

FLYING SAUCER REVIEW

INCORPORATING FLYING SAUCER NEWS

Vol 10 No. 6

NOVEMBER-DECEMBER

1964

CONTENTS

Ten Years Old: Waveney Girvan	3
Our Friend Waveney Girvan: Charles Bowen	5
The Socorro Classic	6
UFOs and the Sea: Antonio Ribera	8
The Mysterious Templeton Photo- graph: Gordon W. Creighton	11
Whidby Island Contact	13
Soil Samplers	14
Mystery Animals: Charles Bowen	15
A Brazilian Sighting: Gordon W. Creighton	18
A Layman's Time and Space: A. G. Cadman	19
World Round Up	22
Mail Bag	28
What the Soviet Press is Saying:	31
The New Zealand "Flap" of 1909	32

1964

© Flying Saucer Review

*Contributions appearing in this
magazine do not necessarily
reflect its policy and are
published without prejudice*

Annual Subscription
U.K. and Eire £1.5.0
U.S. and Canada \$4.00
Overseas equivalent of
£1.6.0 English Currency.
Single copies 4s. 6d.
Back copies 5s.

Flying Saucer Review,
c/o David Clackson,
72-78 Fleet Street,
London, E.C.4.
Telephone:
FLEet Street 2626

Contacts

DURING the ten years' life of this REVIEW, one fact, at least, has emerged and now stands proven beyond doubt. It is that the Government of this country (and of others, for that matter) does not tell the truth about flying saucers. Even when the Ministry of Defence is publicly challenged on this score it fails to justify the absurd explanations it offers for many of the best authenticated sightings of recent years, explanations that are even more lunatic than the worst of the crackpots, fanatics and exhibitionists who have plagued our subject. Nearly everything the Ministry of Defence—and particularly that section of it known as the Air Ministry—has said about flying saucers is not only bogus but can be proved to be bogus.

Why does our Government not tell us the truth? Or would it be better to ask, why does it prevent us from reaching the truth on our own? The usual reply, which has become almost a cliché, is that we would panic; Orson Welles and *The War of the Worlds* are cited as an awful example of what could happen if we were told that Mars is inhabited and that its pilots are actually visiting us. But is that really the reason? It is difficult to believe that the inhabitants of this world, after years of talk about saucers, satellites and space travel, would behave, in the face of truth, in the wild manner of those listeners to the famous broadcast, and go berserk, start looting and bring red ruin to us all.

We know the truth is being withheld, but this REVIEW does not know precisely why. We do not think that the reason is necessarily simple, nor do we believe that there is no possible justification for this silence. It is possible that the truth is so incredible that no government could hope to be believed if it were to release the facts in its possession. A Government that is not believed soon ceases to be a government.

The FLYING SAUCER REVIEW can, perhaps, understand the government's point of view. It faces, we believe, the same sort of dilemma as we do. From time to time, contact stories of a most circumstantial nature continue to reach us. So far we have felt unable to print them in full because either final corroboration has—for good reason or for bad—been lacking and to print without supporting testimony might have hurt our reputation. This lack of confirmation has been variously ascribed to the Official Secrets Act or to the expressed wish or even command of those alleged to have been visiting us. We can, of course, admit that these explanations could just as well have been the devious excuses of the hoaxer or the self-deluded. However, in all fairness it should be said that more than one of these witnesses have impressed us most favourably. In any normal commerce with such people we would unhesitatingly have accepted their word. They have

certainly not been bad witnesses like Adamski, nor have they shown any signs of instability. Apart from the inevitable variations in the circumstantial details in each story, the accounts have been remarkably consistent. As Jacques Vallée in our first two issues for 1964 listed the appearance of "oddities" in order to discover a common denominator, we now list the "humans" for the same purpose. We can claim a much more remarkable link between the stories of contacts with "humans" who, it is alleged, have landed on this earth:

1. Although the visitor was human in form, there were certain distinguishing features, such as a quality about the hair or the eyes, etc.

2. In intellect these beings were superior to us. They were pacifist in philosophy, with a technology so far ahead of us that it was practically incomprehensible.

3. All these visitors claim that they or their like have been visiting us for a very long time and that they are actually working amongst us for wholly benevolent motives. They claim that many of our top scientists know of them and their work and that the governments of the world, also, know the truth and the fact of their infiltration.

4. Because they have been visiting us for very many years, they have no difficulty with any of our languages. They can, however, and often do, communicate with us by telepathy.

5. The visitors are anxious that those with whom they are working on this earth should not be identified and they have means of preventing such an accident. On the other hand, they are anxious that the truth should gradually emerge.

