

BOOK REVIEW. BY THE EDITOR.

UFOS AND ABDUCTIONS: CHALLENGING THE BORDERS OF KNOWLEDGE.

Edited by Dr. David M. Jacobs. PhD. 382 pages, Hardback, with index, selected bibliography and chapter notes. Chapters by Dr. David Jacobs, PhD, Dr. Stuart Appelle, Ph.D., Dr. Thomas E. Bullard, Ph.D., Jerome Clark, Dr. Don Donderi, PhD., Budd Hopkins, Dr. John E. Mack. M.D., Dr. Michael Persinger, PhD., Dr. Michael Swords, PhD., and Dr. Ron Westrum, PhD., Published in 2,000 by the University Press of Kansas, \$34.95. ISBN 0-7006-1032-4

As can be seen, this list of contributors to the book contains the names of most of the U.S. scientists who are known to be interested in UFO research and, between them, they seem to say pretty well all that has been said so far by the scientific community, so I feel that there are no particular points in their arguments that would require mention here.

[The publishers, University Press of Kansas, have asked for any comments that we wish to make, so I am sending them two copies of this issue of FSR.]

NEVERTHELESS it is most important to note that, in this panoply of "the world's finest scientific minds", it is astonishing to find, also, the name of Dr. E. Mack, Professor of Psychiatry in the Harvard Medical School at the Cambridge Hospital, U.S.A. His contribution, Chapter 9, *HOW THE ABDUCTION PHENOMENON CHALLENGES THE BOUNDARIES OF OUR REALITY*, is as fine and clear as anything that this remarkable man has ever written. It seems gravely out of place here among this lot. (Could it possibly have got slipped in through some dreadful mistake?)

A second very striking feature of the book is the fact that its Editor is that same Dr. David Jacobs who wrote *THE THREAT* (published in 1998). Every one of us is free to speculate as to what could have brought about such a change in Dr. Jacobs' thinking in such a brief span of only two years, and even to wonder who - or what - may have even "got at him"!

Undeniably one of the main features of this book is that it tells us a great deal about *paranoia*, and *paranoia* in more than one quarter, for on page 138 Mr. Jerome Clark has this to say:

"A new generation of ufologists grew ever more taken with paranormal 'theories' about UFOs. Such notions, embraced by the influential British publication *Flying Saucer Review* under the editorship of the relatively restrained Charles Bowen, and, later the deeply paranoid Gordon Creighton, amounted to a thinly disguised demonology, in which malevolent shape-shifting entities pretended to be friendly extra-terrestrials in order to manipulate or even destroy their naive human contacts".

In the days of his prime, between 1961 and 1979, the name of the veteran Jerome Clark had appeared on 31 fine and interesting contributions to our pages (25 articles,

and 6 letters to the editor). The sudden illness of Charles Bowen made it necessary for me to take over the editorship of FSR in November 1982. Jerome Clark's last piece was in 1979, and, sure enough, there was no more after November 1982.

In view of my own allegedly high rating for *paranoia*, our readers will surely not be too surprised if I say that my favourite piece by Jerome Clark is this article which I republish below, *WHY UFOS ARE HOSTILE*, which had originally appeared on pages 18 - 20 of FSR 13/6 (November/December 1967).

WHY UFOS ARE HOSTILE.

© BY JEROME CLARK.

On a day in late summer 1939, a military transport left the Marine Naval Air Station in San Diego, California, for a routine flight to Honolulu. About three hours afterwards, several urgent distress signals sounded from the plane, and then silence. Later, the craft came limping back to execute an emergency landing. When Air Station personnel entered the plane, they found every man of the crew, including the co-pilot, who had lived long enough to pilot the craft back to its base, dead of unknown causes.

Each of the bodies carried large, gaping wounds, and the outside of the ship was similarly marked. Air Station men who touched parts of the craft came down with a mysterious skin infection.

One of the most puzzling aspects of the whole affair was that the .45 automatics carried by the pilot and co-pilot as service pieces had been emptied and the shells lay on the floor. A smell of "rotten eggs" pervaded the atmosphere inside the plane.

Was this 28 year-old air disaster an early case of UFO hostility? "Mysterious skin infections" (1) and "rotten egg" odours (2) are phenomena familiar to all UFO researchers. It would seem that the transport was attacked - apparently without provocation - by some sort of strange aerial intruder.

On the basis of incidents similar to this one, Brad Steiger and Joan Whritenour, in their recent *Flying Saucers are Hostile* (Award Books), have concluded that at least some UFOs are visiting the earth for malevolent ends. "There is a wealth of well documented evidence,"

they write, "that UFOs have been responsible for murders, assaults, burnings with direct-ray-focus, radiation sickness, kidnappings, pursuits of automobiles, attacks on homes, disruptions of power sources, paralysis, mysterious cremations, and destruction of aircraft."

