


# Magonia 45

March 1993

95p

1968-1992 □ Twenty five years of publication

**Manhattan Transfer:**  
John Rimmer on the case that's  
tearing American ufology apart




Martin  
Kottmeyer  
looks at UFO  
paranoia in  
the Sixties



**Crashed Saucers  
or Grounded  
Research:**  
Christopher Allan  
reviews the latest  
evidence

Peter  
Rogerson  
examines  
David  
Jacobs'  
Secret Life



# Magonia

MAGONIA 45 (MUFOB 93)

EDITOR  
JOHN RIMMER

#### EDITORIAL PANEL

John Harney  
(Founding Editor)

Roger Sandell  
Nigel Watson

#### CORRESPONDING EDITORS

Peter Rogerson

Michael Goss

Robert Rankin

#### SUBSCRIPTION DETAILS

Magonia is available by exchange with other magazines, or by subscription at the following rates:

|                 |               |
|-----------------|---------------|
| United Kingdom  | £4.00         |
| Europe          | 7 ECU (£5.00) |
| United States   | \$10.00       |
| Other countries | £5.50         |

➤ USA subscriptions must be paid in dollar bills or UK funds. We are unable to accept cheques drawn on American banks.

➤ French subscribers may find it easier and cheaper to send us a 50-franc banknote rather than a money-order. We are happy to accept this.

➤ Cheques and money-orders should be made payable to 'John Rimmer', not 'Magonia'.

All correspondence, subscriptions and exchange magazines should be sent to the editor:

John Rimmer  
John Dee Cottage  
5 James Terrace  
Mortlake Churchyard  
London, SW14 8HB  
United Kingdom

© Magonia Magazine 1993

Copyright in signed articles rests with the authors.

## PETER ROGERSON'S NORTHERN ECHOES



**HO**W else could this column start but with a tribute to the two Johns, and their magnificent effort in producing MUFOB and *Magonia* for an incredible 25 years without any massive staff or elaborate organisation. MUFOB alone among the plethora of small UFO journals started after the great wave of 1967, has survived and is still going strong - indeed is constantly improving - this at a time when several less venerable journals appear to be in difficulties. [That's enough embarrassing panegyrics - Ed. Oh, alright then, it is our birthday; just a few more.]

MUFOB/*Magonia* had its bad patches, of course, most notably in the early 70s when interest in the subject reached an all-time low, and the mag was sometimes down to four pages and a single article, and the Great Hiatus of 1974-5. Under conditions in which most would have given up, John Rimmer took the bold step of resurrecting the old Gestetner-duplicated hobby mag as a semi-professionally produced journal, which has always kept abreast of technological change. [OK, that really is enough - Ed.]

Looking back over 25 years we can see the changing face of fashion and craze: UFO detectors, the Allende Letters, ancient astronauts, electronic voice phenomenon, metal bending, the Bermuda Triangle, remote viewing, MIB, the UFO-bigfoot connection, folklore and fairies; right through to our modern fads of earthlights, MJ12, crashed saucers (the biggest comeback since Lazarus), abductions, psychic questing and crop circles. Of course, many supposedly new ideas are not that at all. Are the modern abductees really that different from the old contactees? (In a future *Magonia* article I will argue no.) Isn't one of the differences that ufologists now will actually listen to the strangest tales, whereas a generation ago they shook their heads and said "That's old Mrs Stoa-

strangler out into the wide blue yonder again"? Can you be sure now that your memory isn't playing tricks when you fancy recalling that strange woman in the room filled with the smoke of exotic cheroots [But I didn't inhale of course - Ed.] was saying that 'they' had taken her baby, or that the couple in the beads and bells said something about being teleported from a mandala in a Warminster field to the Norfolk Broads. After all, you were too busy reading the latest John Keel article to be bothered listening to the obvious nutters.

Some fads' pedigrees can be traced: modern tales of psychic questing pale into banality compared with the extraordinary Snettisham story, and elements of PQ can be found in the Scoriton story; to say nothing of the saga of the Contactee, the Moon Rock and the Telephone Box for which the world is still not ready; or the strange saga of Mr A and the tunnels. Ufology was so full of those stories that one never really got to hear of properly, just hints.

Break for Rant No. 1: Unfortunately, psychic questing is in grave danger of reversing the old adage of things starting in tragedy and ending in farce. While questing for Queen Cartimandura's golden chamber pot might be all good fun, the latest manifestation of questing in my northern neck of the woods - taking a grief stricken mother at the very end of her tether on a psychic quest for the body of her murdered daughter, unsuccessfully, of course, and with all the sensitivity of the Pig and Whistle's annual treasure hunt - leaves one speechless - at least under the constraints of the laws of libel, obscenity and incitement to violence, and a with strong desire not only to take out life-membership of

---

## **Magonia has never had to backtrack on its scepticism, and its sceptical attitude has, years after any controversy, become the routine verdict of mainstream ufology**

CSICOP, but to petition for the reintroduction of the Witchcraft Acts.

Another 'new' idea which aint is 'witness led ufology'. Given that about 50% of the membership of BUFORA joined because of their own UFO experience, this is happening already. In fact what is meant is total acceptance of everything the witness says. Nothing so viciously cynical as an actual investigation - just the sort of thing we had with dear old Arthur and the great Warminster circus. When you examine from where some of these calls come, one sees that the demand is for what we used to know as (before the invention of social-worker jargon) contactee groups, or even contactee cults. The charismatic contactees are surrounded by a bunch of fawning acolytes, who stroke them and assure them what wonderful, special people they are. There were plenty of these in the 60s, too.

It was expression of attitudes like this, and the publication of various articles critical of the aforementioned Arthur Shuttlewood, which earned MUFOB (and its prehistoric predecessor *MUFORG Bulletin*) the reputation of being 'cynical'. The criticism was wide of the mark. 'Cynical' would be to have believed not a word of it, but to have published all sorts of nonsense, because money - or a kind of fame - could be made from the credulous punters who gobbled it up. MUFOB/*Magonia* has always been upfront in its scepticism, and all I can say is that *Magonia* has never had to backtrack on its scepticism, and its 'sceptical' attitude has, years after any controversy, become the routine verdict of mainstream ufology; but I feel that some of my less sceptical contributions are rather embarrassing looked at from this distance. For example, my less than dismissive review of Clive Harold's *The Unidentified*, although at the time even that was criticised for being too sceptical!

One of the persistent irritations between *Magonia* and our critics, is our belief that human motivations are much more complicated than some are prepared to accept. Many ufologists seem to think that

any witness who does not actually dress as Napoleon, or wear a striped jersey and carry a bag labelled 'swag', or have a bottle of meths to his lips, must be a decent, upright citizen. This naivety has led to some ufologists getting involved with some very dubious characters, and into sticky situations with often disastrous personal consequences. At times it seems extraordinarily good fortune that ufologists have escaped serious physical injury.

And a pause for Rant No. 2: Just now we have an excellent example, with the willingness of a number of our fellow UFO editors to include adverts, or distribute leaflets, for the bizarre Wembley Arena conspiracy rant. OK, maybe they don't have the political awareness and background in conspiracy theory research of Roger Sandell, but they might have wondered why one of the speakers included the words "protege of Ezra Pound" in his description. If they knew anything, or looked up anything, about Pound, they would have realized that any 'protege' of his was unlikely to blame the Conspiracy on the Dagenham Girl Pipers. When we hear that the organiser of this affair (described by David Barclay as a "true ufologist") claims that "a new world order power elite" can create storms and earthquakes, we see a true revival of medieval anti-semitic superstition and witchcraft beliefs. She is also pushing the ideas of Lyndon LaRouche, a sinister American who promotes, amongst other ravings, the conspiracy theory that the world's drug cartels are headed by the British Royal Family. Not all barmy pots are harmless.

The main problem with ufology is that it has taken the attitude that everything should be assumed to be mysterious, unless proven otherwise. As proving a negative is often impossible, almost everything is, by this logic, actually mysterious. Often sceptics have fallen into the trap, going to extreme lengths to 'explain away' events, sometimes discrediting their own case by the attenuation of their arguments. The

correct sceptical response should be "as I wasn't there and in the witness's head, I don't know what happened, but that doesn't mean that something anomalous actually happened". The onus should be on those who propose anomalies to find some way of proving their existence. In a recent *Northern UFO News*, Jenny Randles writes "[ufologists] know the UFO phenomenon is real. We know that it is not all down to assorted misperceptions." In one sense this is true enough, because some cases are clearly hoaxes, and others are what I have called 'virtual experience' - abductions and many occupant cases fall into these latter categories, as do, I suspect, a larger proportion than is often suspected of less dramatic incidents. So if we rephrase Jenny's claim to mean are we *certain* that there are any cases which are neither misperceptions, virtual experiences or hoaxes, then I think the answer must be 'No'. That doesn't mean that I am *certain* that no UFO cases have ever been generated by uncatalogued natural phenomena or something even more anomalous, just that the null position is as reasonable as any in our present state of knowledge. If you doubt this, recall that a few years ago most ufologists would have said that the best evidence of some ufological anomaly was the Day film - solemn committees were convened to examine the film in detail: this was to be The Answer. There are indeed many cases in which the events happened exactly as the witness's narrative implies they did, still we are faced with major puzzles, given what we know about perception, memory, description, and even the mental images the witness's narrative conjures up in the minds of the investigators. Ultimately, can *any number* of mere eyewitness testimony really resolve the issue? There were several thousand eyewitnesses at Fatima, and we still don't know what happened there.

