

# FANTASTIC UNIVERSE

SCIENCE FICTION

FEB.  
35c

ICD



Virgil  
Finlay

**3 EXCITING NOVELETS by**

**°STANLEY MULLEN • HARRY HARRISON • THOMAS N. SCORTIA**

**°Startling UFO Articles by IVAN SANDERSON and MORRIS JESSUP**

# continents in space

by IVAN T. SANDERSON

If the UFO are not alive, or machines, are they actually specimens of the flotsam and jetsam existing in the sky?

IN PREVIOUS articles we have considered first, whether there are valid reasons for believing that the objects now called Ufos actually exist and, secondly, what they might be. We then enquired more deeply into two possibilities. One was that some of them might be life-forms indigenous to our upper atmosphere or to space itself—not “gaseous vertebrates” as one Jaques Loeb of Chicago University recently put it, (see below).

The other was that some of them could be machines constructed by intelligent beings indigenous to planets going round other suns or to other heavenly bodies. A third possibility was also touched upon but more briefly. This was the possibility that some of them might be very advanced, secret aeroforms constructed by earth-governments. This will have to be more thoroughly explored some day, but it really is an intelligence or counter-espionage matter and not a proper part of Ufology.

This leaves us with our fourth original suggestion—to wit, that some Ufos are ma-

---

*Ivan T. Sanderson raises some startling possibilities as to what the UFO may actually be in the present article, the fourth of a series written specially for this magazine by the distinguished scientist, author of the recent MONKEY KINGDOM (Hanover House \$6.95) and other books.*

---

terial objects or immaterial phenomena of a natural order but not themselves animate or piloted by animate creatures: that they are, in fact, what I choose to call "Assorted Junk." This calls for careful consideration, but it entails a procedure that will lead us into other related fields of a most advanced unpleasantness, and will probably get us into a lot of trouble. But, before we proceed to so advance, let me try to emphasize one other point.

It appears we have not yet made clear that it is our strong personal belief that Ufos have a most complicated taxonomy—*i.e.* that they are of enormous variety, and even possibly comprise many types of all of our four basic categories. In other words, we do not for a moment intend to imply that any one of these four suggestions could explain *all* Ufos. Further, we would like to put on record that we believe there are a heck of a lot of other possibilities not covered even by these famous four. We have an eight-page, single-spaced list of such, carefully classified and sub-divided. Perhaps I can persuade our Editor to run this list in the back of the magazine sometime: it makes rather startling reading and somewhat alarms many people who are willing to give it serious consideration. But this, again, is really another subject.

Though we are inclined to believe that the Russians may have some excessively high-speed, lenticular-shaped, plane-like devices, and while it is obvious that neither our Government, nor those of other countries are exactly standing still in aeronautics, I don't personally believe that many of the true Ufos—or unidentifiable flying objects—can be attributed to this category. A certain percentage of *Ifos*—objects that can be or have been identified by experts, such as planes, migrating geese, weather balloons, *et alia*—may well be, but, of course, we wouldn't know about that.

Similarly, while we have yet to hear of any single valid—on the grounds of currently accepted scientific belief and/or logic—argument *against* the possibility of there being intelligences elsewhere than on this earth, in the Universe, the suggestion that even a small percentage of Ufos are "ships" or at least machines made by these beings and possibly piloted by them, does not appear to be very acceptable. The idea is a nice one and it excites all manner of predisposed believers, and even spurs on some of the sanest and most cautious enquirers, but it presents some extremely "difficult" aspects. Notable among these are the following.

First, why don't they land?

Second, if they do, why is not the fact universally known or at least accepted? If they do land so secretly that nobody knows about them, how is it done; and, again, why? There are those who would have us believe that all sorts of beings showing intelligence and ranging in form from ski-suited blondes of divine countenance to little aluminum beings with four fingers and bat-ears do land on our earth all the time. There is not a shred of evidence that any human-type creatures have ever so landed but, it must be admitted, there is quite a body of reports now extant that non-human-looking types have turned up from time to time in association with odd-shaped structures from the sky. Then, of course, there are angels and devils, poltergeists and djinns.

