

A Symposium

Opening Statement by Curtis G. Fuller, Publisher of *Fate*,
Which Sponsored the Congress

Could UFOs Be "Psychic Constructs?"—An Hypothesis

During the years when I was actively editing *Fate* I developed several concepts concerning UFOs.

The first idea was that what we call UFOs are probably more than one kind of thing.

The second idea was that some of them might well be a kind of mind phenomenon—though exactly what kind I was not qualified to define.

The third idea was an extension of the second. I offered the specific concept that some UFOs might be a kind of "psychic construct"—an actual physical creation of the mind. Bear with me for a bit if this seems too much to swallow.

In the early 1960s I was president of the Illinois Society for Psychical Research. One of our monthly pro-

grams was devoted to exploring various theories of UFOs. Among the participants were Robert Achzener, who represented APRO, and Sherman Larsen, who has done so much with the Center for UFO Studies and at that time was very active in NICAP.

Both of them were hardware boys, and they were upset with me as a third member of the forum for suggesting that UFOs might be a kind of psychic phenomenon. In defense of my views I discussed the experience described by Mme. Alexandra David-Neel in creating a *tulpa*—or thought form—while she was in Tibet. Mme. Neel's *tulpa* took the form of a monk which gradually grew more and more menacing until she became frightened and determined to destroy it by the same method she had used to create it—the powers of her trained mind.

I recall so well Mme. David-Neel's dry comment that she knew her *tulpa* was an hallucination but she was disturbed by the fact that other people could see it, too.

From that point I referred to the great UFO flaps of the 1890s, when hundreds of thousands of persons reported they had seen airships—before there were any powered airships or dirigibles in the United States. Anyone who studies the old newspaper files realizes that the thousands of persons who saw UFOs then believed they were seeing devices made on earth. It never occurred to them they could be anything else.

I then recalled a particular UFO sighting by Captain Larry W. Vinther, flying a Mid-Continent Airlines plane near Sioux City, Iowa. Captain Vinther had been vectored to the object by ground control, and as it approached he at first believed it might crash into his plane. Instead he watched it go past his wing and barely had time to swivel his head as it went past before there it was again, flying at his wing tip, in the same direction, only two hundred feet away.

Captain Vinther thought his UFO resembled a B-29 in many particulars, and as it gradually veered away he became more and more convinced that it was one of these World War II bombers.

From such reports as these the idea came to me that something more could be involved in UFO sightings than

Proceedings of the First International UFO Congress

CHICAGO, 1977

compiled and edited by

Curtis G. Fuller

and the editors of

FATE Magazine—

Mary Margaret Fuller,

Jerome Clark,

Betty Lou White

ATTENTION: SCHOOLS AND CORPORATIONS

WARNER books are available at quantity discounts with bulk purchase for educational, business, or sales promotional use. For information, please write to: SPECIAL SALES DEPARTMENT, WARNER BOOKS, 75 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10019

ARE THERE WARNER BOOKS YOU WANT BUT CANNOT FIND IN YOUR LOCAL STORES?

You can get any WARNER BOOKS title in print. Simply send title and retail price, plus 50¢ per order and 20¢ per copy to cover mailing and handling costs for each book desired. New York State and California residents add applicable sales tax. Enclose check or money order only, no cash please, to: WARNER BOOKS, P.O. BOX 690, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10019



WARNER BOOKS

A Warner Communications Company

1980, 440 PAGINAS

the presence of physical objects. Whatever the witnesses of the 1890s actually saw, they had to interpret it as an airship. Even though there were no powered airships in the 1890s, they were within the realm of possibility. Jules Verne had written about them. It was widely believed that their development was not far off in the future. So I concluded that whatever the witnesses were actually seeing, their minds were interpreting the sighting in terms of what they could accept and what was familiar.

Similarly, in the case of Larry Vinther's B-29, I asked myself what the object would have looked like to Vinther and his crew if they had seen it in the days before there were B-29s. I concluded they had to see it in terms of the familiar. In Biblical times there were chariots of fire. In the Middle Ages there were sailing ships aloft in the heavens.

