

the animal has been cast on shore from some wrecked vessel. They traced its footsteps for some distance in the recently fallen snow, in hopes of getting a sight of it, but lost the tracks on reaching a large space of rocky ground which was free from snow."

The author remarks that it is highly improbable that the marks were made by a native animal because of the inhospitable nature of the island. W. S. Robertson, 213 Methilhaven Road, Methil, Fyfe.

Not all UFOs are hostile

Sir,—There comes a time in every man's life when he must put pen to paper to protest the vagaries of FLYING SAUCER REVIEW's resident pessimist, Mr. Jerome Clark.

Mr. Clark's article *Why UFOs Are Hostile* in the November/December issue fell over the edge of the REVIEW's broad platform for UFO discussion. The article, which seemed to have its roots in a recent American potboiler, sought to "expose" the sinister—if not necessarily evil—motives of the UFO occupants. The big weakness with this theory is that it relies on the UFOs having a common origin or at least a common design for earth. However, the widely varying saucer shapes and descriptions of reported occupants tend to show that we are being visited by hundreds of alien races and not just by one or a few in conspiracy.

Mr. Clark led off with a frightening tale about the crew of a U.S. naval transporter returning from a routine flight in 1939 with the crew mysteriously dead and the pilot remaining alive only until he brought the plane to a stop on the runway. Not only did it sound too melodramatic to be true, but there was no exact date, no names and no reference annotation for this particular incident. Also the incidents Mr. Clark outlined to "demonstrate" the extreme measures UFO occupants often took against earthlings when disturbed during secret operations were rather poor proof. In no case was there good evidence that the UFOs in the incidents were involved on secret operations.

I was also amused to see that Mr. Clark now apparently accepts the contact cases of Adamski and Guimaraes—but rationalises that the benevolent space people were deliberately hiding their real and more sinister motives—whatever they may be. Methinks he is in need of a little more faith in humanoid nature.

A. J. Brunt, 24 Wembley Road, Mt. Eden, Auckland, New Zealand.

Reply to Jerome Clark

Sir,—In Jerome Clark's article *Why UFOs Are Hostile*, published in the

November/December 1967 issue of the REVIEW, I am accused of expressing sentimental fallacies with regard to the nature of our extraterrestrial visitors and the purpose of their journeys to our planet. Mr. Clark quotes me by citing an incomplete passage from my article *The Problem of the Frankensteins* (FSR, May/June 1967).

Not only is the passage incomplete, but Mr. Clark omitted to include the preface to the passage, which was: "unless there are specific reports which have been withheld from us." The word "specific" here implies actual and factual accounts, thoroughly authenticated as to who caused what, but such explicit specifications appear to be absent from the examples of hostile acts to which Mr. Clark refers in his article.

For instance, the tragedy of the military transport plane in San Diego during the late summer of 1939, with which description the article begins, is capable of more than one explanation, but which tragedy Mr. Clark immediately ascribes to UFO action. Even members of the Air Forces of the world, including pilots and other members of the crew, are not immune from rare but sudden brain-storms and attacks of temporary lunacy which might have happened on board this plane and could have been the first cause of the disaster.

Also, "mysterious skin infections" and the smell of "rotten eggs"—especially the latter—are not solely confined to, nor are they endemic in, the flying saucer phenomenon. Even if the death of one man on this earth was definitely known and proved to have been caused by an alien from outer space—an authenticated act of hostility beyond the shadow of a doubt—can anyone believe that the presses of the world wouldn't be ringing with such news?! Such an event would at least be equal in news value to the event of April 13, 1961, when the actual news that Major Yuri Gagarin had orbited the earth in space headlined all the newspapers.

In Chapter 3 of a recently completed book, *The People That Walked In Darkness* (which book, by the way, is a strong indictment of what Mr. Clark calls "traditional religion", the breakdown of which is not just a current event, for its decline began before the turn of this century), I have stated:

"... Any phenomenon that the herd (meaning the majority of unthinking mankind on this planet) cannot immediately understand or comprehend is suspect. Its members' first reaction to it is fear, which they try to hide by derision; the next is panic, then violence, and finally they

quickly rid themselves of it, if they can, by annihilating it."

Mr. Clark's article about the apparent hostility of our extraterrestrial visitors seems to be a confirmation of what I have stated about our natures at the present stage of our evolution. As for the incomplete quotation from my article *The Problem of the Frankensteins* I can only suppose that Mr. Clark missed its point, or failed to understand its thesis. For I did not, and do not, rule out the possibility that some of our strange visitors may be motivated by evil intentions. But perhaps Mr. Clark hasn't considered the possibility that our visitors may be just as much afraid of us as man on this earth is afraid of many of the human and animal inhabitants of the largely unknown regions bordering the banks of the Amazon—in spite of our various and superior weapons of defence. For when the advanced races take a long, cool look at the state of mankind on this earth, as we must appear to them at the present time, the analogy of a jungle cannot appear exaggerated.

All I am appealing for in the search for the truth in this phenomenon is that we should not approach it with hysterical and foregone conclusions that hostile acts—if they are hostile—are premeditated and deliberately caused by our extraterrestrial cousins themselves. The question as to whether or not hostile acts have been and are being committed by the "creatures" which the advanced races have "made" and are sending or bringing with them is a question which requires a further branch of our investigations.

