

WISHFUL-THINKING AND SELF-DECEPTION

© By Cyril Marystone (New York City)

Dear Mr. Creighton

Your translation and publication of excerpts from the work of Dr. Daniel Rebisso Giese, "Extraterrestrial Vampires in the Amazon Region of Brazil" (FSR, 39/3 and 41/2) were excellent. Is it not just one more piece of evidence of the vampiric - and demonic - character of the aliens? Whether or not the blood they take is "from women's breasts," we already know of the alien interest in human sex organs and reproductive material from the works of Hopkins and others, and of the alien interest in blood from the reports of the surgical animal "mutilations" and blood-draining.

The article of Florin Gheorghita, "UFO With Occupants Seen to Produce Crop-Circles in Roma-

nia," was also outstanding.

On the other hand, I believe that the assertions of Command Sergeant-Major Robert Dean in "We Are in Contact With Several Extraterrestrial Civilizations" (39/3) are full of alien deceptions, whether or not Sgt-Major Dean is personally aware of them. The simple fact is that the aliens create illusions and delusions in the minds of their human victims. See the enclosed article of Budd Hopkins, "Abduction and Deception" and my critique of it. I believe that a discussion of this subject of deliberate alien deceptions is long overdue in UFO research.

With all best wishes for the continued health of yourself and your wife, and also of FSR,

I am, sincerely, Cyril Marystone,
New York 10467, NY, USA, February 28, 1995

(Republished by FSR with permission from IUR Reporter, September/October 1990)

1. ABDUCTION AND DECEPTION

© By Budd Hopkins

Budd Hopkins, author of *Missing Time* (1981) and *Intruders* (1987), is Executive Director of the Intruders Foundation (Box 30233, New York, New York 10011).

In January 1988 two young women students at American University in Washington, D.C. attended a party in a suburb of the city. Around 2:00 a.m., while driving home through an unfamiliar area of warehouses and small factories, they realized they were lost. But then they suddenly came upon a most peculiar sight: a six-car pile-up in the middle of an intersection.

Six vehicles lay smashed together, and yet there was not a soul in sight: no police, no paramedics, no spectators, no drivers, no passengers, no injured people — nothing but a deserted six-car pile-up in the middle of a traffic-free intersection. There were no emergency vehicles, no flashing lights, no flares, no sirens, no sounds.

The two women felt uneasy about the eerie stillness of this abandoned tableau, and though they slowed down at the scene of the accident, they did not stop. They arrived home unusually late that night, puzzled and confused by an experience that made no sense.

A few months later, in the spring, the young woman who had been driving that night read my book *Intruders* and wrote me a letter. In her note Kerry (pseudonym) described only a childhood missing-time experience and a later series of disturbing, UFO-related dreams. We met, I worked with her, and eventually a number of UFO-abduction encounters emerged, events that had taken place at intervals throughout her life. We had known one another for at least a year before she told me about the late-night drive in Washington and the peculiar six-car accident she remembered having seen. She remarked that this incident had always bothered her and

that now, in the light of other things she was recalling, she decided to tell me about it. What we ultimately uncovered about this incident has added important new information to our knowledge of the abduction phenomenon and the deceptiveness that is so often part of it.

On its face everything about this story of a deserted six-car pile-up was implausible; yet I knew Kerry to be a credible witness with a good memory. I suspected, of course, that the massive wreck never took place and that her recollection was a cover story imposed to mask a UFO abduction and the period of missing time it entailed. The first step in my investigation was a telephone call to Ann (pseudonym), Kerry's companion that night, to obtain her side of the story. Ann recalled the odd six-car pile-up well: significantly, she had even described it to her mother the week she remembered its having occurred. She corroborated virtually every detail Kerry had related, adding that she often wondered why they hadn't stopped at the accident scene. **"Someone might have been hurt," she said, "but we truly didn't see anybody in any of the cars."** I asked if they had later reported it to the police; they had *not* and that, too, seemed odd, to all three of us. The whole experience, Ann felt, had been *almost dream-like*.

To explore the matter further, Ann and Kerry separately agreed to undergo regressive hypnosis. The results of these sessions were both surprising and important. The two women's mutually supportive accounts indicate that though Kerry was abducted, Ann was not; she was apparently held in the by-now-familiar "switched-off" state of suspended animation during the time her friend was taken into a hovering UFO. Under hypnosis Kerry recalled first seeing the six-vehicle wreck down the road, then slowing down and finally stopping. Several UFO occupants approached their stalled vehicle while Ann stared straight ahead, unmoving. The aliens took Kerry out and walked her into what she saw now as a UFO instead of a deserted automobile accident. After a typical abduction examination she was returned and told that **what she saw she will remember as a six-vehicle accident**. She got back into the car next to a still-staring Ann, started the motor, and drove off as her friend's normal animation returned.