Now of course I am merely suggesting some background for speculation at this private meeting, just as I did to the Illinois Society fifteen years ago. Some of you have carried these and similar speculations much further. Some of you are opposed to any such concept. I am not offering a personal hypothesis here for debate. But these speculations are the ideas which eventually led to convening this meeting. As Kenneth Arnold says, "I'm still as puzzled about what is going on as I was thirty years ago."

And I don't believe that I am any closer to a solution either.

Jim Lorenzen, Aerial Phenomena Research Organization

Contacts with space beings should not be ruled out even though there are psychological explanations.

One thing that has concerned me about the so-called UFO abduction cases is that they are so varied and so bizarre. They seem to insult human intelligence in many cases. I don't know whether this is a comment on the limits of my imagination or open-mindedness, or whether it is inherent in the evidence. Naturally I prefer to believe

the latter rather than something due to my own limitations.

I have found the work of Dr. Alvin Lawson, who is present, impressive since it may offer some explanation for the weird variety of UFO reports, especially abduction cases.

One thing we have learned when we have gone into the background of persons who claim to have been abducted by UFOs, to have had contacts with UFOs, or to have received messages from space people is that for the most part they have a history of being battered children or have had sad histories in other ways. Betty Hill brought this to my attention initially, and we have confirmed that many of them had very sad childhoods.

This suggests that contactees may be people who, for one reason or another, have been made to feel that they don't fit into their family situations—and that they are looking for ways to bolster their self-images. Their stories seem to follow a regular progression. First, the contactees-to-be feel they simply can't belong to their own family because of the way they're treated.

Next they decide they must have been adopted and that it has been kept a secret from them. Then, when they are exposed to the UFO idea through press and books or electronic media, they begin to believe that maybe they've been transplanted here from another planet.

The next step is that they're being accepted for some sort of special duty by other planetary beings. This leads them to believe that they have special abilities, that they can predict things. And sometimes they do in fact predict things well enough to make us wonder how far an idea like this can take one.

We need to define and to classify what is going on with contactees. The human mind likes to classify things and give them names, and this is one sort of research that needs to be done.

Dr. Lawson's experimental work in California suggests that in some cases we may take a person who has had a real UFO experience and plant in his head the idea that he also had an abduction. (See page 195 for Dr. Lawson's report.)

If Dr. Lawson's work is valid, it certainly suggests

that the subject can then create a complete story of such an abduction. I don't believe this deprives us of the real abduction experiences, however, because there are cases, such as the Travis Walton case, in which I've been closely involved, where so many witnesses report the same bizarre occurrence that it cannot be doubted. It certainly does not sound rehearsed.

In the Walton case there were six witnesses who all passed lie-detector tests and whose testimony agreed and supported each other's without sounding the least bit rehearsed. They were a pickup crew of workers who had grabbed onto temporary jobs and were thrown together. They are not the sort of group one could expect to connive and come up with a conspiracy.

I want to stress, therefore, that although there may be an increasing number of people who, for abnormal psychological reasons, are creating abduction cases, that doesn't mean there aren't real abduction cases. I keep coming back to the same thing. We need good research; we need funding and manning for that research.

**Professor Frank Salisbury, Director, Plant-Science Department,
State University of Utah**

Witnesses' descriptions are accurate even though their interpretations may be faulty.

I'd like to emphasize that UFO witnesses generally do a good job of observing and remembering what they see not only in spite of but also because of the excitement and emotion generated by their experience. Certainly the mind plays a role in UFO observation, but this is not always bad.

The basis for this idea consists of the many reports in which the witness is totally convinced that he or she has seen some unearthly machine whereas the witness is really observing something much more conventional, such as the planet Venus. In some cases, it is possible to compare what was reported with what was actually there.

Aimé Michel had talked about a weather balloon

that moved across southern France and was reported as a UFO by many persons who nonetheless pretty much described a weather balloon. Emotion and excitement play an extremely important role in interpreting what is seen, but the abilities to observe and remember are not distorted by emotion and excitement but are sharpened. It's not difficult to imagine that one's powers of observation might be increased by excitement. One pays attention when one is observing something strange and unfamiliar. One concentrates intently, focusing all of one's senses, sight, hearing, perhaps touch or smell, on the phenomenon.