Which inconclusive note leaves me with the happy thought that there will still be plenty for the contributors to *Magonia* to write about for the next 25 years! ●●●



**Is credibility  
being  
stretched,  
is the truth  
being drawn  
out or are  
our legs  
being  
pulled?**

**Christopher  
Allan**

**reviews two  
recent  
books  
which  
promise to  
throw fresh  
light on the  
Roswell  
case. Do  
they  
deliver?**

ETH). The authors propose a simple, have-it-both-ways answer for the omission of the San Augustin 'crash' from the Eisenhower paper: the second crash was omitted "because at the time this had been given only limited credence; in this way *the briefing paper could well be both genuine and fake*" (my italics); the second crash was thus deleted from the paper before its copy and release. They also say: "admittedly, this is pure speculation". They do concede, however, that "the final answer to the question of the legitimacy of the MJ-12 documents is not yet in" (p.69)

Regarding the two 'crashes', the authors prop up the myth of the July 2, 1947 date when there is not the slightest support for this in any contemporary report (this date is in fact an assumption made over thirty years later by Friedman and Bill Moore); they take the fact of the crash(s) as proven, again despite there being no first-hand witnesses and no mention of such a thing in the press reports (all that was mentioned was a 'landing' or 'recovery' of a light instrument). The change the date when Bill Brazel Jr is said to have been 'visited' by the military and had his few UFO fragments confiscated. The two previous books give the date of this incident as 1949, two years after the crash. Friedman & Berliner insist it took place merely a few weeks after the crash. Despite this, Brazel's memory of the events surrounding the Corona crash is said to be "clear and sharp" (p.86). On p.87 they say Barney Barnett died in 1969, long 'before anyone had heard of a crash in western New Mexico, and long before anyone was taking stories of crashes seriously'; thus conveniently ignoring Frank Scully's 1950 best-seller which was, the authors imply (p.48-9), indeed taken seriously by Wilbert Smith, Dr Frank Sarbacher and Dr Vannevar Bush if no-one else. This raises another question: the authors accept the MJ-12 papers as genuine. Therefore surely the MJ-12 committee members, having taken part so assiduously in the recovery of a crashed saucer in New Mexico in 1947, would have regarded Scully's 1949-50 disclosures *extremely seriously* and redoubled their efforts. Why then is there no mention of Scully's New Mexico crash in the Eisenhower briefing paper? How could the MJ-12 group possibly afford to ignore such a story when they knew the Roswell crash was genuine and they had recovered wreckage and bodies? Another 'limited credence' case perhaps?

On p.80 (again with the wrong date) they say rancher Brazel's press interview "bore little similarity to his original story". In fact only one Brazel interview was ever printed in the press and there was thus no "original story".

The Lydia Sleppy teletype story is given a new twist. The first version of this appeared as far back as 1974 in *Saga* magazine, in a simple form. Every version thereafter differs from, and improves upon, the earlier ones. This time Sleppy says the "mysterious" interrupt was caused by the FBI who were, according to Friedman and Berliner, monitoring teletypes at the time. No mention of the FBI occurs in any previous account of this incident.

On p.100 we are told that Jesse Marcel says "beyond that, I did not actually see him hit the matter with a sledge-hammer, but further on: "we even tried making a dent in it with a 16-pound sledge-hammer. On p.169 we hear that the wreckage was so extra-

ordinary that even "cattle and horses reportedly shied away from it... something told them it wasn't anything normal". (N.B. Brazel's cattle and sheep escaped the mutilation suffered by later generations of farmers at the hands of alien visitors).

The evidence of Gerald Anderson, who only came forward in 1990 after seeing the *Unsolved Mysteries* TV documentary, is given full credence. This alleged first-hand witness was only 5½ years old at the time, but has the most phenomenal memory ever known, recalling everything in perfect detail 43 years later, including the alien creatures' faces, the ship itself, the surrounding terrain, the archaeologists present who got too nosy, the military planes, trucks, even their insignia and names. He recalled his uncle Ted taking exception to the excessive military interference at the crash site and that he "smacked one of them and knocked him right on his ass" (p.106). His older brother, possessing truly amazing insight, realised straightaway the nature of the craft, remarking "that's a goddamn spaceship; them's Martians!" The four members of his family who were present are now, alas, all dead; although an alleged copy of a diary (not the original) survives as supporting evidence. Naturally, Anderson has passed a polygraph test with flying colours.

Likewise, Friedman and Berliner accept without question the testimony of Glenn Dennis, a local mortician who heard about the alien bodies from a nurse now deceased. Dennis tells us elsewhere (in a recorded interview, not reproduced in the book) that the USAF

### **Roswell should provide much interesting entertainment and speculation for the foreseeable future**

warned him to keep his mouth shut or he might "make good dog food".

The authors also accept the Robert Emenegger - Linda Moulton Howe story (without naming them) of secret movie footage of a meeting between the USAF and alien beings at Holloman Air Force Base, saying it "could very well be true" (p.187). Although Friedman and Berliner don't tell you, there are at least two versions of this story: one had a mere 800 feet of film, the other over 12 miles!

Some daft speculations accompany the narrative all through. Dr Menzel was enlisted as a UFO disinformation agent early on (p.152), thus explaining his three anti-UFO books; the invention of transistors in late 1947 is linked to discoveries made from the Roswell wreckage (p.67). No journalist would dare reveal the story even if he knew it because it was "too big" and he could lose his job, thus it would not be worth the trouble! (p.155) Finally, the government dare not let the truth out for fear of a disastrous stock market crash with a deep depression and massive unemployment to follow (chap.15).

THE *San Augustin Controversy* report is the proceedings of a conference in Chicago during Feb 15-16 1992 to try and get to the bottom of the second alleged saucer 'crash' on the presumed date in July 1947. It consists of the two protagonists Friedman and Berliner on the one hand, against Kevin Randle, Donald Schmitt and Thomas J. Carey on the other, with Professor Michael D. Swords

as moderator.

the main topic for discussion is the credibility of the witness mentioned above, Gerald Anderson, who only came forward in January 1990 after watching a TV documentary. A host of supporting documentation in the form of diaries, photos and exhibits is given and a very fair and reasonable analysis by the moderator which leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader (and of just about everyone else in the UFO movement) that Anderson is a complete fraud, having obtained all his vast knowledge of the case from reading *The Roswell Incident* by Berlitz and Moore, the TV documentary, plus other bits and pieces inadvertently passed onto him by Friedman. Naturally, Stan Friedman rejects this and still promotes Anderson as the star Roswell-San Augustin witness.

Considerable discussion centres on a Dr Winfred Buskirk, alleged by Anderson to be the leader of the team of archaeologists at the site at the time of the crash. In fact, due to Tom Cary's painstaking investigation, it turns out that Buskirk was an anthropology teacher at the very school in Albuquerque that Anderson attended ten years later! Needless to say Buskirk, who is still alive, has never seen or heard of any UFO crash in New Mexico in 1947 or any other time. Friedman's response, naturally, is that Buskirk has to say this because he is sworn to secrecy.

Let us admit that there has been a lot of research and investigation over Roswell by many dedicated ufologists over the past thirteen years; with some 400 people connected with the case (some very remotely, it must be said) being interviewed altogether. This number is still rising. Unfortunately the key evidence that could provide the final proof, i.e. actual UFO hardware, alien bodies or irrefutable official documentation, has never turned up. Nor is it likely it ever will. It is impossible to say how much contamination of witnesses by interviewers has occurred, how their memories have been distorted by time, how much some are motivated by the desire for publicity, how much their minds have been conditioned by the UFO subject forty years on, and so on.

Some debris was undoubtedly found on Mac Brazel's ranch in the summer of 1947, and the military were involved in its retrieval. There is one and only one official document that has ever surfaced (and this only thirty years later), an FBI teletype dated July 8, 1947. This leaves no reasonable doubt that the object was an octahedron shaped radar target with an attached balloon, which is precisely what the USAF told the press on the same day. The FBI got their information via a phone-call from the USAF at Fort Worth, Texas. There was no conceivable reason for the Air Force to lie to the FBI.

The other associated 'crash' (San Augustin) is entirely fictitious, being merely a secondhand tale told to Stanton Friedman over thirty years later by someone who could not remember the date, even the year, and who cannot even recall when he was first told the tale himself. Friedman assumed the event was in the summer of 1947 for one reason only, because he wanted it to fit in with the so-called Roswell incident.


Randle and Schmitt are planning a second book. More articles will undoubtedly appear, with a promise of final 'breakthrough' being imminent. It will never happen, of course, but at least Roswell should provide much interesting entertainment and speculation for the foreseeable future

FRIEDMAN, Stanford, and BERLINER, Don. *The US Military Retrieval and Cover-up of a UFO*. Paragon House, New York, 1992. *The Plains of San Augustin Controversy*. Published Jointly by CUFOS and FUFOR. June, 1992 (88 pp.)

**“The sixties were a manic time for UFO belief. Flying saucers were so real only the most bigoted sceptic could deny advanced metallic piloted machines were flying around - a potential threat to the security of the world. Everyone felt something had to be done. Most of all the authorities should openly admit the reality of the problem.”**

# Swinging through the sixties

**Part Two of ‘What’s Up Doc?’ by  
Martin Kottmeyer**



**B**OOK titles convey some of the mood of the period: *Flying saucers - The Startling Evidence of the Invasion from Outer Space*; *Flying Saucers are Hostile*; *Flying Saucer Invasion - Target Earth*; *Flying Saucers - Serious Business*; *The Real UFO Invasion*; *The Terror Above Us*. Wilkins' *Flying Saucers on the Attack* is reprinted with a teaser asking: 'Are they Friendly Visitors from Outer Space or INVADERS Planning Conquest?' The teaser on *Flying Saucers Uncensored* asks: 'Is there a cosmic battle plan - aimed at Earth?' 'Exclusive! First News of America's Most Terrifying UFO Invasion!' was promised by *The Official Guide to UFOs*. The actual content was often less dramatic than advertised, but that hardly mattered. The conviction of urgency transcended the material gathered

to justify the belief in, to use the 1 April *Life* article's title, a 'Well-Witnessed Invasion by Something'.