Ann's account under hypnosis began with the scene of the wrecked automobiles and faded away as she remembered their own car's slowing to a stop. (Before hypnosis, as I have pointed out, neither woman had recalled the car's stopping.) Ann's very next memory was of their car's moving once more, driving away from the accident scene as she looked back through the rear window. The most important new aspect of this case, therefore, involves Ann, the nonabductee bystander, rather than Kerry, the one actually abducted that night. Since I first encountered the phenomenon of the *screen memory* nearly 15 years ago, I have known that UFO occupants can alter the memories of abductees at will.

But this Washington case establishes a major new corollary: identical screen memories — plausible or out-

rageous — can be imposed with equal ease upon **nonabductee witnesses to the same encounter. Inconvenient witnesses present no problems, and thus abductions in semipublic areas can remain covert.**

Some researchers have defined a screen memory as an image *invented by the abductee himself or herself* to soften the impact of disturbing UFO reality upon one's own psyche. The Washington case clearly refutes the idea that screen memories are always self-generated; in this instance an identically detailed, outlandish screen memory was obviously imposed upon two different persons, one an abductee and another merely her companion, apparently as a cover story to mask their late arrival at home. **One cannot escape the conclusion that this image of a non-existent six-car pile-up was "played into their minds" from the outside by UFO occupants bent on deception. And this incident is only one of a number of similar cases I have looked into since that time; all underline the extraordinary mind-control powers at the disposal of UFO occupants, available for use on anyone at any time.**

Alien appearances have been disguised hundreds of ways, most often by externally-imposed imagery. Though the range of screen memories is surprisingly broad, animal images predominate. One abductee, Virginia Horton, remembered talking with an intelligent grey "deer" and in a West Coast abduction case a woman described a five-foot-tall "owl" which walked down the highway and peered at her over the hood of her jeep.

A different pattern of deception occurs when abductees are assured by the UFO occupants that they are safe and will not be hurt, only to have instruments penetrate their abdomens or needles thrust up into their nostrils, procedures that sometimes cause blinding flashes of pain. By contrast I remember with gratitude that my dentist used to warn me of coming pain: "Now this may hurt a little, but only for an instant." He was usually right, and I appreciated his honesty. UFO occupants, however, are not hesitant to promise safety and deliver pain. **Telling the truth to their subjects seems as irrelevant to them as it would be for us to be honest with our laboratory animals.**

Though the aliens do not gratuitously inflict pain, they surely do not feel the need either to warn us of it, to explain their procedures or to ask our permission first. And since the abduction process seems invariably to begin in early childhood or even infancy, this kind of communication would be impossible in any case. By the time an abductee is old enough to understand what might be going on, he or she has already been thoroughly trained and conditioned and is by habit, one might say, putty in alien hands. Sadly, deception is as much a part of the UFO phenomenon as are flashing lights, examination tables, and small grey figures.

As we now know, researchers have seen in hundreds of cases evidence of the profound interest UFO occupants have exhibited in basic human sexuality. This alien curiosity extends to both the physical and emotional

aspects of reproduction and to both the biological and psychological processes of parenting. Because of this long-term interest in human affairs, we can assume that the aliens are aware of the enormous power of our instinctive maternal and paternal feelings.

In this context it has been especially disturbing to me to hear so frequently a particular kind of report: many abductees describe having been told, from their earliest childhood abduction recollections onward, that certain UFO occupants are their *real* parents. A very young abductee is often systematically trained to believe, in effect, that the woman who lives at home, on Earth, is a false mother, an unrelated impostor. The young abductee often holds this subtly-imposed concept well on into later life, passively accepting the idea that the woman from whom one was physically delivered after nine months of shared lifeblood, the woman by whom one was nursed and protected and nurtured and loved, is an impostor. The one who *truly* loves the child, according to this idea, is one of those doing the abducting and conducting the physical experiments! And the basis for this often very strongly-held belief is solely—*solely*—the word of an alien.

How can one judge the truth of this proposition if, since infancy, the young, impressionable abductee has been told again and again by an obviously untrustworthy source that his or her *real* parent or parents are not of this world? Even if one grants the possibility of genetic engineering in such cases, with the involvement of alien genes in the abductee's conception, the human being who bore and reared that child is in no way an impostor. Considering all we know about the UFO occupants' intense study of human parenting and the patterns of deception routinely employed during abductions, one comes to an inescapable conclusion: these stories of alien parentage offer a clever and efficient way of rendering young abductees more tractable, more easily handled. **"Do what we tell you to do, love us, obey us and give us your loyalty, because after all we're your real parents."**

Essentially these alien-parentage tales should be regarded as lies—lies both more complex and infinitely more dangerous than implanted stories of six-car pile-ups and five-foot owls. Sadly, one can only guess how many times these subversive accounts have damaged the fragile texture of family life around the world.

