first. Oberg told us, in an article in Space World, that for personal reasons, Nikolayev, who was head of the cosmonaut corps, removed the Soyuz 9 prime crew and substituted himself and Sevastyanov, as he realised that the Soyuz 9 flight would be the last one that did not require any docking manoeuvres, a technique that he, apparently, was unable to master.

If the above is true, then it is easy to imagine that after the Soyuz 9 flight Makarov was hastily drafted into Leonov's crew as a replacement for Grechko. This sequence of events would give us a crew list of:

Crew

Back-Up Crew

1. Shatalov, Yeliseyev, Rukavishnikov. Dobrovolski, Patsaev, Volkov.

2. Leonov, Kubasov, Makarov.

Following the failure of the Soyuz 10 flight (Shatalov's crew), the back-ups flew the first mission profile again, although recent analysis of launch/landing window data by P. S. Clark indicates that this mission was also cut short and, as the world knows the crew died on their return. This disaster ended the use of the three-man Soyuz ships. It is not too hard to imagine therefore that the Leonov crew was split into two crews, with Makarov joining his Soyuz 9 colleague. Lazarev in the preparations for the next Salyut flight with civilian goals, and Kubasov remaining on the experienced crew with Leonov.

Finally, I enclose a photograph showing cosmonaut



Cosmonauts in training. Who is the man next to Vitali Sevastyanov? (see 'Salyut Crew Selection').

Vitali Sevastyanov and a 'mystery cosmonaut.' Does anyone know who he is?

NEVILLE KIDGER, Morley, Leeds, W. Yorks.

Space Shuffle

Sir, I believe the caption to the photograph on page 275 of the July issue of *Spaceflight* — in an otherwise very good article "Where are They Now?" — is incorrect, with the names of the Group 2 astronauts in the wrong order.

JONATHAN C. McDOWELL, Woking, Surrey.

Astronauts were listed in order of their signatures which does not key with their appearance on the photograph. The correct order of the standing group is: White, McDivitt, Young, See, Conrad, Borman, Armstrong, Stafford, Lovell. Ed.

Saved Again

Sir, Boy, you people ARE indeed optimistic. I live in Vancouver, I do not get to attend BIS lectures, annual meetings, ANY meetings and yet you want me to foot the bill for the Development Fund? I can't take library books out of the BIS library, nor even walk the halls; yet I should pay for a better hall? I should pay for the plaster and typewriters?

Enclosed please find £5 for the purchase of bricks and payment of property taxes; in short for the Development Fund.

Why? Well, I did get something out of my mail slot. I got the Final Report of Project Daedalus. And that, brothers and sisters, makes the whole BIS worthwhile.

> PAUL McDERMOTT, Vancouver, Canada.

Naming Extra-Terrestrial Features

Sir, I read with interest Mr. Gibson's letter (Spaceflight, August 1978) concerning future naming of extraterrestrial features. Although I completely agree with the writer when he considers that terrestrial locations should not be used for features on alien worlds, I cannot see any objection to using the names of famous scientists, composers, etc. After all, the Moon wouldn't be the same without its liberal share of Copernicus's Galileo's and the like.

By the way, the crater Birmingham mentioned by Mr. Gibson, is, in fact, named after a John Birmingham (1829-84) who was an Irish selenographer, and not, thankfully, after the city of that name.

RICHARD A. JONES, Teignmouth, Devon.

NEXT MONTH

Space colonies are unlike any other structure, says Dr. David Sheppard. The greatest care must be taken in the choice of materials for their construction to ensure safety and long life. In a challenging article, he argues that the final solution may lie closer to the kingdom of rock and concrete than metals and aerospace technology. Other features in the January 1979 issue — the first of our regular, enlarged 48-page magazines — will include the second of our reports on the I.A.F. Congress in Dubrovnik by L. J. Carter.