

facts, the faces in the portholes (in photos taken by Adamski of saucer-shaped objects), and the daylight movie taken by Mrs. Rodeffer near Washington, been ignored?"

In reply, I might make the following comments. Regarding the portholes, the images of faces might be due to distortions in the film or reproduction in the book. I do not believe it unfair to say that most photography experts will admit that still photos are unreliable as evidence in many cases.

I have seen Mrs. Rodeffer's film and in my opinion, it is not convincing. The film is of poor quality and jumps around so much from place to place—for no reason at all, at times—that I am extremely suspicious and would not even begin considering whether it contains what is claimed unless it were under strict analysis for many weeks.

—Robert E. Barrow, 4167 Cleveland Road, Syracuse, New York 13215 U.S.A.

Jerome Clark replies

Sir.—Mr. Ronald W. J. Anstee question my contact thesis, *The Meaning of Contact*, FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, September/October 1965, on five counts. I offer the following in reply.

1. My own experience indicates definitely differing reactions between those U.F.O. witnesses who are well educated and those who are not. The first, having observed a strange object, many times retain an intense curiosity about the subject and often go on to study U.F.O. literature, attempting to understand their experience. The second group, with some exceptions, are ordinarily only briefly puzzled, then dismiss the matter. Their reaction is usually less thoughtful, in other words, a fact of which ufonauts may well be cognizant.

What, for example, would be the reaction of an astronomer told by U.F.O. occupants that Venus is an earth-like world populated by earth-like people? "Nonsense!" he would say, and rightly so. A service station attendant, possessing a presumably rudimentary knowledge of science, would be less likely to doubt such a statement.

2. I quite agree with Mr. Anstee that intelligence is not always linked with education, but I do not consider the point relevant. Further, I have great respect for farmers, but to understand the U.F.O. mystery one does not need to know about

"herbs, trees and plants." One needs to know about psychology and physical science, not to mention flying saucers. A farmer may know how to plant corn, but he may not know why it is extremely improbable that intelligent life as we know it exists on the surfaces of other planets in our solar system. That is, I think, what the Wisconsin "Venusian" meant when he said rather coyly that "sceptics are avoided."

3. Nowhere in my article did I use the word "insane." I did on the other hand, characterise the so-called messages as "inane," a synonym for "silly." As Mr. Wade Wellman has pointed out, "One can hardly think that the real facts of the saucer mystery are as utterly insipid as most contact claimants would have us believe." The "philosophy" ufonauts often espouse reminds me of something a not overly-bright junior high school student might suggest. Any society whose highest achievements are reflected in George Adamski's "Cosmic Philosophy" surely could not have developed interplanetary travel.

4. Contrary to an impression I may have given, I do not dismiss Adamski out of hand. Evidently most of his story is pure science-fiction (and not very good science-fiction at that), but some circumstantial evidence for certain of his claims is hard to discount, in my opinion. Adamski apparently experienced *something* but precisely *what* I do not care at this time to speculate.

Aside from this, though, I wish to make it clear to Mr. Anstee that I do *not* discount "evangelical" contacts *per se*, since I used one of them to support my hypothesis about ufonaut prevarication. Indeed, they constitute one of the most important tenets of my theory. I do maintain, however, that by far the majority of "professional" claimants—those who have gathered large financial rewards from their alleged encounters—are liars and hoaxers.

5. Perhaps "wantonly killed or injured" is too strong a statement to describe a certain class of reports. In fact, most "hostility" cases become such because the reader *interprets* them that way. This much conceded, I do not feel my impressions have been particularly unreasonable. Here are three of the (in my view) more conclusive incidents indicating malevolent intent on the part of the ufonauts.

(a.) Kinross, Michigan, 1953. Since it has often been demonstrated

that U.F.O.s are capable of evading terrestrial aircraft quite easily, the destruction or disappearance of the F-89 could hardly have been an accident".

(b.) Venezuela, December, 1954. Several documented reports of dwarfish U.F.O. beings clawing and attempting to kidnap witnesses.

(c.) Brazil, 1962. Disappearances of Rivalino Mafra da Silva and Telemaco Xavier. In the first instance, if the testimony of the boy Raimundo is to be credited, U.F.O. beings rather viciously tormented their victim before abducting him.

Miss Lou Zinisstag asks what ufonauts would gain by contacting "a handful of people of no consequence." The question is answered in my article, and also partially in the above paragraphs. Scientists and other highly learned individuals—whom the ufonauts would be the first to contact were they in earnest—would be suspicious of their motives, particularly when the extraterrestrials tried to pass on information known to be inaccurate. When a contactee quotes a "Venusian" as saying that there are twelve planets in the solar system all inhabited by human beings, the scientist assumes that the *contactee*, not the *contactor*, is lying. Other persons, not so critical, might believe *both* contactee and contactor, and still end up with a completely confused (and inaccurate) idea of the nature of U.F.O.s. The possibility that, while some claimants may be sincere, the saucer occupants may not have occurred to relatively few individuals.

Here I should like to insert a few comments suggested by a recent, startling revelation included in these pages:

Mr. Gordon Creighton, in Part II of *The Most Amazing Case of All*, (FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, March/April 1965), quotes the late General Marshall as stating that the United States government had established that U.F.O.s are piloted by extraterrestrials who are "trying to work out a method of breathing and staying alive in our atmosphere before landing and establishing contact." How this intelligence was gathered we do not know, but the reader infers that Washington has purportedly communicated with ufonauts. If all this is correct (and I have my reservations), we should realise that these details do not conform at all to what ufologists have observed about saucers and their occupants. **But it would seem to be just the kind of "line" that a government**

would believe, especially in the early 1950's, when we knew a great deal less about the "operators" than we do today. In other words, it appears that ufonauts suit their "messages" to their audiences—and contradict themselves in doing so!

