

low, seemingly sucked out of the support towers of the main installation at Launching Pad No. 1. Welded sections had also come apart, and the whole giant Soviet Cosmodrome at Baikonur was consequently out of operation for the first two weeks of June 1982. The second UFO headed for the nearby Baikonur housing complex (60,000 Cosmodrome workers) and in a few seconds knocked out the panes in all the windows or drilled fine round holes in them.

No human injuries were claimed in either incident.

Dr. Alexei Zolotov told Henry Gris that he had been present in Baikonur at the time, staying in the Hotel Cosmonaut.

In a letter dated May 24, 1983, Mr. Gris informs me that James Oberg admits that Baikonur was right out of action for a fortnight in June 1982 and is 'baffled' and has no explanation. Says Gris: "Between the three launching-areas, Baikonur, Kapustin Yar, and Plesetsk (the new third, secret launching area north of

Moscow) with a total of some 80 launching towers between them, hardly a day passes normally without at least one firing into Space." He also says: "Oberg juggles a bit, and, hey presto, another UFO is 'explained'. I have however noted that, of late, he has grown a little less adamant — at least in his conversation with me. I propose to be back in Russia in September '83, when I should pick up the latest on their UFO sightings, plus new data on the Russian Space Programme — now entering a dramatic new stage, with man's first 'Space-Island' a definite reality in 1984 — once again, alas, under the Hammer and Sickle."

Well, there it is! If somebody is romancing, let us hope that we shall soon find out who it is.

As for CSICOP, there is further bad news for them from China, and we propose to report at length on this in our next issue.

G.C.

MAIL BAG

Correspondence is invited from our readers, but they are asked to keep their letters short. Unless letters give the sender's full name and address (not necessarily for publication) they cannot be considered. The Editor would like to remind correspondents that it is not always possible to acknowledge every letter personally, so he takes this opportunity of thanking all who write to him.

"A Warning To All"

(Translation from French)

Dear Sir, — Many thanks for your warm words for one of my articles about GEPAN. (It is all the more timely, because in fact I am advised by well-informed quarters that GEPAN is to be wound up shortly. In a word — another Condon.)

Thank you too for your share in getting my article published in Dr. Hynek's journal (CUFOS).

We are old hands at the game, always battling on the ramparts, since we are certain of the existence of the so-called "UFO Phenomenon" — a term we use because we don't have a better one. The name with which it is decked out has no bearing on its reality, which far transcends any appellation one can give it, as is proved by the book just published in France (Mercure de France), *La Chine et les Extraterrestres*, by the Chinese Ufologist Shi Bo of Peking, who reads, writes and speaks French. The preface is by Aimé Michel. It rather recalls

Aimé's own book, *"Mystérieux Objets Célestes"*. If you have not already done so, I urge you to read it, and I would like very much to see it translated into English. You will find Shi Bo's address in the book, and I think he also knows English.

Very cordially yours,

F. Lagarde,
(LUMIÈRES DANS LA NUIT),
9 rue Camille Desmoulins,
65000 Tarbes,
France

March 31, 1983

(Readers will find an extract from Shi Bo's book elsewhere in this issue. For the latest developments at GEPAN see our last issue, FSR 28/5. — EDITOR.)

The 'E.T.' Plague

Dear Mr. Creighton, — Your Editorial *The 'E.T.' Plague* (28/4) suggested that the feature films produced and directed by Steven Spielberg could be manipulating audiences into a too-

easy acceptance of 'uncouth and nasty' aliens and thus 'facilitating a take-over by something out of the Pit'. This chilling possibility gains in likelihood when we consider the curious system of metaphysics developing through all of Spielberg's films to date. Film reviews may seem out of place in FSR, but if Spielberg is a seminal influence in the formulation of a popular UFO concept with which we have to contend, it may be necessary to examine his ideology.

Spielberg's first film, *Duel* (1972), chronicled the troubles of a businessman on a long-distance drive dogged by a driverless Diesel truck bent on luring him into fatal accidents. This was followed by *Jaws* (1976) in which the 'death-machine' was resurrected as a marauding killer-shark, devouring millions at the box-office and spawning a huge spin-off industry that reflected a disturbing degree of popular veneration for this saw-toothed Shiva-like deity. The anti-human force that impelled the deadly Diesel truck of *Duel* evoked simple terror, but in

Jaws audience reaction was manipulated to become an unhealthy fascination.

