

M E M O

To: Those interested in the UFO problem

From: George P. Hansen
Princeton Arms North 1, Apt. 59
Cranbury, NJ 08512
(609) 426-0927

Date: 23 November 1992

The enclosed paper is one in a series constituting a public debate on Budd Hopkins' Linda Napolitano case (stage name "Linda Cortile"). You may have seen my report "Attempted Murder vs. The Politics of Ufology: A Question of Priorities in the Linda Napolitano Case." In order to fully understand the present paper, you may wish to obtain a copy of that earlier article as well as the response by Jerome Clark, if you have not already seen them. Clark's address is given in the first footnote of the enclosed article.

The ufological community has recently been given an important article from Clark, and I believe that it merits your close attention. Clark is a prominent leader in the field and familiar with some of the secret details of the Linda Napolitano case. His piece should raise serious questions of professional judgement and responsibilities.

Walter Andrus, head of MUFON, has yet to respond. This is most disturbing.

Both Clark and Andrus are in positions to control the information that is, and more importantly, is not, presented in their UFO magazines. Many of you pay good money for memberships and subscriptions in order to obtain that information. I urge you to contact the boards of directors of MUFON and CUFOS and request an explanation for the behavior and statements of their leaders in regard to the Napolitano case.

As with my previous article, please feel free to copy and distribute this memo and enclosed paper, publish them in any periodical, and post them on electronic bulletin boards.

The following paper was published in *Third Eyes Only*
(Issue No. 7, 1992, pp. 68-72) and other publications.

"TORQUEMADA" RESPONDS TO JEROME CLARK

George P. Hansen

ABSTRACT: Jerome Clark is thanked for correcting a misinterpretation of his position reported in the paper "Attempted Murder vs. The Politics of Ufology." Clark has now provided, in writing, his reasons for opposing a federal investigation of the purported kidnapping and attempted murder of Linda Napolitano. This rationale and other writings of Clark are examined in order to gain insight into his thought processes.

This paper primarily discusses psychological factors influencing the investigation and interpretation of the Napolitano case. A paper is in preparation devoted to the substance and evaluation of the claims. This affair provides a wealth of material for those attempting to understand the field of ufology from a psycho-social perspective. In the long run, the actions and beliefs of the leaders of ufology may be far more important than Linda Napolitano's UFO abduction claim. As such, this may yet prove to be "The Case of the Century."

My article "Attempted Murder vs. The Politics of Ufology: A Question of Priorities in the Linda Napolitano Case" has been published in a number of newsletters and posted on electronic bulletin boards. In that piece I reported that Budd Hopkins, Walter Andrus, and Jerome Clark had urged that the reported attempted murder of Linda Napolitano not be communicated to law enforcement authorities because such could be damaging to ufology. Clark has recently issued a response correcting my interpretation of his remarks,¹ and I am grateful to him for now doing so. I should mention that I had sent Clark an earlier draft of my article and invited his comments before publishing it.²

The comments and reasoning of Clark should be of special interest to the UFO research community. He is vice-president of the Center for UFO Studies and editor of its magazine *International UFO Reporter*. He writes a monthly column for *Fate* magazine, has written books and even an encyclopedia on UFOs. The Fund for UFO Research gave him the prestigious Isabel Davis Award for 1992. Clark has placed himself in a prominent, public role and is now in a position to determine what many persons will chance to read about the topic.

1. "The Politics of Torquemada; or, Earth Calling Hansen's Planet" by Jerome Clark; 612 North Oscar Avenue, Canby, MN 56220; October 24, 1992.

2. Clark did not avail himself of this opportunity and sent me a note only saying "George -- Please do not call or write me again."

Clark's explanation

I am pleased that Clark now acknowledges, in writing, that he did indeed urge UFO researchers to suppress evidence of a series of felonies. He apparently wishes to impede the process of justice. His rationale is even more intriguing than I had imagined, and I will quote his entire paragraph explaining his position:

I urged the critics to refrain, over the next six months, from pursuing the investigation, which they had indicated now consisted, or would soon consist, of knocking on the doors of government agencies looking for evidence of the elusive Richard and Dan. I stated that, if this story is true, it is not just a UFO case but a "politically sensitive" event because it supposedly involves a political figure of international stature and therefore has consequences far outside the tiny world of ufology. If that is indeed the case, we would *never* find Richard and Dan (if they exist as who they say they are) because banging on the wrong doors could alert the relevant agency that two of its agents were leaking a huge secret. They would then be effectively silenced, and we would never learn the truth.

(From page 1 of his paper "The Politics of Torquemada")

This is a candid, and remarkably revealing, explanation, especially because Clark told me that he accepts Linda's story of being harassed, kidnapped, sexually molested, and nearly drowned by government agents. Clark's statement provides insight into his mindset.

