

UFO RESEARCH IN THE USA

Part II - Analysis of the Survey

By Jacques Vallée

IN Part I of this article, the need for a survey of civilian UFO groups was discussed, and as well as giving details of the way in which the survey was conducted, we included a list of all groups who have agreed to the publishing of their answers to the questionnaire we had distributed. In this part we proceed with the analysis of the returned questionnaires.

It should be noted that throughout this article we shall use exclusively the statements made by the groups themselves, and will not try to correct their estimates of their membership, even when it could be checked from other sources. In most cases, more reasonable values would be indicated if such corrections were applied: many groups give the mailing lists of their periodicals as their membership.

The reader will probably have noticed strong similarities in the statements made by the various groups concerning their conclusions on the origin and nature of UFOs. These statements are carefully worded and obviously are poor indicators of the true motivations of the group leaders, which can usually be deduced from other sources, like reading their publications. All groups definitely believe that UFOs are real unexplained objects but interestingly enough, when asked if they have reached a *definite* conclusion, they are clearly divided: eleven answer yes, eleven answer no, and three (APRO, Houston UFO Bureau and Steiner Foundation) answer yes with reserves. (See Table I).

Belief in "contactees"

This is clearly a critical point. The 'contactees' are the persons who have received publicity both as a consequence of their alleged meeting with the occupants of the 'saucers', and for the revelations they have received of their origin and purpose. Such stories must be totally separated from two other classes of reports:

- (1) Accounts of 'operators' described by witnesses who do not claim they have received a message.
- (2) Accounts of alleged meetings with messengers, but in a context entirely foreign to that of UFO reports. Such events are usually interpreted as religious miracles. Although many aspects of the

generation of the report and of their propagation among society follow the patterns observed in the UFO Phenomenon, the occasion of these accounts is never a flying object described as a machine. (The Fatima phenomenon, for example, falls in this category.)

In Table I we have classified the degree of acceptance or rejection of various types of reports by the different groups using the following very simple scale:

- A means a report of this type is *rejected* by the group
- B: it is investigated as the other reports
- C: it is considered as possibly true
- D: it is believed under certain conditions
- E: it is generally accepted

The question: "Do you think the 'contactees' should be believed?" has brought the following answers: Seven groups reject these reports absolutely and two treat them as any other report in their investigation. Four consider that there is a possibility of truth in them, eight accept them under certain conditions and four attach definite credence to them: they are: groups No. 6, 7, 19 and 22: Flying Saucer News Club, AFSCA, School of Thought and Morse Fellowship.

It is interesting to correlate belief in contactees with answers to the first question: "do you have a definite conclusion?" Not all who think contactees might be sincere have a definite conclusion. Out of twelve groups who believe at least some of the contactee stories, seven have a definite answer, three do not, two are hesitant. Although it is true that most groups (18 out of 25) are willing to consider the truth of their accounts a possibility, very few take all contactee stories for granted. Among these, some may have made no distinction between 'contact' stories of the Adamski type and 'landings with operators'; this would introduce a considerable bias in the interpretation of their answers.

Credence in descriptions of 'operators'

The question brought interesting comments. It illustrated a sharp difference in spirit between APRO and NICAP. Major Keyhoe's group gave the same uncommitted answer as to the previous question: such incidents "should be investigated."

