

23 Joffre Street,
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.

23 August, 1954.

Dear Mr. Adamski:

I have recently finished reading the book "Flying Saucers Have Landed", written by you.

Studying reports of flying saucers and the possibility of their actual existence, and their origin, has been a hobby of mine since 1947. To set the record straight to start with, I firmly believe, after much study, that they do come from outer space. I admit that at first I was quite skeptical of the whole business. It was simply study of the facts that forced me to change my mind on this matter.

Before proceeding further, I wish it to be understood that I do have a fair knowledge of what I am talking about, as I was a Navy pilot for several years (and still am a Naval Officer), and have some knowledge of astronomy and physics.

I don't doubt that flying saucers have landed, but you have not convinced me that you actually saw one land. I have noted several points throughout your story which I would very much appreciate having clarified by you.

Point No. 1. You tell us that you have made many "expeditions" in hopes of seeing a saucer land, and you mention all your careful planning, and the gear you took along in order to be prepared for any eventuality. In this particular case, your sole object evidently was to see a saucer land, at very close range, take photographs, and meet the occupants, if possible. You were careful to

...2

have witnesses. You were also careful that they did not approach too closely, for fear the space visitors might be frightened away. You, therefore, left your witnesses between a half mile and a mile away. I repeat, your sole object was close range observation (to establish a contact). Therefore, why in the world did you need the 6" telescope? Surely it would have been more logical to leave the telescope with your witnesses who were so far away from you and yet were expected to watch every detail which might occur. All you would need, it appears, under the circumstances as outlined, would be your camera, and possibly a pair of binoculars to watch the saucer land and take off. This does not strike me as being very careful planning, especially when you went so far as to equip your group with such things as plaster of paris for footprints. You stated on page 191 that you wanted your witnesses to "watch closely for anything that might take place". Certainly, under circumstances of such tremendous importance, you would want your witnesses to see closely every detail. I felt that you, fully expecting close range observation, had no need for your 6" telescope.

Point No. 2. On page 193, second last paragraph, you "decided to take a couple more pictures with the Brownie just to show the general terrain in this section in case my space craft pictures turned out well."

An earth-shaking event like the landing of a space ship from another planet, and you use your film for scenery! Surely you would have used every available film for pictures of the space ship, especially as you admit you did not know whether they would turn out. You could have taken scenic photographs after departure of the saucer, or lacking any more film, could have returned later.

Point No. 3. You neglected to explain, or even offer suggestions as to how the Venus man managed to breathe in our atmosphere. Our scientists tell us that Venusian atmosphere is not like our own, in fact that we could not survive on Venus without our own atmosphere. This may or may not be correct as our scientists have often been proved wrong and have

had "to eat their own words." I believe that it could be possible for a race far advanced over us to survive in our atmosphere even if it is different from their own, by one method or another, but as it is common belief among almost everyone that Venusian atmosphere differs from ours and that a person native to one cannot live in the other without artificial aids, I feel that you overlooked a major point by not offering some sort of explanation for this, in spite of your comments on page 215 concerning this matter.

Point No. 4. I believe in mental telepathy. I have seen it, that is, seen its results. Therefore, I believe that you and your Venusian man could have communicated with each other by this means even though you did not understand each others language because as you said, you used "thought pictures" rather than words. However, how did the Venusian know where you lived in order to return your photographic plate by "special delivery air mail" so to speak. You did not explain this in the book. I have my own ideas how the Venusian might have known, but this is another point which should have been given some explanation.

Point No. 5. On page 212, you explain why symbols are universal - "ancient civilizations have lived on Earth whose development and understanding of the universe in which they lived was far superior to that of man today. Thus their symbols-records of their wisdom-would be of a universal nature". I grant you that the symbols may be a universal nature, but not because of the reason given. You imply that because the ancients knew more than we do (I readily agree that they did) that it automatically follows that the symbols are universal. Why should they be? I fail to understand your reasoning on this point.

Point No. 6. Page 214, fifth paragraph. How can sketches be proof of the reality of anything? How do we know that these sketches are not figments of your imagination? Even

plaster of paris foot prints can easily be faked. Sketches prove nothing. I am surprised at newspaper reporters being taken in on this matter, if such is really the case.

