

C

* * * *

FROM THE CRITIC'S CORNER

By Peter Kor = TOM COMELLA

⊞ ⊞

In line with FLYING SAUCERS' policy to present ALL of the evidence, and BOTH sides of the argument, we have secured the opinions of a true unbeliever. Mr. Kor, we are sure, does a fine job of presenting the reverse side of the coin. In our turn, we will respond to Mr. Kor with articles of our own, to prove that our "scientific method" has been valid.

For years enthusiasts have been declaring that the flying saucer phenomena is an invasion (peaceful or otherwise) from outer space. Such enthusiasts are split into two groups: (1) those who rest their case upon the many ufo reports and an analysis of same, and (2), those who claim some personal contact or other knowledge of space intelligences. The first group claims for itself a certain scientific dignity and bitterly attacks the second group as being the lunatic fringe of the saucer subject. Meanwhile, the second group sees itself as the seer of a New Golden Age which will be brought about by the saucer people and it opposes the former group on the grounds that it is composed of closed minds, un-receptive to truth. In this article I will examine the

(5) The United States Air Force has been withholding data concerning ufo sightings for fear of a panic in the fields of economy, engineering and religion if the reality of space visitors were admitted.

A Discussion of the Interplanetary Case: Having restated the case for the interplanetary saucer, let us study it objectively and determine exactly where its foundation lies. Point number one: the question before us is not what the possibilities are that life exists outside the earth, or, what the probability may be that said intelligences may visit us. The question before us is this: are space intelligences visiting the earth now? So that we see that positive answers to the questions of probability stated above, are not points in favor of the idea that such hypothetical entities are presently in our atmosphere. A scientist is forever bound to keep his mind open to those concepts which have not been proven one way or another. Yet, no one is justified in adopting a view or theory without strong supporting evidence, much less insisting that a case is proven without offering a demonstration of that proof.

Point number two: the human mind is a marvelous apparatus for perception. Yet it always makes one vital mistake: it continually attempts to visualize the unknown in terms of a known context. And so it is that the ufo phenomena has been called a fleet of space ships when actually the character of the phenomena has never been demonstrated. So I say that, because the characteristics of an unknown phenomena

viewpoints of each group in an attempt to secure the merits of each as well as the demerits of each. At the same time, a conclusion as to the real worth of the interplanetary claims should become apparent.

The Problem In Perspective: The case for the interplanetary saucer, as stated by group number one, usually consists of these five points: (1) There are 100,000 million stars in the Milky Way of which, it can be statistically shown, a certain percentage probably have satellite planets. Therefore, due to the staggering numbers with which we are dealing, there exists a great possibility that, on a multitude of worlds, intelligences have evolved which rival and even surpass the intelligence of human beings. It is not incredible that other human races exist on other worlds and that they, or other alien types of intelligence, are curious enough to explore the universe. (2) Observations of the ufo phenomena prove that we are dealing with physical structures, the performance characteristics of which are definitely beyond the present technical capability of Man on this earth. Therefore, they must represent the technical effort of a space race much further advanced than ours. (3) Ufos have been observed for centuries, even before the invention of the balloon, which puts the existence of these constructions at a time when the earth was incapable of conceiving of such awesome things. (4) Unusual objects have been observed to operate in outer space by several of the nation's leading astronomers, including William Herschel.

seem to be beyond human capabilities, this does not, in itself, posit a super-human source. One of the tragedies of this scientific age is the gross misconception on the part of the masses of laymen, that all of the mysteries of nature have been discovered. That all there is to do is to somehow find practical applications for the natural forces already revealed. This view is very shortsighted, as there are undoubtedly a myriad of phenomena of nature as yet unsuspected by Man. . . phenomena out of our present scientific reach. Such a phenomenon might exhibit itself to us in some alien, bizzare fashion. And if this were to occur, we could no more understand that phenomenon than a mathematician could solve a calculus problem with simple arithmetic. We should never be too quick to force the unknown into some stereotyped context; for the false security furnished by the statement "we know", is poor consolation for the loss of truth. When viewing the scene of ufo research, one fact stands out bolder than all others to an impartial observer: it is that, no matter how emotionally or emphatically the different groups argue their particular theories, the various observations of ufo phenomena simply will not confirm any of them.

Point number three: that ufos have been observed for centuries tells us nothing other than the fact that some phenomenon, or group of phenomenons, has been witnessed over a certain time period. This in no way implies interplanetary craft unless one has already assigned that character to the phenomena. So the most

we can say is that Man has been aware of unknown phenomena for quite some time.

Point number four: Again, unless one has already decided that space vehicles exist around the earth, the fact that unusual events have been observed in space tells us nothing regarding the nature of those events.

