

Long Service Copy - 273
Return to Editor
SATELLITES AND

VIRAVUS

SPACE TRAVEL

EDITED BY
DAVID WIGHTMAN

FIRST
EDITOR:
E. BIDDLE

Vol. 4, No.4

February, 1958

Our Policy	62
Justice and the Flying Saucers	62
Something Else to go on	65
The Saucers make World Headlines again	67
In a Nutshell	69
Mankind and Space Flight by Verax	71
Odd Bits	72
A Novel and Worthwhile Suggestion	74
Letters to the Editor	75
Saucerzines and their Purpose	78
Personalities and Groups in other Countries by Gavin Gibbons	79

PUBLISHED EVERY SECOND MONTH - POST FREE 2/- OR 35c
MARKHAM HOUSE PRESS LTD., 31 KINGS ROAD, LONDON, S.W.3
SUBSCRIPTION RATE (6 ISSUES) 11/- OR \$1.50

FOR RATES IN WEST EUROPEAN CURRENCIES APPLY TO THE PUBLISHERS

OUR POLICY

It may appear to some readers that our policy has been "destructive" rather than "constructive". This may be so, and to some extent it has been deliberate, for despite the most destructive policy, authentic reports of Saucers remain, and it is this relatively small residue in which we are interested. Your editor receives a vast amount of material, and only a small part of it can be passed on to the reader. One gets the impression that over the last six months there has been a gradual sorting out of the wheat from the chaff, more contact claimants have been debunked, yet even in this field a (very) small number of the reports have withstood the test of a "destructive policy". The latest phase of UFO activity is noteworthy inasmuch as the UFO's seem to be coming lower down into the Earth's atmosphere; are they getting braver or have they decided to carry their plans a step further forward? There is no doubt about it, the activity has stepped up, and there is every indication of it being the biggest "flap" since July, 1952 - keep in touch, things are poppin.

JUSTICE AND THE FLYING SAUCERS

*#(anyone know who's the 23)**
If the "Case" for the existence of UFO's was put on "trial" and methods of law applied: i.e. a "prosecuting counsel (Patrick Moore?), counsel for "defence (take your pick) and "twelve good men and true" as a jury, there could be no doubt as to the verdict. If, to be more specific, the case for the Saucers being intelligently-controlled was similarly "tried", once again there could be only one verdict - "guilty". But to be any more specific, and honestly expect the verdict to be a forgone conclusion, would be the height of folly. By "more specific" we refer of course, once again, to the WHY, HOW and WHENCE of our visitors.

However, we have now arrived at a stage in ufology when it seems probable that not only have we material proof of the existence of the FS's but that the same evidence proves them to be of extra-terrestrial origin, the material proof we speak of is particles of substance

dropped from UFO's, the substance in one case has been successfully analysed, in the second case it has not.

In the August issue of URANUS appeared a brief announcement concerning "material evidence". News of this evidence had come from A.B. Simoes in Brazil where, in December of 1954, metal in a molten state had been recovered after several UFO's had passed over the town of Campinas. The whole case has been reviewed extensively in "The Flying Saucer", a journal of which Mr. Simoes is editor, but it has become very involved, several people having worked on it, some confusing data has been uncovered. However one important point has been established, the metal has been analysed by independent qualified chemists, a Dr Maffei in Brazil and Prof. Nathan Meltz in America, results of these analyses show the metal to be of unusually pure tin, so pure as to prompt Prof. Charles A. Maney to say he thought it most unlikely that the metal could have originated from the Earth. The whole case of this "Campinas tin" is still under rigorous investigation and to tell the story in its entirety would take several pages. But such a statement coming from a man of Prof. Maney's standing indicates the importance of the evidence.

The second piece of material evidence comes from a well known case which happened as long ago as 1952, the Flatwoods "West Virginia Monster". Just recently the Wigan & Dist. F.S. Group received another tape recording from Dr. Dittmar in New York. The recording was taken from the "Long John Programme", which all "off beat" subjects and comes from Washington running six nights a week.

