

Magonia 52


£1.25

May 1995

Interpreting Contemporary Vision and Belief



*



Godships

Matthew Graeber

*



Abduction Absurdities

Willy Smith

*



Dark and Lonely Work

Peter Brookesmith

*

Northern Echoes

Letters



“It is certainly true that contact stories generally have features which distinguish them from normal landing reports. Could it not be argued, though, at least in some cases, that the differences are mainly due to the differing reactions of people of different temperaments to similar stimuli?”

John Harney, MUFORG Bulletin, 1967

IN THE latest issue of *NUFON News* (no. 169) Jenny Randles writes “I fear that ufology may have over-emphasised the differences between fifties style contactees and modern-day abductees”. I remember arguing this in *Magonia* a while back, pointing out that George King and Antonio Villas-Boas represent extreme ends of an unbroken continuum. If one doubts this, just look at the material in Mack’s *Abduction* and other titles which I will review in the next *Magonia*.

It is interesting to learn that John Harney was writing as early as 1967: “It is certainly true that contact stories generally have features which distinguish them from normal landing reports. Could it not be argued, though, at least in some cases, that the differences are mainly due to the differing

reactions of people of different temperaments to similar stimuli?”

Today we would argue that both abductions and contactee reports have similar psychological origins. We should of course not fall into the trap of assuming that *all* abduction reports and *all* contactee reports have identical origins. The *Magonia* rule of “beware of omnibus explanations” should apply here. That said, it is clear that a good percentage of cases are the product of sleep paralysis, false awakenings, hypnagogic imagery and dreams. Some of the latter seem to have the vividness of lucid dreams, but without the insight. Others may be the product of poorly understood types of waking dreams; still others may be due to types of false memory, along with a sizable proportion of hoaxes. It also seems

**EDITOR
JOHN RIMMER**

EDITORIAL PANEL

John Harney
Roger Sandell
Nigel Watson

CORRESPONDING EDITORS

Peter Rogerson
Michael Goss
P. L. A. Driftwood

SUBSCRIPTION DETAILS

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

United Kingdom	£5.00
Europe	£6.00
United States	\$13.00
Other countries	£6.50

➤ 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 100-franc bank-note for a special seven-issue subscription.


➤ 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 1995
Copyright in signed articles rests with the authors.

...from page one



clear that there is again no sharp dividing line between genuine subjective experiences: they too are part of a continuum between conscious and unconscious imagination.

It is not just the temperament of the witness which angles the nature of the contact, it is also the temperament and beliefs of the investigators, who guide witnesses along desired paths. Beyond that there is the vague, but no less important temperament of the time. In the fifties the model of the UFO encounter was the Adamski 'space brother', in the sixties it was the dwarf in a spacesuit, in the eighties it was the Grey. As I have mentioned before it is interesting to see how, because *Flying Saucers Have Landed* was a best-seller in this country, and many British ufologists were socialised into the subject via the tales of George Adamski, contactees were much more acceptable and the image of the blonde space brother cropped up in many more British encounters than in the Keyhoe dominated USA.

Abduction stories should perhaps be seen - as should perhaps the Satanic abuse stories - as vast, collective works of art, in this case folk literature, in the same way that crop circles were collective folk sculpture, in which 'witnesses', 'investigators' and general society all play a part. One can certainly see the parallel between Hopkins, Jacobs, Mack, the Satan-finders, and for example Marge Reider, who was able to persuade a sizable proportion of the citizens of a small town that they were reincarnations of characters in a Civil War drama; or Arthur Guidham who found that a curiously large number of his patients were reincarnated Cathars. We are

all familiar with the concept of body art. Do we have here an analogous 'mind art' created by artists whose medium is other peoples visions, dreams and memories?

Where I do differ from Jenny Randles is her apparent half belief that some of the mind art is being executed by an extraterrestrial force. Though we cannot actually disprove this, there is a complete absence of evidence. It is not simply that no contactee or abductee has come back with an alien artifact, it is that they have never come back with an alien *idea*. These days this includes reincarnation, merging human and alien identities, millennial speculation, pop ecogism, neognosticism, New Ageism, and for those who resist the New Age there are abductions in which military personnel and intelligence agents cooperate in a range of conspiracy theories.

Kevin McClure has expressed the hope that if therapists and abduction-finders were to retire from the scene the good old close encounters of the first, second and third kinds would reappear. I rather doubt this, I suspect that 'normal' ufology is really dead. The principle reason why ufologists have been so eager to endorse dramatic abduction stories and tales of crashed saucers is that they have realised that traditional ufology was getting them nowhere. It is not a coincidence that both these trends really took off after the publication of Allan Hendry's *UFO Handbook* which had demonstrated how equivocal much of the ufological evidence was. If abductions recede, they are likely to be followed by something even more bizarre to grab the attention.

Peter Rogerson.

- Our first few 'Magonia Readers' Group' meetings at the Railway pub, Putney, have been very successful with a small group of regulars turning up and discussing the wide range of topics which appear in *Magonia*. All readers living in or visiting the London area are welcome to drop in. You don't have to book, but might like to ring 0181-876-7246 or 0181-876-6602 just to check that nothing untoward has happened.
- If enough people are interested we might consider moving to, or alternating with, a Central London location. Let's know your thoughts.
- *Magonia 52* will feature a detailed review of current abduction literature by Peter Rogerson, and we're glad to welcome Mick Goss back to our pages with a piece on the realities, or otherwise, of hypnotism, plus the usual features and the reviews we've had to hold back from this issue

Several UFO researchers have discovered the remarkable similarities between today's UFO experiences and Biblical accounts involving visions and miracles, and simultaneous observations of unusual aerial phenomena. Ezekiel's encounter with a mysterious flying wheel is a classic example of one such event - as is the appearance of the great pillar of cloud that led Moses and his followers during the time of their flight from Egypt.

Matthew J. Graeber

godships

ALTHOUGH we might expect to make little headway towards resolving today's UFO enigma by comparing it to past mysteries, we may, nevertheless, examine both present and past UFO events as being comprised of optically perceived images or imagery that occasionally have an extraordinary effect upon the individual(s) who either observe or come into close proximity with them. Such effects may be emotional, physical, psychophysiological, or psychological in nature; and the mechanisms by which they are produced upon the observers by the UFOs are unknown, as is the composition, origin and intent (if any?) of the Unidentified Flying Objects themselves.

Several ufologists have described the UFO experience as a form of "display" (Jung, Alnor, Evans, Sprinkle, Salisbury, Graeber, *et al.*). Theoretically speaking, this display may be directed at an individual observer or a particular group of individuals, or it may even have collective significance. The effect of observing a UFO display may be likened to the intrapsychical process involved during the perception of a Rorschach plate (ink blot), with the exception being that the UFO experience is not contemplative and passive. Rather, it is sudden, shocking, and often overwhelming to the observer's senses.

Primitive man feared, revered or was awestruck by things that came from the sky - probably because he had little or no power over such things as lightning, tornadoes, thunder, whirlwinds, etc., and did not understand what these natural phenomena really were. In fact, many people of ancient cultures even believed that gods and a host of demons also inhabited the skies and that they could swoop down upon them at any moment. So, it is not uncommon to learn of cross-cultural legends and myths about sky people who rustled livestock, abducted humans, mated with earth women, and even switched their offspring for human infants. Today's UFO abduction reports may be a technologically accented version of this ancient myth; but, instead of the aliens snatching babies from their cradles, they now surgically remove the unborn foetus from the abductee's womb. Obviously, today's social experimentation, unrest, and



near obsession with the abortion issue has activated an unconscious or perhaps instinctual response to the "split-mindedness" of our society concerning this issue. Perhaps that is why the "new age" variety of sky people (i.e. the little grey aliens) are reported to look very similar to a human foetus.

Modern day ufologists, especially those of the hypno-abductionist persuasion, would do well to keep these things in mind as they plumb the depths of the human unconscious for proof of alien interactions with humans. For mythological ideas and beliefs such as the above mentioned are, in fact, the end products of unconscious psychic processes that autonomously appear when there is a great emotional need present. So, simply because UFO abduction stories sound very much alike, we shouldn't believe that indicates that they are "real experiences", that is, "real" beyond the realms of the human psyche and its fantastic power and effect upon the individual.

Since we are primarily discussing the optically perceived "display factor" of the UFO encounter, we would probably do well to select a specific UFO configuration to examine for its potential archetypal character and symbolic meaningfulness to modern man. The UFO I have selected for this cursory probe is the gigantic cylindrical

because of the buffeting effect of high winds.

The descriptions of these skytubes tend to vary a great deal, and there seems to be some confusion amongst the UFO groups regarding how they should be categorised. For some of the great ships are said to be rigid forms (metallic looking) and hollow like a conduit of some sort. These UFOs are usually reported to be silvery or quite dark in colour, while others appear to be translucent or luminous objects that closely resemble a red-hot poker that is occasionally sheathed in a veil of white light or smoke.

