

(A similar observation has been made by M. René Fouéré, Secretary-General of G.E.P.A., and editor of *Phénomènes Spatiaux*.—EDITOR.)

## Speculation on Dematerialisation

Sir,—It seems to me that the mystery regarding the disappearance of the Valensole object (reported in November/December issue of the REVIEW) after flying about 20 metres may be explained if the object had accelerated to a speed greater than light. In this case no ray of light would catch up with the object, let alone be reflected in the line of sight. I am aware that scientific opinion regards the speed of light as absolute at the moment and if objects travelling beyond this speed became invisible they could well be excused for so thinking! However it is an illogical view for really the speed of any object can only be dependant on the accelerating force and the density of the medium through which the object is passing.

While pondering on the theoretical possibilities of achieving invisibility, it occurred to me that there are two other ways in addition to the above. One of these would consist of bending the rays of light around the object, and the other is to intercept the light signal sent by the eye to the brain. The first, possibly, I suggest may be achieved by using some kind of magnetic field (probably of a very high frequency) and the second can undoubtedly be done using mesmerism or hypnotism.

Reflection indicates that the disappearance of the Valensole object could also be accounted for with the use of bent light rays particularly if the object's motive power was a repelling magnetic field of high frequency.—R. D. Homer, 19 Kipling Avenue, Caseley, Staffs.

## Dimensional Shift?

Sir,—FLYING SAUCER REVIEW for November/December is full of good things. *The Valensole Affair*, and *UFOs and the Fourth Dimension* as well as the letter about Adamski visiting the Pope have filled my brain with ideas.

This fourth dimension business. Is it the same as Space-time continuum? For it raises all sorts of possibilities,

and to some extent simplifies certain things. I once heard these other dimensions compared to radio wavelengths; that writer said that just as there are lots of stations all on the air at once, and we just get the one by tuning in to that wavelength, so there are numerous dimensions or space-time bands, all running concurrently with ours.

Now, Adamski said that all the planets in the Solar System were inhabited. I took it, that for the giant planets he meant the moons. Yet, if an Earth-made spaceship took off from Earth and landed on Mars, for example, the astronauts would probably only find desert. **But** if they had the instruments with which to **get on to the right wave band**, i.e., the correct dimension, they would find a flourishing population there. See what I mean? This throws a new light on much that Adamski said and wrote. (Could he have changed wavelength inside their ships without knowing it?)

Lastly, though the idea that the 'Big-heads' in the Valensole affair are an 'extrapolation into the future of the past evolution of man' is a fascinating idea, I don't think we should lose sight of the fact that they might be from another planet.—(Miss) Betty Allen, 154 Poolbrook Road, Malvern, Worcs.

## Antarctic Base?

Sir,—Your reports of landings in South America particularly seem to support Al Bender's book *Flying Saucers and the Three Men*. According to Bender, the UFOs have an earth base in Antarctica, this would account for the spate in South American sightings. If they are collecting specimens, etc., they might have returned certain people who were brainwashed. Adamski's visitor may not have been a spaceman at all but a conditioned earthman—sent to establish ideas that the saucers are friendly.—Peter Drake-Brockman, The Bungalow, Stanford, Nr. Ashford, Kent.

## The Moon and Spaceships . . . and Mars

Sir,—I wish to thank the Reverend G. J. Cyr for his letter in the November/December, 1965, FLYING SAUCER SAUCER REVIEW, which carries a full load of interesting analogies. How-

ever, I find very little resemblance between a syllogism and an errand, and even less between a duck and his deduction of spaceships on the Moon.

In his article *The Prime Lever* (March/April, 1965), the Reverend gentleman reports the observations by various astronomers of lights on the Moon, which were stated to be volcanic eruptions in the Press. He claims these were spaceships up to **three miles wide!** Yet this is fantastic! These craft are bigger than fifteen Queen Mary's placed bow to stern! Would it not be possible to consider the proposition that the lights **might** just be volcanic in origin? Since Nikolai Kozyrev proved conclusively by spectroscopic analysis, in 1958, that eruptions do take place on the Moon, this would not be so fantastic. It if of no use writing spaceships into everything; when the Reverend Cyr writes of "literally hundreds of identical or very similar reports" (in his letter), he betrays an unconscious tendency to do this.

I observe that he has a long history of dealings with the Moon. In the issue of your publication for May/June, 1964, he opines that the "moon is covered with vegetation which . . . is hairy or woolly", and is populated by "animals including, perhaps, humanoids, who must be very hairy". He insisted that these would be photographed by the American lunar probes. The cameras of Rangers 7, 8, and 9, which could resolve an object down to twelve inches in width, have resolutely disobeyed his orders. No woolly vegetables are to be seen. And where are the hairy humanoids, please? Taking their siesta? Or are they all on the other side of the Moon, watching a football match against the Mare Moscovium Maulers?

Finally, I should like to refer to Mr. B. C. Jones' letter in the November/December, 1965, number. Mr. Jones asks what has become of the Martian canals, and wonders if they have been ignored for security reasons. In the November, 1965, issue of *Spaceflight*, some of the Mariner IV photographs are reproduced. After an examination of them, Eric Burgess, F.R.A.S., F.B.I.S., came to the conclusion that the canali are real surface features comparable to large rift valleys on the Earth. A further article on the subject is promised in

*Spaceflight* soon.—A. W. Orme, 19 Stratford Road, London, W.8.