There could be many very good reasons why beings intelligent enough to have developed interstellar travel (by photon-reaction engines or by teleportation or what-have-you) should be unable to land on this planet, or possibly, not want to. And, who are we to say that they *could* not do so virtually unknown to us. Nonetheless, who is willing to be so bold as to state categorically that any intelligent entity, let alone a "space-person," has landed on this earth?

Yet, if some Ufos are cruisers constructed by such beings, why have they not been detected? It does not make sense unless we are really so far behind them that we simply cannot conceive of their ideas, activities or competences. Of course, it is true that we are ourselves today rapidly reaching a point where some of our own activities may be prosecuted absolutely without detection—*vide*, electronic scrambling of coded messages in such a manner that it would take even a Univac computer a million years to run through all the possible combinations to be sure, by the law of averages, that it finally hit the right one for decoding the message. If we do have space visitors, they could be so far advanced compared to us that they might be able to just pop in and out of here without detection, and even—as some apparent crackpots assert—take an active part in our affairs, unbeknownst to us. This, naturally, is a very alarming thought, but frankly I don't credit the assertion and I would have to see a lot of practical evidence of its having happened, before I would do so.

In the meantime, there is this fourth category of possibilities to explain some, if not all, Ufos.

There is obviously a lot wrong with our ideas as to what goes on up in the sky

and "beyond" our atmosphere. Only last summer some very serious but open-minded meteorologists demonstrated—by sending a crew to Tierra del Fuego at the extreme bottom-end of South America—that radio transmissions can be reflected back to earth not only from fifty, sixty-five, and a hundred and forty miles up, but possibly from 6000 and even 20,000 miles. This is bad enough but then there has recently also been a distressing reassessment of our beliefs about temperatures as you go up. It used to be thought that the farther up you went the more the temperature dropped towards absolute zero ( $-273^{\circ}$  C.) in "space." Now, we have an upper frightfully hot layer and there is even doubt as to whether space is infinitely cold or infinitely "hot"—radiations passing through same possibly being converted directly into heat on striking any body. Then, space turns out to have a lot more matter scattered through it than was previously thought; and, when it comes to the radiations pulsing through it, we are yearly being left more bewildered by the mounting list.

One would have supposed that this march of discovery would have prompted a decrease in dogmatism among those who study such matters, and particularly among

those who interpret their findings for public consumption; but this is not so. Interpretations of such discoveries are propounded with ever-increasing assurity just as if each had finally capped and sealed all our knowledge of the whole business. Further, while proper scientific caution is often exercised in this interpretation of what has been observed, ever more vehement denials of any suggestions as to what could remain to be discovered are heard. It is strange indeed that so many fine minds devoted to discovery, and knowing how much we *don't* know, should so very often categorically deny even the possibility of anything in general or something in particular remaining to be discovered in their own fields. Worse still, are sweeping statements issued by both real experts and by mere "experts" sneering at or condemning everything they don't believe in or just don't like. A glowing example is the statement mentioned in our opening paragraph. This is best quoted in full, since it appeared in the April, 1957 issue of *MISSILES and ROCKETS*:-

"A telephoned warning this page respects, quoted by a Government man of science from the University of Chicago, biochemist Jaques Loeb; 'If a man claims there is a *gaseous vertebrate* (ital-

ics ours) floating around the atmosphere, it is clearly his duty to prove it and not the duty of every other scientist to disprove. Otherwise we'd be spending our lives disputing the claims of every charlatan and crackpot'."

