

*recognized skills and training and who are certainly sane and responsible as judged by their peers. Furthermore, these reports are not helter-skelter, but fall into well defined patterns. Let's try to find out what lies behind these stories and reports; there could be a scientific breakthrough somewhere in the wings."*

Because we find ourselves in the dawn of the Space Age and have grown up in the Buck Rogers era of science fiction, we have jumped to the conclusion that UFOs must be space craft piloted by E.T.s. But may not this be just another "stone in the sky" situation? Maybe the viewing angle is wrong here too.

Shouldn't our proper approach here be to say, in effect, "Those who have studied the UFO phenomenon over the years and who themselves are scientifically competent (as are those scientists, currently working in many different disciplines, who are associated with recognized serious UFO investigative groups like CUFOS, MUFON, and APRO in this country and with the many similar groups in other countries) have told us that the UFO phenomenon is real and definitely worthy of scientific study. Various "viewing angles" should be explored, one of which should continue to be the possibility that UFOs may in some way not yet be understandable to present day science, represent extraterrestrial intelligences. But we should

not be provincial (!) in our outlook; we should also admit the possibility that the UFO phenomenon may be indicative of an aspect of reality which so far has eluded us. Perhaps we should go even further and admit the possibility that 20th century science is not adequate to conceive of the final solution of what lies behind the UFO phenomenon, any more than the science of the 19th century could have even remotely conceived of nuclear energy. But there will be, we hope, a 21st and a 25th century science which may be able to do so. But this should not be an excuse not to study the phenomenon itself. We should not be bound by the myopic view of the Planetary Society.

Indeed, the Planetary Society should be made aware of the growing number of scientists who are already taking a broader view of the UFO phenomenon. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these is the group initiated by Dr. Peter Sturrock, of Stanford University, the *Society for Scientific Exploration*, which is composed solely of scientists recognized in their own field of specialization, and which seeks to explore those borderland areas of science (UFOs among them) which as yet have not been admitted onto the playing field of orthodox science. In that direction lie the breakthroughs which will become a part of the science of the next century.

## SOME REFLECTIONS ON CHARLES FORT: THE WORCESTER FISHMONGER & THE NORFOLK GAMEKEEPER

*Jean Sider*

Translation by Gordon Creighton from the French original in *Lumières dans la Nuit* No. 217/218 (July-August 1982). With acknowledgements and thanks to the Editor and Committee of *Lumières dans la Nuit*.

"Science concerns itself with adaptations, and science itself is adaptation." CHARLES FORT: *The Complete Works of Charles Fort*. Dover Publication, New York, 1974, (p. 625).

THROUGHOUT our whole world there is a plethora of fishmongers and gamekeepers — tossed out as fodder for the naive and ignorant masses of mankind. The folk responsible for dishing up this phoney pabulum are those whose function it is to be the servile zealots of our obstructionistic and occlusionistic Science. This Science, since the dawn of time, has always aimed to keep the masses in a permanent state of mental sterility. And more and more frequently these

people are called upon to cover up certain facts for which Dame Nature herself cannot conceivably be held responsible, and they do it with a degree of cynicism and a degree of impudence that are downright breathtaking.

Hitherto we had habitually been inclined merely to view with contempt this technique of theirs for explaining away the unexplainable, but today our con-

tempt is beginning to yield place to something more serious — to a well-founded sense of concern and alarm. For, while it is certainly true that Science has a duty to observe a proper prudence, it is quite unacceptable that it should openly flaunt this state of perpetual ignorance in which it desires to keep us. We are not mentally retarded, and it seems about time that Science perceived that we “are of age, and have all our vaccinations”, as one might say!

Let us quote some celebrated Fortean examples of this cover-up in action.

On May 28, 1881, near Worcester, in England, if we are to believe the account given in the *Worcester Daily Times* for May 30 of that year, winkles, with crabs of an unknown species, rained down from the sky on Cromer Gardens Road and all around on the fields and gardens adjoining. And even the grounds surrounded by high walls benefitted equally from this celestial largesse, periwinkles and crabs being found even on the parapets and tops of the widest walls.

Worcester lies far inland, 50 kilometres from the Severn Estuary, and consequently at least 80 kilometres from the sea. Somebody forthwith put around the idea that a fishmonger, faced with the problem of a glut of unsaleable crabs and winkles, had persuaded some of his friends to aid him in getting rid of the whole of this unwanted catch. They did it by climbing over fences and even high walls, and all this without the slightest noise, and without being seen by a single soul. Charles Fort points out that the huge quantities of molluscs and crustaceans gathered by the crowds who profited by this windfall were far, far greater than any single fishmonger in the world could possibly have possessed in those days.