One of several reporters to investigate this weird affair was Ivan T. Sanderson, a well-known figure of ufology in the States, he is a vice president of C.S.I. New York. The case was nothing new to the Wigan members and your editor, but as we all sat in the comfortable room and listened, it became evident that none of us had previously grasped the full importance of the case. Your editor only wishes you could all have listened to it as we did, your opinions could only have become more

not only the metal - but the story told by the lady who claimed saw the metal recovered

Since there were several people working on this metal thing it seems like more info involved

is almost beside him self trying to get the story of it # July the unwavering of this is growing not only tedious, but embarrassing - City it has been "flung" abroad even to Melbourne of C.S.I. long a piece of this

is a... is so... true!... we think... some... from... 11-3-55

conclusive as ours did.

Ivan Sanderson's investigation lasted ten days during which he interviewed some 400 witnesses from which the following main points clearly emerged.

1) Fourteen witnesses, ranging from 5 to 32 years old, saw the strange craft and the "monster" from close range on the ground.

2) These witnesses were questioned closely over a period of three days. They were interviewed singly, in pairs, altogether, and in different combinations of twos, threes and fours, and by professional reporters. None of their accounts differed.

3) Interviews with 400 people revealed that not one but 6 UFO's flew over Braxton county that night.

4) Out of these six craft, all described similarly.

5) One other person besides the original 14 witnesses (a young farmer) saw the craft which landed on the hillside. He observed the craft through binoculars from 3 miles away. His testimony agrees with the main account with the added point that he watched its pulsating light grow gradually dimmer until it finally disappeared. His impression was that it grew "smaller" until it just disappeared.

6) Later it was found that the craft had left evidence of its weight and size by leaving a depression on the hillside some 15ft in diam. with 3 smaller depressions all at a uniform distance from the centre and equally spaced around it, just as though the contrivance had rested on a tripod. In the main depression, grass, shrubs and rocks had been pressed into the ground, giving some idea of the craft's weight. By careful questioning it was concluded that the height of the object was some 20 to 22 ft.

7) The mist which hung closely to the ground smelled strongly of burning metal, and caused a small dog which ran up the hillside with the witnesses to vomit violently and later to die. One of the witnesses was also violently ill.

8) All the witnesses agreed on a description of the monster: 10 ft tall, apparently no legs (it glided along) and two large openings or eyes from which came

faint "beams" with which it was at first scanning the surrounding countryside.

9) From an investigation into one of the other five cases in the area, in which the craft had crashed into a swamp, particles of plastic-like substance were recovered and analysed. Its nature could not be determined, not even by spectographic analysis, nor could a solvent for the substance be found - until someone suggested water.

10) A possible cause of the objects crashing was a belt of polluted air coming from mines and a large chemical plant in the vicinity. The craft which got away were clear of this belt of air.

Only by listening to this tape would readers receive the full and significant importance of this amazing case. Despite a complete investigation which would have uncovered any flaws, the facts stand out very clearly for all to absorb and speculate upon. To postulate the indifference of the authorities to this and similar cases is beyond reason, ^(not to the U.S. any longer!) and researchers of Keyhoe's calibre should press for an official investigation and report on all such cases. This is not a case where "insufficient data", "hoax", hallucination "the planet Venus" et al will pacify those intent on a solution; something was there - WHAT was it?

SOMETHING ELSE TO GO ON

In the October issue of A.B. Simoes' "The Flying Saucer" (Brazil) are listed several very interesting news items. There has been plenty of "action" over Brazil during the last few months. Good reporting of facts is always a feature of this excellent journal, but the October issue being something special.

"Orthotoney is a new word in Ufology, coined by the French mathematician Aime Michel who contends that Saucer sightings have a definite pattern; a straight line invariably connects at least three major check points" (towns).

Simoes speaks?