We do not know if anybody has yet suggested that some Ufos could be "Gaseous vertebrates," but if they have, I am inclined to agree with Dr. Loeb, since the 'vertebrate' bit would seem to be highly improbable in anything gaseous, to say the least. On the other hand, it is possible that Dr. Loeb is referring to the Wassilko-Serecki "theory" or suggestion that some Ufos may be life-forms of a highly tenuous composition but charged with and "feeding" upon energy in some form or forms. The point here is, rather, the stated profession of the stater of this statement. If we caught such a life-form, would we take it to a biochemist? And if we did, on the grounds that he is professionally concerned with the chemistry of life-forms, would we get a proper identification: a *gaseous vertebrate*, and a colloidal bladder filled with free ions, are *not* the same.

The major fault with this statement, however, is its last sentence. Why should even a biochemist sneer at anybody for making suggestions as to how possibly to explain something about which he admits

he knows nothing and apparently does not want to try to explain or even to consider. Charcot and Mesmer, not to mention Galileo and F. Bacon, Esq. were all called charlatans at one time or another, and many a crackpot has made excellent suggestions. The onus to prove a mere suggestion indeed rests upon the suggester, but it is incumbent upon researchers as a whole to at least try to investigate anything that is not explained. Simply to run away from such a problem is pure intellectual cowardice. It is unfortunately a procedure that is far too common, especially where Ufos are concerned.

But there are public statements of another order that are even more pernicious. A classic example may be quoted from a United Press release of the 9th August, 1957, regarding the fifty-pound hunks of angular ice that fell on a farm at Bernsville, Pennsylvania earlier that week. This read as follows:-

"Huge chunks of ice that fell from the sky to the farm of Edwin Groff of Bernsville probably were blown in from the west on a jet stream according to Dr. Malcolm Reider of Reider Associates, a local chemical laboratory. Dr. Reider said an analysis of the ice indicated it was formed in the western section of the nation because of the presence of a high amount of alkaline

dust. He said the ice was blown eastward at 400 to 600 miles per hour by the jet stream, a high altitude air current. He theorized the ice chunk fused and got too heavy for the air stream to support. Groff was working in his fields earlier this week when the big chunks of ice plunged into the ground near his feet."

It is hard to preserve one's equanimity while reading such a statement and thus doubly hard to remain objective when discussing it. One wonders if anybody could possibly be so stupid as to believe that anybody else is so stupid as to believe such a tale. Are we seriously asked to believe that the western section of our nation is the only area in the world to have a high alkaline dust content in its air; that fifty-pound hunks of ice can defy gravity over three thousand miles; that fused ice has angular edges; and that air friction, which almost burns up planes at sonic speeds, won't melt ice? If lots of little bits of ice (hail) can fuse while roaring along at 600 m.p.h. would the resultant hunk be devoid of a granular structure; and why should it fall only when it got to a weight of fifty pounds; why not at a pound or at the proverbial golf-ball size of the largest hailstones; and why didn't it at least melt its edges off while falling? Yes, indeed! Further

comment on this particular piece of pseudo-scientific gobbledegook is not necessary but some comments on its significance are so.\*

This is the kind of rubbish that is put forth in the name of Science—poor science—day after day on all manner of diverse subjects. *Doctor* this or *Professor* that, *Government Scientists and Authorities* and *Experts* sound enormously impressive to the poor benighted public who readily admit that the workings of current scientific theories and technological procedures are quite beyond their understanding. When something unexplained (or sometimes apparently inexplicable) occurs, and is reported but cannot be immediately brushed aside as a mistake or a lie, the public sometimes continues to demand an explanation and somebody then has to be found who is willing to come up with one. The utter irresponsibility of many of these "explanations" is not only amazing; it is inexcusable.

\*Subsequent to writing the above, there have been further falls of ice in Pennsylvania. All told, there have been four major incidents: (1) At Bernsville, July 30th, two pieces, one weighing fifty pounds and angular; (2) a 500 pound chunk at Shimogan on August 14th; (3) an unspecified-by-weight fall at Chester, on September 8th and (4) a forty pound chunk of porous, semi-melted agglutinated ice found in a field at Annandale on September 18th by a road-working crew. It is said that these falls, when plotted on a map, fall along a perfectly straight line. This may have special ufological significance in view of Michel's theory in his new book.