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Group No.	Definite conclusion	Belief in contactees	Official evidence	Official secrecy	Belief in 'operators'	Name or initials of group
1	No	C	Yes	Yes	C	IIUFO
2	No	A	Poss.	Some	C	AMUFO
3	No	B	Yes	Yes	B	NICAP (Keyhoe)
4	(Yes)	A	Yes	Yes	E	APRO
5	Yes	D	Yes	Yes	E	NICAP (Gribble)
6	No	E	Yes	Yes	E	FSNCA
7	Yes	E	Yes	Yes	E	AFSCA
8	Yes	A	Poss.	Yes	E	SAUCERS
9	Yes	D	Yes	Yes	E	Aetherius Society
10	Yes	C	Poss.	Yes	D	CAPIC
11	No	C	Poss.	Yes	C	APIC
12	No.	B	Yes	Yes	B	CFSIB
13	Yes	C	Yes	Yes	D	Planetary Space Center
14	Yes	D	No	Yes	A	Christian Zion Advocate
15	No	D	Yes	Yes	E	Long Beach Interplanetary Research Group
16	Yes	D	Yes	Distortion		Solar Cross Foundation
17	No	A	Yes	Yes	E	Tucson Science Club
18	(Yes)	D	No	Yes	D	HUFOB
19	Yes	E	Yes	Yes	E	School of Thought
20	No	A	Yes	Yes	E	UFO Magazine
21	No	A	Yes	Yes	E	PICAP
22	Yes	E	Yes	Yes	E	Morse Fellowship
23	No	D	Poss.		E	CPB
24	Yes	A	Yes	Yes	E	New England UFO Study Group
25	(Yes)	D	Yes	Yes	E	Steiner Foundation

Does this mean that since 1956 the group has not even reached a working hypothesis on these two subjects?

APRO answers clearly: some accounts of 'operators' should be taken seriously. But certainly not the descriptions made by the contactees, as "they deal with emotionally inspired projections and sometimes are merely the product of people who are attempting to benefit monetarily from the UFO mystery."

A few other answers are significant; thus

Group No. 7: Hundreds of detailed accounts of landings have been made. If Flying Saucers do exist at altitudes of a few hundred feet, why can't they land?

Group No. 17: The "non-communicating" ones where humanoid forms were seen but fought and ran, and the observers did not subsequently go on lecture tours, should be taken seriously. Numerous countries have reported similar events.

Group No. 20: The facts seem to point to there being a small biped associated with UFO landings. They may or may not be the pilots of the craft.

The acceptance of the dwarfish-looking operator seems fairly general. Only one group (No. 14, a contactee believer) specifically rejects all accounts of "little men" landings.

Correlation between belief in contactees and in accounts of operators in general

Most of the groups which accept "little men" stories reject the contactee claims, as APRO does. The reverse is also true in certain cases: a group of contactee believers accepts accounts of "pilots" only if "they look like you and I". The most conservative group is AMUFO (No. 2) which rejects contactee stories and considers cautiously the possibility of the "operators".

Four groups reject absolutely all contactee claims and definitely accept the 'operators': they are No.

4 (APRO), No. 8 (SAUCERS), No. 17 (Tucson Space Club) and No. 20 (UFO Magazine).

Recommended writers and books

Another question was: "what are the books on UFOs your organization recommends?" It led to the following frequencies:

TABLE 2

Keyhoe	13
Ruppelt	10
Michel	7
UFO Evidence	7
Coral Lorenzen	6
Jessup	5
Fry	5
Maney and Hall	3
Adamski	3
Max Miller	2
Charles Fort	2
Van Tassel	2
Gray Barker	1
Dr. Carl Jung	1
Leslie	1
Le Poer Trench	1
Waveney Girvan	1
Trevor James	1
Stranges	1
Laura Mundo	1
Menger	1
Angelucci	1
A Dweller on 2 Planets	1
India to Planet Mars	1
The Bible	1

These answers show that the ideas expressed by Major Keyhoe still have the strongest influence on the leaders of UFO organizations in the United States. The low rating of Charles Fort should, in our view, be interpreted as a certain lack of interest for historical perspective. Even more striking and disturbing is the fact that APRO stands alone in its reference to Dr. Carl Jung's book. Michel and Jung are the only ones out of all the contemporary authors in the list who do not write in English. The trends noticeable here will be confirmed by answers to the next question.

Most significant sightings

Table 3 gives the frequencies associated with each sighting. Out of 58 answers, 47 were relative to American observations. No foreign observation was given by two groups simultaneously.

A total of 26 sightings, of which 11 are given several times, are indicated. Interestingly enough, no 'contactee' type sighting is found in the list of repeated cases. Only one group (No. 13) mentions Adamski's account, although we have seen several groups answering "yes" to the question: "Do you think contactees should be believed?" and three groups recommend his books.

