



1976 MUFON Symposium Proceedings

ANALYSIS OF **HUMANOID** REPORTS

IGNACIO DARNAUDE ROJAS-MARCOS

Cabeza del Rey Don Pedro, 9 - 2.º B
41004 - SEVILLA (Spain)

presented by

DAVID F. WEBB

D-96

INTRODUCTION

Reports of humanoid beings, or entities, associated with UFOs represent an important as well as a fascinating, almost mystical element to the UFO phenomenon. Such reports are consistent with UFO reports in general in that: 1) there are a lot of them - the Humanoid Study Group (HSC) has on file over 1000 specific examples; 2) there are a lot of good ones - many of the 1000 reports are well documented, first-hand investigations by qualified investigators involving credible witnesses and; 3) analyses of these reports, taken as a whole, indicate recurrent patterns many of which mimic UFO reports in general.

Why is this type of report so important to an understanding of the UFO phenomenon? First, the chance of a misidentification by the witness is slight; humanoid reports usually include close encounters with large, structured objects. Because the witness is reportedly close to the UFO and/or humanoid, the alternatives to accepting the report at face value are: 1) a hoax, either perpetrated by or played upon the witness, 2) a temporary hallucination or psychic projection, or 3) the observer is deranged.

Second, although stories involving humanoids represent only a fraction of all UFO reports, the information content of each report is usually large. If we surmise that UFOs are intelligently controlled craft, then it follows that there may be pilots of these craft. We find that the reports support this assumption. Through study of these alleged UFO "occupants", we can learn more about the phenomenon than by limiting our study to sightings of just the craft.

Among the numerous types of occupant cases are those reports of a witness taken aboard the UFO. These "abduction" cases represent the third reason for the importance of humanoid reports. The witness is allegedly face-to-face with the entities for prolonged periods of time. The controversial "contactee" report, where two-way comprehensible communication with the witness is involved, overlaps with, but is not necessarily a subset of the abduction reports. If the witness is credible and the report well documented, we have no choice but to examine the content of the report carefully. If we have learned anything, it is that the content of a UFO report must not be used as the sole criterion for its evaluation.

ORGANIZING THE DATA

The scientific method involves the formation of logical hypotheses which are testable in various ways by careful analysis of data samples, usually collected by experiments. Often a series of hypotheses can only be formulated by a boot-strap method of using the data itself to suggest our hypotheses. This is certainly the case in UFO research. Therefore, proper collection and organization of the data is extremely important.



DAVID F. WEBB

Dave Webb has been active in UFO investigation since 1960. He has been a member of APRO for 15 years, was a member of NICAP during the sixties and has been a member of MUFON since January, 1974. Currently he is co-chairman with Ted Bloecher of MUFON's Humanoid Study Group, and specializes in research of humanoid reports and foreign reports and correspondence. Webb also holds MUFON positions as the Eastern Regional Director, State Director for New Hampshire and is a member of the Board of Directors. He was the State Director for Massachusetts in 1974. He is active as a contributor and an investigator for the Center for UFO Studies. Webb and the Center recently published a revised version of 1973 - Year of the Humanoids, a compilation and analysis of the Fall 1973 United States wave of humanoid reports.





1976 MUFON Symposium Proceedings

The title of this paper is the analysis of humanoid reports. But this is in fact only a part of the research story. The organization of research really involves three separate data tasks, each of which must be performed in sequence. These are data acquisition, reduction and analysis. My point is that we have not adequately completed the first stage of data organization; therefore we must not be surprised that our hypotheses have so far not fit the data, since our hypotheses must be suggested by the data. After 30 years of inadequate research, I believe it is still premature to be forming hypotheses. It should be clear by now that what is needed is the hard work and organized effort that is necessary to solve any difficult problem.

Researchers must have ready access to logically ordered, comprehensive data samples before they can proceed. Until recently there were no such catalogs of known UFO cases of specific types readily available. Only comprehensive catalogs of sightings during specific waves had been produced (e.g., Bloecher, 1947 (1); Michel, 1954 (2); Mebane, 1957 (3); Webb, 1973 (4)).

Vallee's catalog of landing cases presented in Passport To Magonia (5) was the first readily available, published data file that strove for completeness. It included over 300 entity cases. The HSG, co-chaired by Ted Bloecher and the author, now has on file over 1000 references to entity reports. This probably represents the most complete entity file in existence.

