

### The Edinburgh Symposium

By now most people will know this meeting was cancelled, the following is the text of the letter sent out and explains the reasons.

#### Royal Society of Edinburgh

When a Symposium to present new and review past evidence for the existence of unidentified animals in Loch Ness was first proposed by Sir Peter Scott, as Chancellor of the University of Birmingham, its local organisation was accepted by the Royal Society of Edinburgh acting in association with the Edinburgh and Heriot-Watt Universities. The programme was to be that on the first day evidence should be submitted by invited experts to a restricted scientific audience and that an agreed press release would be made on the following day.

It was understood that, by this means, a forum could be offered for the free expression of opinions and criticisms so that a balanced assessment of the evidence could be prepared for the public.

Recent wide publicity, from prospective participants on both sides of the Atlantic, at variance with this understanding, has forced the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the associated Universities to the regretful conclusion that no useful or impartial discussion can take place at this time and under these circumstances.

Accordingly, the Royal Society of Edinburgh, the University of Edinburgh and the Heriot-Watt University are no longer prepared to be associated with the meetings arranged for December 9th and 10th.

Wm H. Rutherford, Executive  
Secretary,

But a spokesman was reported in the press to have said that they still had an open mind about the evidence, and their official withdrawal did not mean university experts would not be at the meeting.

As a result of this the meetings in Edinburgh were cancelled but due to the efforts of David James M.P. a three hour meeting was held on the evening of December 10th in the Grand Committee Room at The House of Commons. I was privileged to be invited to this meeting and was very impressed by the gathering of experts to present the evidence and explain how the various pieces of equipment were developed and used. The meeting opened by Lord Craigton continued with Norman Collins, David James, and Sir Peter Scott, who as directors of the Loch Ness Investigation Bureau gave a short history of the organisation. Dr. Robert Rines then introduced the Academy of Applied Science and the people who had developed the equipment and devised the means of using it in the Loch. He then went on to show the photographs taken in August 1972, and it was photographs for there were two "flipper" pictures taken a short time apart and showing the same shape but in a slightly different position. Also there was obtained at the same time as the pictures a Raytheon Sonar chart showing something very large, and we were shown this and it was explained to us; as was the enhancing process which had been used on the pictures. Then he moved on to the photographs taken on June 20th 1975, telling how in an attempt to reduce the reflection of light by the peat particles they had moved the camera away from the strobe flash as much as practical, this resulted in pictures which have fairly good definition without enhancing. It also resulted in swing which led to a camera pointing about 30 degrees above horizontal, which has to be remembered when looking

at the pictures. We were shown some test film which showed the hull of a boat on the surface some 35 feet above. Then the two new pictures were shown the first being the head and neck and fore part of the body, once more the peat has made itself a nuisance in spite of the moves made by the Academy team. The second shot came as a shock being a very close view of the head, in my opinion, in the lower left of the frame reddish in colour with a roughness and projections from the top. Unfortunately it was impossible to make out details but there was a definite symmetry about it and there seemed to be boney plates on it. These 1975 pictures were shown without enhancing and I feel that they would be much improved by this treatment.

After this Sir Peter Scott introduced the zoologists, principally Dr. Zug, Ph.D. Curator, Div. Reptiles & Amphibians Smithsonian Institution, and Dr. J. McGowan, Ph.D. Associate Curator Dept. Vertebrate Palaeontology Royal Ontario Museum, Canada. Both of whom spoke for the acceptance of the evidence, and while they both made it clear that they were expressing personal opinions and not speaking for the bodies that employ them, the fact they were prepared to stand up and be counted adds a great deal of weight to the argument.

The next item was the showing of Tim Dinsdales film, followed by personal accounts of their sightings by Mr. Lowrie and Mr. Wilkins.

David James spoke on the problems of conservation which was one of the main aims of the meeting, Richard Fitter and Sir Peter Scott added to this point. Sir Peter Scott explained the name given to Nessie, Nessiteras rhombopteryx, and pointed out that it was not usual for bodies other than the British Museum to name new species but that he felt it was necessary in this case; as there was a bill in parliament concerning conservation and it was possible that Nessie may be added to it.