Throughout the first half of the decade Keyhoe's NICAP pressed for Congressional hearings on the UFO problem by such tactics as letter-writing campaigns. The Air Force warned congressmen that such hearings would only dignify the problem and cause more publicity, thus adding to the problem. At one point, NICAP published a book called *The UFO Evidence* and sent copies to congressmen to demonstrate their case that UFOs were in fact real and posed a danger to the fabric of society. The danger included an unprepared public being caught up in a widespread panic if an external danger was suddenly imposed. A sudden confrontation with extraterrestrials could have

■39. CLARK, Jerome, 'UFOs: Mystery or Movement', *Flying Saucers*, August 1965, 17-20.  
LORENZEN, Coral, *UFOs over the Americas*, Signet, 1968, 217.

disastrous results, they warned. Among them, 'catastrophic results to morale'. (40) While NICAP found some support for their position in Congress, nothing happened till the infamous swamp gas fiasco caused a loss of credibility in the Air Force's handling of the UFO problem. On 5 April 1966 Congress held open hearings. This led to the creation of the Condon committee to undertake a new investigation - in essence, to get a second opinion of the Air Force's diagnosis. Keyhoe rejoiced, calling it 'the most significant development in the history of UFO investigation'. (41) Condon confirmed the Air Force's diagnosis:

'Our general conclusion is that nothing has come from the study of UFOs in the past 21 years that has added to scientific knowledge. Careful consideration of the record as it is available to us leads us to conclude that further extensive study of UFOs probably can not be justified in the expectation that science will be advanced thereby.' (42)

'We know of no reason to question the finding of the Air Force that the whole class so far considered does not pose a defense problem.' (43)

'The subject of UFOs has been widely misrepresented to the public by a small number of individuals who have given sensationalized presentations in writings and public lectures. So far as we can judge, not many people have been misled by such irresponsible behaviour, but whatever effect there has been has been bad.' (44)

Even before the report was published, ufologists were up in arms when they realised Condon was making jokes of the nutty people he was running into. He had to some extent pre-judged the problem and admitted he knew what the final outcome would probably be. One thing he failed to take into account in his prognostication was 'the extent of the emotional commitment of the UFO believers and the extremes of conduct to which their faith can lead'. Had he known, he confessed, 'I certainly would never have undertaken the study'. (45)

Condon admits up front that the study focused its attention on the physical science aspects of the problem and ignored the psychiatric aspects. Condon avers this was partly due to a failure to find as much psychopathology as might be presumed. Condon was presumably regarding psychopathology in a restricted sense of severely diminished mental competence and was ignorant of broader usages of the term that include pervasive stereotypical irrationalities. Otherwise he could hardly have failed to realise that the extreme emotional commitment and conduct he encountered would be regarded by some as a sign that a psychiatric approach would likely be the best line of enquiry. Ultimately this mattered only slightly since the approach taken did manage to demonstrate the illusory character of the majority of cases. Ufologists disparaged the Condon report for its failure to find conclusive explanations for a minority of the cases investigated. This is true, but more true than ufologists understand. Extraterrestrial vehicles do not form a convincing explanation of this remainder. The unexplained cases lacked corroborative

integrity, lacked consistency of form and behaviour, and seemed irrational and impervious to an analysis of intelligible motives. Why should a craft that blazes with megawatt brilliance in case 10 be in the same theoretical picture with a craft that presents a trapezoid of dim red lights as in case 31 or a craft overtaking a commercial plane in case 21, which is completely invisible except to radar? Among those cases that are officially unexplained: case 44 which involves a medical student evidencing emotional disturbance predating his sighting and for which he was considering psychiatric help; case 43 which involved teenagers driving to a cemetery to frighten themselves; case 33 which involved two girls whose testing revealed one was suggestible and the other showed tendencies toward borderline hallucinatory distortion; and the Herb Schirmer case. Of the Schirmer case, it should be noted that though it is perhaps unexplained, investigators had no confidence his experiences were physically real since there was no corroborative physical evidence. I think it is suspicious that the aliens borrowed their attire from *Mars Needs Women*.

The UFO literature of the sixties is voluminous and so fantastic it is hard to know how best to start chronicling it all. The writings of the Lorenzens make as good a starting place as any, I suppose. They were required reading and perhaps still should be. *Flying Saucers: The Startling Evidence of the Invasion from Outer Space* adopts as its major premise the Keyhoe thesis that UFOs are engaged in reconnaissance. They are painstakingly mapping the geographical features of our country and testing our defence capabilities. The 1952 D.C. incidents are regarded as accidental, unintended revealings of the aliens because they mistook the Capitol and the White House for military installations. They expect they will be setting up bases since the taking of plants, boulders and soil samples probably means they are testing what sort of agriculture they should establish. The Ubatuba explosion is regarded as self-destruction to prevent superior technology from getting into our hands and revealing its secrets. There is a bare possibility, say the Lorenzens, it was an atomic explosion given other evidence that 'UFOs are powerful radioactive sources'. The dangers posed by UFOs extend to the possibility that our next war could involve 'all nations fighting as brothers against a common foe from outer space'. They showcase the ideas of Dr Olavo Fontes that UFOs possessed weapons such as heat rays and a device which inhibited the function of petrol engines. They claim priority, however, that observations UFOs made of cars and planes in the early years of the flying saucer mystery were done in order to devise these devices to disable propulsion systems. A pattern of reconnaissance is seen which suggests to them that aliens plan to release sleeping drugs into strategic reservoirs and water tanks as a means of bringing the world to its knees in a matter of hours. They are concerned that there are too many blackouts on our power grids. There are also people disappearing. Is this the procuring of

■40. HALL, Richard (ed.), *The UFO Evidence*, NICAP, 1964, 179.

■41. JACOBS, David, *The UFO Controversy in America*, Signet, 1976, 186.

■42. GILLMOR, Daniel S. (ed.), *Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects*, Bantam, 1969, 1.

■43. *Ibid.*, 5.

■44. *Ibid.*

■45. *Ibid.*, 548.

specimens? Add to this the case of a woman with medical problems they interpret as radiation effects. No person of conscience can ignore the UFO problem in the light of all this. The UFO problem has to be taken out of the hands of the military who are lulling us into a false sense of security and given to an International Commission which will handle this red-hot political problem. 'We are in urgent need of the acquisition and objective analysis of basic data.' We are facing potential danger. Maybe they aren't hostile, but 'there is no indication of friendliness either... The existence of a species of superior beings in the universe could cause the civilisation of Earth to topple.' This urgency 'defies expression'. We must be 'anxious to re-learn the bitter lessons of history: Billy Mitchell - Maginot - Pearl Harbor - and so on.' (46)

The hypochondriac themes in this summary are multiform and collective equivalents of motifs commonly encountered in psychotic fantasy. The call for independent verification of the reality of their beliefs via the international

commission is, as we'll see, almost a universally shared concern in this period. The concern over sleeping drugs being secretly put into the water supply is an obvious variant of the poisoning fantasies found in individual paranoids. The talk about war and the toppling of civilisation fits solidly into the category of world destruction fantasies so common in paranoia. Invasion fears have numerous precedents in history; most notably the Great Fear rumour and panic in 1789 France and the 1913 Scareship wave. (47) H.G. Wells's *War of the Worlds* had earthbound ancestry in a sizable literature which ruminated about the threat of invasion and war in the near-future tense. (48) The concern over blackouts has its parallel in the loss-of-life-energy fantasies that sometimes develop around the depression and fatigue aspects of some cases of schizophrenia. The urgency of approaching death is everywhere apparent.

*Flying Saucer Occupants* (1967) is less suffused with fear than this earlier book. It is primarily a survey of a collection of non-contactee ufonaut reports. As such it is a mixed bag open to a variety of interpretations from 'conquerors from space' and 'members of a military organisation' to 'a breeding experiment', or simply 'visitors'. While they prefer to simply assert the reality of these entities, they admit in the final paragraph an alternative theory:



**Almé Michel also  
utilised the disease  
metaphor in  
suggesting the aliens  
'dominate us only to  
the degree that the  
microbe dominates us  
when we are ill'**

very limited period of time - only minutes sometimes - behave in a strange way and see things that are belied by the reliable and stable manner and actions they exhibit in the rest of their lives..Is there a philosopher in the house?' (51)

Gordon Creighton offered the longest exposition of this metaphor in *The Humanoids* (1969):

'One thing at least is certain. These stories of alleged meetings with denizens of other worlds or realms or levels of existence constitute a fascinating social, psychological - and possibly also a parapsychological enigma. And surely an enigma of some urgency, for if the growing numbers of people all over our planet who claim these experiences are indeed hallucinated, or, as we are confidently told, suffering from the stresses and strains of the Nuclear Age, then it is as plain as a pikestaff that they are in grave need of psychological study and medical attention. If a brand new psychosis is loose amongst us, then, instead of wasting so much time on why we hate our fathers and love our mothers, our mental experts and psychologists ought to have been in there right from the start, studying and combatting this new plague since its outbreak nearly twenty years ago! Valuable time has been lost. By now, they might have come to important conclusions, or even licked the malady!' (52)

The population of the world is falling victim to a particularly insidious and apparently contagious mental disease which generates hallucinations involving specific types of airships and humanoids. This disease seems to be spreading.

'Who will be next to contract the malady?

'You?' (49)

The choice of metaphor is interesting and was itself infectious. It turns up in the writings of Hynek for one. In an article for *Playboy* he asserts that if an intensive investigation were carried out for a year and yielded nothing we could then shrug off the UFO problem with, 'There must have been a virus going around'. (50) In *The UFO Experience*, Hynek asks:

'Are then, all of these reporters of UFOs truly sick? If so, what is the sickness? Are these people all affected by some strange "virus" that does not attack "sensible" people? What a strange sickness this must be, attacking people in all walks of life, regardless of training or vocation, and making them, for a

■46. LORENZEN, Coral E., *Flying Saucers: The Startling Evidence of the Invasion from Outer Space*, Signet, 1966, 40, 55, 133, 199, 151, 153, 261, 273, 276, 278.

■47. ROTHOFVIUS, Andrew, 'Analogies of the Propagation Waves of the Great Fear in France 1789 and the Airship Flap in Ohio 1897', *Pursuit*, Winter 1978. BROOKESMITH, Peter, *The Alien World*, Black Cat, 1988, 54-60.

■48. STABLEFORD, Brian, *Scientific Romance in Britain 1890-1950*, St. Martin's, 1985, 30-4. SANDELL, Roger, 'The Airship and Other Panics', *MUFOB*, NS 12, Autumn 1978, 12-13.

■49. LORENZEN, Coral and Jim, *Flying Saucer Occupants*, Signet, 1967, 207.

■50. HYNEK, J. Allen, 'The UFO Gap', *Playboy*, December 1967, 144-6, 267-71.

