

A Monthly Review

APPROACH

M a n i n L i f e a n d S p a c e

Editor: Edgar Sievers

Contents:

Don't Forget the Pilgrim's Ultimate Destination.	49
His Claims Still Stand.. . . .	50
Lucy McGinnis Answers Keyhoe: The Davenport Event - As It Occurred..	50

+

APPROACH is a non-profit, Peace and Brotherhood Programme publication published by Sagittarius Publishers PO Box 1953, Pretoria, South Africa

Per single copy 1s.3d. Annual subscription 12s. (If delivery by air is desired, add twelve times second class air mail rate for one ounce.)

DON'T FORGET THE PILGRIM'S ULTIMATE DESTINATION

IT IS VERY well to ask: man, be active and do something for your inner progress, your salvation. Easily said but hard to follow. Surely there will be no one who would not find himself in a welcoming and enjoying frame of mind should he one day notice any kind of inner progress! Such results would be sweet fruit to him indeed; but to translate mere prospects into reality, is quite a different matter. If it just were not for that effort to get us acting, to get us at doing something! Because time and again, when it comes to working for the 'salvation of our soul' - whatever we may imagine or believe this to be - we see us fail and rather go and look for some lighter obligation or a new, distractive pleasure. Procrastination is the word - be it that we right now "don't feel" like doing that which should be done, or that we console ourselves with the next hour, another day or next year, all bringing so we think and hope, more favourable circumstances. The mind may yet be willing. It may even realise: no, the moment is NOW, don't let it pass! But the body is weak, and our moods so unreliable. Maybe we do not know how to begin? And it would be interesting to see how many people there are just wondering WHAT to do? Asling themselves, maybe even in despair, whether they should go back to church, or try to pray again, or start with meditation or with this memory course or that development clas...

Relax. Do not let your intellect make you feel depressed about it. Don't let it sit in judgement over your lack of initiative or drive. Guide your thinking away, onto a higher level from where you can look down and view the lower components of your Self with a mind that knows of its origin. It was born in a universal fount of the highest conceivable form of spiritual energy. This is your truer, decisive Self. When it sank down to solidify, it clothed itself in various garments, one denser than the other. At last this world of bodily, tangible matter became the end product of condensation. Here the prevalent rate is low. It is the slowness of density. It is the laziness of solidity. It is the rigidness of the hard outer crust. So grant it that inertness & laziness. Grant it first. Then remember. Remember the universal impulse in the opposite direction. Back to the higher origin, your inner unfoldment BACK. And then have patience. Have faith. Never FORCE yourself. But neither EVER FORGET.

In this, our Christmas number we bring you a detailed reply, with minor omissions, by G.A.'s secretary to one more attempt at disproving one of his claims. Such attempts are much welcomed by us (who have accepted G.A. on the basis of his earlier claims) & this for two reasons:

(1) They are the natural check to any unnatural lush advancement in UFO research, thus assuring an even & healthy growth; apart from this, the best any disbeliever can do is work ever harder - and with fair methods, we should like to emphasize - to get at the bottom of the whole matter. This brings us to-

(2) What at short sight looks like painful controversy will yet in the end bring out the ultimate truth - one way or the other.

There are always two sides in these "fights". In contrast to many another claimant in the UFO Contact Story field, who cannot answer or repudiate serious charges, GA has shown time & again that he is able to answer every point held against him. Where he prefers to keep quiet, this is not, as one might infer, because his claims lack substance but rather that his hands are tied, too. Last not least, so often there is absolutely no point in answering an argument when it is clear that the contender lacks understanding.

A YEAR AGO George Adamski had been invited to give a lecture at Davenport, Iowa. Although he boarded a train at Kansas City for his destination, he never arrived at the Davenport station but was there to hold the lecture. GA then told friends that shortly after the train had left Kansas City, there was a stop. Coming from the nearby highway, a man crossed the tracks & identified himself as a space visitor. GA got off the train, they took his luggage along, drove a short distance by car & entered a scout ship by the levitator, an antigravity beam (see also Vol I, No. 4, p. 27; to talk of "teleportation", as some UFO Mags did, is sheer nonsense as something different is understood by this and indeed, it never came into play in connection with GA anywhere along his claims of seven & more years' standing). He was landed near Davenport in time for the lecture. The reception committee at the station had to return home without GA, and he later showed the unused railway ticket from Kansas City.