The meeting was then thrown open for questions from the floor and some discussion followed, a number of pertinent questions being asked. Dr Gordon Sheals, Natural History Museum keeper of zoology, read a prepared statement saying that in their opinion there was no evidence to support the theory that there are large unidentified animals living in Loch Ness. A little later during the discussion Dr Sheals got up and put forward the theory that what we were seeing in the 'flipper' pictures was the tail of a shark, this had a stunning effect on the platform and a large part of the audience. So much so that no one took the opportunity to ask if there was a chance of an official attempt to find out more about this zoological phenomena.

It was a worthwhile meeting unfortunately pushed into too short a time to have all the desired effects, one of which was to get the British scientific establishment to accept a case for official investigation. If the pre-publicity had not caused the establishment to take a defensive stand against the evidence, and the Edinburgh Symposium had gone ahead, I feel that given a full day of quiet discussion some positive progress would have been made.

Monster hunters have to be for ever optimistic and we have next season to hope for, Bob Rines will be back and others, so we may come up with something that must in the end be accepted by everyone as positive proof.

After the meeting I had a few minutes to chat to old friends, and all I talked to had been very impressed by the presentation of, and the contents of the evidence. I preferred the 'flipper' pictures but as I said the 1975 pictures should benefit from enhancement.

I spoke to Ike Blonder (A.A.S.) who is very interested in the sounds Nessie may make, he has equipment which he has left with Dick Raynor to be used in the Loch when weather permits in 1976, he gave me a leaflet headed; "Territorial Imperative" Animal Attractant.

Most male animals mark and defend a territorial area sufficient for their sustenance and breeding. The area may be marked by the scent of sweat glands or urine in the case of land animals that are not dominant, or by vocal sounds from the ones large enough not to fear predators.

Underwater animals are usually silent, probably out of fear for their survival, but those with few enemies and carnivorous, often have sonar type sound producing hunting organs and may also emit "territorial" sounds to warn off competitors from their living space.

"Nessie" undeniably the largest animal in Loch Ness, may be reasonably assumed to possess sound and sonar organs.

Our recording and playback system is designed to record underwater sounds via a hydrophone and replay whatever has been recorded about 5 seconds later through the same hydrophone. Hopefully, the echo will be perceived by "Nessie" as a rival and he will proceed towards the hydrophone uttering new challenges to the intruder.

The desired result of this experiment would be to obtain a recording of the sounds of "territorial imperative" and thereby enable us to attract "Nessie" for photography and observation at will.

This is but one of many schemes which have been, and are to be, tried in an effort to locate Nessie.

#### Odds and Ends

With all the coverage the press gave "Nessie" it was not surprising when one Sunday paper used it as a basis for a 'win a holiday' competition. All you had to do was give your reason for wanting to go Monster hunting, the trite piece was 'the funnier the better'. Why must the press refuse to be serious about it all.

I have news of a strange sighting in Loch Lochy, more of this next time.

News for road travellers next year, the Ballachulish Bridge across Loch Leven is now open, and the relief road for Fort William is well under way, making the journey up the West coast much easier.

That's all for this month, may I remind members that subscriptions for 1976 are now due, unfortunately I have had to raise them to U.K. £1.25 U.S.A. & Canada \$7.00 my address is still:-

R.R.Hepple, Huntshieldsford Cottage, St. Johns Chapel, Bishop Auckland,  
Co. Durham, DL13 1RQ.

All news and views are very welcome.

Rip.

Presentation of Loch Ness evidence to the Members of both Houses of Parliament, Scientists, and Press in the Grand Committee Room, House of Commons on December 10, 1975.

SUMMARY STATEMENTS OF SCIENTISTS WHO HAVE PRESENTLY STUDIED  
THE 1972-1975 UNDERWATER SONAR AND PHOTOGRAPHIC RESULTS AT  
LOCH NESS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND  
THE BRITISH LOCH NESS INVESTIGATION BUREAU.