"Aime Michel has written a new book and it is called, "Flying Saucers and Orthotoney. The book is now being translated into English by "CSI of New York". Now because at least five good sightings were reported on August 24th, 1957 about the same time I have plotted the five points and noticed that from Salinas through Itamarandiba and Ouro Preto runs a very straight line. Witnesses from Salinas and Ouro Preto say the time was 21:30 GMT and I assume that witnesses from

*dangerous
a
deliberate
attempt
to make
facts
fit
theory*
Itamarandiba were somewhat mistaken about the right time as is quite common." Mr. Simoes then goes on to say that he isn't quite sure what to do about "Orthotone-ics" but will offer the data for others to work on. He then goes on to give full details of all the sightings from which it should be possible to put Michel's "Orthotoney" to the test.

*Poor judgement,
dead!*
A new line of investigation is always welcome and this one, coming from Michel should be good, certainly his first book on Saucers was, ranking with that by Capt Ruppelt. *What's w. Ruppelt book? Disgusted me!*

*major Orthotoney
is, read
of book
is, read
of book*
The CSI (New York) magazine for November '57 also has something to say about Michel's new "angle". Eleven incidents involving falls of ice are dealt with at length and make for interesting reading. "Chunks" of ice weighing 25lbs, 40lbs, 50lbs and 100lbs are reported and many of them have been subjected to strict analysis with startling results. The falls of ice began on July 30th, 1957 and the incidents continued for seven weeks. All but two chunks displayed identical characteristics of composition and construction, a difference in structure and lack of alkaline content being the exceptions. The curious fact about the incident is this; when they are plotted on the map it is found that seven of the eight points plotted lie along straight lines with three points in a line. Say the editors of CSI Newsletter, "We don't pretend to know what this means but we thought it was interesting in connection with Michel's 'Orthotoney'.

(Could it be that these ice falls have something to do with the Flying Saucers? Reports of UFO's go back very many years - AND so do reports of ice falls? Ed.)

Several "explanations" have been proffered to account for the falls of ice but the editors of this magazine from NY have very ably demonstrated their flaws. CSI have been able to obtain the backing of several qualified persons, to show up the shortcomings of these 'explanations', so like the Saucers, the chunks of ice can be classed as UFO's. One contributor did offer the theory that the ice blocks were "... gathered together not by winds but by the artificial gravity field of a FS, which subsequently got rid of its frozen accretions. The localization of the falls would then mean simply that the UFO's, for reasons best known to themselves, were frequenting that area at the time".

A short postscript has been added to the CSI bulletin telling of three more falls of ice and they too comply with the "Orthotoney theory".

THE SAUCERS MAKE WORLD HEADLINES AGAIN

Though there is no direct evidence of the latest big Saucer "flap" having anything to do with the launching of "Sputnik No 2", many Saucerzine editors are drawing that conclusion. Unwarranted as this may be, the "flap" now on is the biggest since the July crisis of 1952. However, some of the sightings which have been given "banner headlines" in various saucerzines have not been worth the paper they are printed on - small hovering lights are no longer news-worthy.

Included amongst the more interesting reports is the very mysterious episode of the fishing trawler which lost and later regained its "top coat" of paint after being buzzed by a "Carrot shaped" glowing object over the Irish sea. The object was also sighted over South Wales and from the Isle of Man. So far officialdom has chosen to remain silent on this affair but to suggest they did not take any interest in the mystery is unreasonable. One wonders if the vessel was tested for radioactivity with a geiger counter. This is not the only instance where paint has been removed (or

lapse later?
Fort of this!
Magnetic Hwy.
UFO's
have to travel when in that vicinity?

discoloured) by a low flying UFO? Many of the latest reports have told of "egg shaped" objects, some of ~~which~~ have been of considerable size. The instance at Lovelland in Texas received widespread publicity because of the unusual characteristics and the number of witnesses involved. The object stalled car engines and extinguished headlights, a unique detail hitherto not reported but since then it has occurred several times. Two claimed contacts are quoted, one achieved the rather doubtful distinction of being investigated by Air Force intelligence officials. The man concerned, Reinhold Schmidt told his story of coming upon a cigar-shaped vessel on the Nebraska prairie and talked with four men and two women inside the saucer. Subsequent investigation by the police quickly threw doubt on Reinhold's integrity and actually led to him being confined to a mental hospital. The second contact claim came from a 12 year old boy, Everett Clark of Knoxville, Tennessee, ~~this case sounds more convincing but we await further details.~~