Doubtful of this story Arthur Campbell, a member of the Kansas City UFO Study Club & of NICAP, went to considerable length to investigate, getting affidavits from railway people, etc. These and all the further conclusions appeared to disprove GA's story so that antagonists made full use of them in UFO Mags at the same time when GA was lecturing in Europe. In the following counterblast Lucy McGinnis, GA's secretary, is answering various of Major Keyhoe's points as put in NICAP's "UFO Investigator" of June, 1959, which we are unable to repeat here for lack of space. Lucy writes:

"Dear Major Keyhoe: As usual, when you have attacked Mr Adamski through your UFO Investigator, copies (also) of your June 1959 issue have been sent to us

with inquiries as to the true facts. Previously we have chosen to ignore your attacks because we are so busy that we have no time to waste in fighting. Mr. A. tells of his experiences and leaves it to the people to believe him or not. I have worked with GA for almost 14 years, was one of his witnesses at his well known first meeting with a man from another world (20-11-1952) and was with him in Kansas City last winter. Because you have apparently gone out of your way to try to discredit a man who is doing his best to awaken the people to the facts of what is going on in our world today, I have now decided to answer your long, unkind article. I wonder if you will have the courage to publish my letter in full in your Investigator? (whether this Approach - December, 1959

has happened indeed we cannot say as for unknown reasons APPROACH doesn't seem to be any longer on their mailing list since beginning of this year.) My words are not a repeat from someone else but my own, gained from personal experiences during the years.

First, may I just ask who is your Kansas City affiliate, Arthur C. Campbell? His report as recently published by you is as inaccurate as your own first comment regarding Mr. Adamski, made in your book "Fl.S. from Outer Space" when you stated that he operated a hot dog stand on the side of the road & had his telescope on the roof. If your research had been honest & sincere you would have investigated before publishing such statements. Just a note of inquiry to A. would have brought you the correct information. The facts are: Palomar Gardens Café was at that time owned & operated by Mrs Alice K Wells. Mr A only helped her when and as he could. He had 2 telescopes on the grounds but never was there a telescope on the roof of the café or any other building on the premises. - But back to K.City & the facts compared with your published report. Par. 3 from your article: "When the railroad & chair-car tickets were bought, on Dec 1, the Wheelers also witnessed this purchase." - Fact: The purchase stamp on the railroad ticket was Nov. 26, 1958. This was the night we arrived in Kansas C. and I bought a round trip ticket to Davenport for Mr A before we left the Union Station there. Remember, TWA was on strike at that time, all of their reservations had been cancelled & the trains were filled with holiday travellers. One couldn't be sure of securing a ticket to any place if he waited until the last minute to purchase it. The members of my family & the Wheelers were awaiting our arrival. After introductions all around & a few minutes visiting, I mentioned that I wanted to buy Mr A's ticket to Iowa. Mr & Mrs Wheeler accompanied me to the ticket window & watched while I made the purchase while Mr A. remained with my folks. No chaircar ticket was mentioned at the time nor Approach - December, 1959

purchased. I thought this was included with the railroad ticket. I hadn't travelled by train in several years and many changes have been made during that time.

Quote: "The train to Davenport, scheduled to leave at 9.30 am was nearly an hour late but the Wheelers & Mrs McGinnis remained until the train was called. At this time, a porter took A's luggage & went aboard the train, with A following."

Fact: Dec. 1, was on Monday. Mr Wheeler had to work. Mrs W. picked me up at my parents' home & together we went to the hotel for Mr A. Arriving at the station at 9.00 am, a Red Cap took Mr A's luggage out of the car & put it on his truck, at the same time telling us the train was nearly an hour late. Mr A gave him a nice tip for which the Red Cap thanked him, & asked for his seat ticket (this was the first time we knew there was any such thing). When told that he had none, & Mr A. inquired further about this matter, the Red Cap said the seat tickets could be bought on the train, but for Mr A not to worry, he would pick out a nice seat by the window & put Mr A's luggage in it as soon as the train arrived & before the passengers were permitted down to the train. Mrs W & I did remain with A until the train arrived and expected to go with him as he boarded, staying until the train pulled out. However, because of its late arrival & the crowd waiting at the entrance doors on the main floor of the Union Station, when the conductor opened the doors and started checking the tickets of those going on, we decided against our procedure & only watched him as his ticket was checked & he joined other passengers en route to the waiting train. No porter was in sight. A's luggage was long gone. - No use in quoting your published report of what Mr A told the Wheelers & myself upon his return to KC the following Saturday morning. Your subscribers can review this for themselves. Following is what he told the 3 of us during our luncheon at the Airport Café: As he boarded the car for which he had a ticket he saw his luggage on the vestibule

rather than on a seat as he had been promised. He decided to let the porter bring it in rather than bothering with it himself. Instead he found a seat. Shortly after the train got moving the conductor went through telling passengers that there would be a stop for about 10 minutes. Upon inquiry, Mr A was told that the Rock Island Rocket upon which he was travelling was using the tracks of another line whose trains were running on time. One was incoming at the time so the Rocket had to switch to a side track to let it pass before continuing. When the train stopped Mr A decided to go to the vestibule & get his luggage himself. He had never been in KC switch yards before & thought it would be interesting to look around while the train was still. Since he had been standing for more than an hour & a half in the station, it would hardly seem logical that he would feel the need of getting out to "stretch his legs", does it?

