

always shown wearing the *uraeus* (serpent) is proved by the photographic frontispiece to "The Mountains of Pharaoh"³ which shows the statue of Chephren without the *uraeus*. From the picture we note that the statue is in an excellent state of preservation and that nothing has been knocked off. On the picture in the article, however, there is a slight shadow on the forehead of the man, this might be caused by what is left of a broken-off *uraeus*, which is quite likely to have happened since the breast of the bird seems to have suffered damage at some time. There are examples of this elsewhere, see the head of the king where Amun is placing his hand on his head-dress: "Tutankhamen" p. 175.

Again the photo is not clear enough to suggest that the head-gear is helmet-like except in so far as it is a high-hat. The number of head-dresses worn by the kings of Egypt are many and various: see PLATE XLII² *Head of a dummy of young Tutankhamen wearing a compromise between the crown of the kings of Lower Egypt and the head-dress of Nefertiti*. See also, Illustrations 58 and 121², also "Ancient Times" figs. 52 and 53⁴ for different ones again.

Finally we are told that "the man" is "seemingly coming out of a door"—I like the use of that word 'Seemingly'!—It appears to have been an old Egyptian custom to show gods protecting their 'sons' (kings) e.g. Tutankhamen standing before the knees of Amen: see Illus.4.² If one studies the photo under discussion it is reasonable to conclude that the frame of the 'door' is in reality the outline of the belly and legs of the bird. Hence that Horus stands to the man, as Amen to Tutankhamen in the other picture. The notion then that we have here some representation of a car celestial must therefore be rejected.

Space does not allow me to write anything on the beginning or end of the article. Perhaps an opportunity may occur at a later date. However one gross inconsistency may be pointed out. I quote: "Boat of Nu(n) (the boundless dark void in which everything was created. . .)" is in the next paragraph, equated with the "huge interplanetary spacecraft carrier orbiting round the earth." Could contradiction go further?

All this is "Enthusiasm", not research. The conclusion that seems to emerge is that data on UFO

should be shared out among persons who are expert each in one sphere. If experts are not available, then each researcher should cultivate a branch of knowledge, such as Egyptology, North, Central or South America, botany, biology, and scientific subject, electricity, electronics, astro-physics and so on.

S. A. Paris, Brooklands, Upholland, Lancs.

NOTES

- 1 Orus, 9th king of XVIII Dynasty, probably confused with the god Horus.
- 2 Tutankhamen. by C. Desroches Noble Court.
- 3 Mountains of Pharaoh, by L. Cottevill. Robert Hale Ltd.
- 4 Ancient Times by J. H. Breasted. Ginn and Co.

That Marsh Gas

Sir,—Dr. J. Allen Hynek's statement on the Dexter and Hillsdale sightings leave me somewhat bewildered. Undoubtedly the Marsh Gas phenomenon does happen, but to happen at the same time and to such a degree with so many sightings in the same area seems *too* coincidental.

He goes on to give us a very impressive account on the decomposition of vegetable matter into various gases to understand which people like myself would need to take a course in chemistry.

The facts that stick in my mind are that he claims that no one was within 500 yards of the sighting he was concerned with, and the only sound was that of the marsh gas popping. Well at a distance of 500 yards all I can say is: "Some gas, Some pop . . ."

—P. Cope, 115 Braybrooke Road, Desborough, Northants.

A Plea for human-type 'visitors' and contactees

Sir,—I would like to point out to Mr. Jerome Clark [see MAIL BAG, May/June 1966] that, according to a statement made by Radio Moscow on August 31, 1963 Soviet scientists believe that Venus may be populated by human beings. The full text of this statement, as reported in *Le Soir* September 1, 1963, under the headline **Venus could be peopled by human beings similar to earthlings**, is: "This discovery may modify the space programme of 'The Big Two.'"

"Radio Moscow has announced that the planet Venus has an atmosphere containing oxygen and that it will, therefore, be susceptible to being peopled by beings similar to earthlings. Soviet scientists, declares Radio Moscow, have established, by

analysing the spectrum of light obtained as a result of observations made of the Venusian atmosphere, that oxygen is present in this atmosphere. The scientists have estimated, continued the radio, that because of this fact the atmospheric conditions of Venus are closely similar to those that exist around the earth.

It is estimated here that this discovery may have an important repercussion on the cosmic research programme of the United States and the Soviet Union, in urging the two space powers to renounce their projects of implantation upon the dead or supposedly dead planets, such as the Moon and Mars, and to intensify their efforts to pierce the secret of a 'inhabitable' planet."

Mr. Clark may as yet be blinded by the outdated ideas of some of our unscientific scientists, but I would suggest that he check up on some of the facts before assuming that all astronomers hold the same opinions as he. The noted Soviet astronomer, Nikolai Kozyrev, long ago stated that Soviet studies have indicated that both Venus and Mars have atmospheres similar to earth's both in composition and density. Kozyrev's report appeared in this REVIEW back in July/August, 1962, and in other publications. Another Russian astronomer, F. Zigel, wrote a long and detailed article *There is Intelligent Life on Mars* in September 1961 ("Space World") and it is well known that most Soviet scientists now consider the Martian satellites to be artificial. Recently we find that Dr. William Pickering and Professor Clyde Tombaugh have admitted that the Martian 'canals' do appear in several of the Mariner IV photographs and that they conform exactly to the 'canals' as mapped telescopically by Tombaugh and others.

So where is the sound basis for Mr. Clark's idea that astronomers scoff at the suggestion of a populated solar system? Professor H. Bruck, the Astronomer Royal for Scotland, doesn't think it is nonsense. He said, in a B.B.C. interview on April 28, 1964, that the planets in our system are likely to have humans similar to ourselves, whom we shall meet very soon. He even added that it was very likely they are visiting us now.