In this country, apart from the disappearing paint mystery, the case near Edinburgh (p.57, Dec. URANUS) was the only incident to gain mention in the national press. Insistent enquiries by your editor led to two contradictory statements coming to hand. From the Edinburgh police came a letter which stated, "I am directed to inform you.....part of a radar tracking balloon". The A.M. it seems do not agree with this, stating that they have not found out what the object was. Past experience has shown that to expect the A.M. or anyone else to sort out the mix up would be unduly optimistic.

And so it goes on, there is no sign of the reports slackening and they are still coming in from Japan, Brazil and S. Africa. ~~The intelligences behind the saucers show no sign of waning interest. Instead, they appear to be getting bolder. We hope it continues so. We have tried all we know to get the various world authorities to open up on the subject. If anyone can break the deadlock, the saucer intelligences can.~~

IN A NUTSHELL

Condensed from a lengthy article by Richard Hall which first appeared in UFO Newsletter. (Nov. '57).

Capt. Ruppelt's provocative question, "What constitutes proof...?" is the story in a nutshell. ~~Of~~ what does a "proof" consist? Quite often it is nothing more than a logical demonstration that if one or more propositions are true, another one, under consideration must be true. The proposition under consideration is then "demonstrated" or "proved". "Deductive reasoning enables us to discover what it is to which we must in consistency commit ourselves if we accept certain propositions". Proofs are seldom conclusive, and always depend on the truth or falsity of the premises from which they follow.

In application to UFO's, the academic question of 'proof' must be settled on two levels. 1) What constitutes proof that UFO's are a unique phenomenon rather than merely misidentified conventional objects? In the first place, there is the consistency of the best reports in regard to general shape and flight characteristics. What conventional objects are generally circular, capable of hovering, making sharp turns and accelerating at speeds which astound veteran pilots and experienced scientists and technicians? LIFE reported the astronomer who said the "remarkably sudden ascent convinced me it was an absolutely novel airborne device". What conventional objects ~~evidence~~ *show* curiosity by pacing airliners, leading jets on fruitless attempts at interception by continually accelerating just out of reach, only to turn back and follow the jets as they return to base?

This 'proof', enlarged a thousandfold is all documented and easily verified by anyone interested enough to look at reports. The fact that there is allegedly no physical evidence to work with certainly does not invalidate these reports from experienced airmen and other scientifically trained persons. The cry of "no physical evidence" amounts to little more than exaggerated conservatism and, in many cases a

deliberate avoidance of important evidence.

To reach the "second level of proof" it must first be accepted that UFO's (or better "unknowns") are solid, generally circular objects. Therein lies half the battle and UFO investigators would do well to demonstrate through a careful selection of relevant evidence, that UFO's are circular objects. 2) Granting for the moment that UFO's are unique, solid objects which have manoeuvred as reported, the next required 'proof' is the nature of the objects. Here the problem is comparatively simple, at least in theory. Controlled objects of geometrical design could only be the products of intelligent creatures. Ruling out for the moment the possibility that some UFO's themselves might be intelligent creatures, the choice is clear. UFO's are either secret devices manufactured on Earth, or interplanetary space-ships. The clearest reports do indicate the mechanical appearance and actions of the UFO's and they have metallic appearing surfaces. It is clear the UFO's are manufactured devices.

Once we have gone this far ⁱⁿ accepting UFO's as mechanical devices, there is a 'proof' available to settle the question of their origin. It is the reductio ad absurdum. If UFO's are not Earthly devices, it follows that they are space-ships. If logically minded researchers would concentrate on proving or demonstrating the following premises, Ufology would have a potent argument that UFO's are space-ships. 1) UFO's are real solid objects. 2) They are generally circular in shape. 3) They are intelligently controlled. 4) They are not manufactured on the Earth.