Another equally dangerous but much less frequently reported story apparently told by UFO occupants to their very young abductees is this: "You have no right to object to our taking you because you've already given your permission." Often this self-serving explanation is fleshed out with imagery having to do with an "earlier life" or even, in a few rare cases, a previous life as an alien. Otherwise intelligent people, who might regard with deep suspicion any such statement coming from the mouth of a mere fellow human being, frequently accept "permission accounts" as the unvarnished truth—especially if they emerge from a recollected encounter with UFO occupants. And there are some in whom this has been so deeply ingrained that they actively try to press

this belief onto others, telling abductees who do not agree with them that they have no right to be angry or frightened or upset if they or their children are being seized against their wills. **"You gave your permission," they insist, "either now or in some earlier life, whether you remember it or not"**. Just as some people do not believe in rape—"she was asking for it," "subconsciously she wanted it"—these avid permission-believers will not accept as true an abductee's statement that he or she did not give permission for these abductions, would never do so under any conditions, and desperately wants the abductions to stop.

As an illustration of the absurdity of the unremembered-permission idea, a young man was once passionately maintaining to an older female abductee the theory that in an earlier life she had somehow unconsciously granted the aliens permission to seize her whenever they chose. The abductee was naturally angered by this assertion, and after a moment she demanded that the young permission-believer immediately hand over to her his car keys, bankbook and wallet. Taken aback, he refused to hand over anything. The woman then explained herself in this way: "I remember, even if you don't, that in a previous incarnation you promised to give me all your worldly possessions whenever I chose to ask for them, simply as an exercise in humility." After all, any unremembered permission or promise from an "earlier life" is exactly as valuable and exactly as unprovable as any other.

After years of investigation we know many things about the *modus operandi* of the UFO-abduction phenomenon. We know that deception is central to the covert nature of alien behaviour. Within the abduction experience something much more efficient than human brainwashing takes place routinely, and abductees' recollections can be altered at will. Human subjects can be made to vividly see things that were never there, like talking deer and six-car automobile accidents. As children, abductees can be systematically conditioned to believe that their real parents are impostors, and that they themselves are literally the children of their captors. Normally rational adult abductees can be trained to feel that once, in some vague, earlier life, they gave permission for the aliens to do whatever they wish for all time, to themselves and even to their own children, no matter how damaging or demeaning.

We know that UFO occupants have their own agenda and that we are not being offered much trustworthy information about their goals, their nature or their methods. We know that they do not seem to be either deliberately hurting us or deliberately helping us. They seem to be neither malevolent nor benign. As human beings we know infinitely more about ourselves than we do about such shadowy, elusive entities as UFO occupants. We know that as humans we must support rather than hurt one another, but we do not always behave that way.

A woman with whom I have worked recently has had a series of abduction encounters in which she was paralyzed, examined and, among other things,

forced to have intercourse with an unknown male abductee. She has recalled another experience in which she was immobilized while her 13 year old daughter was abducted, for what purposes she could only guess. This woman, understandably, is feeling angry, frightened and powerless. In a search for help and understanding she attended a New England abductee support group in which she was told in no uncertain terms that she had no right to express those emotions. She was informed that it was wrong to feel such “negative” things since she had undoubtedly given her permission to the aliens to do as they wished, even though she could not recall having done so. To make matters worse, she was told that as an abductee she was herself part alien, “one with the Visitors.”

Now, those who have enough blind faith to believe such things can believe them, but no one has a right to try to inflict these ideas on unwilling others, such as a young mother whose adolescent child has recently been abducted. The attempt to scold an abductee into blaming herself for the pain and anger she was experiencing at alien hands is nothing less than an act of sadism.

Our responsibilities are great. We must continue our investigations on two fronts - as objective scientists, gathering evidence and searching for patterns, and as de facto healers, seeking to bind up the psychic wounds inflicted on those who have been regularly undergoing such disturbing events. But at each step of the way, until new evidence surfaces about the nature of UFO abductions, we need to avoid falling into either of two equally miring ideological bogs. First, we should never regard ourselves as the enemies of UFO occupants; that is a sure path to paranoia and despair. We must remain open to the possible value of what many people have described as the

broadening nature of the UFO-contact experience. To recognise the negative aspects of abductions is not to assume that those unsettling reports were intended.