Then, of course, there are the "cloud ships" or "cloud cigars". These are often said to be detected by the witnesses because they move against the prevailing winds and do not tend to dissipate like the regular clouds in which they take refuge. Interestingly, these carriers also display the ability to land, which is an extremely rare occurrence for the other type and, although they appear to lack any sort of metallic structure, they still manage to maintain a particular shape, such as a loaf of French bread or an enormous cigar.

If we search the ancient writings of man and examine a few of his mythological concepts, we will discover that these motherships probably should be called the god ships. (1) For, certainly these carriers are easily associated with Biblical epiphanies of fire and light, pillars of fire, whirlwinds, and other miraculous manifestations such as the great luminous cloud which was said to have led and nourished Moses and his followers during the time of their flight from Egypt.

We might also find interest in the fact that these cylinders as "a symbolic phallic form" compare quite nicely with the ancient worship of the generative power of nature (and God), which was depicted as a phallus. (2) Such religious rites were practised in several ancient cultures (especially in the Orient), and also appeared in the Dionysiac festivals of ancient Greece. (3)

Symbolically speaking, one might say that the god ship is a colossus (pregnant) and is said to launch (give birth to) many zig-zagging smaller craft (spheres or discs; i.e., female symbols) which wildly scoot about the troposphere like sperm cells in search of an egg to fertilise.

Even more interestingly (according to the reports), the cylinders tend to assume a provocatively youthful erection attitude when the ejaculation of the smaller craft takes place (roughly 40° to 45° off the horizontal plane); and to further compound their male sexuality, they quite often take on a reddish glow that quickly engulfs the entire interior of the cylinder (as if to suggest that blood was surging through the tube).

As an androgynous (phallic-uterine) symbol, the god ship is then a sort of "dual-singularity", or, what Jung might have called "a union of opposites", which has the ability to carry/eject and absorb smaller UFOs. It is at once a sort of visual aid, projected upon the atmosphere, which symbolically explains, according to the level of man's thinking or belief, that:


- 1) That God has the power to create and reclaim;
- 2) That the natural pulse of life (nature) is a cyclic phenomenon eternally replenishing itself;
- 3) That energy is conserved.

Curiously, the followers of the ancient Hindu faith will tell you that Matha-Vishnu (second person of the Hindu trinity) can, by merely breathing in and out,

1. Dr Carl C. Jung informs us that the Berliners call the motherships "Holy Ghosts", while the Swiss military have managed to come up with a much more earthy description for the spherical objects they emit.

2. Early Christian carvings often portrayed the Trinity as a thrice-phallus.

3. The phallus is still an object of veneration in some areas of Japan.



Artist's rendition of a mothership launching UFOs

craft which are commonly called "motherships" by UFO researchers. I have chosen this particular UFO with the hopes that its size and unusual performance will afford us some insights regarding its origin.

Although motherships have been rarely observed in the last couple of decades, they represent an important facet of the UFO legend's ongoing development because they were considered by many ufologists to be the vessels that the aliens use to traverse the stars; while the smaller discoidal craft that they carried were thought to be excursion vehicles primarily used to survey the Earth or to collect terrestrial soil, flora and fauna samples. In this case, it is obvious that man's own space-conquering aspirations and techniques have been directly projected upon an assumed alien technological presence in our environment.

In the early days of UFO activity, these transporters were rather rapidly moving craft and were occasionally involved in the highly publicised airliner pursuit cases of the 1950s and 1960s. But, in more recent times, not only have they slowed down considerably, they also have become rather unstable aerostats frequently said to be observed bobbing about in the sky

create or destroy entire spiritual universes, and we know that this thought closely parallels the remark made by a little sylph to Facius Cardan, (4) which asserted that God's creation was not a singular event but rather an ongoing, from moment to moment, occurrence, and that if God should desist for even a moment, all would end.

These notions seem to have anticipated quantum theory, just as surely as the phallic forms appeared in the skies long before the 20th century. What's more, the phallic also influenced the artists of antiquity, for such forms frequently appear in drawings and carvings which were not only intended to symbolise nature but were also believed to invoke the fructifying powers of the gods at the time of planting. The phallic symbol also appears to have had directional meaning (5) and was possibly believed to have had threatening powers over one's enemies.

Besides being threateningly penetrating, it can also single one out or offer direction to us in the form of a very penetrating dream or dream message. Interestingly, Dr Jung noted that many of his patients encountered this archetypal symbol in their slumber and it was obvious these dreams had very diverse meanings; but, generally, they come through in what he called "big dreams" - that is, dreams of tremendous power and influence. The kind of dream one thinks about a great deal upon awakening, wondering what in the world it might have meant.

One such commentary appeared in Jung's landmark book on UFOs and I would like to elaborate on it here because it illustrates how the phallic UFO is perceived in the unconscious mind which is, of course, extremely important to any serious study of the UFO enigma; simply because we are not certain how many of these mysterious objects hail from man's inner space, that is, his unconscious.

Dr Jung's patient's dream:

"I was out walking, at night, in the streets of a city. 'Interplanetary machines' appeared in the sky and everyone fled. The machines looked like steel cigars. I did not flee, one of the 'machines' spotted me and came straight toward me at the oblique angle. I think Professor Jung says that one should not run away, so I stand still and look at the machine. From the front, seen close to, it looked like a circular eye, half blue, half white.

"A room in a hospital: My two chiefs came in, very worried and asked my sister how it was going. My sister replied that the mere sight of the machine had burnt my whole face. (6) Only then did I realise that they were talking about me, and that my whole head was bandaged, although I could not see it."

I have selected this dream for study for a couple of reasons. First of all, it touches upon the process of selectivity frequently attributed to the phallic symbol and UFOs, and, secondly, because it had the remarkable burning characteristics found in quite a number of UFO cases, in particular, a case on file at UFORIC, (7) which was investigated by Mr Michael McClellan, formerly of APRO.

Mike's report on that experience starts off with the witness's (Mrs Flagg's) letter to him relating her sighting particulars and reads as follows:

"Dear Mr McClellan,

Having read an article in the *Times News* about the UFO sightings in Mahoning Valley that took place - I thought perhaps it might be a good idea to tell you

what I have seen Friday A.M. on October 26. I saw something very unusual in the sky. It wasn't anything like a flying saucer but rather three large silver planes that looked like jets and they sparkled like three large diamonds in the sky. They also had a flickering light that kept blinking at a speed which I have never seen in all my life.

"The three flickering lights kept blinking so fast and each one had a rod attached to it. In other words, from down here, to me, they looked like three wands with a large star at the tip of each rod. The three planes (as I call them) were huddled so close together and I thought for a minute they would crash if they bumped into one another.

"The objects were all lit up and could be seen from all parts of the world. One couldn't miss them. It seemed to me as if they were being held in the air by magnets. They weren't moving there. All of a sudden, the UFO in the center made a quick turn just as a fish would swish its tail (8) and headed towards the opposite direction from the others. This scared me, as I thought for a minute it was going to zoom down here at me. I ran in the house so fast that I almost fell, I turned out all the lights and I went for my binoculars but when I looked up into the sky they had disappeared. I have seen other things (other times) with rays or beams of light emanating from them but it would take a book to write all these and furthermore I always kept this to myself because there are people who think one is a nut. But I was always in fear of these UFOs because I found the tips of my dog's ears all burned as though someone burnt them with a match. I'm just beginning to wonder if the UFOs are doing it?

"Oh yes, on another occasion one came very close to my home when I happened to be looking out of the window, and this thing from the sky kept coming closer and closer. Well, I got inquisitive and watched. All of a sudden it came real close to my window, gave a turn and a beam went out. It was dark and I didn't see anything more that evening but as the ray of light hit my windows I heard them crack. The next morning I looked at the windows and, sure enough, they were cracked. I have three windows and they are still cracked from that time."

Psychophysiological aspects of a close encounter

According to Michael McClellan's investigative report, the witness became quite ill after the incident and she also suffered a cluster of reddish-coloured skin eruptions and some general discolouration on her entire face which was thought to be a direct result of being exposed to the UFO's ray. The pimple-like cluster (9) was treated medically as was the illness (nausea) and their sudden emergence remains as much a mystery to Mrs Flagg as it does to the UFO investigator. (10) It should be mentioned that Mr McClellan is a reliable and thorough researcher, who stressed that he had no doubt concerning the sincerity and mental stability of the witness. However, a clue to the origin of the witness's UFO experience might be found in her rather cryptic references to the UFOs as the "big three" (11) which she thought were about to crash (i.e., clash) together and would be seen by or otherwise involve the whole world. For, the lady was obviously very concerned about mounting international tensions, and had even felt compelled to compose some patriotic music.

Quite interestingly, in cases of this type we must ponder the thought that a distinct psychophysiological

4. Faolus Cardan - father of mathematics and philosopher, Pierre Cardan, as reported by Dr Jacques Vallée in his book on UFOs, *Passport to Magonia*.

5. In ancient Greece, a stone herm (or psychopomp) was often placed at cross-roads symbolising God's role as a mediator between the spiritual and physical worlds.