If my logic is correct, an enlarged demonstration of these premises would provide proof, except for those who are psychologically unable to face the facts, or incapable of seeing beyond their physical noses.

(Ed. note. Richard Hall is an Air Force veteran and a student of both Saucers and logic.)

That is one of the most interesting sentences I've ever read!

MANKIND AND SPACE FLIGHT

by Verax

No matter what the UFO's have managed to do up to the present, mankind are in process of learning the trick and within five years at the least somebody will have landed on the Moon and will be able to observe the phenomena of alien space vehicles, which is what I would prefer to call them rather than UFO's, which implies an almost total ignorance on our part as to what they are.

However as the moon is likely to be our first port of call, there are a few interesting points about it which enthusiasts may not yet have come across. To begin with it is highly doubtful if the moon was ever part of this earth, still less that it was torn from the Pacific Ocean. It is much more probable that it was a small planet between Earth and Mars, with a highly irregular orbit, like some of the asteroids at present, and that it managed to get picked up by the Earth's field of gravitation on one unlucky occasion when it managed to pass too close to us. This must have happened about eleven thousand years ago.

Now one of the problems that is worrying scientists is that we do not know how far away the Moon actually is. The nearest estimate is plus or minus fifty miles or so, and because of this nobody knows whether it is gradually coming closer to the Earth or whether it is getting further away. The first question can be answered with a fair approximation the moment a spaceship is landed. I say approximation ~~as the orbit~~ ^{of} the Moon may not be exactly circular. ~~Certain~~ errors in the timing of lunar eclipses have made this seem possible. But to tell whether it is approaching the Earth or straying away from it will take half a century or more of continuous observations.

While human beings could not possibly live on the Moon except in space suits or specially constructed buildings, there is nothing, in theory, to prevent other beings, having a different physical make up from

*How come
you say
that?*

living there, ^Bbut the chances against the Moon having a population which can be described as "Moon Folk" are astronomical. By this is implied the fact that if the alien space ships come from there, the people who run them must be as foreign to the Moon as we ourselves shall be. It may be that they only use the Moon for somewhere to park their craft, ~~that~~ that is something which we shall only discover when we get there.

But the key note is this: No matter what anybody says or does we shall reach the Moon, (probably within five years), the Planets and, soon, the Stars and we shall do this on equal terms with any alien intellect. What others have done we can do equally well. Do not believe all the fairy tales about the superhuman intellects of Venus or Mars. ~~Anyhow~~, if one judges by their representatives here, they are not so hot. But, seriously, life seems to have begun at about the same time everywhere. In other words the human race is neither older nor younger than the inhabitants of any other planetary system in the universe. There may be slight temporary differences in technical achievement, just as the Soviets have managed to launch a Sputnik whilst we have not yet done so. But these are only differences of months on earth, or even of a year or so in dealing with cosmic visitants, before we catch up. After all it is just possible that many of the warnings against man venturing into space come from beings who fear us as competitors. E.S.

ODD BITS

Doubts cast on John Otto's "Come in outer space" broadcasts?

It was late in 1954 when John Otto conducted his "Come in outer space" experiment. ~~He~~ He received some reports of "messages" received, one being wire recorded by a Mildred Maier of Chicago. On January 7th, 1957 Otto conducted another broadcast and one of the people to claim they had recorded a "coded" message during the silence period was Howard Menger. Lawyer ~~X~~ Jules St.

Germain, investigating for "C.S.I.", New York, secured a copy of this tape. St Germain fed the "coded" messages to standard teleprinter machines which obediently typed out the letters. It was obviously in code as teleprinter messages are but was very short. It didn't take long for St Germain, a very experienced investigator, to find out just how the message got on to Menger's tape. It was a fake alright but with Mildred Maier it wasn't so easy and to date this particular message remains a mystery.