None of which of course prevented the “explanation” from gaining ground rapidly and being taken up and disseminated widely by the press.

Now a certain Mr. J. Lloyd Bozward, a meteorologist well known in the region at the time of the occurrence, did not find the “fishmonger explanation” entirely satisfactory, and so, as one may well believe, he set about making a careful investigation of the affair, and was able to establish the authenticity of the “rain of winkles and crabs.” At the same time, he also managed to establish the fact that, on May 27 and 28, 1881, not a single winkle was on sale anywhere in the whole of Worcester. He interviewed some of the people who had come running to the place to glean whole sacks full of this unwonted manna from the skies, but he was unable to discover a single person who had seen or heard that strange fishmonger who, without a doubt, certainly threw away a fortune. Mr. Lloyd Bozward, a man who “knew his stuff”, promptly published his findings in the *Worcester Evening Post* for June 9, 1881. His conclusions: it was all due to a whirlwind. A whirlwind that had simply given back what it had sucked up somewhere out at sea.

Now, as every mere ship’s cabin-boy knows, *selec-*

*tive* whirlwinds just don’t exist, any more than segregationalist showers of rain exist. If a whirlwind carries off a quantity of sea-water, then it sucks up EVERYTHING contained in that water. It doesn’t operate some sort of sifting process, picking out the winkles and rejecting the cockles and the mussels, keeping the crabs of unknown species and discarding the lobsters and the shrimps, the seaweeds, the fishes, the starfish, the jellyfish, and the rocks and minerals. And when it drops the stuff back on the land, it’s just the same. (Oh, I forgot one little item: along with the winkles and the crabs of unknown species there were also a few hermit-crabs.) Well, any way you look at it, what you have here is a SELECTION. But his story made very little impact, for by then the whole affair had already been forgotten and had passed into oblivion. And, as we all know, oblivion plays into the hands of Science very nicely.

During the winter of 1907/1908, in the County of Norfolk — we are still in England — shining objects were seen moving about over the fields. According to the accounts reported, their brightness was comparable to that of electric light bulbs. Presumably the most powerful brains in the Science of the day in Britain got together to decide on how they were to set about explaining this incongruity.

One R. W. Purdy, a writer known to the biologists and zoologists of the day, collected some of the eyewitness accounts, which he published in the *London Times* for December 10, 1907. Purdy himself had observed the phenomenon on December 1, describing it as “like the lamp of a motor cycle” which at first headed straight towards him, and then moved higher and then retreated. He said the phenomenon moved around in various directions. (See *The Field*, January 11, 1908.)

In the *Eastern Daily News* of Norwich for February 7, 1908, it was stated that on the morning of February 5 a gamekeeper from Lower Hellesdon named E. S. Cannell had seen something shining on a grassy bank. He captured it when it fluttered up to him. It was an owl, of an ordinary run-of-the-mill species, but gamekeeper Cannell claimed that it was “phosphorescent”. He carried it to his home, where it died, “still luminous.” Yet in the same newspaper, for the following day, February 8, it is clearly stated that the taxidermist who stuffed and mounted the bird said: “*I have seen nothing luminous about it.*”

The great ornithologist Count de Sibour no doubt did not know about the findings of that taxidermist. Or, if he did know of them, he was careful not to trumpet them from the rooftops. For he published an article in *Knowledge* for September 1913, stating that the mystery had been explained. It had all been caused by the phosphorescent owl. De Sibour explained that the luminescence had been produced either by scraps of decayed wood from the bird’s nest, or by some fungous disease of its feathers!



Gamekeeper Cannell had not found any luminous owl. And yet this fine little tale rapidly became so well established that, several years later, writers claiming to be scientific were still citing the case among their references!

What is interesting about these two stories (as indeed in many others reported by Charles Fort in his four books devoted to strange facts for which it is difficult to find a scientific explanation) is that, in every case, we always find this mania, this obstinate determination on the part of official Science, systematically to explain these anomalies by means of absurd reasoning. Absurdity, surely, has little relation to Science, which, IN NORMAL TIMES, is renowned for the rigorously strict and prudent quality of its judgements. Which apparently seems to prove, as Monsieur de la Palice might have said, that the only way in which you can explain the abnormal is by an absurdity.

