

centre of the base. Richard Gillson also noticed the poppy shape, which, he said, grew dimmer before the object finally departed. None of the other boys noticed the underside.

6. Sound: Only one boy heard any sound from the object. He is Lee Perkins and he claims he detected a "low, humming sound." The others were quite sure that the object was soundless. However, a contradiction became evident here. Matthew Anderson told us that Anthony Rayment had said at the time that he could hear a "sound like he'd never heard before." Anthony, of course, was apparently the closest to the object and therefore in the best position to notice any sounds. But he told us that there was NO sound from the object.

7. After-effects: None of the boys seemed unduly perturbed by their sighting. Only one spoke of unpleasant psychological after-effects. This was Lee Perkins who said he had been "excited, shocked and frightened" by what he saw. When he thought about it at home later that day, he had felt scared. He had a dream about the UFO in which it landed, two boys were taken on board and guns were fired. He woke up with a scream. After that, he began waking up about every other night, having screamed in the dream and woken himself up. By the time we saw him, Lee's night

problems had ceased, although he admitted the memory of the sighting still scared him.

Conclusions

Unfortunately, as far as we know, no adult witnessed this UFO. Anthony Rayment's mother came along to meet him just at the conclusion of the sighting to be greeted by six very excited boys, all talking at once about their experience. By the time she realised what had happened, the object had disappeared, although she did admit that there was no-one else about and that it was "spooky." So we are left with the testimony of five of the six boys present, all nine years of age, and with stories which tally in many respects but contradict in others.

Did they see a helicopter? Not if their descriptions are accurate for the shape and configuration of the UFO bear no relation to a helicopter, particularly in the matter of the lack of sound.

Did they invent the whole story? If they did they were far more cunning than one could reasonably expect of nine-year-olds. Why make conflicting statements regarding certain features of the object? We

(Concluded on page 24)

FSR BOOKSHELF — 13

New UFO books reviewed by . . .

Janet & Colin Bord

WITH a noticeable lack of close encounter cases nowadays, the attention of the UFO world seems to have turned towards abduction reports. The number of such reports is staggering — 500 in the United States alone, according to Budd Hopkins — and this seems to indicate a new trend in the behaviour of whoever or whatever is the cause of the UFO phenomenon. But anyone who believes he will learn anything about this cause and its possible motives from the abductees' evidence is likely to be disappointed: it is true to say that all "abduction" cases generate far more questions than answers.

Some of these are demonstrated in **Budd Hopkins' book Missing Time: A Documented Study of UFO Abductions** (Richard Marek Publishers, New York, \$12.95, 258 pages, with photographs, drawings, notes, bibliography, index).

In this book Hopkins concentrates on seven cases from the nineteen he has investigated since 1976, most of them cases that will be new to the reader. The first surprising element is that the abductions are not recent: most took place years ago. That they were ever dredged up from the witnesses' memories came about because of puzzling incidents or time losses recalled

by the witnesses, these being probed through hypnotic regression which revealed amazing details consciously forgotten by the witnesses. So if abductions really do take place as recalled by those involved, then this is definitely not a new development in UFO entity behaviour, but something that they have so far managed to conceal extraordinarily well. That interpretation demands that the content of the reports be taken at face value.

But — and here is one of the major, so far unresolved, questions — can we safely take abduction reports at their face value? Hypnotists and those attending the sessions usually remark on how convincing the witness was, in reliving terror and other strong emotions. Also the transcripts of the sessions seem convincing when read. And why, we ask, should anyone make up a story like that, one which is paralleled by so many other "stories"?

The phenomenon of UFO abduction revealed by hypnotic regression is itself paralleled by the phenomenon of past lives revealed by hypnotic regression, a pursuit which has become very popular in Britain in recent years. But careful detective work has now largely discredited this phenomenon as producing

evidence for reincarnation: the “past lives,” when checked, rarely agree with documented history; their content has sometimes been traced back to past reading by the witness, long since “forgotten” (the unconscious mind has a staggering ability to recall in perfect detail pages of books that were barely glanced at, perhaps years earlier); the witness’s desire to please the hypnotist is revealed; and the witness shows remarkable acting ability under hypnosis.