The first of the B.B.C.'s new *Towards Tomorrow* series of television programmes entitled *Assault On Life*, televised on November 30, 1967, has warned us and made us aware of what is going on even now in the field of biology on our own planet; the thought of what may have been achieved by the advanced races of man in this field on other planets "makes the mind boggle!"

MAN (as distinguished from any "creature" he may have made) is, in my view, unique in the universe, and the initiative and the responsibility for all his "achievements"—some of which are extremely questionable—must be his and his alone. But the term "advanced races" presupposes not only technological advancement but moral advancement also, and moral advancement is incompatible with racial hatred and hostility. The reasons for the conclusions at which I have arrived are outlined in the articles I have written for the REVIEW. Ivan Brandt, 162 Sutton House, Scunthorpe.

Support for Jerome Clark

Sir,—At last I see in your magazine a glimpse of the truth about UFO which I discovered years ago.

Jerome Clark rightly concludes that the Ufonauts are *lying*, and that they are at pains to prevent mankind finding out their true nature. There has always been a substantial weight of evidence to form this conclusion, but so many Ufologists are unwilling to face the consequences.

I would go further than Mr. Clark; they are not only lying, they are *liars*; it is their nature. And it is not that they are by nature, or intend to be *hostile* to mankind, although they sometimes appear so, but they are by nature *evil*. Clark has given you the evidence, I offer you the conclusion he refrains from drawing; the true nature of the Ufonauts, the nature they are trying to hide, is that they are *evil liars*. They are also adept at laying false trails and deception. Hence their frequent appearance as "patient, all-wise, god-like figures". That is how they would like to be known, but they are *so evil* that their true nature leaks out. And we now know it.

The existence of a body of evil beings, who have been in contact with this world as long as man has been on it may put your readers' researches to more fruitful pursuits than sky-watches and contemplation of the "new age". The solution is not difficult to find, and lies in possibility No. 6 of C. Maxwell Cade's article in your November/December 1967 issue.

The questions your readers should now ask themselves are (1) why and how are the Ufonauts so closely linked with man through the ages? and (2) what would they lose if man did destroy himself and his planet?

Stuart Campbell, Dip. Arch., A.R.I.B.A., A.R.I.A.S., Edinburgh 11, Scotland.

The Mainz Convention

Sir,—I trust you and your readers will forgive me for writing about my own small part in this fiasco, but I feel that some record of what took place should be included in your journal, especially as, I am glad to say, the REVIEW was not represented at the convention.

A German counterpart of *Life* magazine, the *Bunte Illustrierte*, published on December 6, 1967, an illustrated article on the UFO-convention held in Mainz, Germany, on November 3-6, 1967.

Reporting satirically (with full justification) on the trash and nonsense which some of the speakers had perpetrated, the article excepted two convention visitors as to be taken seriously: the rocket pioneer Professor Oberth ("father of space travel") and myself, a citizen of the U.S.A., at present residing in Switzerland.

After reporting the extravagant claims by the convention organiser, Mr. Veit, the article continues:

"Mr. Veit was contradicted by the UFO-researcher Dr. Kurt Kauffmann from Switzerland. As the only one, he tried—interrupted by hissing and by invectives—to put straight what had been distorted at this convention: 'I shall pay 777 German Marks to anyone who will prove to me credibly within one year, until November 6, 1968, that the locker-room gossip about dead Venusians in the Pentagon contains even a grain of truth.

"'It is simply impossible', Dr. Kauffmann continued, 'to picture high American officers and government officials as liars or as narrow-minded

half-idiots concerning UFOs. They have no reason—and nobody forces them—to enter a sort of secret conspiracy to protect the poor public in America against the shock of space-ships.'

"President Veit called this heart-warming censure 'trouble-making'. Furthermore he thanked a lady from Austria who reported that there have been Venusians for 300,000 years, who reach an age of 500 years, and whose space-ships are flying, without gravity, at a speed of 50,000 kilometres per hour through the Universe."

Professor Oberth shook his head sadly when he heard that lady speak. Dr. K. Kauffmann, Casa Montebello, 6926 Montagnola, Switzerland.

The Writing Over the Door

Sir,—Submitting the following purely for the point of interest, one wonders if it has been observed that three of the four main symbols in the *Writing Over the Door* (FSR, Vol. 13, No. 3, p. 25) are also to be found in Adamski's Plate 8 facing p. 113 of *Flying Saucers Have Landed*.

In order to see the similarities, however, Adamski's Plate 8 has to be turned upside down, and since this was reproduced from a photographic plate with possibly no indication of which way up it should be viewed, the plate may, conceivably, have been printed upside down. Certainly, reversed, the neat top line looks much more like the beginning of the message and the symbols fitted in beside the sketch look more like the end. While the "Writing Over the Door" is how A.V.B. saw it, and therefore the correct way up.

In this position it will be observed

(continued on cover iii)



Part of the audience at the Mainz Convention with Professor Oberth seated at the far right of the front row