While we are on the subject of anomalies, let me here quote another. This desperate insistence constantly to conceal from the public facts that are glaringly obvious is still much in evidence today. And there's the rub! For mankind changes, and technologies evolve, and vocabularies alter, and minds think differently, and concepts change. And yet the same old "scientific" ideas remain. Strange, isn't it, because those ideas ought to be following the kinetic mechanism of our concepts as these continue to evolve.

BUT THIS SCIENTIFIC THINKING IS STAGNANT. IT IS NOT FOLLOWING THE NORMAL PROCESS OF CHANGE. It seems to be anchored, once and for all time, at precisely the same old level, so much so that the very thought that it might undergo a change is no longer conceivable to anybody. Not the slightest sign of progress is to be seen. Let us put the matter more clearly and more precisely: official Science ought long ago to have turned its serious attention to these phenomena with which we are concerned, instead of putting all its effort into covering them up. But, in our own days, here they are, still trying to fool us with their "fishmongers" and their "gamekeepers". The names of course have changed. For, however you look at it, the general ignorance of the mass of the public is less today than it was in the time of Charles Fort. But the nonsensical explanations that are being dished up to us nowadays still seem to be designed for "costive minds". Fort's "*accursed facts*" are still attributed to whatever may be handy, be it earthquakes, or volcanoes, or sudden changes of temperature, or "friction" between air layers, or solar winds, or magnetic perturbations. In a word — *anything* will do. Be it noted incidentally that we are see-

ing more and more pseudoscientific books that explain away all the "Fortean Facts", backed up by vastly abstruse solutions, though each of their authors seems to have his own different explanation. Which seems pretty odd when you reflect that these are folk who claim to explain everything in a *scientific* fashion!

However we may look at it, the fact remains that, in our own days, Science is still registering such a vast mass of natural phenomena, or allegedly natural phenomena — phenomena that we, the heirs of Charles Fort, as we consider ourselves to be, can see as proofs of the existence, here around us, of an active, hidden, intelligence that is entirely alien to our human societies.

In 1921 there was so much respect for maelstroms that the Russian government was suspected of being the cause of the mysterious disappearance of a number of ships. Today, the Russians being what they are, Science prefers to be more prudent and to blame the maelstroms. The maelstroms at any rate won't take umbrage over it.

From 1947 onwards, Science has had serious problems to solve which derive from the numerous sightings of UFOs. And, with the development of our own technologies, first in Aeronautics and then in Astronautics, Science has been able to add considerably to the number of "explanations" available in its armoury. Phosphorescent owls are no longer essential, and air-men are preferred now, rather than gamekeepers.

The winkles no longer seem to be coming down in showers, but new phenomena have made their appearance. Or maybe certain phenomena are displaying greater intensity now, while others have become less frequent.

Armadas of unidentified aerial craft are travelling through our skies; landing in our fields; appearing on our radar-screens; seen with the naked eye by professional observers of the skies; pursuing our aircraft and our rockets; flying over our strategic bases; committing acts of violence against our animals. And maybe are also committing acts of violence against human beings too . . .

Everybody knows. Or almost everybody. But nobody wants to admit it.

So they bring out the new "fishmongers", though these, it seems, have changed a good many times in their predilections over the course of the years. You can see this for yourself, by the differing "lines" in which the "fishmongers" have variously been versed, to wit, Meteorology; Zoology; Astronomy; Aeronautics; Astronautics; Psychism; Sociopsychology; and the (latest one) Psychotronics, in which a knowledge of Quantum Mechanics is needed. And there will probably be better ones (or worse) . . . yet to come!

Man has put down a dozen representatives of his species on to the Moon, but Science, and the Governments, prefer to take matters at a leisurely pace, and deem it impossible that other thinking beings might have been able to do better than that and might have got so far as to leave their own world and have embarked on voyages of exploration in Space that have brought them into the environment of our planet. Nevertheless a research programme has been set up, to determine, by means of Radio-Astronomy, whether any other intelligent civilizations exist in our Universe. To put it in other words, Science admits the possibility that extraterrestrial life might exist, and it considers that, should such be the case, it is we who will discover it rather than it that will come here to us! Please, please, Gentlemen! Let us have a little bit of modesty, a bit of humility. Prudence is one thing. Pretentiousness and bumptiousness are something else.