Miss Zinsstag to the contrary, I am not suggesting that the ufonauts must necessarily have sinister intentions, although I can see how she might have read my article thus. It may be that, even if their mission here is harmless, they simply do not want us in their way, or overly excited about their coming. The less we know about them, the less chance we will have of interfering with them. One detail in the Rivalino "spacenapping" (FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, November/December 1962) suggests this in particular:

Several days before he was taken away, Rivalino Mafra saw two strange beings digging a hole and seemingly putting in or taking out something. When the creatures saw him, they fled into their craft and flew away. Shortly thereafter they returned, stealing him away **apparently to ensure his silence. Evidently he had—or the ufonauts thought he had—seen something they did not want seen.**

I wish to reassure Miss Zinsstag that, no, really I do not favour warfare and nuclear weapons, and, yes, I do care about peace. But, indeed, even in our own times we have seen how words can be corrupted for unworthy ends, and undoubtedly one of the most often abused is "peace," as students of the Communist movement are fully aware. "It is deeds, not words," Sidney Hook has written, "which are the acid test of meaning and sincerity." While ufonauts have often proclaimed interest in "peace," there is little indication that in truth the question is of any particular concern to them.

Finally, I should like to thank Mr. S. A. Paris for calling attention to some inexcusable errors of mine relative to the Fatima affair. Nonetheless, despite these mistakes, my original point still seems valid: that the being involved did identify herself as "the Lady of the Rosary." It is, however, quite possible—as Mr. Paris implies—that my interpretation is too simple, and that Fatima represents a much deeper mystery than any of us have supposed.
—Jerome Clark, Canby, Minnesota, U.S.A.

Great Circles

Sir,—Having studied my copy of the January/February issue,

and having particularly noted Aimé Michel's *New Thoughts on Orthodoxy*. I was idly sitting and contemplating a very small terrestrial globe on which I had stretched both the BAVIC and the Southend-Italy great circles.

It appeared to me that both circles were manifestations of the same orbit, both being inclined at approximately the same angle to the equator.

It would be interesting to discover if other such great circles show similar properties. Despite variations in apparent direction in high latitudes, do they all bear the same relative angle at the equator?

If not, can any nodal points be calculated, bearing in mind the earth's rotation, that might indicate points of terrestrial origin, particularly in relatively uninhabited parts of the world, such as the Andes.

It is particularly interesting that an orbit such as BAVIC can cover practically all of the earth's surface other than the polar ice-caps.

J. V. Webber, 47 Church Way, Sanderstead, Surrey.

Fantasy of Mars

Sir,—Since the American rocket was recently sent to Mars to obtain photographs of a portion of its surface, and other scientific information, there is not so much confidence that Mars is inhabited by a dying race, or by any race of human beings at all. My own belief in a Martian civilisation has sunk to zero anyway.

If, as has been calculated, there are altogether about ten thousand craters on the surface of Mars, that suggests there never has been a Martian civilisation, otherwise by now most of these craters would have been obliterated. Nor were any of the famous "canals" recorded by the rocket camera.

According to my records, the great American astronomer, Professor Percival Lowell (who died in 1916) when studying Mars, used magnification powers of from 350 to 550 diameters, but preferred to use a power of 370 diameters. I think I can remember him stating in an article, that with this magnification power of 370 diameters, the details on Mars were sometimes as clear as engraving, but that higher magnification powers would only have blurred the planetary details out of all recognition.

But perhaps higher magnification powers would have shown the truer details, by which I mean that the Martian "canals" would have

broken up into the real planetary markings.

This I think has been proved by other observations made with powerful telescopes, and a much higher magnification power than those mentioned by Professor Lowell, especially his preferred power of 370 diameters. This brought Mars much nearer visually to these other observers than to Professor Lowell, and shall we say too near to Mars to show the "canals" in the telescope. At such times, some of the so-called "canals" have dissolved into quite a different sort of detail.

The same result was obtained by the American rocket—it was too near to Mars, for its camera to record any canal-like markings. So, although I am not an expert astronomer, I venture to call it the "Fantasy of Mars."

—Walter Firminger, Canterbury Road Ashford, Kent.

Space Hazards

Sir,—The Soviets' achievement of an unmanned 'soft' landing on the moon will no doubt encourage them to speed up their attempt to put a man or men on it. I hope I may be wrong, but I have always believed that the outcome of such an attempt, either by Russia or America, will prove to be disastrous.

It is a very different matter for a human being to encircle the earth in a space capsule well *within* the 700 mile thickness of its atmosphere from attempting a journey to the moon, which is roughly 239,000 miles beyond this atmospheric covering. For I believe that there are unknown elements and factors within the vast *etheric* or *magnetic* envelope of our planet (about 250,000 miles thick, just within the fringe of which the moon has its orbit) that are at present beyond the comprehension of our science.

If conditions existing at about 200 miles above the surface of our earth—which is only about a third of the thickness of its atmosphere—can produce physiological disturbances in the astronauts (losses of calcium and blood plasma, etc.) what is going to happen to man's body and mind when he attempts to probe 239,000 miles into space *beyond* this atmosphere?

The courage of these men who actually make the journeys is beyond all praise.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

Ivan Brandt, c/o 8 Normanby Road, Scunthorpe, Lincs.