First, we are urged to stop investigating the case (even though the affair has been discussed in *Omni*, the *Wall Street Journal*, *Paris Match*, the *Hufon UFO Journal*, and the *New York Times*). The statement displays Clark's true belief about the appropriateness of internal review and criticism in ufology.

Second, though the critics should refrain from investigating, presumably Hopkins should continue. One can only surmise that Clark believes Hopkins to be qualified to investigate kidnapping and attempted murder. He urges all outsiders to remove themselves from the case, and Clark would allow Richard and Dan six more months of unobstructed opportunities for kidnapping and murder. But concerned citizens should remain silent. This has led some to question Clark's grasp on reality.

Third, Clark suggests that "banging on the wrong doors could alert the relevant agency that two of its agents were leaking a huge secret." Clark's suggestion about "alerting the relevant agency" is ludicrous. Hopkins himself had already visited a number of agencies and made inquiries. He had even sent a picture of one of the agents to the United Nations. Further, Hopkins had spoken publicly numerous times about the case, including presentations for BUFORA, New Jersey MUFON, New York MUFON, the Abduction Study Conference at Massachusetts Institute

of Technology, the 1992 MUFON symposium in Albuquerque, and even the television show *Inside Edition*. If there actually was a conspiracy, the perpetrators would be fully aware of Hopkins' investigation. One can only wonder how Clark could rationally offer his idea.

Fourth, and most revealing, Clark suggests that it is plausible that a conspiracy at the top levels of the world's governments is suppressing evidence about this UFO abduction and the subsequent kidnappings, sexual molestation, and attempted murder. Not only was the United Nations Secretary General reportedly involved, but during a meeting I attended on October 3, 1992, Hopkins' partisans made allusions to the involvement of other world figures, though they were not named. Hopkins and Clark seem to think that they possess secret, crucial knowledge of the international political situation regarding the UFO abduction phenomena. Clark, living an isolated existence in a small, remote town in Minnesota, seems to believe himself to be in a position to make important recommendations affecting public disclosures by governments, revelations that would have a profound impact on world affairs.

Clark's earlier writings on conspiracy theories

It is worth briefly reviewing some of Clark's earlier writings on conspiracies because they provide additional illumination of his thinking. For instance, he calls Jacque Vallee's book *Revelations* "the ultimate conspiracy book"³ and describes Vallee as having an "ability to detect connections invisible to the rest of us [and it] reaches its most bizarre extreme..."⁴ He attacks John Keel, saying "that his speculations were laced with paranoia."⁵ These writings suggest deep, visceral reactions. For Clark, notions of conspiracies have a high psychological charge, and he appears unable to grapple with such ideas in a dispassionate frame of mind.

Unlike many vague conspiracy ideas, Clark's and Hopkins' are exceptionally specific. Hopkins claims to have a massive amount of evidence, and that material could be used to identify and convict the culprits. Times, dates, and places of the purported crimes are known as well as the license plate numbers of cars involved. But Hopkins and Clark refuse to divulge information. In any event, their conspiratorial notions are having a dramatic impact on the investigation of this case. We now have a stark instance of some of the most prominent leaders in ufology actively attempting to impede the enforcement of criminal laws they believe to have been violated. Their actions are guided by a belief in the existence of a powerful international government conspiracy.

3. International UFO Reporter, September/October, 1991, p. 3

4. International UFO Reporter, January/February, 1990, p. 8

5. UFOs in the 1980s by Jerome Clark, Detroit: Apogee, 1990, p. 175

By any measure, Clark's own suggestions are far more extreme than those of Vallee or Keel, but because of Clark's prior vehement denunciation of conspiratorial thinking, I failed to grasp his present views on the Hopkins-Napolitano case. This was the reason for my misunderstanding.

Summary

One of the unexpected benefits of the Napolitano case is that it provides remarkable illumination of the mentality of a prominent authority on UFOs. Because of his influence and control over a significant amount of popular UFO literature, this is of particular consequence.

If we accept Linda's claim, Richard and Dan are menaces not only to Linda but to society at large. Yet Clark vigorously opposes reporting them to the authorities. He seems to believe that he has special insight into the world political situation that justifies his position.

Neither Clark nor Hopkins has provided even minimal evidence for such a notion. That being the case, there may be a plausible explanation for their behavior. They imply that they possess secret knowledge of a conspiracy within the highest levels of the world's governments; such thinking can be termed "grandiose"; the word "paranoid" might even apply. Ironically, Clark's previous writings display a loathing of and revulsion toward much tamer conspiratorial speculations. Clark's "Torquemada" article is again emotional and self-laudatory, and I urge those interested to obtain a copy in order to verify that. After such a review, the reader will be in a better position to assess Clark's mental state and deduce the plausible cause of his behavior.

23 November 1992