With the assistance of Lex Mebane, we hope that a catalog of these cases will be published soon through the Center for UFO Studies. Its basic structure will be along the lines of the author's report on the 1973 humanoid wave (6). It will include a computer-compatible, one-line listing of the basic humanoid data, concise narrative summaries, a statistics section and complete references.

Other such data catalogs are needed. To my knowledge there are several catalogs in the works. Ted Phillips has already published his Physical Trace catalog through the Center and, I understand, Fred Merritt will publish one soon on UFO Landing Marks, a potentially very important study. Peter Rogerson, Richard Heiden and others are providing an update to Vallee's catalog of landing cases. It is called the International Catalog and now appears in parts in the revamped Merseyside (England) UFO Bulletin. There are several foreign-language catalogs that need to be translated and made available on a worldwide basis.

We eventually need at least one comprehensive catalog for every major UFO category and the sooner the better. At the risk of sounding overzealous, my suggested order of priority for these catalogs is: humanoids, E/M effects, photographs (with all known photos included), physiological effects. Later catalogs might include such subjects as animal effects, anthropoids and radar sightings.

The minimum data necessary for these compilations is the date, time and sighting duration, location, witness name, and number of UFOs and witnesses. This data alone is very useful for analysis through computer coding. Also necessary are summaries of the witness' narrative account.



However, these catalogs will be of little value unless the reports going into them are accurately recorded. Therefore, the quality of the investigation of each report is very important. The key elements in the investigation are detailed, well documented reports and information pertinent to establishing the credibility of the witness. This latter point is especially necessary for entity cases because of their Strangeness and because most involve only a single witness.

In many ways humanoid cases are more amenable to investigation by a professional psychologist or psychiatrist. Increasingly, hypnosis is being used as a tool for recovering potentially repressed data, but it is not clear that even a professional can tell if data so derived is uncontaminated by the witness' subconscious. The use of the polygraph or the Psychological Stress Evaluator can be helpful in cases where hoax is suspected, but only if performed and certified by qualified personnel.

Verified drawings of entities are useful and not at all common. The investigator or an artist should make a drawing under the witness' supervision if the witness is reluctant to do so. Identikits are used routinely in such cases in other countries and should be incorporated here. All drawings must be approved and signed by the witness.

The HSG and Ray Fowler have devised a detailed questionnaire (Form No. 7) for use by MUFON investigators in entity cases. It is to be filled out in detail and submitted along with the investigator's own report on the case. The investigation and the writing of a report are discussed in MUFON's new Field Investigator's Manual (7). Such procedures and investigation forms should eventually be consolidated by one agency, ideally interacting with other similar groups on a worldwide basis.

With the publication of catalogs based on well documented reports, the acquisition phase is completed and data reduction can begin. A major form of the reduction is the computer coding of the case material. Saunders (8) and Vallee have derived encouraging results from the correlation of relatively simple and noisy coded data.

For coding purposes each category of UFO reports must be treated individually and yet permit cross-checking with other categories. For example, humanoid files must contain data on such unique items as humanoid type, appearance and behavior as well as data which frequently overlap other categories such as landings, physical traces, animal reactions, E/M effects, etc. Some examples of current approaches to the coding of humanoid cases can be found in references (4) and (9). One of the major goals of the HSG is to produce a computer code specifically for humanoid reports, and then to code all these reports into a system such as UFOCAT.

A form of reducing the humanoid data which we have found useful is a matrix of case no. vs salient, recurring features of the reports. An example for the 1974 reports was presented by Bloecher in (9). The general categories we have considered are the appearance and behavior of the humanoids, details of the UFO and the effects of the encounter on the witness and the environment.



1976 MUFON Symposium Proceedings

Data analysis can be thought of as a way to define the boundary conditions of a problem. If we have reason to expect a well documented data sample to be a representative sample, then we may expect to be able to define the limits of the data sample and gain real insight into the phenomenon. For instance we could set out to test the ET hypothesis. We would essentially "prove" it if all the reports in our representative sample were consistent with our definition of ET visitation, and if, and only if some of the reports were inconsistent with every other hypothesis we could think of (say, secret Earth weapons, life in the atmosphere, etc.) Of course, we must convince ourselves that we have thought of all possible hypotheses to test.