6. UFO light beam and propulsion emissions are often said to produce burning effects upon the faces, hands and arms of the observers. In some cases, the skin appears as if sunburned - while in other instances the skin just feels hot to the observer and no discolouration is apparent.

7. The UFO Report and Information Center of Philadelphia founded by the author and his wife (operational from 1972 to 1980).

8. A commonly reported characteristic of UFO flight behaviour.

9. This may be similar to the ring of skin eruptions that formed in the general area of Barney Hill's groin after he and his wife, Betty, had a close encounter with a UFO in 1961.

10. Mrs Flagg's physician thought she had the Hong Kong flu, but Mrs Flagg dismissed his diagnosis entirely.

11. The big three could be the USA, USSR and Red Ch

process may be affecting the observer. How this occurs remains unclear, but that does not deny the fact that marked physical effects upon the UFO experiencers and close encounters with UFOs (or their operators) do coincide. For evidence such as nausea, temporary paralysis, unusual skin discolourations and bouts of memory loss are quite often the only physical proof that the UFO investigator can point to to show that a genuine UFO experience has occurred.

Such evidence is, of course, well documented in the responsible saucer literature and can be verified by the physician's records concerning the observer's treatment(s) after the event. But, evidence of this kind should not be considered as some sort of proof-positive concerning an extraterrestrial visitation. However, it does offer the researcher an excellent opportunity to study the possible workings of psychophysical processes (12) in relationship to the perception of specific UFO-like imagery or psychic symbols.

Anyway, if we look at the motherships' performance record in modern times - we find that they first appeared in the skies as "mystery rockets" over Scandinavia just at the close of World War II. Usually these rockets were heard as well as seen. Moreover, when they were witnessed (as objects with and without vapour trails) the reports indicated that they did not seem to zigzag or hover; rather, they coursed steadfastly through the skies much like the dreaded V-2 rockets and flying buzz bombs that the German military had developed.

Needless to say, many people suspected that these "ghost rockets" were actually Russian devices slapped together by some Nazi scientists who must have fallen into Stalin's hands. So, quite naturally, the Allies (American and British) immediately dispatched military investigators to search for their launch sites, but the effort was in vain because the sightings suddenly dropped off.

So, it wasn't until the Cold War year of 1952 that the "motherships" really earned their status in UFO legend. For it was there, high above the French towns of Gaillac and Oleron, that the sky cylinders started dishing out little saucers all over the heavens while also spewing large clumps and fine strands of "angel hair" over power lines, trees, buildings and fence posts. This gossamer substance has rather fascinating characteristics of its own; for it is said that it quickly evaporates, especially when touched; and quite naturally, one is immediately reminded of the Biblical accounts concerning the heaven-sent manna; for this, too, had a protective coating with similar dissipating qualities. Moreover, the emission of the angel hair has also occurred over several cities of the United States in the late 1960s and early 1970s and it seems that the smaller disc-like objects can also produce similar effects.

UFO investigators specialising in "angel hair cases" advise that we should not think of this substance as hair lightning - nor are we to entertain the rather ludicrous notion that high-flying (wind borne) spiders were responsible for the strands as was asserted by several non-believers in the press. But, on the other hand, one must say that this sperm of the gods appears to be just as elusive as the chariots they drive. For, to date, no one has produced a sampling of either for scientific analysis.

Of course, any discussion of the "motherships" would be terribly incomplete without mention of the "great airship flap" that swept the USA just before the

turn of the century (1895-97). Apparently, these "antique UFOs" also emitted bright light beams and were piloted by both normal-sized human-like entities and a smaller variety which are often called humanoids. Many saucer experts tend to lay a great deal of emphasis on these sightings; (13) and, although it seems perfectly obvious that such airships were almost exactly like the anticipated method of conquering the sky during the era some saucer enthusiasts tend to see them as a sort of alien introductory model. The implication is, of course, that the extraterrestrials are so intelligent and considerate that they were conditioning us earthlings to their presence by promoting the shape of things to come. The problem with this line of thought is, quite naturally, that the aliens failed to anticipate that airships were not to be this planet's sky kings in spite of their superior technology and intellect. In short, the ufonauts and most earthlings of that time period suffered from a very serious kind of techno-myopia and it was only a few far-sighted fellows like the Wright Brothers who were soon to develop and launch the better idea.

Ironically, if we search the 1890s airship flap data we will discover only one reported UFO configuration vaguely resembling a contemporary aircraft or an early glider-like contraption, even though much glider experimentation was occurring in the United States and Europe during that period.

Obviously, the human expectations of the times regarding manned flight involved the lighter-than-air airship simply because most people, including the leading writers and scientists of that era, tended to believe that anything heavier than air could not possibly fly.

Apparently, this ancient desire to see the phallic airship in the skies was pushed well into the 20th century and even finds some very serious proponents today. (14)

One is compelled to think that it is not that the airplane isn't a truly marvellous invention, for it most certainly is, but there is something awesome and captivating about the mere sight of great airships just as there is something truly unique about the sensation of soaring in a glider.

Dare we suggest that it feels more like the man himself is flying - rather than riding in an engine-powered machine which is being thrust about the sky. Moreover, can we seriously entertain the thought that this "soaring feeling" satisfies one at a much deeper level, possibly a level which we have somehow lost touch with, but still yearn to experience?

For we know that man's ancient fascination with flight and his dreams of flying under his own power has not been entirely lost to today's technological advancements. No indeed, for even in this age of supersonics and space shuttles we still find individuals gleefully leaping off the edges of cliffs while dangling on the flimsy wings of gliders; and more recently, there comes the news of the successes of a few diehards who have finally realised Leonardo's dream of true man-powered flight.

One is compelled to think how wonderful this age truly is; the radio has fulfilled one of man's oldest dreams (to send his voice across great distances). TV expands this dream come true and even allows him to see those distant places, while the telephone adds selectivity and privacy to the process. So, too, remarkable flying machines have shrunk the globe to a point where no place is very far away any more.

12. The author is currently probing this aspect of UFO experiences.

13. There is a popular trend in ufological thought which embraces the notion that the UFO operators have had an active influence on the advancement of human spiritual and/or technological development.

14. The Piasecki Aircraft Company of Philadelphia was developing a helicopter for forestry use by the Department of the Navy in the mid-1970s. It consisted of a central gas bag and four modified helicopters for load lift and propulsion. The project was scrapped when the test vehicle crashed and its pilots were killed.

15. Dr Sigmund Freud effectively demonstrated that any pointed object appearing in a dream may take on phallic significance. But it was Dr Carl C. Jung who first noted that the phallic symbol had significance beyond the sexual.

In addition to all of this, human organs are being transplanted, life spans prolonged, and several men have even walked upon the face of the moon. But, despite all these miracles and man-made wonders, we still wish to somehow escape this tiny planet with all its dreadful problems. On the conscious level, we seek tropical vacations to relieve the chilling effects of the stress loads we accumulate. Unconsciously, the "escape wish" takes on the fantasy of a flight from the oppressive weight of reality - and escape from the planet itself becomes desirable.

If the "escape/flight wish" should emerge in its "all-too-human form", that is, as an archetypal symbol catapulted through the unconscious, the instincts and emotions, then man, the flyer (the phallic UFO), and not his contemporary aircraft would be the vision men see in the skies.

For the phallic UFO, which is the aerial extension of man's inner being on the wing is what we mistakenly call the mothership. It is a primitive symbol in the technological guise of the times. This is as obvious a statement as that which is boldly proclaimed by the extended wheels which dart from between the legs of the motorcycle gang member; for his machine "comes off" as being as much of an extension of his manhood as does the image he tries to project with his garb, body language and speech.

We also recognise that more sophisticated individuals express their manhood with far more socially acceptable symbols, such as the long hoods of expensive limousines and shiny sports cars. Yet, we fail to see that the phallic UFO is man, the dream flyer.

Undoubtedly, the sky cylinders are meaningful, for in ancient times they were thought of as gods. But we cannot prove that they mean exactly the same thing to men today. All we might cautiously consider about them is that this type of recurrently reported object may indicate that an archetypal symbol of cyclical, selective penetrating, threatening and/or directional potentiality is evident. (15) If we wanted to find a more familiar concept which touches on these potentialities, perhaps some of the characteristics attributed to the current Christian idea of God as the Third Person of the Trinity (the Holy Ghost) would fit quite well - especially since the Holy Ghost is said to be the conduit between heaven and Earth (or God and Man) and the method by which God implants His seed on Earth too. Something quite similar to the Roman god of healing, Mercury, or the Greeks' messenger of the gods, Hermes.

We as people of this secular age fail to recognise this because we are not as tuned in to the archaic modes of mythological thought as our ancestors were. I think it would be reasonable to say that an ancient man of moderate intelligence and educational background would have had little or no difficulty in the assimilation of this type of vision, for visions of this sort were prayed for and fully anticipated in their times.