These and many other convincing refutations of reincarnation as revealed through hypnotic regression are fully described in a recent book, **Mind Out of Time?: Reincarnation Claims Investigated**, by Ian Wilson (Victor Gollancz Ltd, 1981). This should be read by anyone concerned with UFO abduction cases, because the parallels are so clear. The witness knows that the hypnotist and UFO researcher are looking for, probably even expecting, an abduction event to emerge, therefore the obliging witness provides one (not by conscious fabrication, of course). The details of the abduction are not too difficult to provide, since almost everyone has heard at least something of the Betty and Barney Hill case which was so widely publicised: confabulation and perhaps even telepathy with the investigator provide the rest.

This last possibility could help explain similarities from case to case, as reported by Budd Hopkins in his investigations: the witness need not have read about little-known abduction cases, but since the investigator is closely involved with such cases and presumably has absorbed much information, the details are likely to be available for use by the abductee’s unconscious via telepathy. On all this evidence, the most usual “abduction” scenario seems to be that a susceptible witness is scared by lights seen while driving at night, possibly aeroplane lights which can often seem to be other than what they really are. His fright remains deep within him, later to trigger off a fantasy “abduction” based on material absorbed from the media.

The anti-abduction evidence is strong, and it is tempting therefore to declare that none of the so-called abductions have any basis in reality.

However, there are puzzling features which cannot so easily be explained away, the prime example from Budd Hopkins’ book being the mysterious cuts suffered by four people the investigator knows. All were born in 1943 and all sustained their wounds probably in the summer of 1950, under strange circumstances. They retain scars as evidence, and the events are remembered by relatives. It is just such enigmas as these which remind us that it is unscientific to totally reject any concept; however much one’s intelligence rebels against it. So although we are suspicious of so-called abduction cases and are aware of many ways in which apparently convincing aspects of them can be explained, we do not reject out of hand the possibility that people have been taken away by strange beings — who may or may not be connected with the pheno-

menon we term “UFOs.” We simply ask that everyone involved in abduction research familiarises him- or herself with all the “pro” and “anti” data, so that their future investigations may be informed rather than un-informed.

Budd Hopkins’ stated purpose (p.87) echoes this plea: “We have the data but lack the explanations, and it is partly my purpose in writing this book to stimulate others — psychologists, neurologists, physicists, statisticians — in fact, intellectuals and scientists of whatever disciplines, to examine the data and to begin the task of deciphering meaning.” His book contains plenty of data for the abduction detective, since it contains lengthy transcripts of hypnotic regression sessions. Although the book is interesting and thought-provoking, it may sometimes prove tedious to the general reader as he finds himself plodding through page after page of transcripts. And we wish that Hopkins had not already made up his mind concerning one very important, *and still undetermined*, facet of the UFO mystery — where they come from. “... I believe it is true; extraterrestrials have been observing us in our innocence for many years, and we have *no idea* of their intentions.” If Hopkins has chosen to believe that UFOs are extra-terrestrial, a belief for which there is *no* hard evidence, then he is not a truly open-minded investigator and the data he presents is of necessity tainted by his bias.

Readers should also ensure that their minds are totally open when they turn their attention to another new book from the nimble pen of Jenny Randles (with co-author Paul Whetnall): **Alien Contact: Window on Another World** (Neville Spearman Ltd, £5.25, 208 pages, with a few drawings and photographs, and index). The subject is the fascinating and incredible case of the Sunderland family who live in North Wales. In the first half of the book the phenomena experienced by the family, most especially by the younger children, are described in detail — UFO and entity sightings, psychic happenings, out-of-the-body experiences, meetings with the aliens in their own realms. Then the authors explain their investigation tactics, and reach their conclusions. We do not intend to go into too much detail and reveal all, thus spoiling the book for potential readers. But we can say that the authors appear to have made every effort to remain unbiased: they have not tried to fit the evidence to their preconceptions. An investigator who was also a believer in the ETH would have taken the evidence at its face value and concluded that the children were definitely in contact with aliens from planet X; a sceptic would have concluded that either the children were lying or, possibly, experiencing involuntary fantasies. But if we accept the authors’ assessment of the family’s honesty and lack of motivation in concocting a hoax, while at the same time being aware of other phenomena with similar features (e.g. poltergeists) and

theoretical work on relevant subjects (e.g. energy manipulation), it is clear that this case is not only complex, but that the implications inherent in its solution are vitally relevant to the whole puzzling field of close encounters.

