

MAIL BAG

Correspondence is invited from our readers, but they are asked to keep their letters short. Unless letters give the sender's full name and address (not necessarily for publication) they cannot be considered. The Editor would like to remind correspondents that it is not always possible to acknowledge every letter personally, so he takes this opportunity of thanking all who write to him.

A living creature in the Loch?

Dear Sir,—What is sauce for John Lade is sauce for Ted Holiday; he too should get his facts right.

While Mr. Holiday is right that a single monster cannot have existed on its own in Loch Ness, he is not correct in claiming that a dozen 'is genetically impossible'. Zoologists believe that 10 to 20 creatures would form a genetically stable breeding herd. The reindeer herd, which he refers to, collapsed not due to gene exhaustion, whatever that means, but due to exhaustion of the food supply. They suffered a classic population crash, a fate predicted for mankind in the not too distant future. Mr. Holiday does not say what happened to the eight reindeer which remained, but if they survived then his hypothesis that 12 monsters cannot survive is hardly tenable.

Contrary to his supposition that a Loch Ness monster weighs 35 tons, and I cannot see how he comes to this conclusion, other authorities give 1½ tonnes, e.g. Witchell. Seventy feet is excessive for the average reported length of the monsters; 8 m. is nearer the average. On his own assumptions, 20 1½ tonne monsters would only consume 16 tons of fish per year!

He claims that there is no evidence for heavy predation in Loch Ness. Since most of the fish live at depth in the Loch naturally there will be little evidence. Does he expect the monsters to be splashing about on the surface looking for fish? Predation could be going on unnoticed.

Whatever his views on the food supply in Loch Ness, the fact is that the loch contains salmon, brown trout and sea trout, arctic char and eels, all in abundance. There is adequate food for a colony of marine reptiles.

As far as I know the British Museum have not sent any experts to Loch Ness, nor do they intend to; they do not believe that any monsters exist! Nor have I heard that the Smithsonian are any more adventurous. But of course if this is all secret we would not know about it would we!?

Contrary to his implication that experts have concluded that the Loch Ness monster and Bigfoot are unreal, zoologists have in fact concluded that not only the monster and the sasquatch, but the abominable snowman and the great sea serpent are real unknown animals. The lack of organic remains and food supplies are not seen as obstacles to this belief; after all,

no-one had seen remains of the coelocanth before it was discovered alive. Remains of monsters in Loch Ness will, if they die at the bottom as seems probable, be retained there by the enormous pressure, and decomposition will be retarded by the low temperature.

Ted Holiday's arguments are plainly special pleading in favour of his pet theory that the monsters are not living creatures. By making exaggerated assumptions and ignoring awkward facts he attempts to justify his unbelievable ideas. The only connection between UFOs and the Loch Ness monster is that they are both anomalous phenomena, prone to similar ridicule and myth-creation.

Yours faithfully,
Stuart Campbell,
4 Dovecote Loan, Edinburgh
EH14 2LT Scotland.
March 27, 1976

[I apologise for the delay in publishing Mr. Campbell's letter — EDITOR.]

Who did that?

Dear FSR,—In Volume 21, number 6, someone wrote a letter titled 'effects on animals and birds' pretending to be me. (changing my name slightly with an 'M'.)

That person knew of my UFO adventures and my ideas about UFOs, but it seems peculiar that whoever wrote, wouldn't write under their own name. I have no idea who it could have been.

Now that UFOs have become the "IN" subject, a lot more magazines are cropping up. I do hope they're not stealing your staff and business away. Yours is such a good little magazine it would be a shame if it went under. Hope you have several big 'scoops', or maybe a winning lottery ticket.

Please note the change of address card enclosed.

Sincere best wishes,
B. Niblett,
Gen. Delivery, Sechelt,
British Columbia, Canada.
August 29, 1976.

Those Venusian Footprints

The letter by Colin Bord in FSR Vol.21, No.6, titled "On Dr. Jacob's view of Adamski's photography" jerked my memory to recall that I had seen one particular criticism of George Adamski somewhere else, namely that "...Adamski just happen-

ed to have some plaster of Paris with him."

And indeed I had.

On page 537 of the Condon Report, Dr. Condon quotes from Frank Edwards' second book*:

"...and, having a pocket full of wet plaster of Paris (which he seemingly always carried with him on desert trips), George quickly made a plaster cast of the footprint with the message, which he eventually reproduced..."

This is repeated by Dr. Christopher Evans in his book "Cults of Unreason" on page 148:

"...(Adamski just happened to be carrying plaster-of-Paris with him when he visited the desert that day)".

So it appears it was Frank Edwards who invented this particular myth about Adamski carrying wet plaster of Paris wherever he went (messy, if not jacket-destroying).

Is this a splendid example of scholars (Condon, Evans, Jacobs) sheepishly repeating a thoughtless distortion of facts without checkback — a crime usually attributed to uneducated or 'amateur' UFO enthusiasts?

Perhaps, when we have succeeded in deciphering these hieroglyphics we could well muse over why they were given in the form of footprints.

Ananda Sirisena
Wimbledon, London S.W.19.
October 7, 1976.

* "Flying Saucers — Here and Now!"
New York, Lyle Stuart, 1967.

Entity coincidences?

Dear Mr. Bowen,—I notice in FSR Vol.22, No.2 one of those coincidences which could easily be passed by, regarding witnesses' descriptions of entities, and which perhaps may be of some significance.

In this case it concerns a comparison of the eyes, head and communication of the occupants in the Maine encounter, October 27th, 1975, and Travis Walton's experience, November 5th, only nine days later, but on the opposite side of the country, in Arizona. They both tell of their captors' large eyes, large heads (dome-shaped heads without hair in the latter, mushroom-shaped and apparently, from the drawings, large and without hair in the former), and the lack of communication between the entities in both. A fuller description in Travis