Not far away and paralleling the tracks was a highway along which there were a few cars. As Mr A looked around he noticed a man walking across the tracks toward the train. As he approached this man gave a sign which Mr. A. has been given before by space travellers, saying 'We will take you if you want to go with us'. Mr A did not question but immediately got off the train, the man helping with his luggage. Together they crossed the tracks to a car parked on the edge of the highway. They drove a short distance to a grove of trees above which a scout craft was hovering. The car was parked, the craft lowered & both went aboard. Why didn't others see it? Who can be sure that there were not others who did see it, but said nothing for obvious reasons? Later, at a meeting at the W's home when Mr. A. repeated his experiences, a man present, a railroad worker, asked for more specific details, then verified the train procedure; asked about particular scenery at the place where the train had stopped & said that it sounded like a certain place, near a particular bridge of which neither Mr A nor I had ever heard before. - The next day when my

brother was taking Mr A and me, along with other members of our family for a drive I asked him if he knew of this particular bridge. He did & said we were going over it soon. As we approached it, Mr A recognized some of the surroundings & continued to do so for a short distance beyond. At a turnoff he said: that is the road we went down. Remember, KC & surrounding area is unfamiliar to A. How could he have recognized these places and they be as he had described earlier, if his report was not true? The man at the W.'s, a total stranger to Mr. A. would not have supported his statements & added further information if he was not familiar with railroad procedure & the locale.

Error No 4: The train which A boarded in KC was not scheduled to go to Davenport. It went to Des Moines where the car on which he would have travelled was taken off & switched to another train for D. This was explained to me at the time I bought the ticket & again later when I verified the reservation. In your "KC Claim Reviewed" section you make quite a point of asking how a lost 10 minutes plus 13 min. could have been made by the train. Do you forget the almost hour delay at the start of this trip? Or didn't the train reach Des Moines on time to make the scheduled switch of cars at that point? - On the other hand and along this same line, your readers might be interested in an incident that took place en route to KC. As is customary with passengers I inquired if we were running on time to arrive in K.C. as scheduled where I knew my folks would be awaiting us. I was told that because of icy tracks we had had to travel crossing the mountains, we were running 1 hour late. I verified this by the conductor. Then at a short stop I got off the train, went into the station with the conductor & sent a telegram to my parents. Several hours before the train time my brother had begun telephoning regularly for latest reports and found that our train was steadily making up the lost time. - We arrived in K.C. only 10 minutes late! And there were no "furious complaints from the passengers".

All I heard talking were delighted that they had reached KC so quickly & those who were going on to Chicago for Thanksgiving were grateful that they would be able to make up the 10 min & arrive in Chicago on time for their festivities there, or make train changes for other destinations without long delays. Furthermore, I seriously doubt that that engineer was suspended & fined or penalized in any way.

Correction No 5: As for the incident you make so much of in England, Mr A remembers Mr Wightman well. He came to the hotel lobby where Mr A. was visiting with a couple of other men - not in London as you imply. He was accompanied by a news reporter & a cameraman, "having promised them a scoop". In a loud voice he began accusing Mr A., as we have been told URANUS (Mr W is this Mag's editor) has done persistently since its beginning but at no time did he produce any "evidence" as you state. His manner was so disorderly that the manager of the hotel ordered him to leave. The cameraman did not "try to catch the scene", he didn't even bother to take out his camera & Mr A did not leave the "room". Both the cameraman and reporter remained a short time after Mr Wightman had left & talked very nicely with Mr A. Furthermore A says that at no time did Mr Wightman show any "documents" to him, so there was nothing for him to "attempt to take", as you report. (Mr. W. writes in URANUS, May/June 1959: "...When the detailed investigation (Mr. Campbell's) was produced & points read from it A.'s face registered surprise & then dismay & he came to his feet. On the production of the signed affidavits (of K.C. railroad people) he made as if to take them from your editor saying: 'I would like to see them, you can pick them up when you come by tomorrow', - an improbable exclamation, it sounds to us!)