■51. HYNEK, J. Allen, *The UFO Experience*, Ballantine, 1974, 159-61.

■52. BOWEN, Charles, *The Humanoids*, H. Regnery, 1969, 84-5.

Even rendered in facetious terms the imperative quality of the UFO problem is retained in the overwrought choice of words like plague and grave need. Aimé Michel also utilised the disease metaphor in suggesting the aliens 'dominate us only to the degree that the microbe dominates us when we are ill'. (53)

*UFOs Over the Americas* (1968) is more suffused with confusion than fear. They note a new phase of UFO activity involving car chases. A new observation is forwarded that UFOs show a proclivity to be sighted near cemeteries. They speculate this is just their way to get to the bottom of what funeral processions are. They criticise the scientific community for holding the position that UFOs show 'no intelligent pattern of behaviour; they zip hither and yon but don't seem to be going anywhere'. Yet elsewhere they observe the extraterrestrials' motivations and overall purpose are so well-concealed as to suggest a deliberate attempt to confuse'. They call for a UN sponsored agency to look into the matter. Why isn't clear since they predict elsewhere that UFOs would manifest so constantly that 'it should be evident before the end of 1968 just what UFOs are'. (54)

Alas, the 1969 volume *UFOs - The Whole Story* did not proclaim what that evident identity was. The concern about invasion gives way to the assumption of aloofness. The stoppage of vehicles is downgraded from weapons-testing activity to a means of studying humans at a leisurely pace. For the Lorenzens, the hypochondriacal themes begin to vanish in favour of discussions of UFO politics and ufonauts being time-travellers. (55)

The writings of Frank Edwards were probably the best-selling books of the sixties. Edwards is sometimes dismissed as a journalist and not a ufologist, in part because of his obvious errors. The substance of the books, however, is heavily indebted to Keyhoe and NICAP. The flyleaf of *Flying Saucers - Serious Business* is highly notable for the flying saucer health warning presented on it. For me, it epitomises the hypochondriacal spirit of the times.

#### WARNING!

Near approaches of Unidentified Flying Objects can be harmful to human beings. Do not stand under a UFO that is hovering at low altitude. Do not touch or attempt to touch a UFO that has landed.

In either case, the safe thing to do is get away from there quickly and let the military take over. There is a possibility of radiation danger, and there are known cases in which persons have been burned by rays emanating from UFOs. Details on these cases are included in this book.

DON'T TAKE CHANCES WITH UFOs



### Frank Edwards' flying saucer health warning epitomises the hypochondriacal spirit of the sixties

It is fascinating to note that nearly a decade later, Allan Hendry encountered a UFO witness who still had this warning not to stand under UFOs posted in his memory. (56) Edwards does affirm inside the reality of cases involving 'eye damage, burns, radioactivity, partial or temporary paralysis, and various types of physiological disturbances'. He talks of heat waves and stun rays, and the relationship between UFOs and blackouts is explored at length. They have shown the ability - and sometimes the apparent inclination to interfere with or prevent the functioning of our electrical and electronic systems.' Despite these hints of malevolence, Edwards proclaims near the end of the book that contact will be 'the greatest experience of the human race'. (57)

The sequel *Flying Saucers - Here and Now* was spawned by the incredible increase of saucer sightings and saucer interest in the

middle of the decade. Writings that, in cooler times, would have stimulated half a dozen letters, now filled bags at magazine offices. Besides chronicling the rush of events unfolding, the book includes James McDonald's call for a full-scale Congressional investigation. Edwards maintains UFOs are not hostile, but warns contact will have tremendous impact theologically, psychologically, and sociologically. And that contact is described as imminent. (58)

George Fawcett, in a February 1965 article, surveyed UFO cases for repetitive features. Among his catalogue of commonalities was the phenomenon of pursuit, cases of increased background radiation, cases of electrical shock, burns, dimming of vision, blackouts, temporary paralysis, and hostile acts. (59) In an April 1968 article, Fawcett cites dozens of UFO chases, a half-dozen deaths attributed to close encounters, and numerous instances of electromagnetic interference with machinery. He laments that it 'may already be too late' for our government to act on the UFO problem. Their crossing of international boundaries, at the simplest level of concern, could result in 'an accidental World War III by mistake'. He adds his voice to the chorus of those calling for verification of UFO reality:

'The growing UFO problem worldwide must be solved in 1968 or the explosive situation of UFOs may easily get out of our control and reap a "real" disaster beyond all imagination. A worldwide probe of this problem is long overdue and it should be handled by the world nations through the United Nations.' (60)

The works of Jacques Vallée are a must in every ufologist's library. His first book *Anatomy of a*

- 53. *Ibid.*, 250.
- 54. LORENZEN, Jim and Coral, *UFOs Over the Americas*, Signet, 1968, 161-2, 199, 86, 200, 216.
- 55. LORENZEN, Coral, *UFOs - The Whole Story*, Signet, 1969, 164-5.
- 56. EDWARDS, Frank, *Flying Saucers: Serious Business*, Bantam, 1967. HENDRY, Allan, *The UFO Handbook*, Doubleday, 1979, 104-5.
- 57. EDWARDS, *op. cit.*
- 58. EDWARDS, Frank, *Flying Saucers: Here and Now*, Bantam, 1968, 148, 159.
- 59. FAWCETT, George, 'UFO Repetitions', *Flying Saucers*, February 1965.
- 60. FAWCETT, George, 'Fling Saucers: Explosive Situation for 1968', *Flying Saucers*, April 1968, 22-3.

*Phenomenon: The Detailed and Unbiased Report on UFOs* remains one of the most dispassionate overviews of the UFO mystery attempted and is virtually beyond reproach. The conclusion of his study verges on the poetic:

Through UFO activity, although no physical evidence has yet been found, some of us believe the contours of an amazingly complex, intelligent life beyond the earth can already be discerned. The wakening spirit of man, and the horrified reaction of his too-scrupulous theories: what do they matter? Our minds now wander on planets our fathers ignored. Our senses, our dreams have reached across the night at last, and touched other universes. The sky will never be the same.' (61)

Accepted in a non-literal fashion, even a sceptic can enjoy the numinous quality of sentiments of this nature. *Challenge to Science: The UFO Enigma* represents a drift into the hypochondriacal mindset. There is the call for verification by means of the creation of an international scientific commission to separate out those elements that are the work of the imagination from those that constitute the physical nature of the UFO phenomenon. The challenges they pose are 'unwelcome' and 'disturbing', but must be addressed because 'our own existence will be dependent upon the sincerity with which we conduct this research'. It is problematic whether this constitutes a world destruction fantasy in the strictest sense, but the intimation of death approaching is undeniable. (62) This flirtation with fear is abandoned in *Passport to Magonia: From Folklore to Flying Saucers* (1969). Entity behaviour is dismissed as consistently absurd and their messages are written off as systematically misleading. The search for answers may be futile for they may only constitute a dream that never existed in reality. (63)

Brad Steiger's books in this period are rich sources of hypochondriacal themes. The call for verification appears in *Strangers from the Skies* (1966) with a recommendation for 'an objective and respected panel' to appraise the situation. (66) UFOs have the ability to create blackouts and that ability to scramble power plants would, in his view, make national defence 'a bad joke'. (67) The Lorenzen notion that UFOs may beam down hypnotic drugs into our drinking water is repeated. (68) My favourite fear-of-death example involves a suggestion that one incident involves galactic experiments in cremation. (69) It seemed that UFOs were ready to invade the US on a full scale. (70) 'We must be prepared to establish peaceful communication or be prepared to accept annihilation. (71) These are just highlights. Much more could be cited.

John Fuller's writings are equally rich to the point of tedium. The familiar themes of blackouts, physiological reactions, and mechanical interference recur as does the call for verification by means of a 'scientific investigation on a major scale'. (72) This is 'urgently' needed because of the 'startling, alarming, and dangerous material' surfacing, not to mention its 'mounting seriousness'. (73) He devotes a whole book to

the Betty Hill case which is notably involved in themes of fear of radiation poisoning, abduction, and nightmarish medical intrusions like inserting a needle into the navel without prior anaesthesia. (74)

One of the more interesting examples of the motif to emerge appeared in an article by J. Allen Hynek not long after his conversion in the wake of the humiliating swamp gas affair. Hynek expressed the fear that the Russians might solve the UFO mystery with results that would 'shake America so hard that the launching of Sputnik in 1957 would appear in retrospect as important as a Russian announcement of a particularly large wheat crop'. Hynek felt a Russian colleague slipped up when he revealed Russian scientists were not permitted to discuss UFOs. This suggested that official denials of their reality were a cover. They may have been 'studying with dispassionate thoroughness for years'. (75)

Hynek goes on to discuss the strangeness and credibility problems of UFO reports and admits that 'psychotic and paranoid signals are many'. He warns that the slightest hint from the UFO reporter that he is the subject of imaginary persecution is enough to mean one might as well drop the case. He tells of occasions when he encountered what seemed to be a straightforward story when the witness confided his phone was being tapped or he was being watched regularly by the government or occupants of the craft. One repeater with a persecution complex frequently wrote to Project Blue Book from a mental institution exhorting them to do something about UFOs which visited him regularly and interfered with his sexual functions. (76) Would present-day ufologists take this guy seriously?

Jerome Clark offered one of the more paradoxical reactions to Hynek's swamp gas statement. He took issue with his comment that a dismal swamp is a most unlikely place for a visit from outer space. Clark avers, contrarily, it is a most likely place since they could go there without being seen. They go to fantastic lengths to prevent us from knowing what they are doing. This included killing a village full of people in one incident and the erasing of people's memories in other cases. He berates the idea that UFO injuries were caused by self-defence as inane. Noting that we have never tried to force UFOs down, he remarks that we have been treating them with more respect than they deserve. The change of attitude from the fifties when UFOs possessed savoir-faire is nowhere more evident than here. (77)

The call for verification of UFO reality turns up yet again as the subject of a resolution drafted during a 1967 gathering of UFO buffs and submitted tates and proclaims that unidentified flying objects - UFOs - are identified vehicles from outer space, and that this is a question of a vital problem concerning the whole world.