When I reflect upon the ambiguity of this situation that causes our scientists to scour the Universe in search of an intelligence which is right here very close to us, indeed maybe even an intelligence that has already TAKEN ROOT right here among us, then I ask myself the question: how much longer can this wretched comedy continue?

Unless of course there is something else more important than a simple agreement between governments to deceive the governed. For there is this anomaly that I have already mentioned; this astonishing *lack of curiosity* shown by our official Science towards all these strange phenomena, as well as the frivolous attitude of most of the media. A whole world, in fact, stricken with blindness as regards these bizarre things that are going on.

For nobody is any longer taken in by G.E.P.A.N. I believed in G.E.P.A.N. at the start, just as everyone else did. But now I am more inclined to think that G.E.P.A.N. was no "break" or "opening-up", but rather simply a "cover-up", a take-over. Why then this passivity, this indifference, which are more than just abnormal? Isn't this manifest proof that there has been a CLAMP-DOWN? *A clamp-down that has maybe been engineered by the very phenomenon itself, for we have long been aware that the phenomenon possesses intelligence? Super-intelligence? An intelligence that deludes us, fools us, covers up its tracks, elusive, incomprehensible, avoiding all contact, evading identification.*

*And would not the best way for this "phenomenon" to avoid identification by us be to prevent the best brains among us, the most gifted, the most learned, from taking*

*any interest in its activities? A clamp-down — not psychological but psychic in its nature — exercised upon individuals holding key-posts is possibly already in operation. A crazy idea? Well then, take a look at the facts I am now going to give you, below, and then maybe you will be prepared to 'have another think' about the question.*

Ever since 1973 there has been a recrudescence of incidents involving the mutilation of cattle. It has developed in a number of countries, but particularly in the United States. In seven years, about 12,000 animals have died through it. (I have had a number of articles on this matter published in various specialized journals.)

In April 1979, at the instigation of Senator Harrison Schmitt, a geologist and a former astronaut, a "Commission of Enquiry" was set up in the State of New Mexico, its purpose, so it was said, being to solve the mystery of the deaths of these animals.

Like almost all of the experts and the police officials who have investigated these seemingly so wanton killings, Senator Harrison Schmitt was inclined towards the theory that it was the work of human mutilators, adepts of satanic cults, who would thus be simply carrying out some of their rituals. The wounds on the animals, inflicted with a precision described as "surgical", were however such that one glance at them sufficed to convince that unquestionably tools of a highly sophisticated nature had been employed.

Well now, after a year spent in alleged investigations, this "Commission", directed by a certain Kenneth Rommel, a former FBI agent, has laid an egg in the form of a 297-page Report. And this Report can be summed up with this one phrase:-

*"There have been no mutilations. The animals allegedly mutilated died natural deaths, and the wounds reported are the work of predators." (!)*

Here we have the most absurd scientific "adaptation" put out during the period since the end of World War II! For Mr. Rommel had toed the official Science line by relying on the State Laboratories. And the autopsies carried out by the "commissioned" veterinarians yielded results which were the diametrical opposite of the results secured in autopsies by other official specialists on other occasions. What we see here is in fact a clamp-down or cover-up identical to those perpetrated in connection with the U.S. Air Force's *UFO Projects*. Rommel's conclusions are particularly mind-boggling because the carcasses of the animal victims had been examined by an impressive number of specialists. Nobody saw the Worcester fish-monger, but here, in this cattle mutilation business,



crowds of people saw the animals, all cut up in surgical fashion. Take good note once again of this anomaly: in the one case (Worcester), without any enquiry at all, everyone accepts the existence of the "fish-monger", though not a soul can be found who had seen him at work. In the second case — that of the mutilated animals — everything is rejected: the victims, the eyewitness accounts, the police reports, the autopsies made by veterinarians prior to the creation of the Commission of Enquiry, and so on . . .

With this we have reached the very zenith of stupidity, and we are justified if we ask ourselves how it can be possible that today we are still being fooled in this incredible fashion just as people were fooled precisely a century ago in the Worcester case? It is for this reason that we must not rule out the possibility that there is in operation some sort of clampdown on the process of the evolution of human thought, the purpose being to prevent man's curiosity from reaching a certain level. This would mean in effect that there are some roads that are open to us, and along which our thirst for knowledge may take us, and that there are other roads that are closed to us.