\* \* \* \* \*

1. The following statements represent my personal opinion. These statements do not represent an "official" view of the Smithsonian.
2. The data gathered in 1972 consist of a 16mm film and a continuous sonar record. One part of the sonar record clearly shows a series of small objects and several larger objects. Sonar experts interpret the smaller objects as fish and the larger objects as animate objects in the 20-30 foot size range. I concur with this interpretation and further suggest these are fish and the recently described Nessiteras rhombopteryx, previously known as the Loch Ness monsters.
3. Computer-enhancement of the 16mm film frames taken at the same time as the sonar record of large animate objects reveal a number of objects. The most distinct image is of a rhomboidal shape attached by a narrow base to a larger object. I interpret this as a flipper-like appendage protruding from the side of a robust body.
4. The 1975 16mm film includes several frames containing images of objects which possess symmetrical profiles which indicate that they are animate objects or parts thereof. I would suggest that one of the images is a portion of a body and neck and another a head.
5. I believe these data indicate the presence of large animals in Loch Ness, but are insufficient to identify them.
6. This new evidence on the existence of a population of large animals in Loch Ness should serve to encourage research on the natural history of Loch Ness and its plant and animal inhabitants and remove the stigma of crackpot from any scientist or group of scientists who wish to investigate the biological and limnological phenomena in Loch Ness.

G.R. Zug, Ph.D.  
Curator  
Div. Reptiles & Amphibians  
Smithsonian Institution

\* \* \* \* \*

After careful study of the photographs depicting the flipper-like object photographed with the Edgerton strobe-elapsed time camera equipment at Loch Ness in 1972, it is our considered opinion that the overall length of the flipper-like structure and its connection has a probable value of 6 to 8 feet, but in no event would be less than 4 feet.

Harold E. Edgerton,  
Institute Professor, Emeritus  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Charles W. Wyckoff  
Applied Photo Sciences, Inc.

\* \* \* \* \*

As of November 24, 1975: With regard to the photographs taken in 1972 (one of which has been published in The Photographic Journal), Dr. Zug, of the United States National Museum of Natural History, has said that "computer enhancement of one frame produces a flipper-like object." They cannot disagree with this comment, but the information in this photograph is insufficient to enable them to attempt even the broadest identification.

Third Paragraph of Press Notice  
24 November, 1975  
British Museum (Natural History)  
G. F. Claringbull  
Director

\* \* \* \* \*

The following represents a personal opinion and does not represent an "official" view of the Royal Ontario Museum.

Having assessed the photographic and sonar evidence collected in 1972 and 1975 by investigators from the Boston Academy of Applied Science, and, having considered other data pertinent to the Loch Ness phenomenon, I have arrived at the following:

1. I have no reason to doubt the integrity of the investigators of the Boston Academy of Applied Science, nor the authenticity of their data.
2. I am satisfied that there is a sufficient weight of evidence to support that there is an unexplained phenomenon of considerable interest in Loch Ness; the evidence suggests the presence of large aquatic animals.
3. The Loch Ness phenomenon should be the subject of a consolidated interdisciplinary research effort.
4. Steps should be taken to protect against irresponsible activities in and around Loch Ness.

C. McGowan, Ph.D.  
Associate Curator  
Dept. Vertebrate Palaeontology  
Royal Ontario Museum Canada

\* \* \* \* \*

Having examined and studied all of the underwater photographic material obtained by the Academy of Applied Science in 1972 and 1975, it is my judgement that some of the pictures corroborate earlier evidence and substantiate the existence of large aquatic animals in Loch Ness.

Specifically, two photographs show "flipper-like" objects which possess a contour well adapted for aquatic propulsion. A third picture shows an object, most reasonably interpreted, as the upper third of the body of an animal, including an elongated head-neck and two anterior appendages.

My judgement is based on ten years of in depth study of all data relating to the "Loch Ness Monster" question undertaken as one of the directors of the Loch Ness Investigation Bureau. I believe the evidence obtained merits serious and open-minded consideration by both zoologists and scientists in related fields. Clearly further research is called for and consideration must be given to the preservation and conservation of this unusual population of animals.

Prof. Roy Mackal  
Division of Biological Sciences  
The University of Chicago

\* \* \* \* \*

As a naturalist I have been interested in the possibility of large animals in Loch Ness since 1958 and was a founder board member of the Loch Ness Investigation Bureau. I have watched at the lochside, dived in the Loch and flown over it in a glider. So far I have not been lucky enough to see one of the animals.