'All nations must unite in mutual research and scientific co-operation to investigate and solve this

- 61. VALLEE, Jacques, *Anatomy of a Phenomenon*, Ace, 1965, 244-5. Compare last line of quote to 'If it's true the stars will never again seem the same' which appears in Keyhoe's *The Flying Saucers are Real* (Fawcett, 1950, 66). Such sentiments might be termed 'trema', the delusional mood that something strange is going on that appears in what Arthur M. Freeman terms the premonition stage of paranoia in 'Persecutory Delusions: A Cybernetic Model' (*American Journal of Psychiatry*, 132, 10 October 1975, 1038-44).
- 62. VALLEE, Jacques, *Challenge to Science*, Ballantine, 1974, 210, 220-4.
- 63. VALLEE, Jacques, *Passport to Magonia*, Henry Regnery, 1969, 161, 163.
- 66. STEIGER, Brad, *Strangers from the Skies*, Award, 1966, 143.
- 67. *Ibid.*, 132.
- 68. STEIGER, Brad, *Flying Saucers are Hostile*, Award, 1967, 10-11.
- 69. *Ibid.*, 17-19.
- 70. STEIGER, Brad, *Strangers*, 43.
- 71. STEIGER, Brad, *Hostile*, 159.
- 72. FULLER, John G., *Incident at Exeter*, G. P. Putnam, 1966, 251.
- 73. FULLER, John G., *Aliens in the Skies*, Putnam, 1969, 38, 88, 187-8.
- 74. FULLER, John G., *Interrupted Journey*, Dell, 1966.
- 75. HYNEK, J., *Playboy*, op. cit.
- 76. *Ibid.*
- 77. CLARK, Jerome, 'Why UFOs are Hostile', *Flying Saucer Review*, 13, #6, Nov-Dec 1967, 18-20.

for the common cause and mutual advancement of our peaceful relationship in outer space.' (78)

This theme turns up in several variations during the Roush Congressional hearings on 29 July 1968. James McDonald wanted a pluralistic approach employing NASA, NSA, ONR, and even the Federal Power Commission - the last to take up the subject of blackouts. J. Allen Hynek wanted Congress to establish a UFO Scientific Board of Inquiry. James A. Harder wanted a multiple-faceted approach, preferably at several institutions simultaneously. Robert M. Baker wanted a well-funded programme with the highest possible standards. Donald Menzel, ever the sceptic, thought the time and money would be completely wasted in such studies. (79) Towards the end of 1968 the Rand Document recommended a central collection agency with analysis given over to specialists. (80) The last significant expression of this motif appears in 1973 in James M. McCampbell's book *Ufology*. He recommended setting up a two-phased research effort. Phase 1, price-tagged at \$4 million, would 'confirm absolutely the existence of UFOs in scientific terms and identify any advanced technologies'. Phase 2 would define the new technology and its applications and was price tagged in the \$75 million to \$100 million range. And to think, some people complained the Condon commission wasted half a million. (80)

The concern over invasion spawned some spectacular notions in Raymond A. Palmer's *The Real UFO Invasion* (1967). Palmer offers evidence that the US was preparing for war with weapons so titanic they couldn't have been intended for a mere international war. That war wasn't in the future either. Palmer points to nuclear blasts in Project Argus as being against a satellite not made by earthmen. (81)

Gordon Lore's *Strange Effects from UFOs: A Special NICAP Report* (1969), Robert Loftin's *Identified Flying Saucers* (1968) and Otto Binder's *What We Really Know About Flying Saucers* (1967) deserve brief mention for their treatments of physiological effects from saucers: eye injuries, radiation burns, paralyses, cases of shock, and mysterious blows to the body. A particularly odd and problematic case could be made for including Vincent Gaddis's *Mysterious Lights and Fires* (1967) since it makes an effort to link UFOs to spontaneous human combustion. Unforgettable is Gaddis's question, 'Are We Walking Atom Bombs?' (82)

Passing references should perhaps be given to John Keel's expression of alarm over the 1966 Wave and Robert Loftin's speaking of the UFO threat as something we better get the truth to 'before it is too late'. (83) I also can't resist recalling a number of unusual articles from the period like Otto Binder's which fretted over the number of deaths that had taken place in the UFO field and Timothy Green Beckley's article for *Beyond* which acclaimed 'UFOs Use High-Tension Lines for Re-Charging'. (84) *Beyond* was a haven for weird articles about aliens which probe brains, paralyse observers, and destroy dogs in ghastly manners. One relevant here was James Welling's 'Does UFO Radiation cause Phoenix,

Arizona Residents to be Afflicted with Strange Malady - Why does Press Not Report Epidemic of Electronic Poisoning'. (85) The significance of these items is probably historically slight, but they add interesting flourishes to the portrait of the times.

It is, of course, true ufologists are a heterogeneous bunch and not everyone displayed hypochondriacal themes or shared the same degree of concern. Charles Bowen in *The Humanoids* (1969) speaks of the pointlessness of humanoid behaviour and thinks of it all as 'diversionary play to give people a giggle'. In this same volume Donald Hanlon surveys the range of occupant behaviour and concludes that even with allowance made for their use of immobilisation weapons like knockout vapour, they do comparatively little harm. Gordon Creighton's 'vast surreal nightmare' wasn't apparent to all. (86) The issue of hostility was complicated by a paradoxically simple observation. Why didn't they simply wipe us out years ago? Otto Binder, Cleary-Baker, Mervyn Paul, among others rejected it on that account. (87) John Keel's *Operation Trojan Horse* contains a call for an independent, objective investigation but indicates it should be unhampered by the petty UFO cultists and laments no suitable psychiatric programme had been instituted to take care of those who are going insane or attempting suicide. The ufonauts don't care about us and mischievously confuse us with behaviours ranging from complete hostility to the rescuing of lives. (88) Such differences as these that existed fail to even hint at their being any problems in characterising this period as overwhelmingly dominated by the mindset of hypochondria.

By the time of the release of the Condon report in January 1969 the UFO mania of the mid-sixties had cooled already of its own accord. Some felt it represented the end of the saucer era, but it was just a pause. If it satisfied any ufologist enough to drop out, they left no record of their concession. Even before it was finished, Condon was vilified. As texts on hypochondria observe, doctors are trained to deal in uncovering the physical causes of complaints and are ill-equipped to handle cases rooted in emotional difficulties. After the initial enthusiasm gives way to bitter recriminations and scapegoating at the negative findings, the doctor will be left demoralised at the paradoxical reaction. There's nothing there to worry about, shouldn't they be relieved? The hypochondriac is often in search of a special relationship with the doctor. (89) It has been claimed that James McDonald first tried to cultivate a relationship with Condon at the beginning of the project, but actively orchestrated the campaign of publicity around the 'trick' memorandum penned by Low. (90)

David Saunders was fired over this affair, ostensibly for alleged 'incompetence', though nobody believes that was the real reason. He wrote a book about the Condon committee telling his side of things. He presents the results of a factor analysis of some questionnaires

●● Continued on Page 19 »

- 78. LOFTIN, Robert, *Identified Flying Objects*, McKay, 1968, 144.
- 79. FULLER, *Skies*, op. cit., 84, 88, 56, 167, 205.
- 80. McCAMPBELL, James M., *Ufology*, Celestial Arts, 1976, 162-65.
- 81. PALMER, Raymond A., *The Real UFO Invasion*, Greenleaf Classics, 1967, 38, 43, 49, 59.
- 82. GADDIS, Vincent H., *Mysterious Lights and Fires*, Dell, 1968, 233.
- 83. LOFTIN, op. cit., vi.
- 84. BINDER, Otto, 'Liquidation of the UFO Investigators!', *Saga's Special UFO Report*, Volume II, 1971, 12-15, 69-72. *Beyond*, 1, #3, November 1968.
- 85. *Beyond*, 2, #8, April 1969, 22-34.
- 86. BOWEN, *Humanoids*, op. cit., 248, 185, 88.
- 87. SHUTTLEWOOD, Arthur, *The Warminster Mystery*, Tandem, 1976, 83, 54.
- 88. KEEL, John, *Why UFOs*, Manor, 1976, 284-6, 205.
- 89. BAUER, Susan, *Hypochondria: Woeful Imaginations*, University of California Press, 1990.

**We are about to go on a long journey to seek the origins and driving power of the abduction stories. This first article starts with a review of the legend as it stood in the opening years of the last decade of the millenium.**

# Hunters gatherers and secret abductors

**Peter Rogerson**

**A**S exemplified by David M Jacobs' book *Secret Life: firsthand accounts of UFO abductions* (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1992, \$21.00)

the abduction narrative is a heady brew of sexuality and apocalyptic; of missing babies and women's fears. Jacobs opens his narrative proper with a cinecliche evocation of women's fears: a lone woman is preparing for bed, she reads a book for a while then turns out the light, settling down to God's own sleep, virginally secure in the locked, bolted, sealed habitation of her room. The, by magic, the room and her body are to be violated by the supernatural forces of the wilderness. She awakens in a sleep paralysis, while a light in the room coalesces into the spectral shape of a Gray.

Invisible, impalpable, she is taken through closed windows and locked doors, taken on a night ride to an invisible ship in some unknown sky. Sometimes she is taken in body or in spirit, she knows not which, straight to her destination; on other occasions she must undertake at least part of her journey on foot, through the mean streets and the forests of the night.

On reaching her destination she is taken to a place of ordeal, where she is subjected to medical examinations, degrading and often painful, or forced to play in grotesque psychodramas in which Grays, disguised imperfectly as human beings - often partners or 'significant others' - enact scenes from the drama of her life. Her

body may be impregnated with implants by means of nasal penetration amounting to rape.

Above all she may be forced into loveless congress with strangers, while the 'other' forces sexual imagery into her mind. Here the 'other' seems to be a blind, urgent force or reproduction; the desperate longings of hormones and genes given human or semi-human shape. There is no romantic midsummer's night euphemism in the realm of these fairy guardians of fertility. In what is probably the most disturbing image in the entire book we are presented with a fifteen-year-old girl being forced into sex with a middle-aged man who gives the impression of being drugged: "absolutely out of it, his mouth is hanging slack and his hands are loose at his side like an ape, eyes glazed over, unfocused, cloudy" (p.205). This is an image taken straight from Satanic abuse tradition.