A homely example will explain more fully what I mean. Suppose you are sitting on a bus, calmly reading your newspaper, but your foot extends a bit into the aisle. Suddenly there’s an excruciating pain; you look up and see a 300-pound blind man standing on your foot. It is clear that he did not intend to hurt you, but that doesn’t help the pain or change the fact that you now have a broken toe. **In 15 years of abduction research I have encountered not a shred of evidence that suggests UFO occupants are innately evil. But sadly, in the meantime I’ve seen the equivalent of hundreds upon hundreds of broken toes.**

The second ideological trap is more seductive. We must vehemently guard against letting our optimistic hopes about the UFO phenomenon obscure our sense of reality. There are those who tell us, on no firm evidence, that the UFO occupants must surely be friendly, helpful and benign, and so we should overlook our fear and pain and simply trust the Space Brothers and welcome the Visitors. This is a little like offering the 300-pound blind man your other foot on the grounds that after all, he’s probably a nice, well-meaning person. Of all the things we know about the UFO occupants, two features stand out; their innate deceptiveness and their power to implant self-serving ideas and images at will. **One should no more trust an alien assurance of any kind than one would trust an Air Force handout on UFO reality.**

We owe our allegiance only to our fellow human beings. Without regarding UFO occupants as foes, we must never allow ourselves to be used or misled by them to the point that we become mere apologists for alien depredations. Human beings must come first, on every front. ■

II. WISHFUL-THINKING AND SELF-DECEPTION OF ABDUCTEES AND UFOLOGISTS

© By Cyril Marystone

This paper is a commentary on the article of Budd Hopkins, “*Abduction and Deception*,” contained in the *International UFO Reporter* of September/October 1990. The article shows both the genius of Budd Hopkins and his failure. The genius of Hopkins is evident in his pro-

found discovery that the UFO aliens are playing “screen memories” — ie., false memories, illusions and delusions — into the minds of abductees, in order to cover up and hide their dirty work of abducting and operating on the humans they kidnap.

The failure of Hopkins lies in his wishful-thinking and self-delusion that the aliens are not malevolent.

Indeed, the article of Hopkins seems almost self-contradictory. Piece after piece of evidence is presented which shows that what the aliens are doing to abductees is evil. Yet, despite this evidence (and the vastly greater similar evidence that exists outside of his article!), Hopkins comes to the conclusion that the aliens are not malevolent. ie, they are not deliberately trying to harm their human abductees. One is left wondering why the aliens try to cover up and hide these memories, if these memories do not show evil alien behaviour.

Before continuing this discussion, we should present some of the evidence and remarks of Hopkins contained in his article. He begins by describing the case of two young women students who were driving home from a party one night in 1988 in the Washington, D.C. area. While driving home at 2 am, the women came upon what seemed to be a huge accident — “a six-car pile-up in the middle of an intersection.” Strangely, however, “there was not a soul in sight: no police, no paramedics, no spectators, no passengers, no injured people.” Strangely also, the two women “arrived home unusually late that night, puzzled and confused by an experience that made no sense.”

Because of the weirdness of the events, Hopkins suggested to the women that they undergo hypnotic regression to recover their lost memories, and it was later found that they had undergone a UFO abduction experience. Only one of the two women was actually abducted and taken into a UFO, however, the other was rendered unconscious and held in this “switched-off” state until the abductee was returned. The aliens took the abductee out of the car and walked her “**into what she saw now as a UFO instead of a deserted automobile accident.**”

Hopkins goes on to state his penetrating conclusions: —

Her recollection was a cover story imposed to mask a UFO abduction and the period of missing time it entailed... After a typical abduction examination, she was returned and told that **what she saw she will remember as a six-vehicle accident...**

...Since I first encountered the phenomenon of the screen memory nearly 15 years ago, I have known that **UFO occupants can alter the memories of abductees at will...** The Washington case clearly refutes the idea that screen memories are always self-generated: in this instance an identically detailed, outlandish screen memory was obviously imposed upon two different persons, one an abductee and another merely her companion, apparently as a cover story to mask their late arrival at home. **One cannot escape the conclusion that this image of a nonexistent six-car pile-up was ‘played into their minds’ from the outside by UFO occupants bent upon deception.** And this incident is only one of a number of similar cases...

Alien appearances have been disguised hundreds of ways, most often by externally-imposed imagery. Though the range of screen memories is surprisingly broad, animal images predominate. One abductee... remembered talking with an intelligent grey “deer”, and in a West Coast abduction case a woman

described a five-foot-tall “owl” which walked down the highway and peered at her over the hood of her jeep.