Point number five: the most casual investigation will reveal that the USAF has been very reluctant to release ufo information to the public. However, to immediately accuse them of conspiracy is ridiculous! There are a hundred and one reasons why the air force might not be willing to cooperate with the public on this matter, none of which implies a conspiracy to hide the fact of interplanetary saucers. The most logical reason is that the air force has no solution to the phenomena, and that they continue to investigate with no definite conclusion, not knowing what a future observation will bring. At any rate, the air force has no obligation to keep the public informed on this matter. The function of the armed forces is to protect this country from aggressors. . . they are not information channels to John Q. Citizen. Such information is imparted to the people through other government agencies.

So what can we objectively say about the case for the interplanetary saucer as stated by the constituents of group one? Obviously, the first thing is that the interplanetary saucer is not a fact, it is a belief! I say belief, because the interplanetary case has been

tacts. I insert the words "by demonstration" for any reality can be demonstrated and such assures that the reality exists with no regard as to an argument concerning "degree of proof." Degrees of proof are only considered where a theory is being debated. But when someone talks about reality, he is talking about something which "actually exists". . . there are no degrees of existence. (3) An astounding degree of disagreement is exhibited by the contacts of various persons. And although each contact claim paints the picture of a race of saviors from space coming to earth in her darkest hour in an organized attempt to avert disaster, (the contacts themselves show an astonishing amount of ignorance about other "brothers" who are here for the same purpose.) Two contacts from Mars might not even be aware of each other and probably violently disagree as to their purpose of remaining unrecognized by the world at large. (4) Most contacts say they are here to help Mankind, yet not one of them will help. . . he only utters contradictory remarks to lonely people. (5) The message of the contact never goes beyond the scope of the contactee. When this does occur, obvious mistakes are made in scientific terminology. . . errors which are understandable for a layman to make, but which are inexcusable for a superscientist from Jupiter. (6) Not one message from these contacts from deepest space contains anything new in concept. They are mere re-statements of human concepts. (7) The contacts only present themselves to those people who had always

maintained by enthusiasts even though there exists no positive evidence of confirmation. This displays a certain faith in the idea of interplanetary visitors, but it also displays an utter disregard for the facts. The central fact of the ufo saga is that a significant percentage of people have observed an unusual phenomena . . . a phenomena that has exhibited itself for years. . . one that has yet to be understood.

The Second Group of Interplanetary Believers: This group bases its case, not upon an examination of the evidence, but upon claimed experiences with space intelligences. There have been literally hundreds of contact claims, but because, as of this writing, there does not exist a single demonstration of proof concerning any one of them, these reports can be looked upon as a body erratic data. I say erratic because these claims are not dedicated to a discernment of the ufo phenomena, but rather, they are devoted to the extension of certain ideas and doctrines. I in no way imply that these cases are automatically not true, I merely point out that they are separated from the observations of the ufo phenomena by their character of purpose. A study of many of these claims reveals certain similarities. It is worth while to list such similarities. (1) Not one contactee has been able to convince his contact that their existence should be demonstrated, once and for all. (2) Despite trips into space and long conversations with space people, no contactee has managed to convince an impartial observer, by demonstration, of the reality of his con-

believed in the idea of life on other worlds and interplanetary travel. (8) After eight years of contacts, they have not saved Man from anything. To the contrary, they have only added confusion upon confusion. So it is logical to assume that the space people have been very ^{APPARENTLY} unorganized and ineffective, for their stated purpose has failed miserably.

There are three possible solutions to this body of contact claims: (1) They are true as a whole or in part. (2) They are wholly fraudulent or partly so. (3) They are psychological deceptions in answer to the subconscious aspirations and hopes of the contactees. The stark contradictions apparent in the statements above rules out the thought that the contacts are all factual experiences. In fact, since it is most difficult to find any two contacts which agree completely, it is apparent that if there is truth to be found here, it is only in one or two possible cases. That is, to assume that more than that number actually relate real experiences is to be faced with a wall of contradictions. So the only possibility is that a hidden case or two is real, and that this (or these) case(s) is lost within the context of hoax and fraud. But in spite of the obvious contradictions and utter lack of supporting evidence, the contact movement continues. This, once again, moves the body of data out of the realm of fact into the realm of belief.

In Conclusion: It seems to be obvious that the foundation upon which the interplanetary saucer rests is one of belief. And like all cases of belief, its origin

probably is not in the ufo phenomena itself. It is reasonable to state that three factors permeate the interplanetary belief: (a) A certain rebellion against the orthodoxy of science and the scientific method. A desire, if you will, to discover some realm over which science has no control. . . a realm which is not bound by conventional laws, etc. (b) A will to believe in a universal purpose impregnated with intelligence. A hope that Man is not alone, that even in his darkest hour, help is not far away. (c) A most remarkable phenomenon. A phenomenon which might provide Man with his most stupendous challenge. A phenomenon which was the stimulus that triggered the rebellious and hopeful moods in the hearts of a few. A phenomenon upon which has been made the imposition of super men with super intelligence riding in super space ships. Like most movements of belief, the interplanetary groups have much momentum. Time alone, will reveal their error. Already, a movement which began in utter defiance of orthodox scientific thinking, is beginning to form its own orthodoxy and intolerance.