This is a bit of an oversimplification, but the important point is that we don't know if our present data sample is at all representative of the phenomenon. This is the real crux of the UFO problem today, and we have good reason to believe that our sample is not representative. Reports have been collected in any number only in the last 30 years, and in no systematic way; witnesses are not reporting sightings because of official ridicule and scientific disinterest; and we know little of the frequency or type of reports over the majority of the earth's surface area - Russia, China, the polar regions and the oceans.

However, even with this poor data sample, researchers have produced some interesting results which will need to be retested and expanded when better data samples arrive. These results so far have come from studies grouping the data in time units and in space (geographically). I briefly mention a few of them here.

Vallee (10) discusses a time behavior which he calls the "Law of the Times" that has shown up in studies of both landing and humanoid data. He believes it to be indicative of a constant behavior pattern showing a preference for nighttime landing and "extra-vehicular" activity. The time curve, with a peak about 9-10 pm, is also evident in the 1973 humanoid data (4).

I have reduced Bloecher's humanoid data by month and year and compared the results with Vallee's landing data (4). Both sets follow wave patterns and their peaks correlate well. Saunders (8) found what he believes is a 5 year (actually 61 month) cycle in reports in UFOCAT. A 5 year cycle was first suggested by Pontes (11).

I have also examined the geographical distribution of Bloecher's humanoid and Vallee's landing data and find similar wave patterns. Only a few countries are favored with repeated waves and the United States is far ahead! In fact the HSC catalog lists as many cases for the U.S. as for the rest of the world combined. This apparent interest in this country may be due to our more active news media and reporting network, or to an intrinsic interest possibly because of our technological leadership. Certainly the catalog is missing a lot of foreign reports; we are attempting to rectify this by increasing our contact with foreign representatives with the help of Richard Hall, MUFON's International Coordinator.

Vallee found for the 1954 French wave that there was a negative correlation between the frequency of reports and population density (12). However, Saunders found that population density was the one factor that correlated well in all of his associations using the more general UFOCAT data (8). A negative correlation seems likely with the humanoid data, and the degree of the anti-correlation seems to rise with increasing degree of contact.



1976 MUFON Symposium Proceedings

Michel (2), Mebane (3) and Saunders (8) have studied the Orthotonic pattern of UFO waves. Saunders concluded that there is a worldwide pattern involving the best-defined orthotonic lines, and that the 1954 French and 1947 U.S. patterns seem related. I was unable to find much correlation with the 1973 data (4).

It should be apparent to the reader that the UFO researcher needs a proper forum for presenting his ideas and analysis results; a referred journal is probably the best way to achieve this. There is also a need to get good reports into the hands of researchers quickly. Currently the Center could provide this service by routinely publishing and distributing "White Papers" on good, well-documented cases. Finally, a periodic review of the UFO research literature should be published. This might be along the lines of the Annual Review series, where qualified experts in certain fields are selected to survey the literature and summarize it in a concise paper.



1976 MUFON Symposium Proceedings

REFERENCES USED BY DAVID F. WEBB, "ANALYSIS OF HUMANOID REPORTS"

1. Bloecher, T.: 1967, Report on the UFO Wave of 1947, published privately by Bloecher.
2. Michel, A.: 1958, Flying Saucers and the Straight-Line Mystery, Criterion Books, New York.
3. Mebane, L.: 1958, "The 1957 Saucer Wave in the United States", in appendix to Michel, op. cit., p. 246.
4. Webb, D.: 1976, 1973 - Year of the Humanoids, Center For UFO Studies, Evanston, Illinois.
5. Vallee, J.: 1969, Passport to Magonia, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, Illinois.
6. Webb, op. cit.
7. Fowler, R., ed.: 1975, MUFON Field Investigator's Manual, MUFON, Seguin, Texas.
8. Saunders, D.: 1972, "Some New Lines for UFO Research" in 1972 Midwest UFO Conference, MUFON, Seguin, Texas.
9. Bloecher, T.: 1975, "A Catalog of Humanoid Reports for 1974", in MUFON 1975 UFO Symposium Proceedings, MUFON, Seguin, Texas.
10. Vallee, J.: 1966, Challenge to Science, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, Illinois, p. 151.
11. Fontes, O.: January 1963, APRO Bulletin.
12. Vallee, Challenge to Science, p. 159.