From Jim Moseley, editor of "Saucer News" came the following:

"This "flap" here was the biggest thing since July of 1952, which was the all-time saucer peak. I am sure that all of us can agree that the launching of Sputnik II and the saucer flap are not unconnected. The argument will come as to what the connection is. Skeptics will say it was all "Sputnik hysteria". You say that the space beings are proving they they have something better than **either** us or the Russians. I would go along with Dr Davidson's "Psychological warfare" idea. Incidentally I must confess slight annoyance with your phrasing at the end of your discussion of Dr Davidson's "psychological warfare" article in your October issue. It is not at all fair to say that the article was published just to attract attention and /or discussion. Davidson brought out some points which have not previously been noted. The article was published to bring these points to the attention of saucer fans, but not simply to cause controversy. There is a big difference".

(Ed note: Jim Moseley has been very tolerant over the long period of correspondence and it does seem that once again your editor must apologise for letting his "extra-terrestrial minded typewriter" run away with his good manners.)

Lonzo Dove, (indefatigable it seems,) reports on some photographs submitted to him for examination. A photograph was received from Japan showing a long marking as bright if not brighter than a large bank of cumulus cloud, the marking appeared in one corner of

the picture, clear of the cloud and illuminated from the same top corner of the print. A distinct shadow appeared on the shaded side of the bright mark which even to your inexperienced ed's eye seemed to indicate something amiss. Lonzo Dove seems quite emphatic in his declaration of the marking being a scar in the film emulsion. Photographs (also from Japan) depicting "tadpole-shaped" objects appear more genuine says Dove. Dove goes on to say that he himself observed a disc — shaped object through a telescope near noon on November 3rd. Then on December 5th he again caught a "bright steady, yellowish light with a vapour trail illuminated by the moon above it". Dove gives more details including a dim red flashing light on one side of the object and a very dim colourless light on the other side. There was approx' 5 min of arc separating the lights. Confirmatory reports came in the following day's newspapers, the descriptions fitting that which Dove gave.

A NOVEL AND WORTHWHILE SUGGESTION
—(If you have the time and money)—

If you have the time and the money to build full scale models of UFO's, including flashing dome lights and all and place these models in a remote area, I am quite sure the genuine UFO's can be decoyed at least close enough to be readily observed and studied. Even if some of the UFO's are interplanetary vehicles, I think you stand a good chance of attracting them. Why the United States Air Force and even the British hasn't tried such a thing has baffled me since 1947 when they found out they couldn't catch one in flight.

Kenneth Arnold.

✓ Heard on ~~the~~ ¹⁵ K L X L - sent in by
listener (X) - Don't worry.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

You probably
won't be here
to see what you

RELIGION AND THE SAUCERS

Dear Sir,

I read your October issue of URANUS with great interest and as you invite comment here are a few.

I enclose a copy of my article, "The Mysterious FS's, are they Myth, Menace or Messengers of God?" With the Space Age now dawning, sooner or later the Christian churches will have to face up to this question.

Christian leaders will have to face the question squarely, "Will the new age revolutionize some of our Christian concepts of Heaven? Where did Elijah, Enoch and Jesus ascend to when they left the Earth? Are other planets already inhabited?" All this has positive relation to the FS phenomena, for it is not reasonable to suppose that if Earthman succeeds in examining or even reaching the Moon and/or some of the planets, then the spacemen or messengers of God, whatever term one applies to them will certainly take further action should their own domain be invaded from Mother Earth.

I shall quote from a letter I received via the Australian FS Res' Society; "The well authenticated appearances of FS's seen by thousands of people in the skies of our Earth constitutes a prophetic fulfilment of Christ's own words, 'And great signs shall there be from heaven'".

These "signs and wonders" are an indication that the promised return of Jesus Christ is at hand. The increasing interest of UFO writers in Bible prophecy in its relationship to the Saucers and Christ's return is significant and encouraging, and may force the Christian churches to wake up.

Reginald A. Bradbury.
Editor: "Kingdom Voice"

is going
to the
store!
when
it's
over!