The most frequently named case was Socorro,

New Mexico, which was by far the best known case of 1964. Next in popularity come the Washington incident (1952), Kenneth Arnold and Mantell.

TABLE 3

Socorro	8
Washington	7
Kenneth Arnold	4
Mantell	4
South-West 1957	4
Trindade	4
Kinross Case	3
Personal sightings	3
Rapid City S.D.	2
Lubbock Lights	2
Nash and Fortenberry	2
Alpert (photo)	1
Red Bluff	1
Captain Sperry	1
Father Gill	1
BOAC crew	1
Rome	1
Fort Itaipu	1
New Jersey 1964	1
Chiles and Whitted	1
100% pure magnesium	1
McMinneville	1
Adamski's sighting	1
Star of Bethlehem	1
Lady of Fatima	1
Angel Moroni	1

The most striking character of this list is what it *does not include*: the Kelly landing, the Bismarck case, the Walesville incident, the Lock Raven Dam sighting, seem totally unknown. Similarly, it is remarkable not to find anywhere mention of cloud cigar observations or any of the classical landings (except Socorro), although many groups are cognizant of Michel's work.

It is remarkable that the sightings are practically ranked in the order of the publicity they have received, regardless of their intrinsic value or their convincing character. The sentimental attachment for such cases as the Mantell dramatic accident or the Lubbock Lights is very evident. Clearly the groups take it for granted that the most publicized cases are the most convincing, when even a small amount of research would have brought to light an entirely different type of reports. Again, APRO is the most original group in this respect for it lists three foreign sightings out of five: Trindade, Father Gill and the BOAC incidents. NICAP also gives evidence of careful consideration of the question, although it lists only American cases. They are: Nash & Fortenberry, Red Bluff, Captain Sperry, South-West 1957 and Socorro. Neither Washington nor Kenneth Arnold and Mantell are listed by APRO or NICAP, as among the most significant cases. It is true, however, that the

groups were asked to select only five sightings, which was a heavy restriction.

Geographic repartition

If we come back for a moment to the question of 'belief in contactees', we see that we can narrow down our classification to only two categories; the firm believers in 'contactees' are groups in classifications D and E. All others either reject them, or consider them with some scepticism. On Figure 2 we have shown the location of the firm contactee believers by a triangle and other groups as open circles.

The geographic effect is fairly obvious: Ten contactee believers out of twelve are located west of a line Seattle-Houston. Eleven out of thirteen of the 'others' are located east of this line.

Here is the proper place to mention a recent work on this subject presented by a professional sociologist at a scientific convention.

H. Taylor Buckner, of the Berkeley campus of the University of California, noted in a paper given before a meeting of the American Sociological association that "In 1953 and 1954, ten books claiming contact with the saucers were published. The people who believed them were, in the main, people already functioning in the world of the occult." The same researcher added that eighty per cent of the saucer club audiences are usually older women, single or widowed. They do not have a great deal of formal education, Buckner said, and they believe 'seeing things' is a mark of special sensitivity.

A look at our figure 2 will allow M. Buckner to place his discoveries in their proper perspective. His own geographical location, we suggest, puts him at the focal point of every extravagance in the field of superstition and false science. From such a sampling it is difficult to let him generalize his results to the entire field of research into unusual aerial phenomena. His findings, however, constitute an important element of information to those who are still sentimentally attached to the claims of Adamski, Daniel Fry, George van Tassel and Truman Bethurum. I have pointed out in *Anatomy of a Phenomenon* that George Adamski, for instance, before becoming a prominent figure in 'UFO research', was the head of a mystical cult called the Royal Order of Tibet. The generalization of these indications by a professional sociologist is an element of great interest.

Belief in government 'secrecy'

Of the 25 groups studied here, only one believes that authorities have obtained no evidence concerning the nature and origin of the UFO Phenomenon: it is group No. 14, whose doctrine is that UFOs are direct emissaries from God. Another group (No.