The complete audacity of some is really beyond belief.

The procedure is to get an expert or an alleged expert in almost any subject, but preferably with a doctorate or a secret government job, who is willing to say anything, however illogical, unscientific or stupid. Then the public is fed his statement and told that it explains everything. This attitude on the part of these experts—not, we suspect, of any real scientist—and of the Press on such occasions is execrable, very nearly criminal, and ultimately extremely dangerous. Those giving out the statements are outright charlatans.

No wonder Ufos are so highly suspect. What is the great mass of the public (who have never had the disturbing experience of seeing something in the sky with their own eyes that they cannot explain or identify) to think of the business when the entire Press, if reporting the incident at all, refers to it in ribald phrases that hint at a superfluity of bad liquor, bad dreams, bad observation, mass hallucination public stupidity, hoaxes, lies, and flying-chamber-pots: and then, if all this fails to subdue the observers, drags in a raft of "experts" with high-sounding prefixes to their names who, sitting on their swivel-chairs in laboratories miles away, deride the whole thing and explain it away arbitrarily in

a manner so foolish and fraudulent that even third grade school-children can spot its falsity. Nor is this all!

It may come as a surprise to many to learn that quite a number of things that are ostensibly explained in full in standard textbooks have not really been explained at all; at least the given explanations neither work nor are amenable to logic. Sky phenomena rate high in this category. A good example is Mirages. If you don't believe me, get out an Encyclopaedia or any standard textbook that covers the subject and start reading.

You will be told that mirages are caused by reflections from the undersides of layers of hot air in the sky above, which act like the "ning-ning" or shimmer on hot road surfaces. This is splendid and fairly simple and would seem to explain everything—until you see a few mirages yourself or come to read descriptions of them as given by some reliable travellers and truly scientific investigators, even meteorologists. Then, whatever else may seem odd to you, one fact will stand out. Where are the originals of the things seen in the mirages?

Even if you don't believe somebody who says he saw a line of fifteenth century ships ploughing over a rough ocean in the sky over the Sahara in 1928—and somebody

did say this—where were the ships? In Hollywood, perhaps? But where are the islands, cities, boats, snow-capped mountains, and all the other things seen daily all over the world in mirages? If you really settle down to take compass readings of such sights and then get out charts, maps, and atlases, you will find in almost a hundred percent of cases that no such things exist anywhere beyond the alleged reflection in the sky. What is more, you can take photographs of some of these alleged reflections—of others you apparently cannot. What, in fact, is going on here; and not only in the textbooks, but in the sky?

There are all manner of other fairly common sky phenomena that, having been seen so regularly by so many, are complacently accepted and allegedly explained, though the explanations often defy logic, or at least our present scientific understanding. Ball-lightning is one; the Aurora Australis at the equator is another. Then, there is the appalling collection of assorted junk that has fallen out of the sky.

This was steadfastly denied until very recently despite everlasting reports of its occurrence since earliest times, and even when it was published in the journals of such respected scientific bodies as the Royal Society of England and the Meteorological Socie-

ty. If you want a whole catalogue of them in one go, read *The Books of Charles Fort*. There are rains of blood, frogs, fish, sea-snails, insects, worms, wool, seeds, ice, coke, gases of many kinds, and all manner of unidentified materials. If you prefer, you might peruse the publication of the Fortean Society, entitled DOUBT, that has carried on Fort's work since his death in 1932. From the references given in these you may go back to the original descriptions in newspapers and journals and judge for yourself. You will be surprised to find that a rain of fish actually landed on an ichthyologist (a fish expert) in Mississippi in 1950; and that the British Air Ministry seized several large lumps of stuff that looked like ice but were actually pieces of a kind of 'plastic' or glass, that landed on England from the sky.

