

"California Report"

By Ann Druffel

What Do We Want From "Contactees?"

An interesting situation occurred recently at a meeting of a small group of Los Angeles researchers, pointing up sharply a dilemma which confronts the UFO research field today. It is a dilemma which sets UFO colleague against colleague and threatens, if not dealt with satisfactorily, to upset our concentrated efforts to solve the UFO mystery.

To this meeting of objective, though diversified, researchers, one of us brought a close encounter victim, who himself has been invaluable in performing certain types of technical analysis on bits of physical UFO evidence from cases other than his own.

Please forgive the generalities in this article. I usually give names and identifying information in these columns, but this particular situation must be dealt with as tactfully as possible in order to preserve the excellent working relationships the members of our group have established with one another over the years. Also, the identity of the CE-III participant must be similarly protected for several additional reasons.

Though the majority of us at the meeting had worked in the past with close encounter witnesses (the terms "abductee," "victim," or the more recently revived term "contactee" might be equally applied), a few are either fairly new, though extremely valuable to the field, or, because of the nature of their specialized interests, have not been exposed directly to CE-III (IV) witnesses and know

*I use this term advisedly, with respect for all those scientists who accept nothing as "fact" unless it is experienced by their five physical senses and/or current technology instrumentation.

little of the kinds of damage these persons apparently suffer as the result of very close proximity with UFOs and their occupants.

Our witness was asked to describe his 1950s encounter, which he did with appropriate succinctness. Afterward, he proceeded, under questioning, to explain the dire effects which had befallen him in later years — sudden surgings into his consciousness involving alleged knowledge of "advanced physics," harassment by unidentified persons resembling in many respects the more believable "MIB" reports, and psychological damage which could be traced, in his own mind at least, directly to the initial encounter.

Two of us had worked closely with this particular CE-III witness for many months and had come to appreciate him as a productive, talented human being. We had also developed a certain empathy with him as a troubled person caught up in UFOlogical phenomena, but that did not in any sense take away our objectivity toward the case. A third member was working closely with him as part of a research project involving physical/psychological damage to close encounter victims.

Though for the most part the witness was received well and with objective understanding by our group, the meeting was described later by him as "a disaster." He regretted having come forward, even as privately as this, for he felt literally deluged by questions, doubts, and a feeling close to prejudicial disbelief. Some of his statements seemed to disturb the more scientifically purist* members of our group. They demanded empirical proof from the witness that he had indeed been given the advanced knowledge of physics

from UFO entities, and also demanded that he prove his statements concerning "run-ins" with scientists to whom he was able to offer solutions to complicated questions of physics and nuclear science, as a result of his UFOlogically-derived knowledge.

Unfortunately for the witness, the group, and the field itself, this "knowledge," which the witness stated he had been able to write down over a period of weeks, had been destroyed by him several years before. He had come to the conclusion, he stated, that the advanced knowledge was a source of grief and that it "scared" him, since it was "10,000 years ahead of our time." (This was a phrase he used "off the top of [his] head" as he explained later to me. It did not represent a precise time frame.) Therefore, thinking that he could erase its dire effects, he consigned it to the flames.

The witness is technically knowledgeable and talented in his own field of expertise, but in physics he is not technically qualified to discuss all phases of atomic physics, quantum mechanics, etc. Two or three of our more empirical members were able to "catch" him in errors of terminology in a statement about government policy on secrecy clearances, etc.

The specifics of this case are not yet ready to be published even though it has been investigated for more than a year. The reason for stating even the above particulars is to point up the fact that, in the opinion of at least two or three of the scientists and engineers participating in the meeting, the CE-III witness's story (report) was not believable because a few of the details did not, in their opinion, hold up.

