can't really believe that the 'science' done on earlier over expeditions has been any value at all (bug collecting in the cave (1981) - no bugs: stal dating (1982) - no stal) and I for one am bold enough to say I don't care. But don't misunderstand my attitude I don't resent 'scientific' projects at all. How can I? I just think really that caring expeditions should do the caring: scientific expeditions should do the science. The climbing world had all this bother in the 50's and 60's and now climbing expeditions do no science at all. Perhaps I'm wrong and it's their loss.

Fascinating arguments bother these: can I only plea that the ensuing Proc or Caves & Caving articles reflect them - the one about ethics particularly. I remember in Bonington's book about Kongur there is a massive argument in which B says 'Look I'm just asking a sherpa to walk up a fucking glacier with a rucksack - what's so fucking unethical about that?'

* **WRONG** several previously unknown varieties found read Proc 10.

So what, more than that in my ~~articles~~ ^{articles}.