In the meantime, there does exist an interesting phenomenon to be studied without the rigid framework of belief surrounding it. The most we can hope, is that the phenomenon itself is not the creation of mans' will to believe. . . that after time has eliminated the groups of believers, sincere investigators will find that a phenomenon does, indeed, exist apart from the hopes and dreams of those groups. If such a phenomenon does exist, we must start now in se-

C
in contact with, or, even within close proximity of say 15 to 25 feet, they are burned from radio-activity." But he showed his hand, both sides, and there was no redness or evidence of burns. So you see, I accepted the story with the idea of corroboration by analysis later. All I asked YOU to do was ANALYZE same, and let me know what the analysis showed. I did not ask you to justify that the cake came from an interplanetary source. I asked YOU to ascertain the facts FROM the analysis regardless of what that analysis showed. You are rather presumptuous to think that I wanted a definite result reported, aren't you?

Your secretary reported further: "We are engaged in very important liaison work with Congress which may well lead to hearings on UFO's and we do not propose to compromise this work for the sake of an UNPROVEN, and, you must admit, FANTASTIC sounding claim. (The italics are mine) Accordingly, we do not wish to have any FURTHER PUBLICITY IN CONNECTION WITH THIS CLAIM UNLESS STRONG SUPPORTING EVIDENCE IS FORTHCOMING."

I can see that the subject is a TOUCHY one for you, from your present position. You should change the name of your committee to the better name to apply to your organization, if THAT is your true position as to UFO's. Change it to National Investigating Committee of Aerial Phenomena OTHER THAN SO-CALLED CONTACT STORIES, and that would apply, as you do not intend to investigate them at all.

FS, 5-61 69

parating the observations of it from the beliefs imposed upon it.

As a step in that direction, I propose the adoption of a new word to cover the unusual phenomena being dealt with. . . a word that would free us from the connotations of the words "object", "vehicle", "saucer", "craft" and "machine." For it is clear, to use these words is to use the concepts involved with them. I submit the word Aerophenomena to cover unexplained atmospheric phenomena.

If the Aerophenomena witnessed these past few years is to be understood, investigators must strain their eyes to see, not to change or conform what they see to a particular framework. Before we can ever understand we must see what it is that escapes us. Never before has such a challenge of sincerity been placed before Man. History will tell us how he fared.

VENEZUELA SAUCER

A STRANGE LUMINOUS object was seen over Caracas, Venezuela, September 16, 1960. It was as large as the moon, and round, brilliantly luminous. It seemed to be carrying 3 or 4 colored lights separate from the main body. It left a slightly luminous trail which vanished immediately, was completely silent and flew at supersonic speed at relatively low altitude over the city.

It was also seen over Tachira, Puerto Rico and over Jacksonville. It had been seen the previous Wednesday also, and by a plane near Puerto Cabello.

However, IF this cake has been analyzed and turned out a fraud, that would have proven your theory, but IF it turned out otherwise then perhaps you do not want any such results to turn up, and that you WANT to REMAIN with your eyes shut as to ANY contact story. And just TALK against them instead of nailing them to a cross IF the result showed a FRAUD. Are you AFRAID to examine for fear that it MIGHT RESULT in a vindication of their story?

If this was such a FANTASTIC sounding claim why couldn't you have analyzed the cake and thereafter determined from the facts themselves, such a CONCLUSION instead of forming that conclusion beforehand and NOT even examine or listen unless compelled to? As a judge in a court of record, in a case before me as such, I am required to wait until the evidence is all in, to determine whether the defendant is guilty or not. The defendant (Simonton) deserves the same treatment, that is the analysis, before finding him guilty. I can't for the life of me, see how YOU can justify your conclusion against the Air Force and their position, WHEN YOU SEEMINGLY DO THE VERY SAME THING THAT YOU CRITICIZE THEM FOR. You do not believe in "Doing unto others that which ye would have them do unto you."

Evidently you had NO INTENTION of having that cake examined or analyzed as a result of my FIRST letter. You should have, under such circumstances, RETURNED the exhibit TO ME, as it was not a GIFT to me, nor to YOU, but handed over to ME and by me

to YOU, SOLELY for analysis.

