

which states that Soviet astronomers have calculated that the solar system could be 5,000 times as large in diameter as is at present known, and that there might be a whole string of planets out beyond Pluto, or there might be just dust particles. In other words, the question is wide open, and no reputable astronomer would emphatically claim that there are no more planets beyond Pluto. He just wouldn't know.

I am sorry to read that Mr. Clark considers the philosophy of Adamski's space contacts as "something a not overly-bright junior high-school student might suggest" but it is a fact that this philosophy is too profoundly simple, too basic in its recognition of Cosmic law and principles which govern the universe to be understood by minds conditioned to the false concepts and impractical beliefs of this present era of earthly civilisation. How extra-ordinary it is for Mr. Clark to contend that people who live by such a philosophy could not have developed interplanetary travel! By what strange reasoning does he arrive at this idea? I put it to Mr. Clark that those who have developed a real understanding of natural law and its operation and thereby live in true peace and harmony with themselves *can* devote their time to pursuing wider horizons—in contrast to the earth-bound slave whose spirit is weighed down by the struggle for survival and subsistence in a bloodthirsty society whose values are basically materialistic and immoral. How many earth men can even imagine what it is like to live in a world where people are free and have no fear?

I grant Mr. Clark that not *all* interplanetary craft come from within our system, and I do not believe that *all* inhabited planets are advanced beyond ours in development. But there is no valid reason to doubt the evidence of men like Adamski, Allingham, Salvador Villanueva de Medina, Professor Joao de Freitas Guimaraes, and a number of other lesser-known but reliable persons who have been contacted by some of the visitors from our neighbouring planets.

If we started taking a little more notice of what they have told us we would soon find ourselves much farther advanced in space travel, and better able to learn at first hand what a wiser race can teach us. But earthman is notorious for his inability to see the wood for the trees, and his propensity for throwing the baby out with the bathwater,

if I may be forgiven for resorting to some well-worn but valid aphorisms.

Mr. Clark has the idea that the *ufonauts* as he calls them, are lying to those they contact in order to 'cover up' their real purpose. I can see his reasons for thinking this way, but I believe it is unjustified by the facts of the matter. Evidence shows that we are being visited by *at least two different categories* of interplanetary beings. Those, presumably from another system, or systems, who are obviously exploring what is to them a new and strange world, taking samples and beating a hasty retreat when approached, seem to have little interest in making friends with any of us. On the other hand, we have more than enough evidence of the people, so like ourselves in appearance, who have made so many deliberate physical contacts with various individuals throughout the world, with whom they have talked at length, expressing a real concern for what we are doing and showing tremendous interest in us.

These people say they come from our neighbouring planets—why on earth should we refuse to believe them? What reason could they have for deceiving us? We *have* to accept that their technology is superior to ours when we watch the performance of their craft—why then should we doubt the validity of their 'philosophy' which has made it possible for them to be so far ahead?

For some peculiar reason, the 'philosophy' upheld by these space visitors is automatically looked upon with suspicion by many people, even UFO researchers, because it is identical with the philosophy expounded by all the great teachers throughout our earth's history. How in Heaven's name, could it be otherwise? The Law is the Law, unchanging and unchangeable, and the same rules must apply throughout all creation. What seems to hurt each man most is the fact that these space visitors present him with a living example of what is achieved when man co-operates with nature's laws and actually *lives* what we only talk about. So rather than recognise that they have succeeded where we have failed, we shut our eyes tight and call them liars. What really amazes me is the fact that they keep on coming, despite our pig-headedness.—Brenda M. Hinfelaar, New Zealand Scientific Space Research, Henderson, N.Z.

To and fro object

Sir,—On Saturday, May 28, while looking out of the window of our flat (I live on the 6th floor) I observed a bright orange star-like object moving towards the North. At first I thought it to be a satellite, until it suddenly stopped and slowly faded from view. Three minutes later it re-appeared, this time moving south back along its previous course.

To cut a long story short, the object moved backwards and forwards over the Hampstead, Golders Green and Hendon areas for no less than 50 minutes (11.55 p.m. Saturday to 12.45 a.m. Sunday). Every four or five minutes it would disappear from view, only to re-appear going in the opposite direction. I finally saw the object heading north and watched it until it disappeared into the distance.—C. Bodimead, 40 Prospect Ring, East Finchley, London N.2.

Points on Valensole

Sir,—It seems that the true facts of the Valensole landing are still veiled behind a curtain of contradictions on the part of the witness, M. Masse. Moreover, the questionnaire of Luis Schönherr, and the subsequent replies from Monsieur G. C. and Aimé Michel don't seem to have clarified matters much.

Apart from the variable routes which M. Masse seems to have taken to reach a point from which to observe the vehicle, and the equally variable distance from which his observations were made, there comes to light yet another contradiction in the statements of M. G. C. and Aimé Michel, concerning the 'weapon' with which the witness was 'paralysed'.

According to M. Masse, in his statement to Aimé Michel, the being took the weapon from its **right-hand** side; according to M. Masse, in statement to M.G.C., it was **definitely** a case on the being's **left-hand** side to which the weapon was returned. (As the two cases strapped to either side of this, and the other, being, were of different sizes, I naturally assume that the weapon was returned to the same case from which it was drawn).