A bit strong? Perhaps. But the material they have gathered is certainly unsettling, more than enough to expose the fallacies inherent in sentiments like those expressed by a recent contributor to these pages: "The extraterrestrials, although they may have badly frightened us, have not, so far as we know, deliberately caused any of us serious bodily harm, nor have they used lethal weapons against us. This cannot be said, alas, on our side. Unavoidable accidents may have occurred... but no deliberate act of aggression causing death has been made against us." (3)

From *UFOs Are Hostile*, and the independent research I have done on the question, I dare say that a case might be made for the remarkable restraint on our part. Although on a number of occasions jet interceptors have been scrambled to check on UFOs, there are very few instances in which these aircraft have fired on the saucers, and then only because some action of the ufonauts frightened the pilots. Keyhoe, for example, cites an incident wherein a UFO abruptly switched direction and seemed to be trying to ram the jets which were pursuing it, forcing them to open up with rockets - to no avail, evidently. (4).

There is, of course, the inane "self-defence" plea of certain apologists, who maintain that, because the UFOs are somehow menaced by us and our weapons (puny in comparison with those the UFOs possess), they must strike back to save themselves. Thus, the F89 at Kinross Air Force Base was abducted because the UFO had to "defend itself" - a curious notion since - rather than fleeing, which it could easily have done - the saucer flew directly *towards* the aircraft.

We should also remember that, while flying saucers have ostensibly downed more than a few of our planes, we have *never*, so far as is known, forced a UFO to crash, nor often tried to knock one down. I am inclined to think that we are treating our visitors with more respect than they deserve.

On the other hand, I find it very difficult to believe that the ufonauts are in the early stages of an invasion plan, as Steiger and Mrs. Whritenour profess to feel. The UFOs may be "hostile", but that is not all that can be said about them. After all, they are "indifferent", and, indeed, even "friendly" *when the occasion calls for it*.

What it comes to is this: Because UFOs have killed and injured seemingly innocent persons, we should not conclude that the saucers have sinister motives (at least, I mean, on those grounds alone). Because UFOs usually do not bother us, we should not conclude that they are indifferent to us. Because UFO beings are sometimes kind to us (as in some some contact claims), we should not conclude that they like us. We should conclude, though, *that they are intimately concerned with us - to the extent that they have gone to fantastic lengths to prevent us from knowing what they are doing*.

In earlier articles (5) I approached the issue from the

opposite corner: those claims in which ufonauts have evinced "friendliness". Let me restate my arguments briefly. In contact claims (such as those of George Adamski, Sid Padrick, and Professor Guimaraes) the ufonauts have planted a fairly consistent image of themselves, relative both to their origins and to their purposes.

In communication with human beings in post-Arnold times, the entities usually pass themselves off as benevolent beings from Venus (or other planets) whose coming is stimulated by a desire to save the human race from destroying itself. Yet there is absolutely no objective evidence, other than the contact stories, that the UFOs are either interplanetary or "friendly" in the human sense; but there *is* objective evidence that some of these contacts took place as described. The implication, then, is that the ufonauts are lying.

In the 1896-97 American flap, the UFO occupants flew crafts that resembled in structure, if not in performance, "airships" that the technology-oriented people of the late Nineteenth Century expected to see built in a very few years. Consequently, it was widely assumed that the ships had been invented and constructed by an American engineering firm. Now, of course, we know this was not the case, and that the "airship" is related to the "flying saucer" phenomenon of today.

So how does "hostility" fit into the pattern? Hostile actions are effected, the evidence hints, to cover up the "loose ends", to keep us from seeing behind the veil - to prevent anyone from exposing (if Mrs. Lorenzen will forgive me) the Great Flying Saucer Hoax.

Dr. Jacques Vallée, in his books and articles, has assigned "weight" to UFO reports. The best-authenticated are assigned "heavy" weight; the most poorly-authenticated, "low" weight. I suppose that some such classification system is necessary, and I certainly do not presume to criticise his approach. But I think that, as we come more and more to realise what the UFO mystery involves, ufologists will develop a different "weight" concept, to separate significant and insignificant reports - and this will have very little to do with the quantity or quality of witnesses.