Point No. 7. On page 208, you tell us you were "absorbed in observing every detail of this strange and beautiful craft". You were less than one foot away from it, you say. You evidently were at extremely close range for a short while at least and you estimated its size as being 20 feet (page 218). Yet upon the return visit of the saucer, while the machine was 100 feet in the air, you estimated its diameter as 35 to 36 feet, almost twice the original estimate. If unable to make a very close estimate of its size while close enough to touch it, I question ability to estimate it while 100 feet in the air by "making mental calculations and comparisons with known distances".

Point No. 8. On page 218 also, it is stated that "the plate identified the craft as being the same one I had seen on the desert and the waving hand indicated to me that the one who dropped the holder was the same man I had met".

This constitutes no proof whatsoever, like the case of the sketches supposedly being proof of real Venusian footprints. It is quite possible that the man who took the plate returned to his base (as is probably the case) and someone else may have returned it for him in another space ship. The waving hand indicates nothing whatever. It was merely a friendly gesture, and certainly does not prove he knew you. He was delivering a package to you so why shouldn't he wave while doing it? Any self-respecting delivery man at least says "Good morning" when he delivers a parcel.

I do not make a habit of writing to the author of a book, every time I disagree with him. This is the first time I have done so. The only reason I do so on this occasion is to clarify the above points which are not clear in my own mind, and because of my own personal interest in flying saucers.

I will be very much obliged to you Sir, if you will kindly clarify the points outlined above as I am left in doubt on these particular questions.

Yours very truly,

(A.R.Bray).

23 Joffre Street,
Dartmouth, N.S.
Canada.

29 August, 1955.

Dear Mr. Adamski:

Your latest book "Inside the Space Ships" has been read with great interest. It is without a doubt one of the most amazing books it is possible to read and I offer my congratulations on your efforts.

I wrote you concerning your first book and thank you for your kind reply. I raised many points concerning your first book in my last letter, but this time, there is only one thing which I feel needs to be clarified concerning "Inside the Space Ships".

My query concerns a statement on page 247, where you describe the scout landing on top of the mother ship and how you left the scout, walked along the top of the mother ship and down a hatch. On page 250, you state that you were out in space.

How, then, did you breathe while on top of the mother ship? You did not explain this matter.

With the exception of the above, I could find no reason to doubt the explanations put forth in your book, and once again, congratulate you on a fine job.

Hoping for an early reply,

Yours truly,

(A. R. Bray)

Mr. George Adamski,
Palomar Terraces,
Star Route,
Valley Center,
California.

414 East 27th St.,
Hamilton, Ontario,
Canada.

14 December, 1956.

Dear Mr. Adamski:-

As we have not corresponded for some time and as I have not heard about any new activities on your part in connection with space ships recently, I thought I would write to ask you if there have been any new developments.

Are you still making personal contacts with men from other planets and are you by any chance writing another book? Are you by any chance planning a lecture tour of Canada?

I am still maintaining as active an interest as ever in flying saucers and am collecting all the facts I can to enlarge my file, book collection, etc.

I have been asked a question concerning the space ships and have been asked to refer it to you, for as detailed an answer as possible.

"It is assumed that people from other planets do breathe the same mixture of atmospheric air as we do and produce CO₂ through their lungs in the same space in which they are enclosed. Is there an explicit system, chemical or mechanical, to maintain the pressure and the percentage of oxygen necessary for human life in the space ship that came to your attention when you were there?"

An explanation of this problem would be very much appreciated.

Now, a question of my own, if you don't mind. Certain people claim, on supposedly a similar source of information to yours, that our friends from other planets can materialize and dematerialize themselves and their ships at will, and that they travel by this method, simply by changing their vibratory rates.

This procedure appears to be at variance with the information in your book "Inside the Space Ships". Would you please outline your views on the above procedure in as much detail as time permits.

(cont'd)

I will very much appreciate hearing from you again, Mr. Adamski. By the way, I understand that you will send photographs of flying saucers, upon request, so if this is correct, I would be indebted to you.

Sincerely,

(A.R. Bray)

Mr. George Adamski,
Palomar Terraces,
Star Route,
Valley Center,
California,
U.S.A.