All this junk comes down out of the sky, all right! This cannot be denied either by 'experts', experts, technologists, or even government officials. Real scientists have kept more 'mum' about this than about things that don't come down out of the sky—such as Ufos—and very rightly, for when you actually have such an "offensive" object in your hand, you *have* to do something about it, and theories to explain it have to be very carefully propounded. The Press also tends to do a

more objective job on such occurrences and well they, too, might because a Government ichthyologist clobbered by a one-and-a-half-pound fish at breakfast time in mid-country is apt to get a bit peeved if he is accused of being drunk or having hallucinations. Government scientists aren't members of the public; they are public servants!

There is, however, an obverse side to this business of unauthorized objects coming down from the sky. This is the *going-up* phenomenon. If you can get ahold of any reliable reports of what went up in any tornado and of what subsequently came down, or was found *down* after the tornado had passed, you will immediately discover that an awful lot more sometimes appears to go up than comes down. Of course, like missing persons, you may calm yourself by simply saying that they just went somewhere else. But did they? And to where? I know of one well-documented case of a two-storey chicken brooder with two men in it that went up in a tornado but, while some lumber and a lot of chicken *feathers* and the body of one man were subsequently found scattered over a large area of farmland, only about ten percent of the chicken *bodies* were accounted for, one man has never been found, and not one sin-

gle bit of the heavy metal roof of the building ever turned up again. This was well inland and far from any wild area where a couple of tons of sheet-metal roofing and some fifteen hundred chicken corpses might be overlooked. Where did this junk go?

Stuff that is sucked up in tornados is the standard explanation for stuff that comes down unexpectedly from a clear sky. But consider a crowded chicken brooder for a moment. It contains a wide variety of items from sheet-metal roofing to hens' eggs. Everything that goes up must, according to the old adage, come down; also, tornados could have some kind of sifting device, whereby the down-coming is delivered piecemeal by size or weight. But, by *what* process does a tornado—or a jet stream, for that matter—deliver material qualitatively—namely, fish of all sizes in one place, frogs in another, and ice in a third? (And why doesn't it deliver plucked chickens?) Surely, there must be a lot of stuff of the same size or weight as a plucked chicken in a smashed barn, or as fish or frogs in a fishpond! Charles Fort went over all this long ago, but nobody has tried to do anything about his suggestions and, yet, neatly sorted, as well as assorted, junk continues to rain down upon us.

Things that come down,

must come from somewhere—especially *live* fish and frogs. The 'somewhere' is manifestly up above us. Do they reside up there and sometimes get shaken down, or do they wander off an end of floating "continents" of ice as Fort suggested, or do they rip around the earth in slip-streams as this Dr. Reider suggests? If so, how do they defy gravity? Or does earth gravity have a "blind-spot" or belt around its waist, like a giant bar-magnet? If so, can junk be shot up into this, and remain alive up there long enough to be transported to another continent before being sorted into species and later dumped?

Of course, all this sounds like unutterable rubbish and we are more than willing to admit that it is, but just how are we to explain these phenomena? You cannot just leave them lying around; they are too much of a challenge. Nevertheless, we must stop speculating and try to tackle yet another aspect of the problem.

There are now several so-called models of the first artificial satellite that is allegedly to be shot into the upper atmosphere next year. These models vary from the size of a large grapefruit to a fair-sized barrel. We don't yet know what size the real one will be but we are already being confidently told that it will circulate the earth at

some two hundred miles or more above us, that it will not be bigger than a football, and yet that it will be "plainly visible to the naked eye for certain periods at dawn and dusk." Now what kind of nonsense is this?

Try picking out an apple on a tree at a mile, a candle-flame on the deck of a ship on the horizon, or a super-bomber at 40,000 ft. on a clear day. Using a powerful telescope we are told that you could pick up a candle flame on Mars. We can only believe these statements but, if you come to think about them, there is something very wrong here. In conjunction, they are nothing but a neat way of avoiding another issue—namely, what can be seen in between these two points and does anybody look for anything in between.

Finally, there is the astonishing amount of cosmic junk, that is already known to and accepted by proper science, that floats about within our little solar system.