We will eventually decide, no doubt, that the account of a peasant who witnesses a landing will "weigh" more than the account of a physicist who sees a peculiar light high in the sky. As John A. Keel has pointed out. (6) some reports are merely of "cross-overs," i.e. movements from point to point: But more ominously, other sightings are diversions, designed to draw attention away from the real object of ufonaut interest. In the Ravenna, Ohio, case - which Keel mentions specifically - the sighting at the arsenal would be "heavy", under the new system, while the police chase, despite the quality of the witnesses, would be "low". (7)

It ought to be very evident that the "hostility" incidents deserve the greatest weight of all. For in them we can see the ufonauts desperately covering up activity that reveals more about them than they dare reveal. Apparently certain actions of theirs are not meant to be observed, and seeing what should not have been seen has proved fatal to hundreds, possibly thousands, of persons around the

world. Consider a tragic incident recounted by Steiger and Whritenour:

In June 1954 an 11-year-old African boy named Laili Thindu and several companions watched odd lights flying over and landing on Mt. Kenya. The UFOs appeared to be involved in intense activity of some kind.

One night a short while later, a fleet of glowing objects swooped over a nearby village, beaming down bright rays of light. Laili Thindu witnessed the spectacle in astonishment, but not until the next day did he learn that *the entire population of the village had been seared to death.*

A brutal, vicious attack, surely, but not pointless. Whatever was being done on Mt. Kenya was of sufficient importance to the UFO beings to cause them to destroy all the witnesses. The boy survived, however, and carried his story to the authorities in Nairobi. (8)

The two young Swedes, Hans Gustavsson and Stig Rydberg were more fortunate. Returning from a dance at 2.55 a.m., they saw a light shining through an opening in the trees, where a UFO was not quite successfully concealing itself.

As they walked toward the craft, according to Rydberg: "All of a sudden we were attacked by four lead-grey creatures about four feet tall and about fourteen inches in breadth." The beings attempted to drag the men into their craft, but Rydberg escaped to the car and began to blow the horn. Frightened, they let go of Gustavsson, retreated to their ship, and flashed away. (9)

Again, the witnesses seemed to have stumbled upon a secret operation. Determined to keep them quiet, the ufonauts attempted to steal them away, but the blowing of the car horn (which might have brought more people to the scene) forced them to flee before even more damage could be done.

Mr. James Flynn of Florida, sleeping in a swamp, was awakened by his dogs, and saw a lighted object in the distance. When he approached it and tried to communicate, something or someone knocked him unconscious for over 24 hours. "A dismal swamp", the good Dr. Hynek assured us when he visited Michigan in March 1966, "is a most unlikely place for a visit from outer space." (How he knows this is a mystery). A "dismal swamp" is, quite to the contrary, a most *likely* place for a visitor who does not care to be seen or disturbed.

There are many similar cases. They usually occur in secluded areas in the darkness, and the witnesses are often paralysed, as was Marius Dewilde; injured, like Flynn, or Jesus Paz; killed, as were Miguel Jose Viana, and Manuel Pereira da Cruz; kidnapped, like Rivalino Mafra da Silva. Some incidents have special twists: Jose Viana and Pereira da Cruz apparently established contact with ufonauts and learned so much that they were lured to a Brazilian hillside and done away with. (10)

Mafra da Silva, three days before his disappearance, saw two little men digging a hole. Suddenly aware of his presence, they fled into their craft and flew away. (11) Mr. S. at Cisco Grove, California, stumbled onto a nighttime UFO operation in the middle of a deep forest. Appearing to fear he had seen too much, several ufonauts went to incredible effort in an abortive abduction try. (12)

The Barney and Betty Hill encounter adds a new dimension to the problem, with the erasing of the participants' memory of a UFO experience. (13) A similar incident, which allegedly took place in Brazil in November 1961, has recently come to light. (14) A little known contact has it that an American working in Austria in 1951 had his memory preserved only because a dog's barking frightened the ufonaut away at the last minute. (15) Ufologists are investigating other "memory lapses" right now.

Air disasters like the one described at the beginning of this article might be explained not as random attacks but as strikes necessitated by the aircrafts' crew and passengers having come upon secret UFO activities which, if reported, could provide valuable clues to informed terrestrials.

I feel that I should mention in passing the rather startling work of an American investigator who has discovered that mysterious individuals of decidedly odd physical appearance are threatening and sometimes attempting to kidnap witnesses to certain UFO sightings. These men, whoever they are, do not seem to be government agents, but they *are* determined to keep some people from talking.

As I have said, "hostile" incidents do not in themselves prove that the over-all plan of the UFOs is dangerous to us. But neither do they show that our visitors are the patient, all-wise, god-like figures in whom some UFO students (perhaps victims of the breakdown of traditional religion) insist on believing, despite all the evidence to the contrary.

