

# THE CONTACT CLAIMS

## A NEW LINE IN RESEARCH

BY WAVENEY GIRVAN

**F**LYING SAUCERS, like any other subject, must develop or die. We can regard the last thirteen years of saucers in terms of "make" and "break": there was a "make" when Kenneth Arnold gave a name to the discs, but this was followed by a "break" until 1950 when the first books on the subject started to appear. This, in turn, was followed by a "break" until 1953 when the first of the contact claims was publicised. If general interest at the moment is at a low ebb it is because we are in another period of "break"—another important development is needed if we are to rise out of the trough. This development could arise in a number of ways, but speculation is unprofitable because events are largely, but not perhaps wholly, out of our control. It often seems that all we can do is to watch and wait.

### A lot can be done

As a matter of fact, while we are waiting there is a lot that could be done and the purpose of this article is to indicate a line of research which seems to have been overlooked, but before I go into details I would like to try to put the contact claims into their proper perspective in the saucer story as a whole. A number of believers in saucers have declared that George Adamski and others have done very severe damage to the cause and have retarded, and in many cases destroyed, a general belief in the subject. Donald Keyhoe is prominent among such critics and he has been working very hard to discredit Adamski so as to remove him altogether from the scene. Without even discussing whether Adamski is genuine or not, let us consider the saucer scene without Adamski and the other contact claimants. What would the position be if we had never heard of such people?

Well, we can quite easily answer that question: we should be back in the period of the 1951-1952 lull that followed the publication of the first Keyhoe book and those by Frank Scully and Gerald Heard. Public interest had almost completely evaporated, largely because all saucer sightings had been explained away as skyhook balloons. Only those who have been connected with flying saucers since their *début* can appreciate how dead the subject was in the early fifties. It is just not true to say that Adamski and others have retarded the subject. Their claims, even if spurious, have helped to keep it alive, and I will now try to explain why this is so.

### Flying saucers "a heresy"

Flying saucers have been an affront to the Establishment. They have offended every orthodox opinion and those in authority have rallied to the defence of the *status quo* when challenged by such a revolutionary new concept. Until Adamski and others came on the scene the easiest method of dealing with these flying heresies (and with other heresies like the Loch Ness Monster, for that matter) was to explain them away: to claim that what had been seen had been misinterpreted by the eye-witness. It is an extremely difficult case to answer when one is arguing before the bar of public opinion. The eye-witness, however honest and competent, has to confront an acknowledged expert, high in his profession and accepted by the public (which is in the position of a judge) almost as the final arbiter in such matters. The nearest analogy that springs to mind is the influence the late Sir Bernard Spilsbury held in criminal cases: his opinion, and his opinion alone, was often sufficient to send a man to the gallows.

George Adamski altered all that. Dr. Menzel, for instance, could not apply the "misinterpretation" technique when it came to a contact claim. No temperature inversion, no skyhook balloon, could explain away a fair-haired Venusian: such people do not airily step out of lenticular clouds and reflected car head-lights. The only answer that was available to such experts as Dr. Menzel was "Faked." And, in due course, that was the answer given.

### Discoveries may be concealed

We can admit, therefore, that if Donald Keyhoe and others do finally succeed in ridding our subject of Adamski and others, then we are back in the dark days of the saucers and it is doubtful whether the truth would come out for a very long time: it must be remembered that even the American and Russian space probes may not lift the veil immediately for those who will be doing the probing will, in fact, be the agents of the Establishment. What the probes discover may not be publicly revealed for some considerable time. I want therefore to confess immediately that I have a wish to believe Adamski and I have now declared my reasons for this wish; they have nothing to do with the fact that I was his first publisher. I wish his story to be true because without him and others, the subject of flying saucers might well collapse or at best slowly wither away. I think Donald Keyhoe is wrong, not because he disbelieves Adamski, but because he thinks the subject would be healthier without him. I readily concede, however, that if one is absolutely convinced of Adamski's dishonesty, then, come hell and high water, he must be exposed whatever may happen to the subject as a whole.