Dear Sir,

Your highly interesting October issue is to hand, very readable indeed.

A somewhat frustrated note, it seemed to be which our editor struck wasn't it? The "Why, Whence and How?", yes, what unsolved mysteries! And what would the outcome of a "Saucer Congress" be? To my mind just a repetition of such affairs as the Giant Rock rallies, the same old stories from the type of person such ventures inevitably attract.

Religion; yes I strongly recommend that you DO face this problem in relation to the FS mystery, it will need courage. As for the problem of landings, and "Contacts" "which should be tackled now", why not make a start with the two articles by Lobsang Rampa?

Regarding "Towards a Workable Hypothesis", I think I should correct a small error which has crept into this and previous issues of URANUS. In the German version of my book, "FS über Südafrika" I did not deal with Shauberger or his experiments; actually I don't think very much of them. What I did do at length was to approach the problem of propulsion by the only legitimate and academic way open to us, outside of conventional physics and that is by parapsychology. Here, true anti-gravitic phenomena as with levitation are a legitimate and genuine object of research. There has been but little headway so far and I permitted myself to submit my own contribution in the form of a Natural Field theory. *Story*

As for our dear friend Lonzo Dove I still feel far from being counted out, but shall we leave this at rest for a while.

Readers will be interested to learn that Mr. Overstreet's film of the Kilimanjaro incident had actually been processed here. It was quite a "hush-hush" affair. A reporter friend of mine saw the movie and said it was not first class because of the distance involved. "The object was one which could not better be described than a very strange and unfamiliar aircraft, very probably a space craft of sorts". On arrival in NY, Mr. Overstreet was met by three men to whom, for unknown reasons he

saw fit to hand the film. Nothing has been heard since of either Mr. Overstreet or his film.

Sincerely Yours,
Edgar Sievers.
Pretoria S.Africa.

From Mr. A.A.C. Mills of London.

Sir,

I have been reading URANUS for some considerable time and no one has convinced me Adamski is a fake yet.

Your article "The Carpet Baggers and their False Reasoning" - such statements as, "neither mankind or our planet is in danger from destruction by nuclear bombs". Please tell me how you can possibly know.

"The whole of the last paragraph, "It has been... but ourselves". Especially between, "This is so insignificant ... effect the climate on Mars".

Please tell me from what wonderful source you obtained this information. There isn't a person on Earth who knows.

Why not find one or two "Nuts" and have a chat, you may learn something. I should not be surprised at all if they solved your "WHY, WHENCE and HOW for you.

Yours faithfully,
A.A.C. Mills.

It is hard to resist a lengthy reply to this mis-directed criticism. I would respectfully ask Mr. Mills to read the short sentence immediately following the title of this article on p 49 of the December issue. There he will find that a man named "Justin Case" was responsible for the text.

As for the "NUTS". I am not primarily interested in a philosophy of living but in an ultimate solution to the saucer mystery. Some of the "Nuts" with their high-falutin philosophies (as I have said before) should be commended for their ideals, it is good for people to have ideals. Could they answer the "big three" questions? Any more readers have ideas?

Adamski, we as a magazine have finished with this

gentleman, as far as we are concerned, in regard to the saucer mystery he has been rendered hors de combat. His ideals are set high and if he helps some people to attain and keep that high standard he will have done his life's good deed.

Amen! & Finis!

SAUCERZINES AND THEIR PURPOSE

It would be hopeless to try and compile an up to date list of Saucer periodicals for even today, after a decade of Ufology they blossom and fade more frequently than French governments. Those which do thrive, (and among these are one or two "old timers") can be divided roughly into three groups. One of these groups can truly be called journals of research for they not only bring up to date UFO news to their readers but are also critical. Their editors are not afraid to print results of investigations which have uncovered hoaxes or cases of mistaken identity, etc. The ed' of a true research journal in the field of Ufology has an unenviable task. The results of his labours must often appear destructive and not constructive, for the number of Saucer sightings which can be regarded as genuine beyond doubt is comparatively small, to say nothing of contact claims. True research is rarely spectacular and for this reason a research-minded editor has difficulty in holding his reader's interest. In addition he cannot help making enemies among proponents of other particular aspects of the problem. This unhappy state of affairs has already lost us one valuable saucerzine, L. Stringfield's "ORBIT".