In *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* (1978), the predatory impulse was concealed and the man-eating shark was transformed into a man-capturing saucer occupied by entities so cherubic and celestially-illuminated as to command adoration. 'UFO-believers' were portrayed as blessed with a childlike innocence and empathic clairvoyance that admitted them into the kingdom of heaven; they were not shown as oppressed by inexplicable forces and living in a kind of psychic backwater. In the closing scene the entities obligingly returned to Earth some victims of UFO-related disappearances; they did not restore to life, health or sanity victims of the more inclement alien incursions. *Close Encounters* made it clear that Spielberg knew a great deal about UFO phenomena but had carefully selected his facts to serve the ends of commercial cinema, a cosmetic cover-up and a quasi-mystical philosophy.

In *E.T.* the deification programme now elevates the alien to the status of the Son of God, no less. Scriptural allusions come thick and fast. After E.T.'s 'death' at the hands of a team of white-robed surgeons (theologians, 'doctors of the Church?') in a suggestively echoing cathedral-like atmosphere, led by a doctor with pronounced Semitic features (the high priest of the Sanhedrin that condemned Jesus?), the alien is 'resurrected' from a coffin with an egg-shaped window and prepares for his 'ascension' in the UFO. Elliot, the boy who first befriended E.T., lays his head upon the entity's breast (in the manner of John, the 'beloved disciple'). E.T. then invites Elliot to join him (as prior to his ascension Jesus invited John: 'Follow me'); at which the gov-

ernment agent with the ever-jangling bunch of keys (Peter bearing the keys to the kingdom?) looks askance (as did Peter query Jesus' invitation to John). When Elliot declines, E.T. marks his forehead (opens his 'third eye?') with his luminous finger and tells him: 'I'll be right here' (Jesus: 'I shall be with you always').

The meticulous care that has gone into the symbology and compelling visual effects of these films suggests that Spielberg is not so much naive as dedicated to a policy of inculcating naivety in the public mind. We see the systematic disguising of an 'evil' as a 'good' reaching its apotheosis in the creation of an 'irresistible' Messianic counterfeit. Spielberg achieves this by misrepresenting the real issues of the UFO problem while subversively juggling with religious archetypes (thus producing subconscious repercussions irrespective of consciously-held attitudes) and dressing-up the whole package as an emotionally coercive spectacle. So certain does he seem of the improbability of audiences unmasking his subliminal tricks that he indulges in a sardonic joke at the end of *E.T.*: the craft taking the alien 'home' is suddenly seen to be decorated around its circumference with a zigzag design that exactly reproduces the deadly dentures of *Jaws*! For those who have eyes to see, there is little doubt about where it's all coming from.

As is customary for one who does as he's told, Spielberg has become a rich man. It goes without saying that anyone trying to make a feature film about the crucial issues of the UFO enigma would be unlikely to raise tuppence-worth of backing, let alone profit from a multi-million dollar spin-off industry. Or might there one day be a market for Betty and Barney Hill sweatshirts, Falcon Lake transfers

and Villas Boas love-dolls?

Yours sincerely,
Malcolm Dickson,
25 Hey Street,
Sawley,
Long Eaton,
Nottingham NG10 3HA
16 April 1983

The Good/Zinsstag Book on Adamski

Dear Sir, — After having read the book, "George Adamski: The Untold Story" by Lou Zinsstag and Timothy Good, I wish to say, as a co-worker of the late George Adamski, that the opinions expressed in the book do not necessarily reflect mine.

I would also like to add that I have supplied no material whatever (photographs, text or letters of George Adamski to myself) to the authors for the purpose of their book. Any material in the book concerning myself was used without my knowledge.

May I ask you to publish this letter in your next issue of the *Flying Saucer Review*?

Sincerely yours,
May Flitcroft,
Formerly May Morlet

As one of the committee members of the Queensland Flying Saucer Bureau who initiated the 1959 world lecture tour of George Adamski, and further as one who has had the opportunity of speaking to those persons who knew him since the 30's as well as to study much of what he wrote and taught, I wish to add that I can no more support all the views expressed in the above book.

Keith Flitcroft,
c/o Berkenlaan 13,
B-2610 Wilrijk,
Belgium
2nd May 1983