## Martian Canal?

Sir,—I was most interested in a letter printed in 'Mail Bag' about the Mars photographs (November/December issue). In the *Sunday Express* on September 18, 1965, there is an article entitled "Space TV picture gives a clue to life on Mars".

Briefly, it noted that a faint line had been discovered on picture number 11 sent back by America's Mariner IV spacecraft. The picture was shown at the sixteenth World Space Travel Congress at Athens. The line appears to run straight for about 160 miles, and furthermore, it is in the southern hemisphere where the canals have been plotted. It was also stated that it would be about a year before the scientists could complete their analysis on the Mariner photographs.—M. A. Coombs, Springfield, Hawthorne Avenue, Carshalton, Surrey.

## Mars Photographs

Sir,—I have been looking back at the September/October issue of the *REVIEW*, and would like to refer to the

editorial article and particularly to the Mariner IV photographs. I was glad to see that you extended congratulations to the Americans on this project, for it was indeed a magnificent achievement. But I cannot help feeling that something 'fishy' is going on here, even the possibility that the truth with regard to the inhabitation of Mars—if they know it—is being withheld. For although the photographs were taken thousands of miles away from the surface of the planet, by a series of dots, and therefore cannot be regarded as conclusive evidence of anything, it seems to me very odd that certain definite features, such as Schiaparelli's 'canals', did not show up on the photographs—to say nothing of the mystery of the planet's satellites!

Since the position of the orbit of Mars is within what is called the 'zone of habitation', and there are other factors which suggest that the planet cannot be so very different from our own planet Earth, I find it difficult to accept the news that Mars presents a moon-like surface of 'a bleak landscape of canyons, sharp peaks, and craters.'

Could this 'news' be a conspiracy by those already known to be engaged in misleading us about the UFO problem to mislead us further about

the inhabitation of planets in our own solar system?

But there may be another explanation of this odd appearance of the surface of the planet; with reference to the mystery of the 'shadows', and the position of the sun when the photographs were taken, could it not be that Mariner may, by some means or mistake, have taken photographs of the surface of either Deimos or Phobos? For Phobos is said to have a diameter of at least ten miles and is about 3,700 miles distant from the surface of the planet, while Deimos is about five miles in diameter and about 12,500 miles distant from the surface. Either one of the satellites could have been eclipsing the surface of Mars at the time the photographs were taken. Not only this, but whichever satellite may be interposed between Mariner (a mere point in space) and the surface of Mars, the speed of travel of both Mariner and the satellite might have been roughly the same, thus entirely eclipsing the surface of the planet while the photographs were being taken. Anyway, whatever the truth is, I'd like to end this letter with a loud and clear endorsement of the penultimate sentence in your Editorial.—Ivan Brandt, c/o 8 Normanby Road, Scunthorpe, Lincs.

## PERSONAL COLUMN

(Rate: first three lines 5/-, extra lines (or part) 5/- each)

UFO DETECTOR. Swiss precision made unit, very sensitive. 52; J 3; J 12;. Gives loud and visual signals. Airmailed U.S. \$10.00 or equivalent. Assembly kit: U.S. \$5.00. Blue print only: U.S. \$2.00 (Details free). PERRIN, Box 16, 1216 COINTRIN, Geneva, Switzerland.

"SPACELINK", articles, news, comments. 9/8 p. free quarterly. "UFOLOG", monthly sighting summary sheets, 12 issues 10/6 p. free. Write: F. W. Smith, 4 Connaught Road, East Cowes, Isle of Wight.

SALE—31 CLEAN COPIES FLYING SAUCER *REVIEW*. December, 1960 to December, 1965; reasonable offers. NAVIER, 19 Ormonde Avenue, Hull.

## ON THE AIR . . .

Mr. Charles Gibbs-Smith's appearances on TV in connection with the Cappoquin photograph are mentioned elsewhere. Other TV and radio appearances by *REVIEW* personalities so far 'this year' have been as follows:—

**December 31, 1965.** Gordon Creighton interviewed on Granada TV (standing in at short notice for the Editor).

**January 13, 1966.** Gordon Creighton interviewed in the Spanish Overseas Service of B.B.C. Radio on the subject of UFOs in 1965, with special reference to South America.

**January 13, 1966.** Gordon Creighton, later the same evening, read a statement on UFOs in South America in 1965, in the B.B.C. Overseas Spanish Service to South America. In both cases the scripts were prepared and written in Spanish by Mr. Creighton.

**March 4, 1966.** The Editor, and also Charles Gibbs-Smith and Gordon Creighton were interviewed on the mass-audience programme *Women's Hour*, B.B.C. Radio, Light Programme. It is interesting to note that for this programme the Editor recorded answers to questions for 15 to 20 minutes, speaking about the policy of the *REVIEW*, about the classic Socorro case, the famous B.O.A.C. Atlantic sighting, about Valensole, and many other cases. After 'editing' he was on the air for less than one minute. Messrs. Gibbs-Smith and Creighton suffered similarly.