What's more, if our minds were so conditioned through a kind of mental reverie built up over generations of relative unchange, as were our ancestors', then the modern day visions would be read without much difficulty too. But today's man is living in a time of tremendous uncertainty and fear caused by volatile social transition, mounting political, economic and intellectual turbulence, along with fantastic technological

advancement. Indeed, in a generally "non-spiritual" but, nevertheless, so-called "enlightened age" when even the most brilliant of theologians tend to ignore and/or completely fail to interpret the signs that men are seeing in the skies.

To summarise, the god ship UFO (a specific archetypal symbol) is reported to be the carrier, ejector and retriever of smaller UFOs. As if to suggest that, on the one hand, a complex nucleus is expelling some of its components (packets of power) or on the other, is absorbing additional energy.

Our search of the reports gathered and investigated by UFORIC probes and that of "the good UFO literature" indicates that, generally speaking, many smaller objects are expelled or disbursed; but only one or two seem to be recovered, if any at all.

This may be an important psychodynamic display, for it illustrates that the energy levels are being spent, reduced, or divided as we have proposed by describing the Dynamic Display as psychically therapeutic.



Dirigible landing at Mineola, NY, July 1919

The UFO sightings and the elation factor

UFOs perform all sorts of marvellously preposterous feats - they wobble, spin, glide, and flit about at blurring speeds. They perform bug-like aerobatics, hover, blink off, blink on, and then completely vanish before one's eyes. They apparently do not behave in a logical manner while operating; but yet, they manage to elude capture, overt contact attempts and our most sophisticated aircraft.

Through a marvellous mixture of sensory stimulation and emotional responsiveness, they tend to excite and delight us because they routinely overcome the obviously threatening, and make a mockery of statistical probability. In short, they either beat or cheat the odds each and every time.

They are, quite simply, a joy to behold and provoke very powerful emotions in their observers; for, not only are they consciously perceived, but they are also "unconsciously recognised" as the observer's fears

problems on display. Most importantly, these problems (as symbols) are shown to be overcome, split up, or reduced in power; perhaps this is why some adult UFO witnesses proclaim that "their" UFO sighting somehow changed their lives - although they haven't the foggiest idea why they feel that way about it, while, on the other hand, some youthful witnesses often say that their sightings seemed too much like a fantasy (which is, of course, a process of active imagination that has not yet been educated out of them or lost to the advancement of the ageing process); and they, too, would really like to know exactly what they did observe.

Anyway, this cursory probe into the probable meaning behind the observation of the cylindrical type of UFO still falls far short of what is required, for it has only touched upon that fact that the symbol, whatever it finally represents in consciousness, is only one side of its potentiality, for all psychical symbols are two-sided and extraordinarily multi-faceted.

However, the symbol is not 'complete' at its source; in fact it is not an image at all, but rather only the potential of one that develops, much like a photo negative as it moves into the light of consciousness. And it is in consciousness that a person's need to find some relief, a saviour or mentor - or conversely their fears of meeting with the very devils that are tormenting them - may become affixed to any kind of strange occurrence like rumours about the appearance of UFOs in the sky. It is because of this all-too-human factor that UFOs become endowed with all sorts of awesome, miraculous and magical powers.

Perhaps we have discovered enough about the mythical, sexual, and marked psychic background of the god ships to determine that their origin is most likely the human unconscious, and not some alien planet situated at the edge of the cosmos. For it seems highly unlikely that a visiting alien intelligence would be so human-like as to possess similar intrapsychical processes regarding the development of their technology, their exploratory aspirations, and their myth-making tendencies.

It also appears that, while we may have been actively seeking a better understanding of some aspect of the UFO phenomenon's interaction with humankind while examining the god ship legend, we probably have uncovered a great deal more about humankind's projection upon the rumours of UFOs appearing in our skies.

This type of human interaction with the UFOs is "a reality" - whether or not UFOs (i.e., extraterrestrial space craft) actually exist and are visiting our planet. ●●●

REFERENCES

- ALNOR, W.M., *UFOs in the New Age*, Barker House Company, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1992
 DIONE, R.L., *God Drives a Flying Saucer*, Bantam Books, New York, NY, 1973
 EVANS, H., *Gods, Spirits, Cosmic Guardians*, Aquarian Press, UK, 1987
 EVANS, H., *Alternate States of Consciousness*, Aquarian Press, UK, 1989
 GRAEBER, M.J., 'UFO sightings as "vision-like experiences" which may produce beneficial effects on the observer(s)', AASMI Conference, 1991
 JESSUP, M.K., *UFO and the Bible*, Citadel Press, New York, NY, 1956
 JUNG, C.G., *Symbols of Transformation*, The Bollingen

- Foundation, New York, NY, 1956
 JUNG, C.G., *Flying Saucers a Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Sky*, Rascher & Cie, Zurich, 1958
 JUNG, C.G., *Synchronicity, An Acausal Connecting Principle*, The Bollingen Foundation, New York, NY, 1960
 LE POER TRENCH, B., *The Sky People*, Award Books, New York, NY, 1960
 McCULLY, R.S., *Jung and Rorschach*, Spring Publications, Dallas, Texas, 1987
 SALISBURY, Frank B., *The Utah UFO Display: A Biologist's Report*, Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Ct., 1974
 SPRINKLE, R.L., 'Psychological implications in the investigation of UFO reports', in LORENZEN, L.J. and C.E., *Flying Saucer Occupants*, Signet, New York, pp 160-186, 1967
 SPRINKLE, R.L., 'Psychical analysis of UFO experiences', International Symposium on UFO Research, Denver, Co., 1992
 VALLEE, J., *Passport to Magonia*, Henry Regnery Company Ill., 1969

BACK ISSUES

We have recently had a lot of demand for back issues of *Magonia*, and some issues are in short supply. We have copies available of the following numbers, which are all available for £1.50 each, including postage (overseas £2.00 or \$4.00). Highlights of each issue include:

- 25: Strange Helicopters; Earthlights
- 26: Cracoe Case, Witches; Magnetism
- 27: UFOs as Theatre, Mirages; Haunted Houses
- 28: Temporarily out of print
- 29: History of ley-hunting; Earthlights
- 30: UK Government Files; UFOs on TV
- 31: Nightmares, Sex and Abductions; The Urban Legendary Elvls
- 32: Boundary Deficit Hypothesis; European Ufology; Imaginal Realm
- 33: UFOs, the American Way; Moore and Bennewitz
- 34: Kottmeyer on Abductions; more on Abductions, 'The American Way'
- 36: Spontaneous Combustions; Abductions
- 37: Death of Ufology; Bullard defends The American Way
- 38: The important issue which first discussed Satanic abuse claims, articles by Roger Sandell, Michael Goss and Peter Rogerson
- 39: Eyes from Space; Seeing Things
- 40: Flying Saucers from Hell; Eyes, part 2
- 41: Roswell; Abduction Variations; Eyes, part 3; Corn Circle Criticism
- 42: Folklore; Satanism Panic
- 43: Victorian UFO Crashes; the start of the Cat Flap
- 45: UFO Paranoia; the Napolitano Case; 'Secret Life'; Crashed Saucers
- 48: Satanism Panic; Paranoia, part 2
- 47: Living Laboratories; UMMO; Fairyland's Hunters
- 48: Mattoon Revisited; Virtual Banality
- 48: In Search of Real UFOs; Sex, Science and Salvation; Allentating Fantasies
- 50: Influencing Machines; the Forgotten Abductions; Radar Visual Controversy

Order from address on Page Two. Cheques etc. payable to "JohnRimmer", readers in U.S.A., please pay in dollar bills.

abduction absurdities

Dr Willy Smith discusses John Mack's new book with a passing Devil's Advocate

One more book (1) about abductions has appeared, but this time with a significant difference: the author is a distinguished Harvard psychiatrist and has the background and credentials that previous dilettantes (2,3) lacked. Thus, one would expect a more precise and scientific presentation of a controversial issue, establishing a solid platform from which a rational treatment of the subject matter could be launched.

Unfortunately, that is not the case, perhaps because the topic itself is unamenable to scientific discourse. As in previous attempts, all we find is a collection of anecdotes obtained mostly by hypnotic techniques from witnesses whose personalities, occupations, training and position in our society are barely sketched. The narratives are interesting, unusual, bizarre more often than not, with an abundance of detail that, instead of increasing their ontological validity, only emphasises the absurdity and physical impossibility of what we are told.

As in previous works, not a shred of evidence is provided to substantiate the stories, even in instances where apparently corroborating information could have been obtained. As one of Mack's critics (4) has perceptively indicated, the author is content with whatever he obtains from the witnesses in his office and does not go into the real world to validate his contentions. In fact, one has reason to doubt that he has done his literature research with enough care, when, for instance, he uncritically repeats (Ref. 1, p. 12) that abductions have taken place in 17 countries, among others, France, Spain and Uruguay. The truth is that only one totally discredited abduction report in France is found in the literature, that the 3 or 4 cases allegedly occurring in Spain are very dubious and that – as far as I know – no abduction has ever been reported in Uruguay. The reality is that the abduction aspect of the UFO phenomenon occurs typically and predominantly in the US, not surprisingly considering that its main advocate, former artist Elliott Budd Hopkins, is a resident of that country.

