

appeared to collide with the smaller object. The impact seemed to cause both objects to bounce. There was no explosion.

No longer wobbling, the large UFO turned away, and moved slowly from its smaller companion before accelerating, and sweeping away at a high speed. It is conceivable that these actions appeared strange, and even mysterious to ground observers, especially if it was their first encounter with a UFO. Many in Australia have already read about this incident in the March 3, 1965, issue of

Everybody's. Now I can offer an explanation.

Those among us who have studied the evidence of the UFO and have reached the conclusion that they have surrounding protective fields, realize that the "bounce" seen over Canberra was due to a collision, not of the craft themselves, but of their G-fields. Having also studied the electro-magnetic effects of UFOs, we offer the suggestion that on May 3, 1964, the observers near Canberra, Australia, witnessed a re-charging operation between two space-craft from another world.

The meaning of Contact

By Jerome Clark

IT may be superfluous to say that the UFO mystery is confusing, but it is true nonetheless.¹ Some of this confusion no doubt results from censorship of various kinds, and also from fear on the part of ridicule-wary witnesses to come forward with potentially significant reports. But this certainly does not explain it all, for, judging from its antics, officialdom—which presumably knows a great deal more about our subject than it cares to admit—is every bit as baffled as we are.

The most basic cause of the apparent incomprehensibility of the flying saucer enigma, I believe—and again I hope that I am not stating the obvious—is the UFOs themselves. To be brief and to the point, *it appears that the beings who pilot the machines are performing their operations in deliberate secrecy—evidently they do not want us to know the nature of their mission on Earth, and consequently they are going to some lengths to mislead us.*

Fantastic? Perhaps—yet a conclusion one must inevitably draw from even a most superficial examination of the mass of UFO data recorded from earliest times to the present. And, I hasten to add, this same conclusion can be reached without resort to such disputed matters as Al Bender's purported silencing. The validity of our assertion is proven by the actions of the UFOs themselves.

It is well known, for example, that the vast majority of sightings take place during the early morning hours, apparently so that the craft can carry on relatively unobserved and undisturbed. Moreover—and quite significantly—landings, the most revealing of all UFO incidents, occur usually in the most secluded spots, away from prying eyes. It may not be mere coincidence that South America, a continent of vast unexplored jungles,

has such a large proportion of fantastic saucer encounters, quite often involving occupants stumbled upon by unsuspecting wayfarers on abandoned roads, or in similarly untravelled areas. One wonders how many completely unnoticed landings have been executed in this part of the world.

But the problem does not end here.

The "ufonauts" probably wish that their activities could be carried on undetected, but this, of course, is impossible. Transient and fleeting as they may be, the flying saucers have been noted and worried about by virtually every major national government in the world; and we are told that these same agencies are spending large amounts of money in feverish attempts to solve the enigma. Is it not possible—probable, even—that the UFO beings, in taking cognizance of this concern about them, might therefore put a false cover over their activities so as to keep officialdom or anyone else from coming close to the truth?

Seen in this light, the much-maligned contact claims become a kind of tool with a two-fold purpose: to discourage legitimate inquiry into the saucer field by making it look ridiculous, and to instill false ideas into the minds of those who do go on to investigate the subject.²

If it is true that the real story is being kept from us—and I can hardly see how this is to be doubted—it scarcely follows that the ufonauts would unhesitatingly reveal everything about themselves in the course of conversations with "contactees"; but it *does* follow that they would impart patently phony information concerning their identity, their origin, and their purpose. And this is precisely what has happened.

FSR VOL. 11 N#5 28
ANO 1965
MES S-0

2P

We do know that contact is always carefully planned; ostensibly, certain persons—or types of persons—are picked beforehand. It should be emphasized that contactees are hardly ever particularly educated individuals—the kind of people, in other words, not likely to question what they are told; in fact, if it must be said, they are “gullible.”

With this in mind, let us examine an American contact incident which, though little known, may prove to be one of the most significant on record:

A newspaper reporter named House writes that he was driving near Lake Huron in Wisconsin when he stopped at a service station to have his car filled. The proprietor offered him a cup of coffee and engaged him in conversation, saying that a UFO had been landing regularly on a small island about a hundred yards off shore, and that he had talked with its occupants.