The UFO, as the works of Paul Misraki (16) and W.R. Drake (17) have indicated, is a phenomenon at least as old as civilised man. The UFO holds a highly significant place in the history of humanity, and some imaginative theorists have suggested that these extra-mundane intelligences have secretly guided us - or used us.

Who knows? It is too early for us to speculate intelligently on the nature of the UFO mission. But we are involved in it to the extent that it would be to the ufonauts' detriment for us to know about it. So they act positively and negatively in their dealings with us.

Positively, they seek contact with human beings and deliberately mislead those daring and presumptuous enough to believe in their existence to start with. (They don't have to bother with the sceptics, of course!)

Negatively, they destroy or drive away those who, however briefly and imperfectly, have seen through the facade. The ufonauts could behave in this manner whether their motives happen to be "good" or "bad" for us (probably only an incidental question to them) - just so long as their purposes are concealed from us.

All of which makes UFO research infinitely more difficult. But we can learn. We can reject the "obvious" conclusions, i.e., what we are *supposed* to conclude, and we can begin all over again, paying special attention to the cases that don't "fit", which will be a tiny minority of reported sightings - and the most important.

Particular attention should be paid to incidents that occur in backwater areas, where encounters with ufonauts are accidental and where the ufonauts probably do not

expect to find human beings. The Cisco Grove story is a prime example, and so is Flynn's Florida report.

The results of this new approach to UFO study should bring us closer to the truth than we have ever been before. ■

REFERENCES.

- (1) The Merom, Indiana, case (Rene Gilham) of November 1957, and others.
- (2) The Flatwoods, West Virginia, landing of September 1952, and others.
- (3) Ivan Brandt, *The Problem of the Frankensteins*, FSR, May/June 1967.
- (4) We might add that the governments of the world have generally afforded the UFOs *preferential treatment*. The objects have *not* been treated as enemy aircraft, which would have immediately been blasted from the skies.
- (5) Jerome Clark, *The Meaning of Contact*, FSR September/October 1965, and *The Strange Case of the 1897 Airship*, FSR, July/August 1966.
- (6) John A. Keel, *North America 1966: Development of a Great Wave*, FSR, March/April 1967.
- (7) "... the Ohio incident ... began near Ravenna, Ohio, the site of a large government arsenal. While the two police officers were dashing across the countryside in pursuit of their dome-shaped cloud of swamp gas [sic], a reddish circular object was operating at ground level around the arsenal. This appears to be a case of pure diversion and misdirection. By luring the local police away from the area, the UFOs were able to make their

visit to the arsenal without interference.

(8) A recent article in *Sports Afield*, an American outdoor magazine, claims that a tribe of Indians in Alaska has a tradition that "Sky People" regularly land in saucer-shaped vehicles on mountain ranges and abduct individuals who come upon them.

(9) For a complete account, see Coral E. Lorenzen's *Flying Saucers: the Startling Evidence of the Invasion from Outer Space* (Signet, 1966 - a revised, updated paperback version of *The Great Flying Saucer Hoax*) pp. 60 - 64.

(10) Charles Bowen, *The Mystery of the Morro Do Vintem*, FSR, March/April 1967.

(11) Coral Lorenzen, *The Disappearance of Rivalino Mafra da Silva: kidnapped by a UFO?* FATE June 1963, See also

(12) Coral Lorenzen, *UFO Occupants in United States Reports*, THE HUMANOIDS (FSR Special Issue, October/November, 1966, pp 61-63.

(13) John G. Fuller, *The Interrupted Journey* (Dial Press, 1966)

(14) Coral and Jim Lorenzen, *Flying Saucer Occupants* (Signet, 1967), pp. 199-200.

(15) *Prince George Citizen*, 1957. See also Charles Bowen: *Fantasy or Truth?* FSR, July/August 1967.


(16) Paul Misraki (writing as "Paul Thomas"), *Flying Saucers through the Ages* (Neville Spearman, 1965).

(17) W.R. Drake, *Gods or Spacemen?* (Amherst Press, 1964) and *Spacemen in the Ancient East* (Neville Spearman, 1967).

THE "HUMAN-LOOKING" ALIENS. © BY R.P. COLLINS.

(EVIDENCIA OVNI, No. 9 (Puerto Rico, 1995) (Translation from Spanish. G.C.)

"The problem is that, along with the reports of "humanoid" beings there were also reports of "human beings" breathing our air and walking around normally on the Earth. The most logical conclusion that you can draw from this is that these beings are humans, or are in some way or other the product of the human imagination. You cannot ascribe them to the biology of another planet, no matter how much you stretch your imagination." -DR. JACQUES VALLÉE. (Interview with *OMNI*, January 1980).



Author: R.P. Collins