The absurdities:

From the viewpoint of the hard sciences there seem to be two options mutually exclusive: either the whole abduction structure has no foundation in reality, in which case we are wasting out time, or, alternatively, the stories reflect real events, although at times they may be somewhat distorted and diffuse. We will assume that the latter is true, and see where *reductio ad absurdum* will lead us.

(a) Provenance: The basic tenet of Hopkins *et al.*'s ideas is that we are presently visited by aliens whose world is coming to an end, and who are engaged in an all-out effort to save their race from extinction by applying their more advanced genetic knowledge to engineering a hybrid race that eventually will take over Earth.

Since our spatial probes have visited most of the planets able to support life in our solar system and found no indication of life, it follows that the aliens must come from exterior space, bringing into focus the difficulties of interstellar travel. The abductees describe huge crafts, sometimes of the order of hundreds of yards, with large crews of at least two types of aliens, which have to be fed and lodged. But more important, the energy requirements to displace such a craft through distances of the order of light years would be staggering. Yet, we are led to believe that more than one of those interstellar crafts prowl in our atmosphere.

What does the Devil's Advocate say about this?

D.A.: i) The crew could travel in suspended cryogenic animation, thus requiring few provisions;
ii) fuel could be obtained by sweeping hydrogen atoms from space while travelling;
iii) or, the ship could transit through a white hole, except that the magnitude of the gravitational forces would make survival impossible;
iv) a planet threatened with final obliteration would not hesitate to use all the available resources in a last interstellar fling, or even to mount expeditions to several neighbouring stars of the right spectral type; but it

1 MACK, John E., *Abduction*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1994

2 HOPKINS, Budd, *Missing Time*, New York, Marek Publishers, 1981 and *Intruders*, New York, Random House, 1987

3 JACOBS, David M., *Secret Life*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1992

4 CLARK, Jerome, 'Big (space) Brothers', *International UFO Reporter*, March/April 1994, p. 7



would be against its interest to send all crafts to the same destination;

v) the aliens arrived in the solar system a long time ago (ref. 1, p. 227) establishing a base on Mars (don't forget that alleged head there!) or on the moon, and have to travel only short distances, an easy feat that even we, with our chemical fuels, can perform.

Only (v) above has some merit, but then the expectation would be to see smaller crafts better adapted for the Earth-Moon milk run, contrary to the data. The first absurdity is thus firmly stated.

(b) The familiar aliens: Since the pioneer work of artist E B Hopkins, passing through the entertaining book of historian Dr David Jacobs, and terminating with the respectable efforts of psychiatrist John Mack MD, we have been confronted with a parade of aliens having some surprising common characteristics: i) they are overwhelmingly humanoid, exhibiting two arms, two legs, one head, two big wrap-around black eyes, and the rudiments of mouth and nostrils; and ii) they move unencumbered in the Earth's gravitational field, without requiring breathing apparatus.

Probabilistic considerations indicate that it is quite likely that among the large number of stars which form the galaxy, many will have the correct conditions to harbour planets capable of supporting life. But life, as we know it, is possible only within a very narrow range of physical parameters, and a small percentage change, say in the value of the solar constant, would wipe out life from our planet. Consequently, humanoids as described by the abductees must come from a planet almost identical to Earth, another absurdity. Such a planet indeed can exist, but can be anywhere in the galaxy, and the question is: why would the aliens select our insignificant star in a remote galactic arm as the destination of their quest for a new home?

D.A.: If the aliens reached the solar system many millennia ago, and settled in a base on Mars or the moon (say), they had a long adaptation period, and only in modern times were capable of implementing their genetic plans.

(c) Alien multiplicity: The aliens described by the witnesses studied by each researcher (Hopkins, Jacobs, Mack) might be similar in form but the three authors make quite clear that their attitudes toward the abductees are remarkably dissimilar, although their genetic efforts seem to be the same.

We can safely reject the notion of three groups of aliens from the same remote planet, but having diverse philosophies, not only because of its absurdity, but also for the fact that the aliens described to each specific researcher seem to have the same attitude in spite of the random witness selection process.

D.A.: The descriptions of the aliens seem to be similar, thus establishing a common origin, which could be even a single planet, but might equally well result from the fact that latter-day abductees have unquestionably read previous books (Hopkins, Jacobs) and have subconsciously adjusted to the pattern.

Each abduction book is the end product of the interaction of a certain group, the abductees, with one specific analyst. An exact statement of the protocol is not given, but since the hypnotic sessions were lengthy and extended over many months, the influence of the

analyst is not only expected but unavoidable. This influence is not reflected in the physical descriptions of the aliens, but in their moral and ethical attributes, mirroring the political or other bias of the authors. While Jacobs's aliens are indifferent to issues not related to the breeding activities, in the words of one critic (5) "the abductors have the same relationship to abductees that laboratory technicians have to white rats". Mack's witnesses are terrified by the entities, which inflict intense physical pain and torture with sadistic unconcern.

This dichotomy is an absurdity. For if the aliens have a common provenance and a common operational goal, it would inflexibly control their behaviour in all cases. Thus, the diversified perception of the entities by their victims, not randomised but sorted out by researcher, only decreases the potential reality of the abduction experiences.

(d) Technical contradictions: The abduction researchers have asserted that the aliens are able to penetrate solid obstacles such as walls, (6) specifically during the initial stages of the events. There is no evidence for this except the testimony of the witnesses, but when one abductee arrives at the waiting craft, she is brought inside "through a hole in the floor". (7) When the same victim is ready to be returned, the floor "sort of disintegrates beneath us", (8) which is not the same as penetrating solid matter.

The main and apparently only objective of the aliens is the creation of a hybrid race, and to that effect they have mounted a vast operation to obtain sperm and ova from human victims, selected at random and transported to their ship(s) for the purpose. This implies not only a great deal of effort, but also entails a definite operational risk of detection. Yet, the same ends could be obtained by raiding a sperm bank or similar facilities where the desired items are stored without stringent security. This would be easy to accomplish by aliens capable of transversing solid walls, and yet, we don't see any signs of such activity.

D.A.: The aliens endeavour to keep their activities covert, and the sudden disappearance of stock from a sperm bank would undoubtedly trigger an in-depth investigation. Forensic examination of the place would reveal the visit by non-human entities, something the aliens can't afford. Besides, time is on their side, and their present method is less likely to attract attention, as so far there is no incontrovertible evidence of the abductions.

Alien visits to specific indoor spaces are sometimes a daily occurrence, as was the case with Melissa Bucknell, Dr Jacobs's star witness. (9) An attempt was made to record the event using a TV camera, but it failed, as could be expected considering how easy it was for the aliens to circumvent the trap. It would have been a completely different story if someone had thought about doing an in-depth forensic sweep of the "scene of the crime" *after the fact*. Yet, absurdly, this was not done, perhaps because negative results would have been the kiss of death for abduction research.

D.A.: Indeed, immediate examination of the location of an abduction by forensic techniques could provide incontrovertible proof of an alien presence in a room. But the staggering cost indeed was and is a powerful deterrent. Perhaps the Fund for UFO Research should consider setting aside the necessary resources and have

5 Reference 4, p. 9, col. 2

6 Ref. 1, p. 170: "she described passing through her window, the porch and a tree" riding the beam of light.

7 Ref. 1, p. 170

8 Ref. 1, p. 174

9 Ref. 3, p. 258

Devil's Advocate:
The aliens are far more advanced than we are in biology and genetic engineering. It is anthropomorphic to attribute to them our own limitations



have them available at once if the occasion presents itself again.

(c) Craft size and multiple humans: Abduction researchers (Hopkins (10), Jacobs (11)) have repeatedly asserted that the crafts described by the witnesses are extremely large and display a constellation of lights. The huge dimensions are confirmed when the abductees tell the investigator that they were taken into gigantic rooms, with hundreds of tables where they saw other humans, "between one hundred and two hundred", on whom procedures were being done (Mack (12)).

The absurdity of such a possibility is twofold. First, a large illuminated craft hovering over a fixed location for the duration of the procedures – which we are told is of the order of an hour or so – hardly would have escaped detection not only by the public at large but by the authorities monitoring our air space. And second, if the craft remains at a fixed place, the simultaneity of the procedures for a hundred or more persons seems to demand that the abductees were taken from a limited geographical area, again an event that could hardly go unnoticed.

D.A.: The craft doesn't have to remain stationary at a given location, but moves continuously to lift and return the abductees. If the lights are off, and the aliens have stealth technology, those motions will not be recorded by radar, and their chance of escaping detection is excellent.

The absurdity is then in the scheduling. To collect and return each abductee of necessity requires some time that, from the given narratives, one could estimate at two minutes, each individual at a different location. Thus, 100 abductees demand 200 minutes, to which a prudent man would add a transit time between stops, say another 2 minutes, for a grand total of 400 minutes, or more than 6 hours, just for the logistics of the operation. No matter how we look at it, the concurrent presence of one or two hundred abductees in a single room in an alien craft is almost a physical impossibility.