Not all the earth's scientists are as backward as Mr. Clark would like to believe. I might also add that scientists do not share Mr. Clark's certainty that our solar system has only nine planets. I have a press report from last month

which states that Soviet astronomers have calculated that the solar system could be 5,000 times as large in diameter as is at present known, and that there might be a whole string of planets out beyond Pluto, or there might be just dust particles. In other words, the question is wide open, and no reputable astronomer would emphatically claim that there are no more planets beyond Pluto. He just wouldn't know.

I am sorry to read that Mr. Clark considers the philosophy of Adamski's space contacts as "something a not overly-bright junior high-school student might suggest" but it is a fact that this philosophy is too profoundly simple, too basic in its recognition of Cosmic law and principles which govern the universe to be understood by minds conditioned to the false concepts and impractical beliefs of this present era of earthly civilisation. How extra-ordinary it is for Mr. Clark to contend that people who live by such a philosophy could not have developed interplanetary travel! By what strange reasoning does he arrive at this idea? I put it to Mr. Clark that those who have developed a real understanding of natural law and its operation and thereby live in true peace and harmony with themselves *can* devote their time to pursuing wider horizons—in contrast to the earth-bound slave whose spirit is weighed down by the struggle for survival and subsistence in a bloodthirsty society whose values are basically materialistic and immoral. How many earth men can even imagine what it is like to live in a world where people are free and have no fear?

I grant Mr. Clark that not *all* interplanetary craft come from within our system, and I do not believe that *all* inhabited planets are advanced beyond ours in development. But there is no valid reason to doubt the evidence of men like Adamski, Allingham, Salvador Villanueva de Medina, Professor Joao de Freitas Guimaraes, and a number of other lesser-known but reliable persons who have been contacted by some of the visitors from our neighbouring planets.

If we started taking a little more notice of what they have told us we would soon find ourselves much farther advanced in space travel, and better able to learn at first hand what a wiser race can teach us. But earthman is notorious for his inability to see the wood for the trees, and his propensity for throwing the baby out with the bathwater,

if I may be forgiven for resorting to some well-worn but valid aphorisms.

Mr. Clark has the idea that the *ufonauts* as he calls them, are lying to those they contact in order to 'cover up' their real purpose. I can see his reasons for thinking this way, but I believe it is unjustified by the facts of the matter. Evidence shows that we are being visited by *at least two different categories* of interplanetary beings. Those, presumably from another system, or systems, who are obviously exploring what is to them a new and strange world, taking samples and beating a hasty retreat when approached, seem to have little interest in making friends with any of us. On the other hand, we have more than enough evidence of the people, so like ourselves in appearance, who have made so many deliberate physical contacts with various individuals throughout the world, with whom they have talked at length, expressing a real concern for what we are doing and showing tremendous interest in us.

These people say they come from our neighbouring planets—why on earth should we refuse to believe them? What reason could they have for deceiving us? We *have* to accept that their technology is superior to ours when we watch the performance of their craft—why then should we doubt the validity of their 'philosophy' which has made it possible for them to be so far ahead?

For some peculiar reason, the 'philosophy' upheld by these space visitors is automatically looked upon with suspicion by many people, even UFO researchers, because it is identical with the philosophy expounded by all the great teachers throughout our earth's history. How in Heaven's name, could it be otherwise? The Law is the Law, unchanging and unchangeable, and the same rules must apply throughout all creation. What seems to hurt each man most is the fact that these space visitors present him with a living example of what is achieved when man co-operates with nature's laws and actually *lives* what we only talk about. So rather than recognise that they have succeeded where we have failed, we shut our eyes tight and call them liars. What really amazes me is the fact that they keep on coming, despite our pig-headedness.—Brenda M. Hinfelaar, New Zealand Scientific Space Research, Henderson, N.Z.

To and fro object

Sir,—On Saturday, May 28, while looking out of the window of our flat (I live on the 6th floor) I observed a bright orange star-like object moving towards the North. At first I thought it to be a satellite, until it suddenly stopped and slowly faded from view. Three minutes later it re-appeared, this time moving south back along its previous course.

To cut a long story short, the object moved backwards and forwards over the Hampstead, Golders Green and Hendon areas for no less than 50 minutes (11.55 p.m. Saturday to 12.45 a.m. Sunday). Every four or five minutes it would disappear from view, only to re-appear going in the opposite direction. I finally saw the object heading north and watched it until it disappeared into the distance.—C. Bodimead, 40 Prospect Ring, East Finchley, London N.2.

Points on Valensole

Sir,—It seems that the true facts of the Valensole landing are still veiled behind a curtain of contradictions on the part of the witness, M. Masse. Moreover, the questionnaire of Luis Schönherr, and the subsequent replies from Monsieur G. C. and Aimé Michel don't seem to have clarified matters much.

Apart from the variable routes which M. Masse seems to have taken to reach a point from which to observe the vehicle, and the equally variable distance from which his observations were made, there comes to light yet another contradiction in the statements of M. G. C. and Aimé Michel, concerning the 'weapon' with which the witness was 'paralysed'.

According to M. Masse, in his statement to Aimé Michel, the being took the weapon from its **right-hand** side; according to M. Masse, in statement to M.G.C., it was **definitely** a case on the being's **left-hand** side to which the weapon was returned. (As the two cases strapped to either side of this, and the other, being, were of different sizes, I naturally assume that the weapon was returned to the same case from which it was drawn).

The report in the *Dauphine Libéré*, in which M. Masse is said to have seen one being inside the vehicle, and one standing outside, is, as Luis Schönherr points out, a direct contradiction to the later statement of the witness that he observed two beings, both standing **outside** the