

To be just, however, a flood-tide in the progress of science and scientific discovery is now very evident, giving rise to new fundamental concepts and producing hard data resulting in the emergence of new, possibly strange and way-out technologies—technologies which will go far to, if not actually, establish “scientifically” what the mystics have been saying “unscientifically” for thousands of years. The battle to win respectability for these new technologies has been, and will continue to be, bitter in the face of a teeth-gnashing hard core of

unimaginative pontificators who will quite certainly be forced to yield to the growing number of recognised and highly qualified scientists, thinkers and savants now working on the wider and deeper aspects of human life, evolution and environment and who all appear to be approaching the same astonishing and, what would be to many, shocking answer.

I suggest that before the final breakthrough is made UFO researchers should seriously adopt the motto: *Sauve qui peut!*

MAIL BAG

The Birch photographs

Dear Sir,—I was distressed to see and hear Alex Birch on TV admit that his photo of flying saucers in 1962 was a hoax.

As I appeared on an ITV programme *Here and Now* with Alex Birch, Alan Watts, Hon. Brinsley le Poer Trench and Desmond Leslie arranged by Mr. Reginald Dutta in 1963, I had an opportunity of talking to Alex Birch and believed him to be a shy, truthful 15-year-old—but evidently he conned me with the rest.

However, as I have seen three things, since 1963, that I cannot explain it hasn't altered my belief that something is going on we don't know about—or perhaps some do.

The biggest mystery to me in this case is why three Air Ministry officials questioned an ordinary 15-year-old boy for three hours about something that does not exist.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. P. M. Watters,

12 Johns Walk, Whyteleafe, Surrey.
January 14, 1973.

Different animal effects

Dear Sir,—I write in respect of the effects that UFOs seem to have on animals, having followed with interest Gordon Creighton's series in *Flying Saucer Review*. Having recently heard of two instances involving cattle, I feel it may be of some help to the records if I related them.

These two instances involve not UFOs but IFOs, one being “Europa,” the new airship recently completed at Cardington, and the other being a black and white chequered gas balloon.

The airship was first seen by my next-door neighbour, a cattle farmer who was at the time feeding his stock. Seeing the unusual object he stopped work to watch it pass. After a moment

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.

or two he noticed that the farm had gone quiet and looking round saw that the eyes of every beast in the area were also on the airship. They followed its path across the sky without moving until it disappeared in the distance. They even stopped eating to watch it.

The gas balloon had an even more spectacular effect, floating silently over the field at about 300ft. on the first of July. The cattle were grazing peacefully in the sunset at the end of a fifteen-acre meadow. On seeing the balloon commotion broke out amongst them and the entire herd bolted head-long down the field to hide in the sheds. From there they watched the fearful thing pass, continuing to watch the sky for a long time after it had gone.

Living near Thurleigh airfield—whose flightpaths seem to pass right over our village—many different aircraft fly over, from Jumbo-jets to *Phantom* fighters and *Harriers*, often at very low altitudes. The cattle take no notice whatsoever of them, though one would think that such a variety of screaming giants would frighten them. It seems, though, that the contrary argument may be true, that is; if it makes a noise it is normal and can be dismissed as harmless. The two IFOs obviously posed a sudden threat of the unknown, as their actions indicate. They had never before seen an aerial object that *did not* make a noise, and they panicked, even though the objects were both man-made.

Obviously one must be very careful when deciding what is relevant in a UFO report dealing with the reactions of animals. They are suspicious and fearful of anything new or different from the experience of their everyday lives.

Perhaps Mr. Creighton should look again at his files and perhaps place more value on those reports where no reaction was noticed. That really would indicate something odd.

Again it is a complicated, and if we're not very careful, misleading path we tread.

Yours faithfully,

Miss E. C. Hargreaves,

Copper Cottage, Ravensden, Bedford.

Forerunner of the flying “lady” of Vietnam?

Dear Sir,—There is something I would like to add as a supplement to the report about the “flying ‘lady’” (*FSR Case Histories*, Suppl. 10, p. 14). The famous Russian traveller V. K. Arsenyev described a similar case in his book *V gorach Sichote-Alinya* (“In the Sichote-Align mountains,” Vladivostok, 1947, p. 52):

“The rain stopped, the temperature of the air remained low and the mist appeared over the water. It was then that I saw the mark on the path that was very similar to a man's footprint. My dog Alpa bristled up, snarled, and then something rushed about nearby trampling among the bushes. However, it didn't go away, but stopped nearby, standing stock-still. We had been standing like that for some minutes . . . then I stooped, picked up a stone and threw it towards the unknown animal. Then something happened that was quite unexpected: I heard the beating of wings. Something large and dark emerged from the fog and flew over the river. A moment later it disappeared in the dense mist. My dog, badly frightened, pressed itself to my feet.

“After supper I told the Udehe-men about this incident. They broke into a vivid story about a man who could fly in the air. Hunters often saw his tracks, tracks that appeared suddenly and vanished suddenly, in such a way that they could only be possible if the ‘man’ alighted on the ground, then took off again into the air.”

This event took place near the

mouth of the River Gobilli on July 11, 1908.

Yours truly,
Yurij B. Petrenko,
Kharkov—86, U.S.S.R.

More on "secrecy"

Dear Sir,—I am writing to you yet again because Vol. 2 No. 5 of the *Canadian UFO Report*, p. 24, mentions briefly a case which I suspect might possibly be the same as that kept secret by P. M. H. Edwards in "Speech of the Aliens Part 2" in FSR Vol. 16, No. 2, p. 23, case 34. They discuss a sighting on November 12, 1967, by a Calgary boy, who told under hypnosis of being taken into a UFO by an orange beam and given a physical examination by scaly creatures. I have asked John Magor for details but don't know if he will answer. The case withheld by Dr. Edwards is dated only "a few years" before 1970, but hypnosis cases can't be very common.