The hybrid question

According to Hopkins *et al.*, we are being visited by one or more alien races in decline, whose purpose is to shore up their genetic pool by using the human reservoir. The abductions are aimed at obtaining sperm and ova for hybridisation processes.

Two things do not seem to fit this hypothesis. First, in the accepted view of present-day science the issue of mixed species is not fertile, and thus the resulting human-alien hybrids would not represent a definite solution for the long-term survival of the aliens. But perhaps the real purpose is different as, for instance, just to create a work force which could easily adapt to local conditions and perhaps eventually melt into the earth's population and go undetected. This would explain the need for the continuous aggressive programme that the abduction experts believe is taking place.

The second point is just an observation. In subsequent visits to what are apparently the same craft, the abductees are often shown human-alien babies which are their own, but no mention has been made in the published material of full-grown hybrids. There are two possible explanations for this omission: the alien breeding programme is failing, and babies do not reach adulthood or, on the contrary, the programme is a success and the grown-up hybrids are shipped elsewhere to do what they were designed to do in the first place.

I am not a biologist and only offer the above suggestions for completeness, in an attempt to give sense to those relentless activities which the abductionists believe are covertly taking place in our midst.

D.A.: The aliens are by far more advanced than we are in biology and particularly in genetic engineering, and have no difficulties in inter-species breeding, as shown by their activities, which otherwise would be senseless. It is anthropomorphic to attribute to them our own limitations.

Conclusions

The absurdities loom in spite of efforts by the Devil's Advocate to eliminate them, a clear indication that the interpretation given by the abduction experts to the bizarre narratives of their clients must be ontologically incorrect. Until such a time when and if physical evidence of the abduction phenomenon becomes available, those events have only anecdotal value at best, although the many books on the topic, even if of dubious scientific value, make entertaining reading and are a source of revenue for their authors. ●●●



10 HOPKINS, Budd, 'The Woman on the Bridge', *MUFON UFO Journal*, #296, December 1992, p. 8. Since the alleged witness (known only as Janet Kimble) "stated that it was wider than the size of the building", an estimated diameter of 100 ft is conservative.

11 Ref. 3, p. 82. "Abductees describe UFOs that range in size from thirty-five to hundreds of feet in diameter."

12 Ref. 1, p. 182. Abductee 'Catherine' was led naked into an enormous room "the size of an airplane hangar".

Clear the bar, and someone hold the coats... It's round three in the Brookesmith-Randles slugfest!

dank



Peter Brookesmith

and lonely work

The meaning of meaning

It is difficult to know where to start in answering Jenny Randles. 'This ain't poysanul; this is business', maybe? Or 'When is a whinge not a whinge?' It's not relevant to the article in Magonia 50, but I'll gratuitously let slip that I do think it discourteous to answer a criticism made in one illustrious organ in the pages of another, especially when that other is your very own, and a gander at the subscription list will not reveal my name, and you don't recognize facetiousness when you fall over it. Oh well. There you go again. Obviously Fortean Times needs an Ironicals typeface as well, and it's certainly ironic that this issue should suddenly start being thrashed out in the pages of a third, no less esteemed, publication.

But while we're at it, let's not publish misinformation: FT didn't print a retraction of any kind (look in a dictionary), but a classic beside-the-point letter from Randles whingeing, I would call it, solely about my passing lampoon of her fanzine. And how's this for a rib-tickler: it's intriguing that Randles doesn't let on what her mag's circulation actually is, although she is keen (and why not?) to advertise its venerable age and global readership. Which is missing the point at least twice over, a talent that, I am beginning to think, is Randles's peculiar forte. Perhaps it has something to do with her idiosyncratic use of near-English.

The second paragraph of her letter contains an interesting example of an absent point, and of her passion for the non sequitur: '...what Brookesmith fails to tell your readers is that my book *The Paranormal Year* was a general review of 1993 - as is clearly implied by the title.' True. I stand condemned. I did so fail, abjectly. Oh God, lost face, ah-so, fall on biro. But hold! What is this? Does not that title appear twice in my article? Enough, perhaps, for a clear implication to penetrate the dank recesses of even the most troglodytic Magonian's notoriously easily-befuddled mind?

Repetitive strain

I do wonder, scanning her letter, if Randles read the article that I wrote. Are the editors of Magonia party to a separate Randles-Wind-Up conspiracy that not even Paul 'Ajax' Fuller has tumbled to? Are they sending out specially-constructed spoof copies of the magazine to her? Or - wait, no, be reasonable - of course, why didn't

I think of it - my copy is the only one with my original article in it, and everyone else's has these terrible libels under my name that Rimmer and his cronies dreamed up as a result of swilling down that Wetherspoon character's body fluids and reciting the Maastricht Treaty backwards! How else can one explain the fact that 'Randles' is an anagram of 'slander'?

So: er - what are all these allegations and items of misinformation I am supposed to have tossed out? In the version in my (wow! maybe valuable) copy of Magonia 50, I allege, in rhetorical fashion, that no one asked whether the plane's and the ATC radars both showed a return from the UFO. Randles's rehash of the case is only slightly more detailed (illuminating) than the account in her book (which is quoted in my article: readers may compare and contrast at no extra expense). Both her accounts of the investigation give leave to think that indeed no one did ask. Nor do I infer (she means 'imply') that she or Good were in error. I say - I say again, wearisome as it is to do so - that either the investigators didn't ask the right questions, or they didn't get helpful answers, that nobody knows either way, and that the case isn't worth talking about until one knows a lot more about it. I offer some suggestions as to what that 'more' might be. Where is the misinformation? Where is the factual inaccuracy? Why does John Rimmer have to reply to Randles by return of post?

I didn't infer - Randles may again mean 'imply', but I didn't do that either - that a full-length or dozen-page account was required, of her or of Timothy Good - but I should have appreciated one that was unambiguous and showed that some critical intelligence had been applied to the whole of the claim made - particularly indeed as these works were popularizations, not the presumably nittier-grittier accounts in the fanzines, vast as their readership no doubt is.

Why does one have to repeat everything? Hypothesis: Randles was too annoyed - anyway, she failed - to notice that the 'points' of the article as a whole were: that her and Good's accounts were inconsistent with each other, were anyway both obscure because ill-written, didn't bear much common-sense scrutiny [a lapse I attempted in my feeble way to demonstrate], and - as the text-breaker shouted - that, if ufologists can't focus some wherewithal on piddling cases like this, there is all the more reason to distrust their accounts of

There you go, indeed: Randles herself can be eminently witty and entertaining, when the mood takes her. Her depletion (in a letter to Sheldon Wernikoff published on Fidonet) of me, spending the nights of UFO conferences with a misshapen oddball named John while being under the wild misapprehension that this character was none other than J. Randles, while J. Randles herself was possibly being abducted, is very funny indeed. (And entirely true, of course.)

the more elaborate ones. In short, one had hoped for something a little higher on the intellectual food chain. Did anyone else not understand that?

Meditation and Introspection

Do these central issues have anything to do with my mischievous remarks about somebody's UFO fanzine? No. Did I ever call the said fanzine 'useless'? No, nor do I think it is. I didn't call it a fledgling news-sheet, either. Are toy balloons capable of travelling at 1368 km/h or even 640 km/h? No. So do they have much bearing on the essential matter? No. And if you consult Randles's book, will you find the toy-balloon hypothesis offered specifically as an explanation of the Zaghetti sighting? No. In her letter, does Randles answer, or even address, the seven numbered questions I posed about the sighting? No, on six counts. Only just on a seventh. Does she address my questions about the radar tapes and images thereon? No. Does she dispute or improve on my calculations? No. Does my article suggest that Randles had changed, or erred in, her versions of this tedious case? No. Do I retract, recant, take back, renounce and regret any mention of 'idle minds'? Yes: I now think these minds are perhaps a trifle too busy. Does the word 'avoid' mean the same as 'obviate'? No, but I see someone here may think so. Does Paul Fuller know the meaning of the word dËbÔcle? I doubt it. Have I singled out Jenny Randles in particular for public ridicule? No.

Given the opportunity, and some fresh ones have lately arisen, I'll send up anyone who mangles the English language (ah - is that Mr Mantle and his amanuensis standing in the shadows?), who seems never to have heard of William of Occam, and who leans toward taking themselves a mite more seriously than their circumstances demand. I would expect the compliment to be returned, and perhaps one day it will be; and I hope I learn something from it. It strikes me as faintly pertinent too that editors keep printing what I send them; presumably some harmonics are resonating somewhere. And elsewhere...