All researchers who have been

(continued on page 18)

California Report, Continued

deeply involved with investigations of close encounters and "abduction" reports have come across similar situations. They find essentially honest, rational witnesses giving coherent accounts of incredible events. It is not the "incredible" part of these reports which bother us especially, for most CE-III and CE-IV reports, though incredible, have enough elements in common that they can be accepted, at least, as "real" in the witnesses' minds. Logically, if hundreds of essentially reliable and productive human beings feel that entities from apparent ET sources have contacted them, cannot UFO researchers regard these persons as having a rightful part in the UFOlogical scene? Study of, and human empathy with, these individuals should not take away anyone's objective desire to document and verify their statements, but the harsh fact is that many of their statements concerning their initial encounters (and subsequent results of such encounters) are unverifiable.

Researchers are able to verify *some* of the statements, but *real proof*, that is, empirical evidence, of the root contact eludes us.

Those of our group who knew the witness well and regarded him as an essentially honest and productive person tried to explain that empirical evidence in contactee cases is often difficult to gather and gave our opinion that such reports must nevertheless be studied, meanwhile treating the witness with humane concern. Our empathy does not denote carelessness about "facts," but rather it is a recognition that many close encounter victims have been deeply disturbed by the contacts they sincerely believe are real, and they look to UFO researchers for information which might provide them with partial answers.

Should scientists expect the seasoned expertise from contactees which they themselves have acquired? It seems that empirical scientists working in highly specialized fields would like to prove the existence of UFOs within their own fields or at least some other physical

science or sciences. The UFO phenomenon, however, will not be thus limited. It seems to manifest in *all* phases of physical being and also in fields of being beyond the reach of conventional science such as parapsychology, mind-matter interface, and quantum mechanics. Its "reality" cannot be limited to empirical evidence only.

We must open our minds and accept the fact that this is a phenomenon which is deeply affecting witnesses in what I am forced to call "subjective reality." Everyone of us, scientist and layman alike, is aware of reality in a slightly different way. Sometimes we cannot convince the other guy that what *we* sense as "reality" is actual fact. We must open our minds enough to admit the possibility that an essentially rational CE-III victim is telling us what he believes is "real" and treat his statements as "real," at least to him.

Therefore, I contend that demands for empirical evidence in some "contactee" situations is impossible, but that should not prevent us from continuing to study those cases if the human being behind the report is rational. We must not forget that

some "hard sciences," though claiming to be based on empirical evidence, in reality are not exclusively so based. I cite, for example, astronomy, quantum physics, anthropology, paleontology. We know that astronomy's "black holes" and "neutron stars" have never been seen or measured. Other "verified" sciences, likewise, change almost yearly as new discoveries are made.

The evidence presented by the more stable CE-III (IV) witnesses has a certain empirical quality about it which cannot be denied. They *have* been deeply affected by their reported sightings and contacts. Their stories are internally consistent and consistent, in many regards, with hundreds of like stories all over the world. What can we do with "evidence" like this? Ignore it? Or continue to study these reports, accepting the witnesses at face value while attempting to evaluate, as best we can, each facet of their UFOlogical involvement? I opt for the latter. UFOs are a human problem in that they are deeply affecting numerous members of the human race. The reports of CE-III (IV) witnesses must be treated with human caring and concern.

UFO Summit Conference

By Walt Andrus

Worldwide interest in attending the 1982 Summit Conference being held Monday, July 5th from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. at the Westbury Hotel in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, in conjunction with the 1982 International MUFON UFO Symposium, has been overwhelming. Many regionalized UFO study groups and organizations in the United States and Canada have already expressed interest in sending representatives to the conference by responding to the invitation extended in the December 1982 issue of the *MUFON UFO Journal*. The major UFO organizations on the North American continent have already selected individuals from their Boards of Directors to represent them.

In most cases, their Director will be the principal representative, which

will help to expedite planning and decisions. Several European UFO organizations have asked permission to present short papers, that could lead to greater international cooperation. It is gratifying to know that so many people are anxious to participate in a dialogue that will lead to greater cooperation in UFOlogy and volunteering their individual and group talents to help resolve the enigma. The fine response to date is evidence that an apathetic attitude does not prevail in the current leadership of UFO agencies.

In order that each representative group may present short papers on their proposals, the entire morning (9:00 a.m. to 12 noon) will be scheduled for this purpose. Each paper

(continued on next page)