After my second letter, your secretary states that you have now arranged for an analysis by a competent chemist "who said that he would send a report to you (me) in his own name." This means, that YOU do not want your name attached to the report, no matter whether the sample proves to be a hoax or just what Joe Simonton represented it to be. What a FUNNY position for a Director of a National INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE? Sounds more like a Hush-Hush Committee, wanting nothing to do with the results UNLESS HE CAN CONTROL WHAT THOSE RESULTS SHOULD SHOW. YOUR attitude seems to increase the U.F.O. confusion. You state "The ludicrous nature of the story (Simonton) is ready-make for ridicule. . .and distortion. It is also a rather incredible story, and it is up to claimants (Simonton) in such cases to substantiate THEIR stories; not for US to DISPROVE them."

My comments are these: You are taking the position that it is up to Simonton to "prove" his case. He has no Geiger instrument to prove that such a radioactive space ship hovered above his land; he has no funds to analyze the pancake. You set yourself up as Director of an Investigating Committee, and up to this time, I honestly believed that you meant that title, an Investigating Committee, but now I wonder if you should change it to "Suppression Committee" instead. I believe that you intended to give Simonton and I the old "Conspiracy of SILENCE".

Simonton was curious and expressed curiosity unto the first spaceman and he noticed Simonton's interest and immediately GAVE him the cakes; but NOT IN EXCHANGE FOR the water; the cakes were a gift after the first act was completed and there was no intention to obtain cakes in "exchange therefor" when Simonton went after the water. So you see how your story in your paper called the UFO Investigator does not represent the facts? Why the alleged spaceman "needed" the water, we do not know.

May 24th I received word from Mrs. June Larson, Director of the A.P.R.A. stating that she was the Director of the Aerial Phenomena Research Association and that their organization is NOT one of the so-called "fringe element" organizations, nor do we have any pre-conceived ideas as to the nature and purpose of the UFOs. We are, rather, objectively seeking some reasonable answer to these phenomena, and are interested in pursuing every possible separate investigation through which such an answer might come." "We have access to laboratory facilities, and would be most happy to provide you and/or Mr. Simonton with a copy of any such analysis, once completed, however, your co-operation in providing us with a sample for this purpose would be greatly appreciated." My comment is this: This letter came too late to help me formulate any ideas in this above letter; but I am glad to note that the purpose of her organization conforms in words, at least, to what I expected of NICAP, and that they would do exactly what I expected in

For your information, the Air Force took a cake; Dr. J. A. Hynek, Head of the Astronomy department department formerly of Ohio U. but now of N.W.U. of Illinois took half a cake. He intends to analyze same too. So there should be the same results announced from all examinations and no FALSE report. May I have the name and address of the chemist in New York City that you gave that cake to for analysis? It is now over a month since I sent that exhibit in to you, to wit April 22, 1961, and have no report whatever.

Your April-May issue of your UFO Investigator, on page 8 thereof, stated:

New Contactee Claim

"The recent "spacemen contact" claim at Eagle River, Wisc., received so much publicity that it unfortunately may lead many to think the UFO Mystery a joke. According to Joe Simonton, Eagle River plumber, a "flying saucer" landed in his yard April 8th, and three spacemen gave him some pancakes IN EXCHANGE for a jug of water." Major Keyhoe, THAT story presents a WRONG view. The 3 men did NOT GIVE some pancakes IN EXCHANGE for a jug of water. The story as given to me by Simonton DIRECT was that one alleged Spaceman needed water and requested water from Simonton. Simonton got the water for him and in handing up the receptacle filled with water TO the one spaceman in the open hatchway, incidentally SAW another spaceman through the open hatchway working over cakes being cooked or fried.

analyzing the cake.

Why not return the cake to me now without analysis? Yours, Judge Carter.

There you have Judge Carter's letter to Keyhoe. It does not take much analysis to determine that the Judge is angry. And he certainly has good reason to be incensed at the treatment he has received. But on the other hand, he should be delighted, for it is by his faith and integrity that we have finally smoked the woodchuck out of the woodpile!

Before we take Major Keyhoe to task, let's go back to pages 8 and 9 to clear up one thing for certain: we are going to speak strictly of Major Keyhoe, and secondarily, about those we will specifically designate. So, we want to mention Mr. J. B. Hartranft as a man who is a personal acquaintance of ours, since we worked with him when he was connected with POPULAR AVIATION (later changed to FLYING) in Chicago for many years. A finer, more honorable gentleman does not exist. He would never be a party to a deception, although he would defend his country to the utmost, and if that included keeping a military secret, he would do so with utmost efficiency.

As for Capt. Ruppelt, he is dead. We admire the way he acted under orders, and we certainly do not blame him for the outright lie in his book which stated we were the perpetrators of a "dirtiest hoax in history" at Maury Island which resulted in the deaths of two fine intelligence officers.