Suppression of information continues to prevail. In this country the newspaper, magazine, and book publishers seem to be agreed that UFO information cannot be permitted to be published because of "lack of public interest." Donald Keyhoe claims that he does have a publisher for his forthcoming fifth book, but he is keeping the title, publisher, and publication date strictly secret from everyone. Very frustrating.

Speaking of frustration—it has occurred to me that after 26 years of ufology, we (or at least I) know almost nothing for certain. Most of what we do know for certain is negative, and due more to space exploration than ufology. Thus, we do know that there is no atmosphere on the back side of the moon and that the surface temperature of Venus is 900°F, so Adamski's stories are in trouble; also, that the moons of Mars do not look at all artificial. However, I myself do not know of enough data to prove that Mars is not the source of UFOs, and the only way I know to prove this is to go there. Unfortunately, the American people have an unexplainable, intensely bitter hatred of space exploration, which makes it clear that the exploration of Mars will never take place.

In this desert of secrecy and lust for ignorance, FSR *ought* to be a welcome oasis. Unfortunately, it continues to withhold data regarded as "too traumatic" etc. to be published.

Yours sincerely,

"Ph.D.,"

Dallas, Texas (name and address on file).

January 8, 1973.

[We know the reason for our correspondent's wish to remain anonymous,

and we appreciate it. I am sure he will be glad to see that in these pages we have published the report which we at first considered "too traumatic" etc. to be published.—EDITOR.]

Technical details questioned

Dear Sir,—As always, there is some very interesting fare in the September/October 1972 magazine. However, there were some technical details in some of the articles which appeared to me, as a photographer, to be open to question. The first appears on page 3 about halfway down, where it says "... taking two shots at 3.5 f.p.s. ..." f.p.s. (frames per second) is used in cine photography, and as these were still photographs it probably should be f3.5 which would indicate the widest aperture of the lens on a modest still camera.

The second query is more involved. I refer to page 20, right-hand column, 3rd paragraph (incidentally, your printer has left off the two "ll's at the end of Bell & Howell). The point I am querying is the reference to the minimum speed of the cine camera being 1/16th or 1/24th. Should this perhaps be 16 f.p.s. and 24 f.p.s., these being the standard speeds used for silent and sound movies respectively on 16mm cameras. I assume that this is the type of camera a TV cameraman would use. If this is so, then a speed of 16 f.p.s. gives an effective shutter speed of approx. 1/32 of a second, and that of 24 f.p.s. 1/48 second. The theory being that if the shutter is open 16 times during 1 second, it must also be closed 16 times, to enable the film to be moved on for the next shot. And so each time the shutter was open was approx. one 32nd part of a second. Only a test with some sophisticated electronic test gear, of the actual camera used, could determine precisely how long the shutter was open at these running speeds, though the makers of the equipment would be able to say what shutter speed a camera in good condition would be giving. If my assumptions are correct, they in no way invalidate the author's* argument. Instead I think it would double the estimated speed of the UFO. Perhaps you would check these thoughts of mine with someone who is more familiar with cine work than I am. I haven't done any movie-making for a number of years and my reasoning may be at fault. But if it is not, then I guess you would want to correct the facts on record.

Colin Bord,
34a Barnsdale Road, London W9 3LL.
January 6, 1973.

* [The author being Mrs. Irene Granchi
—EDITOR.]

On FSR editorial "Bad publicity"

Dear Sir,—It has been brought to my attention that part of the September/October FSR editorial was devoted to berating me for "collaborating" with the *Sunday People* on an article that appeared in their pages, and I feel several points should be clarified in order to put this into perspective. The implication in the editorial was that I might well have sought out such an article in order to increase *Gemini's* circulation: this was not in fact so—had it been I would certainly consider adverse criticism was merited. However, far from my seeking an article in this paper, their reporter planted himself on me with practically no notice at all already armed with a considerable knowledge of the cases involved. Under such circumstances, whether "experienced" or "inexperienced"—and I would question whether the *ALL ROUND* UFO experience of FSR's editor is very much greater than my own—it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to dictate how an article should be presented: it is also impossible to prevent publication, as if this is attempted one may expect short shrift indeed. So far as the published description of *Gemini* as "the leading UFO journal" is concerned, this title was not claimed by me then, nor is it now—though the *Sunday People* were certainly aware of FSR's existence and of its promotion of the AVB case.

The suggestion that, because of this article, *Gemini* may not be conducted in a responsible manner is strongly resented. Agreed, as well as the more common aspects we examine those which may be classified "fringe." These are, however, treated in a responsible manner—should any reader doubt this they have only to obtain a copy of *Gemini* to decide for themselves. The article "Sex and Saucers" which touched off the *Sunday People's* interest was written in a serious and constructive vein and indeed researchers examining this aspect include Ray Palmer and John Keel, the latter having himself produced an article entitled "Sex and the Single Saucerer." It is *Gemini's* intention to continue to examine all possible facets of the UFO enigma, whether or no they be controversial—though I doubt if other "angles" will attract similar attention.

Yours faithfully,
Norman Oliver,
95 Taunton Road, London SE12 8PA.
December 27, 1972.

[I am glad to be able to say that I have had no experience with UFOs, so Mr. Oliver has the advantage of me: my sole

(continued on page iii)