A different pattern of deception occurs when abductees are assured by the UFO occupants that they are safe and will not be hurt, only to have instruments penetrate their abdomens or needles thrust up into their nostrils, procedures that sometimes cause blinding flashes of pain... UFO occupants... are not hesitant to promise safety and deliver pain... **Sadly, deception is as much a part of the UFO phenomenon as are flashing lights, examination tables, and small grey figures.**

.. it has been especially disturbing to me to hear so frequently a particular kind of report: many abductees describe having been told, from their earliest childhood abduction recollections onward, that certain UFO occupants are their **real parents**. **A very young abductee is often systematically trained to believe, in effect, that the woman who lives at home, on Earth, is a false mother, an unrelated impostor. The one who truly loves the child, according to this idea, is one of those doing the abducting, and conducting the physical experiments!...**

... these stories of alien parentage offer a clever and efficient way of rendering young abductees more tractable, more easily handled. **“Do what we tell you to do, love us, obey us and give us your loyalty, because after all we’re your real parents.”**

Essentially these alien-parentage tales should be regarded as lies — lies both more complex and infinitely more dangerous than implanted stories of six-car pile-ups and five-foot owls. Sadly, one can only guess how many times these subversive accounts have damaged the fragile texture of family life around the world.

Another equally dangerous but much less frequently reported story apparently told by UFO occupants to their young abductees is this: **“You have no right to object to our taking you because you’ve already given your permission.”** Often this self-serving explanation is fleshed out with imagery having to do with an **“earlier life” or even... a previous life as an alien.** Otherwise intelligent people, who might regard with deep suspicion any such statement coming from the mouth of a mere fellow human being, frequently accept “permission accounts” as the unvarnished truth — especially if they emerge from a recollected encounter with UFO occupants. And there are some in whom this has been so deeply ingrained that they actively try to press this belief onto others, telling abductees who do not agree with them that they have no right to be angry or frightened or upset if they or their children are being seized against their wills. “You gave your permission” they insist, “either now or in some earlier life, whether you remember it or not.”

... these avid permission-believers will not accept as true an abductee’s statement that he or she did not give permission for these abductions, would never do so under any conditions, and desperately wants the abductions to stop...

After years of investigation, we know many things about the *modus operandi* of the UFO-abduction phenomenon. **We know that deception is central to the covert nature of alien behaviour. Within the abduction experience, something much more efficient than human brainwashing takes place routinely, and abductees' recollections can be altered at will. Human subjects can be made to vividly see things that were never there, like talking deer and six-car automobile accidents. And children abductees can be systematically conditioned to believe that their real parents are impostors, and that they themselves are literally the children of their captors. Normally rational adult abductees can be trained to feel that once, in some vague, earlier life, they gave permission for the aliens to do whatever they wish for all time, to themselves and even to their own children, no matter how damaging or demeaning.**

...We know that these abduction experiences, as recalled by the subjects themselves, are often frightening, sometimes painful and certainly psychologically damaging...**A woman with whom I have worked recently has had a series of abduction encounters in which she was paralyzed, examined and, among other things, forced to have intercourse with an unknown male abductee....** In a search for help and understanding, she attended a New England abductee support group in which she was told in no uncertain terms that she had no right to express those emotions. She was informed that it was wrong to feel such "negative" things, since she had undoubtedly given her permission to the aliens to do as they wished, even though she could not recall having done so. To make matters worse, she was told that as an abductee she was herself part alien, "one of the Visitors."

...The attempt to scold an abductee into blaming herself for the pain and anger she was experiencing at alien hands is nothing less than an act of sadism.....

Of all the things we know about the UFO occupants, two features stand out: their innate deceptiveness, and their power to implant self-serving ideas and images at will. One should no more trust an alien assurance of any kind, than one would trust an Air Force handout on UFO reality. We owe our allegiance only to our fellow human beings Human beings must come first, on every front.

Thus far we have the very brilliant and human insights of Hopkins into the abduction phenomenon. Now we must unfortunately turn to the blindness and failures. In spite of all the previous negative remarks about the aliens, Hopkins also states:

1 We know that they do not seem to be either deliberately hurting us or deliberately helping us. They seem to be neither malevolent nor benign....

2. In 15 years of abduction research, I have encountered not a shred of evidence that suggests UFO occupants are innately evil...

3. the aliens do not gratuitously inflict pain.
4. we should never regard ourselves as the

enemies of UFO occupants: that is a sure path to paranoia and despair. We must remain open to the possible value of what many people have described as the broadening nature of the UFO-contact experience. To recognize the negative aspects of abductions is not to assume that those unsettling reports were intended.

So there we have it. According to Hopkins, the UFO aliens terrorize humans, kidnap them and their children, fill their memories with illusions and deceptions and lies, rape humans or have them raped, steal eggs from women and sperm from men, steal foetuses, perform involuntary operations upon humans such as implanting devices to track (and possibly monitor and control) abductees, give humans terrible pain, tell abductees that their parents are "impostors" and that they have had "previous lives" in which they made promises to the aliens, drive some humans to suicide, boast that they are god-like and superior to man, etc. etc. **And in spite of all this, he says that they are not malevolent!!** If by their actions we do not know them, how else are humans to judge the aliens?