Point No 6: "during one London press conference A said that people 'high in British society' were trying to arrange an audience with Queen Elizabeth & Prince Philip". - Mr. A disclaims any such statement & is at a loss as to its origin but this Approach - December, 1959

is not the first time words have been put into his mouth which he did not say... So far as I have been able to learn, an audience with the Queen & Prince Ph. in England was at no time requested or expected by Mr A or any of his friends there.

Point No 7: "Probably Queen E's refusal was due in part to the press protests in Holland, after A was received by Queen Juliana". - Mr. A was in England before going to Holland. Surely, if her Majesty Queen E was considering an audience with Mr A she could not have been influenced by events which had not yet happened! - Point No 8: In the first paragr. of your "Brief Review of A's other Claims" you state: immediately after this 'contact' (i.e. of 20-11-1952) A reported, one of his party... - This is incorrect! Mr A to my knowledge has never made any such statement. He has always said that all of his 6 witnesses came to the spot & saw the footprints impressed in the desert. Two made sketches of them, photographs were taken by both, Betty Bailey & Betty Williamson, then G.H. Williamson made the plaster casts. Why did you not mention Williamson's name as long as you were being so careful to mention names? You know it very well! You know too that he has always supported Mr A's statements in this respect and that he has the best of the 3 sets of footprints made refusing to return them to Mr. A. as he promised at that time. In a letter to me, GW said that he considered the footprints belonged as much to him as they did to Mr A since he was one of the witnesses. - Photographs: It is easy for one man to denounce another man & his accomplishments. But it is quite another thing for such a man to prove his statements. This holds true of Frank Edwards, Lonzo Dove & anyone else who states that Mr. A's photos of space craft are fake. This may be their opinion to which they have a right, yet through

To all our readers and friends the Season's Greetings and a Happy and Prosperous New Year!

the years many have tried to establish such proof without success. And today our government as well as England is constructing craft after this pattern when in the beginning it was said to break every law of aerodynamics. Why are they spending billions of dollars in this way if the whole thing is nothing more than a big hoax as you seem to be trying to make it? And why when you through your books, admit the presence of other world craft moving through our atmosphere, do you think it impossible to get photographs of them? If Mr. A. had not had his trips into space as he tells in his book (ITSS), how could he have told in '54 & '55 of conditions in space, totally contrary to accepted ideas at that time, but which are now becoming proven facts by our own satellites? How could he have told that because of the ionosphere we have never been able to get a correct reading of conditions (around our sister planets)?...

Error No 10: "In a later publication Mr. A reported he had been invited aboard a space ship & had flown around Venus & the moon. Pictures accompanying this new claim..." - To my knowledge Mr A has never claimed to have flown around Venus. Beyond the moon, yes, but not around Venus... You are correct, the negatives have been protected & not been sent out for "study". Too many people have had their negatives returned, ruined with scratches, cuts etc. A was advised to protect his negatives and it was even suggested that if he should freely show them it would be an easy matter for one to be dropped & 'accidentally' stepped on & ruined or touched by a lighted cigarette. I was present when he was given this advice. I know those who gave it to Mr. A and respect them highly. Because of their positions we have never disclosed their names, nor the departments for which they work. It would be no good. Those who want to believe will do so. Others will not, no matter what proof would be offered to them

Question No 11: You ask why the space ship was

not seen descending to land near Davenport? "It was daylight at both times & both areas are well travelled & well-populated." - Fact: The space craft which took Mr A to D. did not land him until after dark. He suggested that they do just what you asked, lower their craft & land him during the daylight so that 100s of people would see him alight. But they told him that although they probably would escape harm from our planes, he would be arrested & held incommunicado. They reminded him of Mr Schmidt's experiences... (who - after talking to a space crew was first accepted by officials & the press, later arrested & for a fortnight shut up in an institute.) Mr A was told, that his treatment would be even worse than Sch's, even if 100s of people did see him land....they would be quickly silenced, that not one of them would make an effort in A.'s behalf. They really know Earth's people well!..

Realizing that no man ever kicks a dead dog around, I can't help but wonder why you have so persistently attacked Mr A. Was it perhaps under orders from 'higher up' who fear the effects of a well-informed public? Or is it possibly your way of keeping his name before your reading public? In any case, Mr. A is very appreciative because whatever your motive, you have done just that, thereby giving him an opportunity to contact interested, thinking people who otherwise would never hear of him and his experiences.

In ending, let me agree with you: "If the K.C. claim by A. is proved a fabrication, his other claims probably will be labelled false by many who once accepted these stories." The same statement can well apply to NICAP. I have brought out a number of points that were published (by you) which I know to be absolutely false. We will let the people make their own decisions, remembering that no man's beliefs have ever changed a fact. Truth will reveal itself, even though sometimes it seems to be very slow..."