The most competent current investigators of this phenomena have propounded the theory that one of our sun's family of planets blew up about 300,000,000 years ago, giving rise to the asteroids, meteorites, and a lot of gas and other stuff. They contend that this planet was composed of concentric layers of metals, covered by layers of rocks of various densi-

ties, and finally by a coating of glass, which latter gave rise to the *tectites* that fall on this earth. All this is residual matter now wandering about this part of space, and bits of it, they contend sometimes rush into or through our atmosphere.

How do we know of what this may be composed? And how do we know, as yet, exactly how it is going to behave when it gets within, say, the new outer limit of 20,000 miles of our atmosphere, however tenuous? The density of some bits might cause them to float, and to glow, and be whipped about by jet-streams at sundry altitudes above the surface of the earth. Great Fortean rafts of ice could come drifting in only to break up in an atmospheric storm and spatter worthy Pennsylvanian farmers with fifty-pound left-overs.

The fish, frogs and snails I don't like. They are oxygen-breathing creatures that appear, when they have been properly examined, usually to be exactly of recognized earth species. However, if it should ever be proved that such items didn't go up anywhere, they must have been up there in the first place and, for the life of me, I can't think of anything more "logical"—or at least amusing—than old Charles Fort's classic suggestion that they fall off the edges of their ice-rafts, or blobs of water, or

asteroids, when migrating! That, at least would explain their neat differentiation by species, if not by size. But we, too, get very extreme. Let us stick to facts and suggestions, and particularly our famous fourth one.

To reiterate, this is that at least some Ufos are examples of this assorted, non-animate, spacial junk that is naturally indigenous to our solar system. Such stuff could not have any 'desire' to land on this earth; it need not invariably be subject to gravitic attraction, and if it is, it probably for the most part burns up or volatilizes before it reaches the surface of the earth. It could appear to behave in an astonishingly swift and erratic manner to an observer on the ground, by whipping along a slip-stream and then suddenly dropping below it, to be flipped off at an acute angle by another air-current, a manoeuvre that would squash any animate pilot. Some of it might play tag with our planes due to forces of attraction and/or repulsion of which we know nothing at present. It might glow by reflection or from some internal cause. It might come showering down in the form of "angel's hair," blobs of mauvish refrigerated jelly, hunks of glass, great glowing globes that flatten standing grass or bushes and then dissolve, or in lenticular fragments that sway or whip about like a

falling paper-plate. Long "cigar-shaped" bits might sail majestically across our upper atmosphere and they could be going at cosmic speeds very high up and be enormous, or be travelling comparatively slowly at lower levels and be fairly small. Some hunks could be big enough and far enough away to get between the rim of the moon and a startled astronomer looking through a telescope focussed at exactly the right range from earth. There could be an enormous amount of this junk meandering about between the proposed orbit for our artificial satellite and the more usual focussing points of our telescopes, hidden by the blanketing effect of light-scatter in our atmosphere.

However, this is no excuse for saying that Ufos don't exist, and it is no reason for calling anybody, who says they have spotted one of them coming down, a liar. Moreover, it is the direct responsibility of "science" and of scientific research workers to get to work to try to explain these things with a view to trying to catch some of them and describing them. Such workers *should* give up a specific amount of their time to consider and examine every suggestion that is made as to what they might be. They would, in some cases, be much better employed in doing this than in doing the things they are doing now.

### The Wassilko-Serecki Theory

In your February, 1957 issue you ran the first of my series of articles on Theoretical analyses of the nature of Unidentified Flying Objects and this was primarily devoted to a theory that some, if not all of them, may be life-forms indigenous to our upper atmosphere or to space. This theory was ascribed to a lady by the name of Zoe Wassilko-Serecki. Unfortunately insufficient credit was given to its author therein and certain rather misleading statements crept into what accreditation there was. These I would now like to correct.