“They look like you or me,” he explained; they “speak good English, although in a ‘sing-song’ manner. They are tall, strong, and live for hundreds of years, much advanced in technology, and keep equipment in their aircraft which would amaze an earth scientist by its perfection and material—however, I am not permitted to reveal what these instruments are.”

The contactee stated that the particular crew with whom he conversed were from the planet Venus; they “have friends on earth whom they visit with and who have been picked by a method known only to them.” Sceptics are avoided.”³

The beings were here to promote “everlasting peace,” and had not made their objectives known to more than a few people, the witness was informed. The craft contained approximately 25 occupants, but the man had spoken with only one of them.

The contactee’s wife and son, when queried by House, confirmed that they had seen the craft land on the island and disgorge men in “shining clothes”, on a number of occasions. House cross-examined the boy, who appeared quite intelligent and sincere, and was unable to break his story.

Examining the claim, noted ufologist Coral Lorenzen speculated that “if a race of beings meant to take over the world, would it not be efficient and logical to contact gullible (the opposite, incidentally, of ‘sceptical’) peace-loving people, convincing them of good intentions, limit their knowledge of anything which might benefit them technologically (such as instruments) and use them as a pipeline of information as well as a first step toward actual infiltration? . . . Could it be that some people have actually contacted real spacemen and are unknowing dupes and traitors to their own race.”⁴

Mrs. Lorenzen’s observations are interesting

and, I believe, correct in part. We rather doubt, however, that the ufonaut’s purpose is necessarily invasion—the evidence for hostility on their part is at best equivocal, although admittedly there have been more than a few instances in which human beings have been wantonly killed or injured by UFOs; still, these constitute only a very small proportion of all known saucer cases. Furthermore, as we pointed out earlier in these pages, ufonauts were lying about their identity as far back as 1897.⁵

Also, it is questionable whether these beings use contactees “as a pipeline of information”. We have already noted that most of those who allege communication are certainly not learned people, and we might add that in the typical claim it is the contactors, not the contactees, who monopolize the conversation.)

But we do believe, with Mrs. Lorenzen, that communication is effected either to mislead or falsely to reassure human beings. Exactly why this is done, we do not know; but it is being done, quite obviously.

This accepted, the UFO picture becomes at once more clear and more confusing. Indeed, following our reasoning, even the interplanetary-saucer theory comes under new scrutiny, for is it not at least a little odd that the ufonauts themselves have seemingly gone out of their way to confirm our own guesses as to their origin and purpose? What of 1897, when they were thought to be American aeronauts, and they identified themselves as such during contact? What of 1917, when, in the presence of three deeply religious peasant girls at Fatima, they claimed that they were divine entities? Why are they inevitably what they are suspected to be?

I have not meant to suggest here any new theories concerning the nature of the UFOs themselves. I do feel, however, that we know much less about them than we think we do. I submit that the contact claims should be re-examined in the light of our conclusions, but that they should be neither over-estimated nor under-estimated. That contact has actually occurred is hard to deny; that, on the other hand, the often inane “messages” of the ufonauts concerning themselves bear any resemblance to the facts of the situation is equally hard to accept.

NOTES

¹One is reminded of the late Sir Winston Churchill’s famous remark concerning the Soviet Union—“a riddle within a mystery within an enigma”—which is probably even more applicable to the UFO problem.

²By “contact claims” we wish to make it clear that we are not alluding to the extremely fanciful yarns of such professional claimants as Adamski, Bethurum, Van Tassel, *et al.* It should be apparent by now to readers of the REVIEW that a great gap separates these and the evidently authentic reports of Gary Wilcox, Mario Zuccala, “Adhemar”, and many others.

³The Green Bay, Wisconsin, *Press-Gazette*, June 26, 1959.

⁴*A.P.R.O. Bulletin*, September, 1961.

⁵See “A Contact Claim” in the January/February, 1965 issue of the *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW*.