In previous articles I have referred to Adamski's photographs. Such has been my awareness of my "wish-to-believe" that I have always been on guard against this form of self-deception and have tried hard to lean the other way. Instead, therefore, of challenging my readers to disprove the photographs, I tried to discover what would happen if one started with the assumption that they were faked. I think that impartial readers must admit that, so far at any rate, the photographs have fared on the whole rather better than their critics. My purpose now

is to test Adamski once again, but this time to reverse the procedure: I am going, for the purpose of the exercise, to accept him completely at his face value and I shall select one of his claims that has always seemed to me, and to many others, as the most difficult of all to swallow. I will quote Adamski from *Flying Saucers Have Landed*, p. 203, English edition:

"I have heard many times that men from other worlds are walking the streets of Earth. And if this be true, I could easily understand his desire not to be photographed, because there were a few distinguishing points about his facial features. Normally these would not be noticed. But in a photograph they would be conspicuous and serve as points of identification for his brothers who have come to Earth."

When I last saw Adamski, in the presence of two others, he repeated this claim in much more categorical fashion and indicated that the number of space visitors now amongst us had increased considerably since the quoted words were first written. The claim, bluntly put, is that the Venusians are amongst us in large numbers and that they carry distinguishing features to those who know how to recognise them.

If Adamski and others are telling the truth about these visitors, then surely there must be evidence that can be produced. After all, the claim is perhaps the most staggering of all and, although Adamski offers no support to it, it is the one statement that should be capable of being put to the test. These people, I repeat, are said to be walking about amongst us and identifiable.

All over the world there are saucer groups and magazines devoted to research. Here is an opportunity that is being missed. Among the readers of this REVIEW and among the members of the various groups there must surely be found a number who, if suitably encouraged, would come forward to support Adamski's claim. May I ask all those who read this article to report their knowledge of any such evidence that exists? Let me be the first to come forward: I know of two people who claim to have been in contact with Venusians.

The most recent experience concerned a young Englishman whom a colleague and I have interviewed on a number of occasions. Unfortunately,

*"... Venusians are amongst us in large numbers"*

he is reluctant to come forward for a number of reasons: his strongest reason is that he has no proof to back his story. We are trying to explain that we want his story merely as evidence at this stage and I am hoping that he may be in time persuaded to publish an account of his experience.

### **A Puerto Rican contact**

My other witness introduced himself to me by way of a letter from Puerto Rico in 1958 and he told me of his contacts in that country, in Canada, Honolulu and the United States. I have recently received another letter from this correspondent and he has promised that he will write a full account of his experiences, so I will not anticipate the form his revelations are likely to take beyond quoting briefly from his latest letter: "I have never had any doubts as to who the

people were that I met in 1946-1947, but since I was never inside a space ship it is difficult to explain just why I knew that they were from outer space. Adamski has far more evidence than I have. Because of my own experiences I know well that his are factual. It still never fails to amaze me." I am hoping that before long, in a subsequent issue, you will be able to read a full account of this man's extraordinary encounters.

So far the research has made a promising start. If these two men are genuine, then there must be others. And if there are others, then they are more likely to be discovered by the existing saucer groups or by their individual members. Would it be possible to initiate a world-wide search for such people? I would like to make the point that primarily I am in search of testimony and I hope that any who may read my words will not hesitate to come forward merely because they lack proof.

## ***Back Numbers of THE FLYING SAUCER REVIEW***

**are available at 5s. each post paid.**

Please include remittance with order. Make cheques, etc., payable to  
FLYING SAUCER REVIEW, 1 DOUGHTY STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.

The following issues can still be supplied, but readers are advised to make early application, as in many cases only a few copies remain.

1955—Volume I: All issues out of print.

1956—Volume II: No. 2 only available.

1957—Volume III: No. 6 only available.

1958—Volume IV: No. 4, 5 and 6 only available.

1959—Volume V: No. 1 out of print.  
No. 2 available.  
No. 3 available.  
No. 4 out of print.  
No. 5 available.  
No. 6 available.

1960—Volume VI: All issues available.

**NOTE:** From and including Volume II, the key to issue dates is: No. 1, Jan./Feb.; No. 2, Mar./Apl.; No. 3, May/June; No. 4, July/Aug.; No. 5, Sept./Oct.; No. 6, Nov./Dec.