The story behind that article was odd to say the least. Being myself primarily a biologist, I had always been interested in the suggestion that some Ufos might be life-forms—a point that was long ago mooted by Charles Fort, and latterly reiterated by the U.S.A.F. in its Project Bluebook Report. I had no theory upon the idea and had never encountered one until late in 1955 when an unknown well-wisher sent me a photostat of a mimeographed copy of an article, in German, on the subject. This bore no authorship and there was no indication as to its origin. Its sender, a casual listener to a radio program I then had, could tell me no more than that he had received it from a friend in the American Armed Forces in Germany.

When it was translated I immediately saw that its author had done a great deal of thinking on the subject and I therefore took the work as a basis for not a little research into the flight of insects and humming birds, the comparative sizes of animals at different levels in the oceans, and all manner of corollary matters that had been assembled as evidence for the possibility that Ufos *could* be animate or subanimate. When I came to write the article for *Fantastic Universe*, I incorporated my findings with a paraphrase of the original article.

About that time a good friend of mine who has for many years been a most assiduous collector of data on Fortean phenomena—Stanley I. Rowe—sent me tear-sheets of the German article but in *print* and in *English*. This too was cropped head and foot but did have the author's name on the head. The name was Zoe Wassilko-Serecki.

Then, even more unexpectedly, another friend rang me to say that he had been cleaning out his collection of magazines and had come across an article right up my alley, in an old copy of *The American Astrologer*, all about Ufos being animals. When the copy arrived I found, at last, I had the original, and I immediately rang our Editor who kindly offered to make what changes possible at the last

minute before publication. These could not be sufficiently extensive and have proved to be somewhat misleading for another reason—namely, that I still did not recognize the name of the author. Its significance was first pointed out to me by Isabel Davis, Secretary of the C.S.I. of New York, whose article on Saucer Contactees appeared in the *November*, 1957 issue.

The author, in fact, turns out to be none other than The Countess Zoe Wassilko-Serecki, a most prominent figure in Fortean fields of research in Europe since the early twenties, and who was the *discoverer* of the famous Romanian Poltergeist girl and medium whom she took to London to be studied by the famous Dr. Harry Price. The Countess is President of the Austrian Astrological Society and is, of course, not only just "residing in Austria" but has always lived there despite the terrible vicissitudes through which her country has passed during her lifetime.

The theory she has developed actually first appeared—she now writes me—in a publication entitled INCON-NUÉ (Editor Pierre Genillard) in Geneva, Switzerland in 1955, and was then reprinted by Clancy Publications in New York in their magazine.

There is one other point that I should like to clarify. In my article I inserted the

phrase "rather surprisingly" when giving the origin of the theory as being an astrologer. The Countess wishes me to explain this. I will be quite frank in saying that it did come as a great surprise to me as I never previously heard of astrologers being interested in Ufology, and I will be even franker in saying further that I have not previously encountered any theory based on astrology that so closely intermeshes with currently accepted scientific theory and which—most surprisingly of all—did not once call upon astrological theory in its promulgation. All Ufologists will be equally surprised, and science-fiction readers will doubtless be quite startled, as astrology is a taboo subject in their field.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the Wassilko-Serecki theory while being

one of the four most logical yet put forward to explain at least some Ufos, has been and still is gaining ground over all others as an explanation of many sightings and also of several related phenomena, such as stinks from the sky and notably of falls of *Angel Hair*, jellies and other substances. It will have to be seriously considered in the future not only of Ufologists but, if the "saucer business" persists in going on, by those scientists who will eventually have to tackle the problem at the request of the public, the press, or officialdom. Meantime, I am hoping that FANTASTIC UNIVERSE may be able to find space for a fuller elaboration of the theory together with the results of its many corollary studies in a Future Issue.

I.T.S.

---

NEXT MONTH —

Avram Davidson's THE BOUNTY HUNTER

Theodore Pratt's SEED

Robert Moore Williams' SON OF JALNOR

Donald Keith's COMMAND PERFORMANCE

and

RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY, A New Novel by JOHN BRUNNER

— in FANTASTIC UNIVERSE