Hopkins does not accept the alien claim that they are both intellectually and morally superior to mankind, and so he does not blame them for their abominations on mankind. He says. "We know that they do not seem to be ... deliberately hurting us." **But he does not really "know" this. He is merely wishing this to be true.** With regard to the intentions of the aliens, Hopkins draws an analogy:

.... Suppose you are sitting on a bus, calmly reading your newspaper, but your foot extends a bit into the aisle. Suddenly there's an excruciating pain: you look up and see a 300-pound blind man standing on your foot. It is clear that he did not intend to hurt you, but.... you now have a broken toe.

According to Hopkins, the aliens are like the 300 pound blind man who unintentionally stepped on your toe in the bus. This analogy is completely false. First, the aliens are not blind. Since they abduct humans so often at night, they even seem to be able to see in the darkness. Second, the aliens consciously and deliberately select and abduct the humans they want. **The abductions are completely intentional.** In the article by Hopkins, note that he repeatedly uses the word "systematically" to describe the activities of the aliens (systematically trained," "systematically conditioned"). So there is no doubt that the aliens know what they are doing.

Hopkins says that the alien-parentage tales should be regarded as "lies". The dictionary defines a "lie" as **"an untrue statement made with intent to deceive."** Deceiving people is evil and lies are intentional, contrary to the analogy of Hopkins.

Finally, the aliens know perfectly well when they are hurting humans, since they routinely employ pain as a means of controlling abductees. Along with physical pain, the aliens use "psychological pain," such as threats (unspoken or spoken) of further abductions or

other punishments, to render abductees submissive. To think that the aliens, with their intensive “mindscan” operations, are incapable of reading and understanding the signs of their torture on abductees’ faces and bodies is simply ludicrous.

An example of the alien use of pain to control abductee responses is shown on pp. 137-138 of Raymond Fowler’s *The Andreasson Affair*. **In addition, the phenomena of alien control of speech facilities, voices in the head, and speaking in unknown languages, described in these pages, is completely identical to that of demonic possession. In full demonic possession, there is also the phenomenon of “missing time” (ie loss of consciousness during the period of the possession fit) characteristic of abductions. Likewise, in the partial demonic possession, there is the phenomenon of “compulsion”, also apparent in the actions of UFO abductees.** See the writer’s paper *“Possession — Demoniacal and Other,”* which is a review of the work of T.K. Oesterreich of the same title, in relation to abduction phenomena.

The repeated infliction of pain, as well as the repeated giving of rewards, is a tool of alien conditioning and control.

If a man rapes a woman because of his uncontrolled sexual desire, this is apparently OK to Hopkins, as long as the man harbours no innate hatred for the woman. He just “has his own agenda” and “is doing his own thing,” like the aliens. Likewise if a person steals the property of another to satisfy his own desire, this is apparently OK to Hopkins, as long as the thief bears no hatred for the human from whom he steals. Hopkins seems to think that “malevolence” does not depend upon **“the damage consciously done to the victim by the perpetrator. But it does: conscious actions show intentions.**

The aliens just do not understand us, Hopkins says. This is the explanation he gives for their evil behaviour in regard to the humans. **Yet there are probably thousands of cases where humans — abductees and others — have received messages from the aliens saying, or implying, that they are both intellectually and morally superior to mankind.** The aliens constantly prattle on about how good and superior they are, coming from the heavens and the “Galactic Confederation,” and how inferior and evil man of Earth is with all of his hatred, wars, pollution, egoism, etc. Thus the question for the ufologist is: How can the aliens be so intellectually and morally superior to mankind, and yet be doing such abominable things to abductees? “They just don’t understand us”? **The evidence is that they understand us more than we do ourselves!**

Hopkins says that he has not found one case of malevolent aliens in 15 years! Apparently the customary cool, intellectual demeanour of the aliens deceives him. In relation to this, one wonders how many cases Hopkins rejected out of hand as “unreliable” or “unreal” simply because of his dogma that the aliens are not malevolent. Of course you are not going to find any malevolent aliens in 15 years — or in 15 million years — if you

unconsciously or consciously censor out the apparently malevolent cases as **“unreliable” or unreal**”. For example how does he treat the reports of aliens who killed and drained the blood from humans in Brazil during 1977, as reported in the Autumn 1994 issue of Gordon Creighton’s *Flying Saucer Review*?