Without further evidence, it is impossible to endorse such stories. But if, just for a moment, we

were to suspend judgment and accept them without question, much that was obscure becomes clear. The story is, of course, the same as Adamski's in *Flying Saucers Have Landed*: it is a story that has been repeated in much the same form by literally hundreds of other contact claimants from all over the world. If, as one of our readers suggested in our September-October issue, one removes a sectional religious element from the Fátima "miracle", that event also falls neatly into place. And, let it be admitted, 70,000 unanimously agreed witnesses cannot be lightly controverted. Even if one does dismiss the orthodox religious element from this story, the three little children were triumphantly vindicated on one point. The saucer, or the miracle, have it as you will, did occur at the time and the date and the place foretold.

Our speculations are unscientific, we know, but may we not here have a clue as to how life on this earth began? Are we descended, not from apes, but from angels? Are we perhaps the heirs to those who visited us centuries ago? As Charles Darwin becomes increasingly discredited, might we not find more truth among the fundamentalists than among the nineteenth century scientists? Here, too, we may find the answer to those of us who are inclined to complain that nothing final ever happens in the saucer story. Perhaps it has already happened. And is continuing to happen every day of our lives. Does every saucer occupant always return whence he came? For what other reason is this traffic in the skies?

If this be truth, then no government could possibly proclaim it.

It is with very great regret that we inform readers of the death of our editor, WAVENEY GIRVAN, at Winchester on 22nd October, 1964.

He was taken seriously ill early in September, yet characteristically,

the Editorial and a number of items for this issue had been prepared well in advance.

Our sympathy is extended to Mrs. Girvan, and to his son Ian, in their bereavement.

TEN YEARS OLD

By *Waveney Girvan*

IN January 1955, the first issue of the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW appeared under the editorship of Derek Dempster. The edition was a small one and it has subsequently become a collector's item. The issue in which this article appears (November-December, 1964), therefore marks the tenth completed year of publication.

To have survived ten years of publishing in an era of adverse economics and without subsidy or patronage of any sort would normally be regarded as an achievement for a small magazine dealing with any other interest, but as flying saucers are generally believed to lack both existence and significance, the achievement should appear much greater to the sceptic than to the believer. But the REVIEW will not look forward with any confidence to a general acclaim and wishes for a happy birthday. The occasion will no doubt be allowed to pass with customary silence—customary, that is, to all who know the truth about the saucers and who patiently await the day when the subject can be intelligently and fearlessly discussed in the columns of the national press. That day is not yet with us.

A unique publication

The REVIEW can look back upon its particular decade with mixed feelings (one of which, of course, is gratitude born of survival) upon a unique publishing experience. It is impossible to think of any other topic that would have brought a publisher similar problems. To begin with, as officially there is no such subject, strictly speaking the REVIEW should never have been able to start, let alone pass its tenth milestone. Our sceptical friends, bless them, will probably suggest that there are always enough credulous folk about to keep any sort of magazine afloat, but this is not my own experience. There are and have been hundreds of post-war periodicals on a variety of respectable subjects that have either gone under or have depended upon a subsidy for survival—or even have kept going despite their having broken the solvency barrier and through the perhaps unwitting generosity of their creditors. The REVIEW is run on business lines and has managed to remain solvent. Furthermore, several of the periodicals that have foundered have done so despite a large circulation heavily buttressed by advertising revenue. The FLYING SAUCER REVIEW has depended

for existence entirely upon its readers' support and very little else. I think therefore it does have some claim to general recognition of its achievement in surviving. But its subject, I must not forget, does not exist. And being handsome is no use, if you're wearing an unfashionable hat.

One of the reasons why we have managed to survive is, strangely enough, because we have been small. The REVIEW has never attempted anything beyond its power. For instance, it has never tried to get on to the bookstalls which, in this country, at least, are not geared to the small circulating periodical, a fact I learned the hard way several years before the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW was launched. Attempting to obtain a larger circulation by what appears to be the obvious method has been a potent cause of failure for many a small review.

The sceptics faced with these facts may care to ponder—though I doubt whether they will—on the possibility that perhaps, after all, there is some element of truth in our message that flying saucers do exist and that it is this truth that has carried us from 1955 to 1964. The evidence produced in the REVIEW over the years is surely weighty enough to sink a battleship of doubt. The sceptics might further consider that all our subscribers and contributors are not the credulous fools of their imagining. Our subscribers' list would not encourage them in this misconception. Among the names are many men and women prominent in various walks of life and in their respective trades or professions they are highly regarded, and even famous, and are known as persons of sound judgment and integrity. It is because of their continued support that we are still alive.

A vast potential

It must be admitted that a subject that has, in the past, attracted such ridicule and even hostility has brought difficulties enough. Of worse effect have been the periods of silence in the national press which, in their turn, have caused public indifference. There is a vast potential readership waiting to be tapped as flying saucers become, once again, a topic of general interest and discussion. I have to remind myself of the 1950s when popular Sunday papers ran serials on their front pages and, in particular, the autumn of 1953 when I published *Flying Saucers Have Landed* which became a best-