Figure 2

18) indicates that government investigators have probably obtained no evidence, "but at least 80 to 85 per cent are on the right track". Group No. 18, we should keep in mind, has received confidential evidence and withholds other comments. (This is a group of strong believers in Bender's theory of 'The three men in Black').

Five groups see a strong possibility that evidence is in the hands of the authorities. "The question is: which authorities?" asks group No. 2. Another group simply answers: "Hmmm!".

All other groups flatly answer: "Yes".

The next question was: "Do you think the information obtained is kept secret, and why?" These are the answers we have obtained:

1. Certain information is secret for many reasons.
2. Some secrecy does exist. To what extent we have not determined.
3. Much of it is (secret), no doubt partly for reasons of bureaucratic thinking and underestimation of the intelligence of the public.
4. Because the ultimate answers—who, why and whence—are not a certainty, and their motivations are not known. Such information, without *full* information would be disastrous politically, economically and to some extent, emotionally for all the people of the world.
5. Yes. The world's monetary system and religions.
6. Yes. To protect manufacturers of our rockets and satellites—may hamper their production.
7. Yes. Several reasons. Introduction of revolutionary new forms of power would make present power sources obsolete and jeopardize our economy. As throughout history, special interest groups feeling their power and financial status threatened by introduction of new knowledge, oppose progress.
8. If the Air Force has significant information that the public does not have, it is kept secret for what they consider to be security reasons.
9. Yes. Official recognition would result in loss of government power and influence.
10. Yes. Maybe because they are scared of UFOs or because of what public reaction might be.
11. AFR-200-2 and JANAP 146 demand secrecy for unsolved cases. Fear of panic, economic collapse or other reasons might justify secrecy in the event they know what UFOs are.

12. Yes. Air Force directives and their policy of withholding information seems to indicate this. *The Flying Saucer Conspiracy* best outlines this.
13. If they consider possibilities, at all, who are Earthman that is, fearing panic on part of people, by religions . . . only angels "up there" . . . and monsters by writers.
14. Yes. Because they can't understand it.
15. Yes.
16. Not secret, but distorted! Due to religious views, those who would panic, and advanced military devices.
17. Yes. Each country is trying to discover the secrets of the saucers, especially their advanced technology, and trying to prevent other countries from profiting from this evidence and getting there first.
18. Yes. I think in some cases, the truth may cause mass hysteria.
19. Yes, kept under cover. The truth would upset our economy, religions, education and military ego.
20. Yes, it is hard to say why. They may think some sort of panic could come from a disclosure that there are UFOs. However, it seems that bureaucracy plays an important role in UFO suppression.
21. Yes. They are afraid of scaring the American public.
22. The materialists have no explanation for the realm of spirit which is reality.
23. No answer.
24. Refer: AFR 200-2, CIRVIS Reports, Holloman Air Force orders, etc. Panic. Time to duplicate Saucers for own space arsenal, etc.
25. Yes. Because it contains a whole new conceptive idea unknown to conventional science—that of *Emergence* into our plane of existence, intelligently directed.

It is somewhat difficult to extract the basic elements in these statements, because of the differences in wording. We should probably have asked the question in a more direct form to obtain answers easier to classify. In trying to summarize the reasons given for official secrecy, we have found the following frequencies:

7	groups mention	Fear of panic, Mass hysteria.
5		Economic disaster.
4		Collapse of religious faith.
3		Loss of political power
3		Protection of space industry.
3		Officials are unable to understand.
2		Hope to be the first discoverer of the 'secret'.
2		Bureaucratic thinking.
1		Still insufficient conclusions.

Conclusions

We have presented this study only as a preliminary step toward the establishment of a global, up-to-date Directory of UFO research groups. Such a Directory would permit a more efficient distribution of the literature and would favour a flow of ideas between centres of active research. It would avoid delays in the announcement of significant sightings which, at the present time,

remain too often unknown outside of a very small circle.