The aliens know what they are doing, and indeed constantly boast of their own superiority. One might conclude that Hopkins could not face the truth, so he created the delusion for himself that the aliens are not malevolent. This delusion seems to be like the Freudian “screen memory” or “cover story” described by Hopkins himself. According to this concept, the victim of a horrible, traumatic experience may create a delusion for himself or herself, in order to make the memory of the event more palatable. After listening to the pains and suffering of so many abduction accounts — and taking them all to heart — Hopkins may have grasped the horror of them all and reacted as to a traumatic experience. In his great sympathy for abductees, he identified with them.

Hopkins may also have felt threatened if he believed and published that the aliens are malevolent. He would be right to feel so, because he would then be their enemy. Would he have suffered some “accident” like those described in many UFO-related “accident” reports? We do not know. Whatever the case, it is clear that he would have felt psychologically threatened, since he says that “we should never regard ourselves as the enemies of UFO occupants: **that is the sure way to paranoia and despair.**”

But if the aliens really **are** malevolent, is facing the truth really “paranoia and despair.?” Is it a mental disease to tell the truth, as Hopkins implies?

It is not difficult to understand why Hopkins takes the position he does. One hears from abductees and ufologists many statements to the effect that the power of the aliens is vastly greater than that of mankind, and therefore it would be foolish to fight them”... the aliens have demonstrated that their power and technology far exceed that of mankind.” “We have no defence against them.”

“They can do what they want with us, and we cannot stop them.” “They could have taken over our planet and wiped out the human race decades ago, if they really wanted to.” Etc.

Much of this may be true, but does it excuse us from not telling the truth to ourselves?

And if the aliens are really demons, there are definite ways of fighting them, contrary to the preceding remarks. But one must recognise an enemy in order to fight him, and this is what the position of Hopkins prevents.

Finally, the reason why the aliens have not taken over our planet thus far may be because they have been prevented from doing so by a Higher Power, rather than because they are allegedly “not malevolent” (that the evidence generally contradicts).

It may be replied that many abductees have been converted to the alien viewpoint, even after all of the pains and outrages of their initial abductions. For exam-

ple, one may point to the thirteen abductees described by Dr. John Mack in his recent work. *Abduction*. Most **seemed to end by submitting to the aliens.**

In relation to this, I mention again the fact that the repeated infliction of pain, as well as the repeated giving of rewards, is a tool of alien conditioning and control. When the aliens deal with abductees, everything is a matter of condition and deception. As in training a dog, both punishments and rewards are used, and they are used repeatedly in both hidden and open ways. The alien punishments — the abductions, terrors, pains, threats etc — used to drive abductees down into submission are well-known. Note also the so-called “*Stockholm syndrome*” described by Dr. Mack.

One must also mention the “rewards” used by the aliens to **seduce** their abductees. They are certainly real. Some abductees who have submitted to — or “cooperated” with — the aliens have become celebrities. Many have suddenly gained “psychic abilities” (ie the alleged ability to predict future events, read minds, levitate, move objects or bend spoons with their minds. etc.)

While these so-called “psychic abilities” no doubt involve real phenomena, here again alien deception is involved. Abductees are led to believe that **they** possess these powers themselves, and that they have gained them as a result of “cooperation” with the aliens. **In reality, the invisible aliens produce “psychic abilities” for cooperative abductees behind the scenes.** According to the article “*Psychic Uri Geller,*” in the **UFO ANNUAL 1977**, Uri Geller stated: “**I get my power from UFO intelligences**”.

By itself the human mind has no power to move objects. But knowing the human pride that comes from newly-acquired “psychic abilities,” the aliens are happy to flatter human vanity and promote human deception by cooperating with those who cooperate with them. In the same programme of “seduction by flattery,” the al-

iens tell abductees, “You are chosen!” Then the abductees are given “missions” and “tasks” to carry out during the coming Apocalypse upon earth, and this makes them feel important.

All of the “reincarnation” and “past lives” nonsense elicited from abductees in Dr. Mack’s book is more of the same. But as Hopkins and Dr. Mack say, “We must remain open to the possible value of what many people have described as the broadening nature of the UFO-contact experience.” God save us!

We end by presenting a few words on alien deceptions by the late Dr. Karla Turner from her work. *Taken:*

...The aliens, whether by intellectual, psychic, or technological means, are able to create any perception, and therefore any illusion, for the person in their hands. The implications are explosive. Perhaps that is why these... implications are so rarely taken into account. If we credit the idea of illusionary mastery with serious validity, then we must either come up with a reliable acid test to discern illusion and actuality in abduction events, or we may have to admit that the truth behind these events is unknowable in current scientific terms. **Dealing with the aliens’ deceptive abilities may be the most crucial problem facing abduction research today...**

The abductee also learns from experience that the aliens induce an altered perceptive state in humans during every encounter. Employed for control, it can be used to prevent any undesired responses from the abductee. And the altered state prevents any objective assessment of the situation by the witness.. **Abductees report alien-controlled information...**

NOTE BY EDITOR OF FSR.