A second type of saucerzine is the one which attempts to steer a "middle path". This "species of editor" can infuriate a true researcher, for in such a magazine one rarely sees a healthy controversy in progress. When conducted properly, such a controversy very often results in other readers achieving a satisfied state of mind on the point under discussion. The "neutral" mag' often sows the seeds of doubt and suspicion also, for it is inevitable that two editors may gain possession

of identical information, in which case the editor of the "neutral mag" will weed out the critical facts and print only the claims. What is the critical investigator supposed to think? Why suppress facts? A letter to the editor of the offending magazine rarely produces an acknowledgement, as we know from experience. One conclusion from a mag' following this chosen path is that it is run solely for financial gain, though this may well be false reasoning. It is unlikely however that the ed' or publisher of such a saucerzine would be interested in an ultimate solution to the mystery. This can obviously never be achieved by a deliberate suppression of facts.

PERSONALITIES AND GROUPS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

—by Gavin Gibbons—

author of "The Coming of the Space Ships"
and "They Rode in Space Ships".

In October of 1956 I became free of office life to become a "free-lance reporter" and author. I had already made plans to visit Yugoslavia, Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and Holland on what I considered to be a well-earned holiday. My good fortune in being able to understand and speak several foreign languages would be a great asset, indeed it would be necessary if I was to gain any benefit from my projected trip.

My first meeting with a foreign ufologist came slightly unstuck through my being situated in the last carriage of the train when it stopped at Mainz station just across the Rhine from Wiesbaden. Here I was only able to shake hands with Karl Veit, sec' of "Wiesbadener UFO-Studengemeinschaft" and ed' of the monthly "UFO Nachrichten".

In Munich I met Dr Hermann Buhler who had reviewed my first book in the above mentioned journal. We had differences of opinion on some points. Dr Buhler believes the Allingham story but disbelieves the Fry and Bethurum accounts, whereas my opinions are exactly the opposite. There are regular meetings in Wiesbaden, the members

coming from nearby towns. The group holds a much wider interest however covering all Western Germany and extending into Austria and Switzerland.

To my knowledge there is no UFO group in Austria itself, not even in Vienna. My friends in Salzburg seemed interested so I put them in touch with the German group.

My next stop was in Zagreb, Yugoslavia where I met with some language difficulty but eventually mastered it to the extent of being able to make intelligent conversation. To my intense disappointment I found not only was there no UFO group in Yugoslavia but the people were devoid of interest. During conversation with many people I found only one who confessed to having seen a UFO - he was a young soldier who saw a brilliant silver disc over Belgrade in 1954. He was quite convinced it was a Russian secret weapon.

After extensive travel by rail and boat I made my way to Italy. In Pietrasanta I met Prof Ernesto Thyat who is of Swiss nationality. He described his attitude toward ufology as someone keenly interested but skeptical. Prof Thyat founded C.I.R.N.O.S. a small Italian group of 25 men working earnestly on the various relative problems. He is himself a keen and excellent researcher and being also an accomplished linguist has a wide overseas correspondence.

I had hoped to meet Jimmy Guica in Marseille but bad fortune intervened once more as it did upon my arrival in Paris where the monthly meeting of Ouranos had been cancelled owing to the illness of Marc Thourin. I had better luck in Amsterdam where I met A.F. van Wieringen. The Dutch UFO group thrives, having 150 members scattered throughout the Netherlands. They have their own bi-monthly journal, "UFO Gids". Another group, in the Hague "UFO Group Nederland" boasts some 100 members who meet regularly. During my visit to these countries which had extended over some seven weeks I gained a lot of new friends and (I hope) ~~and~~ a little toward bringing the Saucer enthusiasts of Western Europe closer together.