A Federation of UFO groups on a planetary scale has been suggested: we hope that the present work will help define the problems associated with the planning of such a federation.

As it is presented here, the list of American UFO groups is still largely incomplete. We have examined some of the reasons for this inaccuracy. In the time elapsed since the survey a wave of new sightings has developed over the area under study and it has undoubtedly favoured the generation of new groups. Therefore we present these conclusions as indicative of *trends* in American 'ufology' rather than definite results.

We think our survey indicates that the leaders of the UFO movement in the U.S. are: (1) **Conservative:** Captain Mantell and Major Keyhoe remain their typical symbols, while Father Gill and Professor Jung are practically ignored. (2) **Suspicious** of foreign observations. The main 'waves' that have taken place outside of the United States (New Guinea, Australia, Scandinavia, Europe) have had no impact on their ways of thinking. (3) **Unscientific:** The role of these groups is limited to diffusion and documentation of reports. None of them has the equipment, the training, the staff or the funds that would permit effective scientific research.

Yet, an objective analysis of their motivations and theories gives a picture much brighter than the public generally believes. It is true that a majority of groups are irrational in their thinking. An even larger set considers 'Ufology' as a hobby which brings into their uneventful lives a touch of mystery and science-fiction. But most are undoubtedly open-minded. We have seen that very few indeed went all the way with the 'contactees'. Our general impression is that a serious effort on the part of trained scientific investigators to bring the UFO problem into the open would be supported by most of the groups and that most would be willing to admit the weakness of their present theories.

The current attitude of these civilian organizations toward the alleged 'official secrecy' should be brought to the attention of the responsible agencies. The distrust of the Air Force investigating procedure, for instance, is complete, and this cannot be explained simply as a consequence of the popularity of Major Keyhoe's books. It seems that the UFO groups have indeed a large fraction of the public with them when they condemn the present handling of the reports by the authorities. Several articles and editorials in American newspapers have confirmed this trend this summer. (See for

instance *Medical Tribune*, July 17, 1965, *Christian Science Monitor*, August 21, *Chicago Sun-Times*, August 8, *Chicago American*, August 6, etc.).

Most of the groups surveyed here give evidence of sincerity and serious dedication. They certainly do not deserve (if we make exception for a few extremists) the term of charlatans which is often applied to them.

The next step, of course, is to repeat this survey on a global scale. To this effect, we have asked this periodical permission to reprint our questionnaire: we ask all the groups engaged in research in this field anywhere in the world, that wish to contribute to this study, to return this questionnaire to the author c/o the FLYING SAUCER REVIEW. We will appreciate infinitely a sample of their publications, if any.

NOTE—We append the form of questionnaire which was sent to the Civilian UFO Organizations in January, 1965.

(All questions are optional)

Name of Organisation or Group

Date of creation

Official address

Name of publication, if any.....

Is this publication regular?..... irregular?.....

How many issues have been published?.....

Average No. of members in 1964.....

Has your group arrived at a definite conclusion concerning the nature and/or origin of the UFO Phenomenon?

Yes..... No.....

If you answered 'Yes', what is the conclusion reached by your group?.....

What are the books on UFOs your organisation recommends?.....

What are, in your view, the five most significant observations of UFOs?.....

Do you think the 'contactees' should be believed?.....

Do you think the authorities have obtained evidence of the nature or origin of the UFO phenomenon?

Do you think the information they have obtained is kept secret, and why?.....

Do you think descriptions of "UFO pilots" seen on the ground should be taken seriously?.....

Please give a summary of the general viewpoint of your group, concerning the UFO problem if it has not been covered by questions above.

IN OUR NEXT ISSUE:—

**THE 1965 VIRGINIA FLAP
SAUCERS & SPEECH
SPACEMEN IN NORMAN TIMES**

**By Donald B. Hanlon
By Dr. Bernard Finch
By W. R. Drake**

ALSO—ARGENTINA 1963/64 Part III, THE GREATEST FLAP YET? Part II and a glance back at events in 1897 by Gordon Creighton