If there is any fruit of this unholy union it is aborted from the womb and grown in the factory farm incubatorium, like an image from Huxley's *Brave New World*. Fœtuses are reported as being put in drawers or stored in glass retorts like monstrous exhibits in a medical museum. In the best fairy tradition the woman may be needed as a nursemaid, if not to give literal milk, then at least some little milksops of human kindness to the strangely wan and sick fairy child, which the enchantment can make appear beautiful,

the abduction debate





but true sight renders horrific.

It is not only the listless child, "sick and palely loitering", but the grim abductors themselves which hail from the realms of the dead. Jacobs' descriptions of Grays which neither breath, not eat, not excrete, nor, lacking genitalia, reproduce, nor experience any feeling, is that of the dead, exiled from the organic round and lusting after the living, needing their emotions and their wombs to experience a simulacrum of life.

That the place the woman has been taken to is to be regarded as an antechamber to Hell is further emphasised by comparisons with Auschwitz, and imagery of corridors "silent save for the clanking of machines, the shuffling of feet and the occasional moans of victims".

There are however, other images, which Jacobs finds difficult to comprehend. There is the immersion in the 'breathing pool', a liquid in which the captives can breath easily, a sort of baptism in the living waters of



### Jacobs creates a vision of an 'antechamber to hell'

the womb. There are travelogues of apocalypse, given to the naked captives, herded into pens, while the Tannoy-voice of God over the public address system of the mind, gives a commentary on scenes of the new heaven and new earth that the changeling children will inherit. There are messages which come in dreams, which no waking mind can hold. There are images of a paradise too good, too fine, too glamorous.

Jacobs suggests that abductions can occur on an almost daily basis, leaving the victims with symptoms he ascribes to post-traumatic stress. The only defence against the Grays is the videotaping of the sleeping victims.

To investigate these stories, and to offer some relief from the traumas, Jacobs sets himself up as a charismatic 'therapist'. Like other therapy gurus he lays claim to a unique cause for human suffering. In Jacobs' case it is a 'abduction-finder-general': he claims to have pioneered the 'correct' way to interrogate potential

abductees in order to reveal the 'true' nature of the abduction encounter.

Jacobs' technique is to secularise and standardise the stories as much as possible. If the narrative I have presented above seems suffused with magic, the original stories - which Jacobs does not permit us to learn of in detail, but of which hints creep out - are even more fay. They are of magical animals, night flying in the company of angels and dead relatives, channelling and visions of apocalypse. Who knows what else might lie in the raw narratives, as anything which does not fit Jacobs' preconceived, standardised model is dismissed as confabulation, or the result of hypnotic techniques by the Grays.

Although downplayed here, Jacobs continues to believe against all the evidence in real abductions by real space aliens into real spaceships. *Magonia* readers know otherwise They will see in the opening scenario a typical case of sleep paralysis, the Gray materialising from an amorphous light is an echo of many a ghost story, the night ride recalls the witches night ride with Diana in the army of the dead. Both in style and substance Jacobs' narrative echoes those of the Satanic abuse hunters. Within the frame of the narrative they were originally sceptics driven to believe in 'the worst thing there is' by the pain and trauma of the victims; by the 'numerous small details' in geographically separate stories. By these means they are persuaded to believe in the impossible. They appeal to the deep fear in us all of loneliness, of 'not being believed', of the terrible, un-shareable secret.


Both sets of explorations start with the unknown trauma, the nameless, faceless, fearful dread which peoples the sinister dark. The therapist turns the key which opens the floodgates of the unbearable memory of ultimate abuse: abuse so secret it is largely hidden from the victim herself. Both evoke dramas of desperate, loveless sexuality, women being forced to bear children of hate (one of the worst of the claimed atrocities in Bosnia has been the raping of women and then holding them hostage until the enemy's children are born), the forced abortion, the rows of incubators, even the bizarre ceremonies, the images of the sacred perceived as a malignancy, even such small details as the 'dreadsome drink'.

If this book is a meta-story in which the Grays can only be seen as the deceitful dead to whom the living must be sacrificed, then the introduction by John Mack hints at an alternative tradition, seen in some of the writings of Whitley Strieber, Ray Fowler, Ann Druffel, Ken Ring and even, at times, of Jenny Randles. This is the tradition of the abduction as theophany, the intervention of the divine in human affairs. For Mack they are God's bankers and chartered accountants, come to place the Earth under receivership and to bring new stewardship over our mismanaged and polluted world, heralds of the Second Coming. Thus as AIDS meets the millenium, are eros and thanatos united in the myth of our age. ●●●

# Manhattan transfer

**John Rimmer**

**reviews the latest controversy dividing ufologists in the USA, a sensational abduction story from the heart of Manhattan**

 *N Magonia* 44 I mentioned in the 'Hold the Back Page' feature the latest controversy setting U.S. ufologists at each other's throats - the Linda Napolitano case. Presently being promoted by Budd Hopkins, Linda's story tells of her being abducted from her twelfth floor apartment on Manhattan's lower east side.

Linda had first contacted Hopkins in April 1989 after reading *Intruders*. She claimed that thirteen years before she had discovered a bump next to her nose, and that a doctor had told her that she had undergone surgery, a thing which she had never remembered. You will recall that a major feature of many of the abductions Hopkins investigates is the use of nasal 'probes' and 'implants' by the alleged aliens. After being in touch with Hopkins for some months, Linda called him on November 30th to report that she had been abducted in the early hours of that morning. Subsequently hypnosis 'revealed' that she had been carried out of her bedroom, through the window, and into a waiting craft which was hovering above New York City.

So far, apart from the untypical location, this was a fairly typical sort of abduction case. In February 1991 the case took on a dramatic new turn, alluded to briefly last issue. Two policemen, calling themselves Richard and Dan (surnames apparently not revealed) wrote to Hopkins saying they had witnessed the abduction whilst waiting in a car under the Franklin D Roosevelt elevated freeway, near Linda's apartment block. In later letters they changed their story, now alleging that they were working for a security agency and were guarding a 'senior political figure', who is now believed to be Javier Perez de Cuellar, the former Secretary General of the United Nations. (Perez de Cuellar's office states that their man was safely home in bed at the time, but, as Hopkins would undoubtedly say, they would do, wouldn't they.)

There then began a curious campaign of harassment by Richard and Dan against Linda Napolitano. According to Linda they visited her apartment, expressing relief that she was alive and safe. It's not clear why they waited a year after the event before checking up on someone they claimed to be concerned about, when they were apparently able to identify Linda's building, and the window she was transported from. Curiously, although they made themselves known to Budd Hopkins in their first letter, they seemed strangely unwilling to meet him in person, and to date it would appear the only person who claims to have met them is Linda herself.

Subsequent meetings were not so friendly; as reported last issue Linda was allegedly kidnapped by the two men, threatened, sexually propositioned and threatened with a gun. She also received a bizarre letter from Dan, who now claimed to be incarcerated in a mental institution. It was following these claims that the suggestion was made by ufologist George Hansen that these matters, if accurately reported, constituted a criminal act and should be put in the hands of the police. He argued that the interest of a private citizen who was being threatened by agents of the security services was more important than the pursuit of a UFO investigation, and that ufologists like Budd Hopkins, Jerome Clark and Walt Andrus, who wanted to put the whole matter 'on hold' to see how the ufological aspects of it developed, were being irresponsible. A circular expressing this viewpoint was sent to a number of ufologists in the US and Britain, including myself.

The story now takes a detour from Linda, and gets us involved in the political undergrowth of American ufology. Hansen's first circular was rapidly followed by one from Jerome Clark, headed 'The



'The Politics of Torquemada or, Earth Calling Hansen's Planet'. This is an incredibly ill-tempered missive, comparing Hansen with Torquemada, the chief persecutor of the Spanish Inquisition (I did not notice any suggestion in Hansen's letter that Hopkins, Clark, *et al* should be burnt at the stake). This has been followed by responses from Hansen and Willy Smith, and a further circular from Clark entitled 'Wasting Away in Torquemadaville'. For those of us who in the past have had a great deal of respect for Clark's writings, the intemperate tone of these letters is worrying. No doubt like most great American ufological feuds, this one will run and run, and end up... well, this is a magazine intended for family reading.

Back in Manhattan, Hopkins had found another witness to the abduction event. A year and a half after the alleged incident Hopkins received a letter marked on the envelope 'Confidential, Re: Brooklyn Bridge'. (This external warning seems to have been called for as Hopkins apparently never opened a previous letter from the same person.) This came from retired telephone operator to whom Hopkins has given the *nom-de-plume* Janet Kimble. She claims to have been driving over Brooklyn Bridge when her car stopped and the lights went out. She saw a brightly lit object over a building, and although the light was so bright she had to shield her eyes, and was over a quarter of a mile away, she was able to see four figures emerge from a window and move into the object. 'Kimble' was frightened by this, and reported that other drivers whose cars had stopped were running around on the bridge and screaming in panic. Curiously, none of these other people have come forward to confirm her story, and in her letter to Hopkins 'Janet' says she thought the incident might have been someone making a film of Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs! Willy Smith in his circular on the case comments: "[she] was a former telephone operator, familiar with what to do under the circumstances. Did she call the police, then or later? No. She chose to report the incident to abduction expert Budd Hopkins - after a lengthy process to locate him - by writing to him the following summer".

The latest document to be received on this case is a long report by George Hansen and two other researchers, Joseph Stefula and Richard Butler. Curiously, in his first 'Torquemada' letter Jerome Clark distinguishes between the what he sees as the inquisitional style of Hansen's contribution to the debate, and the 'honorable' approach of Stefula and Butler. This joint document suggests their attitudes to the case are closer than Clark admits.