Dr. Karla Turner, PhD, died of a galloping form of cancer early in 1996, and there are many in the USA who think they know who and what was responsible for killing her.

III. A LIST OF SUGGESTED DELUSIONS CREATED OR PROMOTED BY THE ALIENS

© *By Cyril Marystone*

1. That the aliens do not create illusions and deceptions in human minds;
2. That most of the deceptions and “cover ups” in Ufology have been created by humans, rather than by the aliens themselves;
3. That the aliens come from distant planets and stars (the “ET hypothesis”), rather than from the Earth itself;

4. That pollution on Earth, or even a nuclear World War III, could damage any hypothetical “alien planet” that is the satellite of a star light-years distant from the Earth;
5. That humanoid life exists on other planets;
6. That the aliens are biological entities;
7. That the Government or Military have made a secret pact with the aliens;
8. That the Government or Military hold “crashed saucers” or “alien corpses” somewhere in the US (eg

Roswell);

9. That the "black helicopters" associated with aliens are real Government helicopters;
10. That the "Men in Black" are real human Government agents;
11. That the aliens are not malevolent;
12. That the aliens are morally superior to mankind;
13. That the aliens who come in UFOs are good angels;
14. That Barry Downing's ideas identifying UFOs and aliens in the Bible are correct;
15. That the UFO alien phenomenon is not a religious phenomenon.
16. That the aliens created the world and mankind;
17. That alien "doctrines" do not contradict the Bible and Christianity;
18. That the "reincarnation" and "past lives" doctrines taught by the aliens are true;
19. That the aliens are going to "save" their elect group of human followers and give them a "new body" and "eternal life."
20. That some humans have lived previous lives as aliens;

21. That some humans possess "psychic abilities" by themselves;
22. That there is truth in astrology, crystal ball reading, palm-reading, horoscope-reading, numerology, tarot-card reading, ouija boards, and similar alien-related nonsense;
23. That the aliens are so powerful that humans cannot fight them;
24. That the aliens have not caused the animal mutilations and blood-draining.
25. That the aliens have not caused the "crop circles".
26. That the aliens are trying to prevent World War III, and not to cause it.
27. That UFOs and aliens are not real, but "a natural phenomenon".
28. That the aliens are not the "demons" and "false gods" of the Bible and historic demonology;
29. That the "hybrid children" created by aliens are not demons;
30. That the aliens do not "possess" humans (as in demonic possession), to create the phenomena of "missing time," voices in the head, compulsions, speaking in unknown languages, etc.

EXAMINING THE MYSTERY OF THE "PARA-APES"

© *By Don Worley, Investigator - Researcher for 31
years, FSR Consultant.*

We shall take a limited look at where these hulking, apeman-like entities are seen; their physical and emotional nature; the UFO link; and the dimensional-telepathic factor.

Let me make it clear at the outset. I do not intend to ridicule, or put down, the legions of Sasquatch/Big Foot investigators, all their efforts, their data, and their cellars full of plaster foot-castings. Maybe there are two distinct types — A settled-in, seemingly physical ape, and the bio-etheric-like "red-eyed ape". However, I frankly doubt this, and I believe that they are all the controlled creations of the Intelligence behind UFOs. As we look at the elements of this murky enigma you may begin to understand why I have this conviction.

WHERE ARE THEY SEEN ?

Their density is proportional to the encroachment of humanity. On a global scale, depending on location, they are called Dhzutheh, Guliyavan, Almasty, Mapinguany, Yowee, Sasquatch, Big-Foot, Mighty Mo, Old Slue Foot, and other names. To simplify things I

will call them para-apes. I have mentioned their widespread geographical dispersal because I want to point out that despite hundreds of thousands of incidents since the 1800s, not one hairy being has ever been delivered to a laboratory for scientific surgical confirmation. **This is a valid indication that we are not here dealing with a flesh and blood thing.** In my analysis and paper delivered at Dr. Hynek's 1976 International Conference in Evanston IL, USA. (234 reports, 602 witnesses, 266 para-apes) I showed that a great majority of the entities are passive. I'll mention several cases of this type.

* The members of a large religious group in the Western Canadian Provinces are quite familiar with them. They call them the "*In-Betweeners*" because of their ability to appear and vanish at will. Mutual respect prevails.

* In Florida's Holliday Park in the USA, 14 tourists watched as a para-ape walked a 40 ft. half circle around them and then disappeared over a dyke.

WHAT IS THEIR PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL NATURE?