The report in the *Dauphine Libéré*, in which M. Masse is said to have seen one being inside the vehicle, and one standing outside, is, as Luis Schönherr points out, a direct contradiction to the later statement of the witness that he observed two beings, both standing **outside** the

vehicle. Mons, G. C. explains that, as M. Masse had admitted concealing the whole truth in his first statement for fear he should be branded a madman, he also twisted the facts for the same reason. It is surely ridiculous, however, for us to believe that M. Masse was afraid to admit that he saw *two* beings outside the vehicle, for fear of his sanity be questioned, but be quite happy to tell of *one* being inside the vehicle and *one* outside, this statement it seems, being quite acceptable!

It is of course, quite probable that the real explanation for the conflicting statements was nothing more than mis-quotation on the part of the *Dauphine Libéré*

The reason for my being prompted to mention these various contradictions is that I feel that they must not be passed over too lightly when considering the Valensole Affair. I am not being sceptical . . . merely

objective. It is important to remember that these conflicting statements come from **one** witness, not several. Perhaps a better picture of the whole affair could be put together if M. Masse were approached again and we started from scratch.

—Noel Ford, 14 Clement St.
Nuneaton.

The January 1965 Flap

Sir,—Several comments are in order concerning D. B. Hanlon's article *Virginia 1965 Flap* in the March/April 1966 *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW*.

Mr. Hanlon lists a number of sightings (14/12/64, Needham, Massachusetts; 20/1/65 Long Beach, Mississippi; 25/1/65 Bedford, Virginia; etc.) with "personal communication" as the only documentation given. In these cases additional information would facilitate a meaningful independent analysis. The Needham case would be especially interesting when one considers the

great number of UFO reports in Massachusetts traced to NASA test aircraft and advertising airplanes.

Any discussion of the Virginia flap should also include the official explanations put forth to explain specific sightings. For example, the Patuxent Naval Air Station radar report of two objects (not three as Hanlon states) was "explained" as false radar returns by the Air Force. In addition Major H. Quintanilla in the April 1, 1966, issue of *Life* magazine and before the House Committee on Armed Services denied any unexplained radar UFO cases existed.

The January 4, 1965, Bethel, Vermont sighting by Dr. Woodruff and others was evaluated by the USAF as meteors from the Quadrantids meteor shower. Mr. R. E. Fowler, chairman of the Massachusetts NICAP Sub-committee, who investigated the sighting ob-

(Continued on page 4 of cover)

DUE SHORTLY . . .

a new book by engineer Leonard G. Cramp (author of *Space, Gravity and the Flying Saucer*). A study of saucer landing reports, and experiments with a centrifuge leads to remarkable conclusions. **PIECES FOR A JIGSAW** will be published soon by Somerton Publishing Co., Ltd., Newport Road, Somerton, West Cowes, Isle of Wight.

"FROM WORLDS AFAR"

The Sensational L.P. Record

by Mollie Thompson

who, with her guitar, recently toured the United States and sung her ballads to enthusiastic audiences at UFO conventions.

GET YOUR COPY NOW! POST FREE
SEND £1 ONLY TO . . .

NIELD & HARDY LTD.
P.O. BOX 7
STOCKPORT
CHESHIRE
ENGLAND

Main Distributors
Phone: STO 6611

PERSONAL COLUMN

(Rate: first three lines 5/-, additional lines—or part—5/- each.)

WILL ANYONE keen on SKYWATCHING and living within a few miles of Shepperton, Middlesex, please contact J. Goddard. Tel: Walton-on-Thames 24814.

CINE FILM, photographs, drawings connected with UFOs urgently required on loan. Sources of the above also needed. Postage refunded.—Lawrence Moore, 4 Armadale Road, London, S.W.6. FULham 4071.

UFO DETECTOR: Swiss precision made unit, very sensitive. Gives loud and visual signals. Airmailed. US \$10.00 or equivalent. Assembly Kit: US \$5.00. Blue print only: US \$2.00 (Details free. PERRIN, Box 16, 1216 Cointrin, Geneva, Switzerland.

WANTED: *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW*, Vol. 10, No. 6 and Vol. 11, Nos. 3 and 4. Will pay double original cost. Write: Capt. C. Eather, P.O. Box 6146—KOWLOON, HONG KONG.

UFO BOOKS FOR SALE OR PURCHASED. Lists 4d. Write: Miss S. Stebbing, 87 Selsea Avenue, Herne Bay, Kent.

Together we harmonise and become one. Who are we? WE ARE UFOLOGISTS EXTRAORDINARY. Contact: "Lochryan-Bay", 119 George Street, Whithorn, Wigtownshire, Scotland.

"SPACELINK", article news, comment, 9/8d. post free quarterly. "UFOLOG" monthly sighting sheets, 12 issues 10/6d. post free. F. W. Smith, 4 Connaught Road, East Cowes, Isle of Wight.

REQUIRED urgently all back copies of *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW* from 1965. Good condition. Numbers 3 and 4 Volume 11 5/- each. Bids to B. Kent, 2130 Wenman Drive, Victoria, B.C., Canada.

HUMANOIDS, UFO-OCCUPANTS, SAUCER-MEN. Details of less known or unpublished sightings are required for serious book covering all aspects. Please write: Lionel Beer, Flat 15, Freshwater Court, Crawford Street, London, W.1.