When somebody who occupies a relatively high social position starts asking a few too many questions as to the nature of certain strange, indeed even disturbing, facts . . . *hey presto*, a phoney "Commission" is formed and then . . . curtains!

All the various "Projects" of the U.S. Air Force were created only because a few elected representatives had got a bit worked up in the House of Representatives or in the Senate. So a pretence was made of listening to them . . . Roughly the same thing took place here in France with G.E.P.A.N.

The American Senator, Harrison Schmitt, who had too much curiosity, was seen off. You might even say that he was made to look crazy, and that his career has been compromised. The betting is that his term of office will not be renewed, and that he will end up somewhere in the oblivion of anonymity, somewhere in some obscure governmental bureau.

At precisely what level is the manipulation that creates the ideal conditions favouring this sort of clamp-down? Maybe it is high time that we started aiming in other directions with our research? Maybe we are wasting our time when we spend it in collecting UFO sightings? Or in producing statistics on the "Phenomenon"? Maybe all this is simply leading us nowhere?

We might, for example, try to trace it back to its source. I say "try". When it comes to *WHERE*, *TO WHOM*, and *HOW* — that's when the obstruction begins. It seems to me that this perpetual maintenance

of an obscurantist posture deserves investigation in depth, if only in order to observe how the obstructor goes about it, if indeed there be obstruction. But I don't harbour any illusions as to where we would get with such an investigation. It would probably run into a *super-wall*. But who knows? We will only know if we try. Well, you might ask me, where should we make a start?

*With the astronomers, I would say.*

I admit that I have no great liking for the astronomers. Don't get me wrong. By "astronomers" I mean of course, in essence, those astronomers who are always trotted out in TV programmes and in discussions on the radio. They are nearly always the same folk, hogging it in the discussions, contemptuous, peremptory, self-important, pontificating, utter stinkers the minute anybody "rocks the boat" by mentioning the UFOs.

Get hold of these astronomers, drag them outdoors some pitch-black night and show them anything you like that possesses any sort of light-source that is not travelling too fast. They will tell you that it is a star, they will tell you its magnitude, its parallax, and the place it occupies in its constellation. This is what Charles Fort had to say about them:-

"If nobody looks up, or checks up, what the astronomers tell us, they are free to tell us anything that they want to tell us. Their system is a slippery imposition of evasions that cannot be checked up, or that, for various reasons, mostly are not checked up . . ."

*(The Complete Books of Charles Fort, Dover Publications, New York, 1974, page 720.)*

When the astronomers talk about UFOs, they say anything they like to say, and nobody checks up on them. And I think it would be very interesting to know why. For it can't be that they are simply engrossed and bemused by the stars at which they are always peering. There must surely be some other factor that enters into it. But what is it?

And here is another point. What qualifications have the astronomers for determining whether an airborne vehicle does or does not belong to our (human) technology? They have none. You might just as well ask an ornithologist. Nor are the astronomers any more expert in questions of Astronautics or Extraterrestrial Civilizations.

And, moreover, as regards these "occlusionistic" astronomers who show such contempt for the lower strata of the atmosphere and who don't even know how to tell the difference between various types of aircraft, such as a *Super-Frelon SA-3210* and a *Breguet 1150 Atlantic*, I am more inclined to regard them as

either folk who are all right on book-learning but have failed in their examinations, or as cretins who managed to pass. I am sorry if I am hard on them. But I am only prepared to excuse accidental mistakes. I don't excuse deliberate fraud. It can rain all sorts of things: nails, coins, coal, lumps of beef, blood, or winkles...

Whole squadrons of unidentified flying objects can pass through our skies, and phantom submarines that will never put into our ports can travel to and fro in our seas.

Cattle can perish, chopped up with high surgical skill, and left drained of blood. Their remains can repel the fiercest of dogs and the most famished of coyotes.

Objects can disappear. And people can disappear. And bizarre animals can appear and leave astounding traces.

Vast numbers of other extraordinary happenings can occur, duly established, rigorously checked, scrupulously witnessed, and scrupulously certified.

On the other hand we have our segregationistic whirlpools, our meteors, our herds of whales. We have our carnivorous predators, with their teeth as well as their beaks all shaped like scalpels. We have our seismic activity, we have our swamp-gas, we have our ball-lightning, we have our phosphorescent insects,

and God knows what else. And we have all those fishmongers and all those present-day gamekeepers, well polished and groomed, all bright and shining, docketed in categories, all ready to emerge from the official cupboards.