*Magonia* readers, conditioned by 25 years of insidious scepticism will already have dismissed the Napolitano claims outright, but they are worthy of more detailed consideration. Stefula, Butler and Hansen's report is important, as none of the authors can be considered 'knee-jerk debunkers'. Hansen has written a considered critique of the failings of the CSICOP organisation, Butler claims an abduction experience himself, and Stefula was, until his recent resignation, the MUFON State Director for New Jersey. Nor are they armchair ufologists, as they have interviewed Linda Napolitano, and done on-the-spot investigations. It was during one of their on-the-spot visits to the lower east side that they noticed an important piece of information that was not offered to us by Hopkins and his apologists: that the supposed location of this event - blinding light,

hovering UFO, people floating through windows, - was directly opposite the night loading bay of the *New York Post*, the city's leading sensationalist tabloid daily. Surely even tabloid hacks could not get so tired and emotional that they would miss this earth-shattering event taking place on their back doorstep? The loading bay manager, who is on duty to 5.00 a.m. recalled nothing of these events.

Stefula, Butler and Hansen (SBH from now on, if they will forgive me) give an account of their interviews with Linda, which revealed further information not available from Hopkins. At a meeting on February 1st, 1992, Linda stated that Hopkins had received a letter from 'the third man' (now believed to be Perez de Cuellar) which Linda was able to quote from memory. It discussed potential ecological disaster, claimed that aliens were involved in ending the Cold War, and warned Hopkins to stop searching for the 'third man' because it could harm world peace.

SBH discuss at length the many problems involved in this case. None of the other 1600 residents of the apartment block complex saw anything, nor did any of the night duty security guards.

At a meeting with Hopkins, David Jacobs, Jerome Clark and Walter Andrus on October 3rd 1992, a number of disturbing features of Hopkins' investigation came to light. For instance, he had not bothered to check on

---

## **"By the nature of the endeavour, those trying to be helpful can be vulnerable to deception"**

---

weather conditions on the night of the abduction, although this could have been vital in assessing the evidence of the Brooklyn Bridge witness (in fact the night was clear). Nor had he bothered to check, as SBH had done, with the apartment block security guards to see if anyone else had witnessed the event. It emerged also that Hopkins and his associates now believed that there was a large motorcade carrying Perez de Cuellar and other world figures through NYC in the early hours of 30th November 1989.

Linda's husband made a significant contribution to the meeting, but significant in the manner of the dog in the Sherlock Holmes story which did not bark in the night. He answered a few questions, but, as SBH say: "he seemed to have difficulty with some of them, and Linda spoke up to 'correct' his memory. He left the meeting very early, even though Linda was under considerable stress, and despite the fact that she was overheard asking him to stay." They conclude: "His leaving raised many questions in our minds." This 'semi-detached' attitude by spouses of witnesses and abductees, when one might expect them to have a clear picture of what was happening to the person they shared their lives with, seems to be a feature of many encounter and abduction cases on both sides of the Atlantic.

At the same meeting reports were presented from two psychologists. They sing a popular refrain: Linda's intelligence is 'average', but to plan and execute

such a complex hoax (oh dear, that again) would require the brain of chess Grand Master Bobby Fischer, and Linda was not capable of 'orchestrating such a massive, complex operation'. Oddly, the names of the two psychiatrists who came up with these conclusions were not given at the meeting - maybe not surprising if such facile comments are typical of the standard of their work.

SBH's paper is too long and detailed to quote at much greater length here, and I give details on how it may be obtained. However, I would like to conclude with a lengthy quote from part of their conclusion, in which they debate the psycho-social aspects of the investigation, particularly the reaction of American ufology's 'establishment'.

"Do these leaders," ask SBH "really believe, as they said, that they accepted the report of attempted murder? If so, they seem not to have acted as responsible citizens... We believe that other motivating factors and concepts provide a better explanation for understanding these seemingly bizarre actions. We would suggest that perhaps, at some semiconscious level, these individuals do not really believe their UFO investigations to be fully engaged with the 'real world'. Rather, their behaviour and statements seem more consistent with something like fantasy role playing, perhaps akin to the game Dungeons and Dragons.

"Both ufology and D&D allow direct, immediate



involvement with powerful 'other-world' beings and mythological motifs. Both endeavors have been known to overtake (possess?) the participants, though only occasionally to their detriment. Most players are able to successfully detach themselves from involvement, but occasionally the game becomes obsessive and interferes with 'real-world' pursuits. This role-playing taps archetypal images that hold great psychological power. The archetypes can become immensely attractive, even addictive to those playing the game...

"In the Napolitano case the 'other-world' figures include not only the ET aliens, but also the pantheon of agents of an unreachable, evil government conspiracy determined to prevent humankind's knowledge of the ETs. Intermediaries between flesh and blood humans and the powerful masters of the mystical higher orders are ubiquitous in the realms of religion. Angels and devils serve the centers of ultimate good and evil. So here we see the largely invisible minions 'Dan' and 'Richard' and the mysterious witness on the bridge furthering the cause of 'Truth'. Likewise, Hopkins discerns the skeptical investigators as agents of a secular satan.

"Thus the interactions of Hopkins, *et al*, with these players are seen to conform to the rules that historically control the interactions between humans and gods. Humans question and provoke the gods only at the greatest peril. The proper approach is to appease,

mollify and supplicate these 'entities'. It should be no surprise that the simplest reality tests of the Napolitano story were not made in this case. Hopkins' failure to check the weather conditions during the abduction actually makes sense in the context of this cult-like thought process..."

"The rôles of high priest and acolytes are only too obvious when examining the behaviors of persons Hopkins, Clark, Jacobs and Andrus. These aging white males patronizingly refer to Linda's 'average' intellect, perhaps to reassure themselves that they are indeed in control. Yet the high priestess has, in effect, achieved the godhead (metaphorically speaking, of course)."

They conclude this discussion: "We are not denigrating ufology by such comparisons... nor are we attacking the existence of 'other-world' entities. Regardless whether entities or ET aliens exist, the comparisons are useful and the consequences and insights are applicable. Such a comparative analysis should not be limited to only D&D players and ufologists; similar comparisons could be made for virtually everyone in the 'real world'. they can help serve as warnings about becoming too complacent regarding beliefs in our own 'rationality' "

This is a valuable lesson in many contexts, and in *Magonia* we have already pointed out the comparisons that can be made between D&D fantasy rôle-playing, and the 'psychic questing' phenomenon which dominates much fringe research in this country. We leave *Magonia* readers to consider who are the 'aging white males' and who the 'goddesses' in our own contexts.

Surprisingly, after an efficient demolition job on the Napolitano case and Hopkins' investigations, Stefula, Butler and Hansen conclude on a magnanimous and sympathetic note, recognising the difficulties and complexities of Hopkins' relationship towards his 'clients':

"The outside critic who is not directly involved in such activities almost never recognises how difficult it is to serve as both a therapist and as a scientist. Those persons trying to help abductees emotionally need to provide warmth, acceptance and trust. The scientist, however, needs to be critically open minded and somewhat detached and analytical. The two functions are not altogether compatible. We cannot realistically expect one individual to be 100% effective in both rôles. By the nature of the endeavor, those trying to be helpful can be vulnerable to deception." ●●●

I will be happy to send copies of some of the documents I have received which have circulated in this case, in exchange for £2.50 and a large A4 sized envelope, stamped 22p. These are Hansen's original plea that the threats against Linda should be reported to the authorities; Jerome Clark's 'Torquemada' response, and Stefula, Butler and Hansen's detailed (25 page) critique of the case. US readers may obtain copies from Hansen at Princeton Arms North 1, Apt. 59, Cranbury, NJ 08512



# LETTERS

Dear Mr Rimmer.

Although I have enjoyed reading *Magonia* and MUF0B for years I have never written before, and I'd like to make a few brief comments. Some of the best material you ever printed was Nigel Watson's field reports [Now available in the collected volume *Portraits of Alien Encounters*, £10 from Valis Books, 52a Lascotts Road, London N22 4JN. Ed.]. I would certainly like to see more along these lines whether from Nigel or others. Also more articles on perceptions and interpretations of the paranormal in other cultures - Islamic, oriental, etc. - would be nice. 'An Algerian Case Study' way back in issue 14 is an example. The articles (Kottmeyer *et al*) on connections between fictional and 'real' UFOs are interesting.

Martin Kottmeyer's 'Entirely Unpre-disposed' linking the Hill abduction to *Invaders from Mars* is thought provoking, although I'm not convinced. The fictional story about UFOs (although that term didn't exist at the time it was written) with the most emotional impact that I've read is Clark Ashton Smith's *The Light from Beyond*. It has an almost archetypal feel - yet I've never come across any 'real' report that seems anything close.

One caveat - don't let any orthodoxy take over *Magonia* completely. Some of the psycho-social advocates (and occasionally others) seem to be tending towards a grumpy, humourless, true-believer tone that's as bad as the ETH'er true-believers. Sometimes it is not really much more than "it's obviously psycho-social (or theory XYZ) - so adhere to the party line - and we don't want to hear any more out of you" type view. Dennis Stacy's 'Alien

Abortions, Avenging Angels' is a notable and excellent exception.

One comment on his article though: although Bud Hopkins has popularized the idea of an alien obsession with human sexuality, John Keel was talking about this, and supposed hybrid babies, and false pregnancies, etc., from way back, such as in *Mothman Prophecies*. Keel just didn't centre his whole books around this theme as Hopkins has done.

I always found the Jungian psycho-social approach as in Clark and Coleman's *The Unidentified* more convincing than most of the P-S theories - even if I have some doubts about it. Jung seems to have fallen into disrepute with the PSHers though, even with Clark who is now ETH I believe. Odd - guess Jung is too mystical or the collective unconscious seems too far out.

Articles on modern folklore and urban legends are great. Roger Sandell's subject matter is intriguing, though he seems to be slipping towards an automatic "there are no real conspiracies, no real Satanic groups." Am I misinterpreting this? While a lot of the Satanic abuse claims seem overblown, I don't agree with the view some sceptics seem to have, that since there is no evidence for some monolithic, world-wide Satanic organisation, then Satanic abuse and ritual abuse do not exist. There are a wide variety of occult, including Satanic, groups with widely varying beliefs and practices - most probably isolated, some with ties to other groups, a few possibly as networks. Maury Terry's *The Ultimate Evil*, on the Son of Sam murders, offers at least fair evidence for the existence of one violent Satanic group.