The underwater photographs taken by Dr. Robert Rines' Team from the Academy of Applied Science, in collaboration with the Loch Ness Investigation Bureau, seem to me to show parts of an animal which Dr. Rines and I have described as Nessiteras rhombopteryx, in particular so as to facilitate conservation measures which we believe to be necessary.

In particular two of the photographs show a structure which to my eye cannot be other than the flipper of an animal. The fact that there are two photographs taken about one minute apart which show a slight variation in shape is entirely consistent with consecutive aspects of an animal paddle which has moved slightly between pictures. To me the second picture makes the first enormously more significant.

Another photograph shows what appears to be the head, neck and front of the body of one of the creatures which recalls the shape of certain fossil specimens from pre-history.

In conjunction with a number of earlier records, on film and in still photographs, which cannot be explained in terms of known phenomena, the underwater pictures leave no further doubt in my mind that large animals exist in Loch Ness.

Peter Scott  
Chairman, Survival Service Commission  
of Int. Union for Conservation of Nature  
Chairman, World Wildlife Fund.

\* \* \* \* \*

I personally find them extremely intriguing and sufficiently suggestive of a large aquatic animal to both urge and recommend that, in the future, more intensive investigations similar to the type that you have pioneered in the past be undertaken in the loch.

My reasons for this are as follows: 1) On at least two separate occasions you have come up with a photograph suggestive of an appendage; 2) The so-called "head" clearly seems to be a relatively small head on a rather thick neck and may match up with the object faintly connected to the body in the photograph, which seems to be the body of a large animal...I am unable to even suggest the type of animal to which the head belongs...

A. W. Crompton  
Professor of Biology  
Harvard University  
Museum of Comparative Zoology, Director

\* \* \* \* \*

1972 1) Three frames taken while sonar showed large animals in or near the camera field of view themselves showed unusual shapes. These shapes were not artifacts, and did not appear in hundreds of frames taken when no sonar echoes were recorded... Assuming ranges indicated by the sonar were correct, the size of the animal or animals seen in these pictures agreed with size estimated from the sonar record. One animal may have had a 16 foot body...

One frame (the "flipper"... ) showed a fairly distinct, coloured object which I inferred was the animal or a portion of the animal. A final frame showed two objects, an interpretation which was consistent with the sonar record. One was much

further from the camera than the other, according to the sonar... the distant profile was about 12 feet long. The "flippers" hanging down from it were about 4 feet long.

1975 One picture showed a body with a long neck and two stubby appendages... The second frame appeared to show a neck and head, with the head closer to the camera than the body... The neck was reticulated. The head supported projections... I see no evidence that they are pictures of a model, toy...or whatever. I emphasize: I detect no evidence of fraud. These objects are not patterns of algae, sediment or gas bubbles.

Alan Gillespie  
Jet Propulsion Laboratory  
California Institute of Technology

\* \* \* \* \*

The 1975 photographs certainly support the belief that a large aquatic animal inhabits Loch Ness. Although the identity of the creatures is not distinguishable, in retrospect these photographs re-confirm the animate image you obtained in 1972, which was reinforced with computer enhancement techniques.

We are unable to interpret or suggest any assignment of a name to this creature. In reviewing the notes of the viewing, the photographs lead one to believe that the object is animate with proportionally large appendages and either a long neck and head or long tail. In particular the photograph of the body and appendage support your previous photographs obtained in 1972. The photograph which has been designated the head further supports our impressions of an animate object because of its bilateral symmetry...

The results of your investigation certainly indicate that additional evidence is needed and more action should be taken in the immediate future to solve this mystery. We hope that you will be able to continue your efforts to identify the creature.

On the other hand, we must take whatever action feasible to protect the animal and it's environment from man's direct actions once your evidence is made public and make sure that man's indirect actions on the environment through pollution, increased boat traffic, etc., does not prevent us from learning more about the creature or even more regretablely leads to its extinction.

David B. Stone  
Chairman of Trustees  
Henry Lyman  
Vice Chairman of Trustees  
John H. Prescott  
Executive Director  
New England Aquarium

\* \* \* \* \*

Newspapers and periodicals interested in the use of photographic materials, please contact Nature, Little Essex Street, London, W2.

For further information on the strobe equipment used in the Loch Ness experiments, see "Electronic Flash, Strobe", H. E. Edgerton, McGraw-Hill, 1970.

/jm, cmr