This case and its investigation also point up the fact that investigators of such cases *must* be widely read, and *must* be able to call upon expert knowledge in a variety of apparently unrelated fields. Though we do query the statement that there is a Celtic goddess by the name of Ana (p.146). The nearest name we could locate is Anu, which does not really come very close to Gaynor's entity friend "Arna," and we feel this is a false trail. Also it is a pity that neither editor nor copy-editor nor proof-reader picked up the numerous spelling errors (like the non-existent "cooperative" — presumably "corroborative" was meant — "jepordise" for "jeopardise," "Dr. Cal Jung" for "Dr Carl Jung,"

"theorem" for "theorem," and so on). Occasional infelicities of language notwithstanding, we have no hesitation in recommending this book as vital reading for all ufologists.

In FSR Vol. 27 No. 1 we mentioned the *Zetetic Scholar's* dialogue on UFO theories. Issue 8 of ZS continues the dialogue with 29 pages of J. Richard Greenwell's "Replies to his Commentators."

The same issue also contains Ron Westrum's report on "UFO Sightings Among Engineers and Scientists," as well as an open letter to Carl Sagan from Robert K. G. Temple on the Sirius Mystery, and interesting material on Peter Hurkos and psychic surgery, with much else besides. (ZS costs \$12 p.a. in U.S.A. and Canada, \$18 elsewhere, and is obtained from 'Zetetic Scholar,' Department of Sociology, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197, U.S.A.)

HUMANOIDS IN THE FOREST OF MARSOIS

Another French close encounter of 1956 comes to light

Lionel Danizel et al.

We are indebted to the Editorial Committee of *Lumières dans la Nuit* for this interesting report — prepared by L. Danizel, Roger Thomé and Christine Zwygart — taken from their journal, issue No. 205 (May 1981) in which it first appeared. Translation from French by Gordon Creighton.

THIS close sighting of two small humanoids—took place in broad daylight, at 7.00 a.m. during the summer (June, July, or August) of 1956. The place was a broad path in the Forest of Marsois, not far from the hamlet of Mauvaignant, in the district of Nogent-en-Bassigny, in the Département of Haute-Marne, East Central France. The spot is quite close to a well-known local prehistoric monument, the dolmen called *La Pierre Alot*.

The witness was a local woman, Mme. L—, of Nogent, who was aged 52 at the time. This lady's identity is known to the LDLN investigative team, but she insists that it shall not be divulged.

The Encounter

Mme. L—, was in the habit of making long early-morning excursions on foot through the woods and fields to gather mushrooms, and also fodder for her rabbits. The weather was fine, the sky clear, and the temperature mild.

Arriving at the Marsois Forest, she set out along one of the broad straight tracks. When she had

reached the vicinity of the dolmen, which stands beside the forest track, she noticed that two small individuals were coming towards her down the track. They seemed to be walking along quietly, in Indian file, and when she first caught sight of them she thought they were at a distance of perhaps 80 or 100 metres from her. Her first thought was that they were children, so she carried on towards them with no feeling of apprehension.

But, when she had gone a few metres or so past the dolmen, she halted. And the two entities at once halted too, and began to eye her fixedly. By this time, they were no more than 10-15 metres from her, so that she was able to take pretty clear note of a good many details about them.

The two small beings were about 1 metre 20 cms in height, with stocky, thick-set bodies. Their legs were short, thin, and bandy. They were dressed in a sort of close-fitting white one-piece suit, on which she could detect no seams or buttons, at any rate from where she was. Their hands were covered by black mittens, with no fingers showing. On their feet they had half-boots, likewise black, and round their waists they had broad