My criticisms are not meant to imply dissatisfaction with *Magonia* or psycho-social articles in general - I've asked for more of some psycho-social themes. I just don't want any rigid viewpoint to dominate - and I don't think it has yet, but the PSH seems to be in ascendancy with some adherents tending towards a true-believer viewpoint. I've probably overstated this a little to make a point, but so far *Magonia* has done pretty well over the years to offer diverse viewpoints. I just don't want this to change. I wouldn't want ETHers to dominate either, however at this stage a little more from the ETHers would be welcome. I do appreciate the current efforts towards balance - Tom Bullard for instance.

Perhaps you see *Magonia* with an emphasis on psycho-social as a counter-balance to the dominance of the ETH in the USA. Well fair enough, but I don't read other UFO magazines, so the more variety in *Magonia* the better.

Finally, thanks to Peter Rogerson in MUF0B for drawing my attention to Norman Cohn's *Pursuit of the Millennium* years ago. I think this is one of the most important and fascinating books I've ever read.

Overall I think *Magonia* is excellent. Keep up the good work.

Best wishes,

Terry Lee, Hixson, Tennessee.

John Rimmer writes: *Terry Lee's connection with Magonia goes back many years, to the days of MUF0B, and it is a particular pleasure to receive this letter from him as we celebrate our 25th anniversary. He makes many good points, particularly about the value of field reports. I emphasise that Magonia is always willing to*

*publish accounts of research and investigation, unfortunately it seems that most active researchers are already 'under contract' to particular groups or journals, or are preparing their own books! There is always a danger of any journal which is edited by a group of (fairly) similarly-minded friends becoming a house magazine for a particular viewpoint, and I am pleased that Terry does not think that Magonia has gone too far in this direction. I think we have tried to keep our pages open to other viewpoints; and shortage of 'opposition' material is more a function of how little of it is submitted to us than any desire to promote our own viewpoints to the exclusion of others. All contributions, as they say, eagerly awaited.*

Sir,

I have been intrigued by the BullardEvans-Rogerson debate about abductions, the one side arguing that the methodology of folklore, through pattern and consistency, supports the reality and credibility of reports, the other that the Psycho-Social theory, accepting that the mind and its owner can together get up to almost unlimited mischief, can cover almost any claim of perceived experience.

What has surprised me is that the argument has proceeded so far on such very peculiar grounds. We are talking here about accounts obtained very substantially by means of regression hypnosis, often administered by non-professionals, and tangled up in the world of support-groups, and the reinforcement of potential crack-pots by those already established in that role.

I am unaware of any tradition of folklore deriving from people who are actually unconscious. Even less so of folklore recorded by operators who have much to gain by compiling narratives of specific form and content perhaps best described as 'marketable'.

Thomas E. Bullard is undoubtedly one of the world's key UFO researchers, and I can imagine him referring to his detailed analysis of abduction narratives obtained with and without hypnosis, featured in JUFOS, vol.1, 1989. He the concluded that there was little significant difference between the results produced from each, but there have been important changes since. Particularly the narratives

presented have become so much more gynaecological, the elements of physical interference so much more exotic, and the degree of racial engineering so extreme that his comparisons with relatively conventional 'conscious recollection cases' - Villas Boas, Hickson, Walton and so on - are no longer valid.

I can't help but feel that the boundaries between abduction recall and channeling are becoming increasingly vague. It is time we insisted on taking seriously only recorded accounts - preferably on time-marked videos - of these supposed investigations, so we can assess the role of the input in shaping the output. In the meantime an argument based on the content of the output alone seems pretty meaningless, especially when the 'standard' account of abduction is so clearly accruing and developing relative to the belief threshold of those who - at the very least - facilitate the production of the accounts. All parties to the debate appear to agree that true folklore should have its roots firmly in the real world. there is little evidence to suggest that recent abduction narratives even approach such a status.

Yours

Kevin McClure, St Austell, Cornwall

Dear John

In his review of the second volume of my *UFO Encyclopaedia (Magonia 44)* Hilary Evans complains, legitimately, of its "absurdly high price". I would be grateful if you would inform your readers that both it and the previous volume, *UFOs in the 1980's*, are available at a special price of \$34 each to ufologists. The publisher is Omnigraphics Inc., 2500 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan 48226, USA. Incidentally. *Choice*, a journal published by the American Library Association, recently named *Emergence* one of the Outstanding Academic Books of 1992. Surely a first for a UFO book.

Cordially,

Jerome Clark, Canby, Minnesota.

## STRANGE MAGAZINE

America's leading Fortean magazine.  
UK Subscriptions £13.50 for four issues.  
Sterling cheques payable to 'Mark Chorvinsky'  
to *Strange Magazine*, PO Box 2246  
Rockville, MD 20847, USA.

Continued from page 12.

which yielded a taxonomy of UFO belief. It was his opinion that Condon must belong to the group he termed 'Prejudiced' based on remarks he had made subsequent to the writing of the report. Digging up the paper showing how this taxonomy was constructed renders this judgement invalid. If one takes a close look at the numbers one will find the people he termed prejudiced were getting high scores for agreeing with the statements 'Some flying saucers have tried to communicate with us' and 'People have seen spaceships that did not come from this planet', and disagreeing with the statement 'There is no government secrecy about UFOs'. These are manifestly not the positions of Condon. The 'Prejudiced' unequivocally were believers in extraterrestrial visitations and government secrecy. Saunders termed this group prejudiced because of the high score of agreement with the statement 'Science has established that Negro people are not as intelligent as white people'. (91) This finding brings Saunders in line with a study of 259 NICAP members by Dr. Leo Sprinkle that uncovered significantly higher levels of dogmatism and closed-mindedness among ufologists than a control group of psychologists and guidance counsellors. This also fits in with other studies linking prejudice to paranoia and superstitious beliefs to closed minds. (92)

■ 90. KLASS, Philip J., 'The Condon UFO Study: A Trick or a Conspiracy?', *Skeptical Inquirer*, 10, #4, Summer 1986, 328-41.

■ 91. SAUNDERS, David R. and HARKINS, R. Roger, *UFOs? Yes!*, Signet, 1968, 221-2, 225. SAUNDERS, D. R., 'Factor Analysis of UFO-related Attitudes', *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 27, 1968, 1207-18. SAUNDERS, D.R. and VAN ARSDALE, Peter, 'Points of View about UFOs: A Multidimensional Scaling Study', *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 27, 1968, 1219-38.

■ 92. ALLPORT, Gordon W., *The Nature of Prejudice*, Anchor, 1958. ROKEACH, Milton, *The Open and Closed Mind*, Basic, 1960.




Part Three of Martin Kottmeyer' article, covering the period from 1974 to the present day will appear in the next issue of *Magonia*.

# HOLD THE BACK PAGE

Miscellaneous ramblings from the ufological fringe

Thanks for the memories...



An American correspondent sent us a couple of pages from a New York State paper which carried an article about local people who claimed abduction experiences. If nothing else, this demonstrated just how everyday and mundane the abduction experience has become in modern America. One 'victim', James, reports: "I was awakened and attacked by a man-like creature" he says, "I went to grab a plug-in flashlight off the night stand. I was struck in [sic] the head, and the flashlight was knocked out of my hand. When I woke up my face was sore, and the flashlight was on the floor next to the door."

No danger, I suppose that the 'man-like creature' was actually a man, and

James merely the victim of an attempted burglary? Certainly not, if an announcement on the back of the news clipping, between the ads for Cohen's Optical and the Max Full-Service hair salon is anything to go by. Reproduced above, it offers regression hypnosis for retrieving memories of 'missing time', sexual abuse and 'other traumas'.

This raises a lot of rather worrying questions. For one, just how common are agencies like this in America? Is it probable that someone going to such a service, seeking the retrieval of a 'lost memory', will be sent away, after an extensive (and I suspect quite expensive) course of hypnosis, with the news that nothing traumatic ever happened to them? Unlikely, somehow. And could the existence of these agencies, operating from convenient downtown locations, advertising in neighbourhood newspapers, have anything to do with the epidemic of not only abductions, but also child-abuse memories, now surfacing across the USA? (And, as one disturbing case shortly to be discussed in *Magonia* suggests, starting to crop up in the UK.)

Is it a case of "Thanks for the memories... after all I have paid for them"?

In researching the 1954 French wave he noted that sightings recorded on a particular day could be linked into groups along a series of straight lines; most notably those for 24 September 1954, where many sightings were strung out along a line linking the towns of Bayonne and Vichy; the 'Bavic' line. Since its original publication, the orthoteny theory has come under scrutiny from other researchers and the significance of Michel's calculations have been disputed on statistical grounds by Klass and Vallée. Even the validity of the raw data from the 1954 wave has since been seriously compromised by later scrutiny. However some researchers have pointed out that even in the eventuality of the disproving of each individual Bavic case, the line still has a phenomenological importance. The 'orthoteny' theory had a particular resonance for British researchers, many of whom from the days of Tony Wedd, were linking UFOs to the idea of 'leys'. The undoubted seriousness of Michel's work lent a degree of respectability to some very flimsy arguments circulating on this side of the Channel.

Michel's influence on ufology in Britain was enhanced by his longstanding friendship with Charles Bowen, editor of *Flying Saucer Review* in its most influential era. Bowen published many articles by Michel, both on his orthotenic theories, and deeper, speculative pieces on the nature of intelligence, both terrestrial and extraterrestrial, and the possibilities of communication. Michel had a learned academic background studying music and the theory of sound, and was an expert on animal communication. Many of his more speculative pieces were written in the form of elegant imaginary conversations with his tabby cat Grisonne.

*Phénomène* records that he had been retired from ufology for many years, 'persuaded that UFOs were above human comprehension' ●●●

## Almé Michel, 1919-1992

As the BackPage is being prepared we read in the French magazine *Phénomène* of the death of Aimé Michel in December 1992, at the age of 73. His interest in ufology was awakened by the Scandinavian 'ghost-rockets', leading to his first book, *The Truth about Flying Saucers* in 1954. The writer of a number of important reports on French cases (his account of the 'Dr X' case is a classic) he will perhaps best be remembered for his development of the theory of 'orthoteny', first put forward in his book *Flying Saucers and the Straight Line Mystery*, published in English in 1958.

We knew, of course, that the Greys were taking over the world, but we just didn't think they were going to do it by democratic elections...