The mouths of flying horses

John Rimmer forwarded me another letter and a printed report on the case (in AFU Newsletter 37) from Clas Svahn, chairman of UFO-Sweden, who actually interviewed Capt. Zaghetti. I am very grateful to Mr Svahn. He says: 'I want to stress you are perfectly right about the sloppy research done so far [on this case]. Nevertheless I think you went too far by suggesting that [Sr] Zaghetti has "put someone on".' Reading the report of his interview, I think I probably did. But I thought this a risk worth taking. And I am still not sure how to reconcile Zaghetti's claim in the interview that 'First, I didn't even want to make a report because it is always difficult [sic] that someone will believe you' and his appearance (at whose instigation?) on RAI television in Italy. And Svahn's interview reveals another rather crucial fact. Zaghetti says: 'I saw something circular, very similar to a missile. I used the word "missile" because of the shape, not because I saw a missile. It was like a missile. It was round, about ten feet long...' Later in the interview he stresses that it was 'just a flash'. The thing is beginning to dissolve almost before the eyes.

Key issues in this (in any) sighting are weather conditions and visibility. No one has been very specific about them: Zaghetti says only that 'The day was

coming down but we had light because of the height' and, when asked about the weather, refers again to it being 'light up because of the sun'. As is well known, I have spies everywhere; one, Capt. Mike Jay, pilots 747s for British Airways; so I picked his brains. First, he said that at the altitude of the sighting, sunset is about 25 minutes later than on the ground. On a perfectly clear late April day at that hour, he went on, visibility is good. But the amount and kind of any cloud, the phase and visibility of the Moon, and whether or not you are facing the remaining daylight (Zaghetti was half-facing the sunset), create so many variables in that kind of twilight that unless the witness is absolutely specific about them it's impossible to judge what and how much he could or couldn't see. As Capt. Jay put it: 'Everything looks grey or brown in those conditions.' All of which leads me to a place not unlike my starting point. I'd say that, far from spending more space on this sighting, Randles and Good could have spent none on it without greatly affecting the usefulness of their respective books.

Whose closet now?

As for the lane of unscrupulous innuendo on which the house (or home) of Mr Fuller rattles in the wind - I suppose if you perceive mildly over-stated criticism of the nation's most visible ufologist's lapses of thought, logic and language as a species of ad feminam vendetta or slur on her integrity, then you probably can't quite work out, either, why John Major's caricature appears so often on Spitting Image. Oh, hang on, wait a minute - am I missing the joke here? Is this geezer taking the piss? So maybe I should be grateful, already. With white knights like Fuller coming out of the woodwork to defend Randles, I can take a few days off. Persons of breeding might say it's Jenny Randles's business, not his, to speak in public about her private life.

Actually, Jenny Randles already knows, because I told her, that I don't give a toss one way or the other about her personal history. But she can hardly be surprised if the bulk of humanity finds it intriguing. Even the half-honest among us admit they find it that. The breathless nature of many of the Fidonet exchanges [thanks to John Rimmer for letting me see them] demonstrate this, if often at a surprisingly puerile level. They also demonstrate that English was scarcely alone in making 'public' what almost everyone else had known all the time but had had the good taste to treat as interesting but idle gossip, so he should not get all the stick. However, English (whose memory seems to resemble a vast gallery of self-generating Chinese whispers) ferociously misquoted me, right down to the context of our exchange, and capped that by inventing the more colourful parts of my side of it; thus I am not exactly pleased with him myself. But I think his whimsical little ways are at least slightly more innocent, because he seems unable to help them, than Fuller's tacky descantings.

So - my private agenda? Ooh, dunno, shady character, hard to say. Dodgy one that. Name's an anagram of HE POKES MIB ROTTER, ever think of that, guv? Got engaged to another bloke once, he did, no, no, straight up, 1980 this was, only at the end of the party they both went off with girls, so that was the end of that. Draft agenda maybe: do better next time; try to suffer fools with greater gladness; try to reconcile myself to the fact that I won't die with a clear conscience.

2 'anyone... themselves...their': a construction used by Shakespeare and not condemned by the OED or H.W. Fowler is good enough for me, who want to avoid tiresome arguments with the politically deranged and find the alternatives even more inelegant than this.


The common pursuit

So, quite apart from the merry badinage, I wonder what some people think a thoughtful skeptic is supposed to do when confronted by the vast majority of ufological effusions. Perhaps they'd rather one did as so many reviewers do - politely, but dishonestly, ignored the malapropisms, the shambolic logic, the multiplication of entities, the remorseless intellectual perfidy and poltroonery, the sheer wilful ignorance and all the rest of the slovenly imbroglia that infests so much ufological commentary. When one does expose these unfortunate qualities, one suddenly discovers that a threatening tribe of devout disciples of Lady Bracknell is in our midst: 'I dislike arguments of any kind. They are always vulgar, and often convincing.' Reporting what you really find, apparently, is just not on, as my riding mistress would say. Well, tough tittie, girls. In this context I can probably survive without the supreme unction of English hypocrisy. Articulating skepticism with some modicum of trenchancy is like goat-herding or cunnilingus - dark and lonely work, but someone has to do it.

Not least for these reasons. Not to point the finger, ultimately, does a disservice to those who promulgate vacancies; one would like to encourage self-criticism.

And people who do dreadful mischief to their native tongue deserve chastisement and correction. Those who issue words without first grasping their meanings and the rudiments of syntax are preventing themselves from thinking properly, let alone lucidly, as well as making it difficult for everyone else to follow what they might have been struggling to say. One can point to cases in which the jabberwocky is so painfully advanced that only a fool could pretend that the writers know - or have had the courage to decide - what they want to say.

And anyway, for God's sake. There's surely no reason why criticism, while also striving for clarity, shouldn't try, at least, to be as entertainingly off-the-wall as its object. Ufology must be one of the most exquisite forms of comedy known to mankind, yet you rarely saw such a miserable po-faced pompous lot as a congregation of the ufological class. Oscar Wilde again: 'On an occasion of this kind, it becomes more than a moral duty to speak one's mind. It becomes a pleasure.' And does not the Talmudist declare: 'Man will be called to account for all the pleasures he has failed to enjoy.'? Oh, go on, crack yer faces. Skeptics needn't have all the fun. You've got to have a laugh occasionally, or you'll get ill, that's what my Mum said. ●●●



Clas Svahn, chairman of UFO-Sweden, comments on Peter Brookesmith's original article:

After reading Peter Brookesmith's article *Screen Memories* in *Magonia* 50 I must clarify some facts concerning the investigation of Mr Achille Zaghetto's report concerning an unidentified object observed during a flight from Milan to London on the 21st April 1991. Since I have interviewed Mr Zaghetto I will try to answer some of the questions put by Mr Brookesmith. I also think that he went too far by suggesting that Mr Zaghetto has "put someone on".

From my interview with Mr Zaghetto it is clear that he made his observations in sunlight even though it was dark beneath him. The object was seen above the airplane's horizon against a clear and sunlit sky. But it is also clear that Mr Brookesmith is quite right in his criticism of the use of the word 'simultaneously' in the report. Zaghetto and his co-pilot saw the object first and

then reported it to London Air Traffic Control. Mr Zaghetto never emphasised the shape of the UFO but says that it "was like a missile. It was round, about ten feet long". Later on in my interview he stresses that it was "just a flash".

Nevertheless, the radar plot on the ground indicates that the object must have been larger than Mr Zaghetto's estimate since smaller objects would not have been plotted.

Mr Brookesmith is also asking (question number six) what exactly the CAA calls a UFO. In response to my request for information, CAA spokesman B. H. Dale answers as follows: "The investigation has therefore been closed and the sighting will be listed as an unidentified flying object" indicating that it was the two pilots' report. But since Mr Zaghetto refers to the ACC/operator in his 'near-collision' report, the radar return was known to the investigators and if that return had indicated any known object as a solution to this report that would have been stated by Mr Dale.

There is no indication of any cover-up (question 4) of the incident. Mr Zaghetto told the world about it on RAI3 Television. The reporters were waiting outside his house when he arrived back in Rome. I have a copy of that interview.

I have tried to get more information on this observation since I am very interested in "missile"-shaped objects (that are quite common over Sweden) but have failed so far.

Readers especially interested in these sorts of UFO-observations should read the article by Anders Liljgren and myself in *International UFO Reporter*, July/August 1994.

Clas Svahn,
Chairman of UFO-Sweden,
Stenbockens väg 21,
S-175 60 Järfälla,
Sweden

Letters

Dear John:

I've just picked up Magonia 51 from Watkins'. Congratulations to Roger Sandell on his very balanced article. I feel though there was an issue which wasn't discussed, and that we will never understand the question of so-called Satanic abuse until it is.

Organised sadistic abuse certainly exists (though fortunately it is rare). But why do people who are not fundamentalist Christians persist in interpreting such abuse as being by Satanists? Looking at the book *Treating Survivors of Satanic Abuse* we see that the editor included some complete rubbish about Satanism in general, and that some of the therapists and social workers wrongly regard the cases they refer to as being abuse by Satanists. But it is clear that the clients in most of the cases had indeed been severely abused. (By the way, the report by Bentovim and Tranter in that book is clearly the Nottingham case, where abuse definitely took place, though the claims of ritual abuse were never substantiated).