And all this will be thrown in your face, with condescension and commiseration of course, by astrophysicists, by astronomers, by biologists, by psychiatrists — all of them experts on space-vehicles and on extra-human or extra-terrestrial civilizations. And there will always be a squad of yes-man and rubber-stamp journalists standing by to publicize it all, backed up heavily with deceitful texts, dubious radio programmes, and one-way "debates".

Maybe in twenty or thirty years from now, when all our seas will be nothing more than immense garbage-bins, the fishmongers will have disappeared, because there won't be any more winkles to scatter... And maybe later still, when the air is so polluted with the various stuff we have thrown up there that the birds can no longer breathe, well, maybe then there won't be any gamekeepers either, because there won't be any luminous owls left for them to catch.

But Science will get along all right without the fishmongers and without the gamekeepers, and will find something else instead. The panoply of ready-made explanations is in good shape, thank you very much.



Science, obscurantist, pigheaded, obstructive, obsessed, will still be there and will come and bash out to you its old tunes, its crazy, soporific old theories, backed up with iniquitous stop-gap legislation and with statistics cooked up for the occasion, all of which it will of course be highly unseemly for anyone to dispute, or even to verify . . .

So sleep in peace my lambkins. Astronomer-shepherds and anaesthetist-astrophysicists are watching over your flock . . .

A flock that has been lulled to sleep in a most masterly fashion.

*"Science is a maw, or a headless and limbless stomach,*

*an amoeba-like gut that maintains itself by incorporating the assimilable and rejecting the indigestible. There are whirlwinds and waterspouts, and it seems acceptable that there have been rare occurrences of faintly luminous owls. Then by a process of sorting over data, rejecting the objectionable, and taking in the desirable, Science saves itself great pains, because a bellyache is something that is only a gut in torment. So, with alimentary treatments, a shower of living things can always be made to assimilate with the whirlwind-explanation, and a brilliant, electric thing can be toned down digestibly. In extreme cases there is a secretion of fishmongers or gamekeepers."*

*(The Complete Books of Charles Fort, Dover Publications, New York, 1974. Page 628.)*

## BOOK REVIEW

**B**ERTHOLD E. SCHWARZ, *Ufo-Dynamics, Psychiatric and Psychic Aspects of the UFO Syndrome*. Moore Haven, Florida: Rainbow Books/Betty Wright in association with Futura Printing, Inc. 564 pp., in 2 vols. 1983. \$22.50 post-paid per set in U.S., \$24.00 post-paid per set Surface Foreign.

A prolific and important contributor to *Flying Saucer Review* is Dr. Berthold E. Schwarz, and his major contributions join some pieces published elsewhere in this collection of reprints, together with some new material. Various well-known contactees are described, especially Stella Lansing. All the essays and photographs have been reset, to a high standard; but the texts could have been more carefully organised for this reappearance. Several of the essays contain long footnotes which, therefore, could not be printed close to the keyed text. The references have not been updated, so that certain manuscripts and preprints are still so cited, even though they are now in print; on p.212 Schwarz even cites 'for future publication' an item which is now available as ch.22 here!

The common theme throughout these essays is that many of the UFO contactees also experience (other) psychical phenomena on other occasions: a sub-theme states that investigators may be subject to such phenomena in the course of their work. The task, then, is to classify these data and cases in a comprehensive way, and to produce a general theory, or at least taxonomy, of connections. It is no criticism of the book that Schwarz does not achieve such a theory; for the data are still too disparate to achieve effective correlations. Psychokinetic effects, including poltergeistery, are the most popular; but they form a vast spectrum in themselves. The task that Schwarz has set is shown by his essay entitled '*Clinical observations on telekinesis*' (pp. 484-522), which contains a wide range of cases, both his and others'; but ufology plays a small role in it.

Schwarz sums up the situation well in his freshly written introduction, in which a number of his own 'coincidences' experienced in the course of his investigations are described. It seems that in fields like this the distinction between the case and its student does not obtain in the usual way; like the well-known "experimenter effect" in psychical research, the student comes into the case as a component of its continuation, or at least of the context into which it fits. While this side of ufology is well enough recognised by researchers, not much is known about it, and this collection of Schwarz's writings is particularly useful as a source of information on this sub-theme, as well as the main theme which is the target for all of us. —

I. Grattan-Guinness