It is, I think, also significant that Judith Trowell wrote a piece in that book. She was the independent expert in the Orkney enquiry. She was very critical of the evidence collected by the social workers, and concluded that because of leading questions, misinterpretations of what the children said, and even poor videoing it was impossible to conclude in detail what had happened. But it does appear now that she is of the opinion that some of the children, though maybe not all, were indeed abused.

It seems likely that some of the cases we hear about were originally genuine cases of abuse, but where, under pressure from social workers and others, fantastic elements get introduced until it is impossible to know what has happened. This is made worse because, in cases where organised abuse is suspected, many children get interviewed, and it is almost certain that some of them will be thought to have been abused and that this impression is wrong.

How do we protect children both from being abused at home and from being taken away without need?

The two most recent cases remind me once again how difficult it is to get reliable information from the newspapers. In the Sunderland case I think the Guardian was the only paper to report that the prosecution (and other professionals concerned with the case) are certain that the children were abused by some adults, so certain that they withdrew the prosecution of the 14-year-old, who all agreed did abuse some of the children, because it was unfair that he should carry all the guilt when there were adults involved. It looks as if the case got mixed up in a local feud, and that the children accused adults who were disliked rather than their actual abusers.

In the Ayr case, too, if one looks at most of the papers one would conclude that there was no abuse. But in the Guardian I find that the Sheriff found that the case was so confused that he could not decide on the truth, and that on the balance of probabilities, and because of errors by the social workers, the case should not have gone forward. Indeed he actually said that though the evidence was gathered so badly that it was contaminated, it was quite

possible that it was a case of child sexual abuse. Yet in the original hearing that Sheriff, despite some criticisms of the social workers, found the case proved beyond reasonable doubt (though he had only to find it proved on the balance of probabilities). So, once again, the situation is unclear. And, at best, the newspapers had a 450-page report to summarise, so how much of the information will we get?

In the Pembrokeshire case I understand that, as claimed, some of the social workers did put unacceptable pressure on some of the witnesses, so it was not safe to rely on those statements, which were retracted. But all one can say with certainty is that in any case involving a number of people (not just abuse cases) there is likely to be pressure from those most involved to prevent others saying anything, and there is likely to be counter pressure from the authorities.

Roger makes reference to the report of Linda Williams showing that 38% of a sample of adults who were sexually abused as children had no memory of the abuse. I understand that the original report did not mention the ages of the children, but that in response to criticism later papers gave this information; it affects the figures, but still gives a large percentage who might be expected to remember and didn't. I don't know whether the survey distinguished between single events of abuse and long-term abuse. Roger's question whether "don't remember" means "won't say" is a very obvious one, and was considered. The methodology of the survey was such that this is unlikely to have happened. I could say more, but prefer to wait until I have seen the information myself rather than relying on what I have been told.

I understand that the Gallaher report on organised abuse is due out soon, and disagrees significantly with the La Fontaine report. This is despite the fact that the data collecting was done jointly. The reason, I gather, is that La Fontaine is primarily concerned with whether Satanic abuse



exists at all, while Gallaher is concerned with organised abuse in general. Consequently he puts more emphasis than she does on cases of sadistic abuse which sometimes in the process gets called ritual abuse. But there are some disagreements of the number of cases even when they are using the same definition. Also there are weaknesses in the La Fontaine report. She does not identify or comment on individual cases (perhaps on the advice of the Department of Health). The only three cases she regards as ritual abuse were identified in the press. They do not include one case for which court records are easily available, and have a finding that abuse occurred in a "bogus ceremonial or ritual" context; one cannot tell why not. And she does not appear to have talked to the psychologist who appeared for the parents in the Rochdale case, who is specifically stated in the records of that case to have testified in many more than three cases where the courts found that ritual abuse had occurred. This psychologist specifically denies that these cases were Satanic abuse, and it is not clear to me why she or the courts used the phrase 'ritual abuse'. But La Fontaine should surely have discussed these cases.

Yours sincerely

Daniel Cohen, London NW3

Dear John

After reading the Spanish translation of *Secret Life*, the book about abductions written by Dr. David M. Jacobs I came across another book that gave me the answers to several questions that lingered from the first one. Surely *Magonia* readers should be interested.

But first a short commentary about *Secret Life*. All the amazing stories told by the abductees and Dr. Jacobs's peculiar interpretations about them, find themselves unconsciously summarised in a paragraph on page 62: "From the very first seconds of the incident, nothing is within the limits of common human experience. It is a sudden fall into a mysterious and fantastic world. At once the witness finds himself in front of a technology and biology almost in the realm of magic."

I like this peculiar reversal of Arthur C. Clarke's famous Third Law: "Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic". It seems magic therefore is an advanced technology.

Advanced indeed! So much so that we are left flabbergasted by dematerialisations, invisibility, etc. Some questions that sprang to my mind when reading such accounts were later so easily answered by the second author that I will quote extensively.

• *Question:* How can aliens find their victims and abduct them again and again?

Answer: Just set a compass on them. "An object-compass is a needle of specially treated copper, so activated that it points always towards one certain object after being set upon it". They are sensitive enough to find a person "anywhere up to about one-and-a-half light years".

• *Question:* How can aliens see inside homes? Walls do not bar their vision. And how can they witness everything with neither a receiver or a transmitter at the other end?

Answer: They don't. "The secondary projector out there is composed of forces, visible or invisible, as we please. Part of those forces comprise the receiving, viewing and sending instruments. They are not material it is true, but they are nevertheless fully as actual, and far more efficient than any other system".

• *Question:* How can aliens read the minds of the abductees, and even implant memories and fictions?

Answer: Their machines "operate on a band of frequencies lying between the longest light and heat waves and the shortest radio waves (...) Nearly all matter is transparent to those waves. However, cerebrin, a cerebroside peculiar to the thinking structure of the brain is opaque to them (...) This three-dimensional model, or view, is converted into electricity in the headsets, and the resulting modulated wave goes back into the machine. There it is heterodynes with another wave - the exact frequency existing in the optic nerves themselves - and sent to the receiving headset. Modulated as it is, and producing after rectification in the receiver a three-dimensional picture, it of course reproduces exactly what has been 'viewed', if due allowance has been made for the size and configuration of the different brains involved in the system".

• *Question:* How can aliens show the abductees fragments of their own past?

Answer: "We know within half an hour the exact time (...) We'll simply go out the distance light has travelled since that time, gather in the rays given off, amplify them a few billion times and take a look at whatever went on". If you also wish reconstruction of speech, "it would mean two projectors, due to the difference in speed of sound-waves and light-waves."

This second book I am quoting also shows how all alien races are amoral, the only intelligent species that has any scruples against manipulating or destroying individuals is the human race.

The title of this book is *Skylark Three*, written and published in 1930, its author was the famous S.F. writer E. E. 'Doc' Smith. Applying Jacobsian logic, what all these quotations clearly show is

that E. E. Smith was (as happened with one of the false abductees in Lawson's study, Dr. Jacobs said) just another American suffering from "UFO Abduction Syndrome".

Yours sincerely,

Luis Gonzalez, Malaga, Spain.

Dear John,

You will be interested to hear of a variation of the 'cat-flap' stories in *Magonia* 51 and earlier issues. A few months ago in our local paper there appeared the usual story of the nocturnal catnappers at work, but this time it was not for the purpose of selling catskins in Europe, but to feed the cats, live, to angry pit-bull terriers. Following some cat disappearances in one area near Crewe, a cat rescue-home owner spoke out about this evil practice.

I tried to find out more by phoning one cat rescue centre (not the one in the newspaper and asking what they knew of it. The woman proprietor replied that yes she did know about these happenings, and that she had heard of a secret warehouse in Winsford, Cheshire, where these ferocious pit-bulls tore the poor cats to pieces, in full view of spectators. She did admit however that there was no proof of this and that the stories were second or third hand.

There have been strict laws in recent years about keeping pit-bulls and no doubt many owners are flouting these laws. These tales may be no more than an attempt by anonymous cat-lovers to draw attention to illegal dogs being kept by their friends and neighbours. My guess is that accounts of these 'pit-bull fights' will continue to emerge from time to time, with small variations. Unfortunately I did not keep the press cutting, but I am pretty certain it will pop up again, sooner rather than later.

Regards, Christopher Allan,

Alsager, Stoke-on-Trent.

Dear John,

Because I do not subscribe to *Magonia*, I thought to obtain a library copy (to keep up to date and see if you had published my reply to John Harney). However, it seems that no library in Scotland receives copies. Not even the British Library receives any. As a librarian you must know that there is legal obligation to supply the B.L. with copies. Why was this not done? They will not ask you to send copies but would appreciate receipt of them. I would also appreciate it (I would be able to keep in touch without subscribing).

Sincerely

Steuart Campbell, Edinburgh

To help Mr Campbell out of his predicament, donations may be sent to the "Tightfisted Ufologists Fund", c/o *Magonia*.