Distortions develop, but the point is that you see what you expect to see, and this may distort the memory of what was observed. Still, in my experience with UFO reports I'm amazed at the small extent to which the memory is distorted by this phenomenon.

Three weeks ago I was in Snowflake, Arizona, and got to meet Travis Walton. I was giving a series of lectures at the local church and I mentioned the Travis Walton case and asked if anyone had any information that might relate to it.

Later, a woman told me about two men who she believed had seen a UFO in the same area and at the same time that Travis had his experience. This was exciting news, so I visited one of them. The sighting was on November 15, 1975, ten days after Travis had been abducted, so the witness had his mind full of the Travis Walton case at the time he had his experience. The two men had been hunting only two or three miles from the site of the abduction. About three o'clock in the morning, they decided to return home. They drove down the rim road about a quarter of a mile from the highway, looked to the east, and saw a brilliant light shining through the trees slightly above the horizon. As they drove along, the light came up out of the trees and moved about a half mile ahead of them on the highway.

They stopped the automobile to listen for sounds coming from the light, but everything was perfectly silent. When they stopped the automobile, the object also stopped. As a matter of fact, whatever they did, the object maintained the same distance from them—about a

half mile to the east. They sped up, slowed down, changed directions as the road turned. As they drove the two or three hours required to reach Snowflake, the object gradually increased its elevation. They observed it through a rifle scope and thought they could discern a saucer shape but its brilliance was too great for them to be certain of this.

They became quite worried and excited. On two occasions a buzzing sound seemed to come from the dashboard. When they arrived home the man awakened his wife, who also was able to observe the object until daylight.

Of course, the men had been observing Venus. A little checking confirmed that Venus was at a near maximum elongation from the sun in the eastern sky at that time and also at near maximum brilliance. The men were totally convinced and had remained convinced for a year and a half after the sighting that they were watching a UFO, perhaps the same one that abducted Travis Walton. Yet everything about their description exactly matched the planet Venus, with the exception of the buzzing in the dashboard, which obviously was some kind of coincidence. The position in the sky, the brilliance, the apparent movement only when the witnesses moved, the increasing elevation in the sky as the morning wore on, even the brilliant distorted shape in the rifle scope all perfectly match Venus. As far as I could tell in listening to this man there was not a single item in his report that conflicted in any way with reality. Yet the witnesses were emotionally wrought up and fully convinced that they were observing an extraterrestrial machine rather than an extraterrestrial planet.

On another occasion, I was telephoned by several UFO witnesses. They were watching a saucer-shaped, silvery object in front of the mountains west of Fort Collins, Colorado. There were two women and several children and they had been observing the object for more than an hour. I was unable to see it from where I was so I drove to their place and was impressed that the witnesses had been able to discern through binoculars that the object was square-shaped rather than disc-shaped. As

I observed the object through the binoculars it was difficult to see the square shape. It was just at the bare limits of what could be perceived.

We drove toward it and found that it was a silver-colored polyethelene inflated weather kite being flown by the Atmospheric Sciences Department at Colorado State University. Again, the witnesses showed all the psychological symptoms of typical UFO observers and yet every detail of their description exactly matched reality.

In a third case, there may have been a detail that did not exist which was generated by the excitement of the sighting. Two women, a mother and a daughter, were driving in Wheatridge, Maryland. As they drove by a schoolyard, they saw a puzzling light, pinpointing its location above the playground. Suddenly it moved rapidly to the northwest and disappeared below the horizon. The next night I went to the area with the intention of questioning people in the neighborhood about TV or radio interference. Some high-school boys were making hot-air gas balloons with candles and polyethelene bags.

As you must anticipate, when I asked what they had been doing the night before they said they were doing the same thing. Again, the appearance of the light described by the two women exactly matched the appearance of the hot-air balloons. The rapid disappearance was described by the boys as being due to a high wind coming over the school that would catch the balloons and move them rapidly toward the northwest.

Of course, witnesses are notoriously inept at estimating sizes, distances and velocity, so it is easy to see how the women could have said it went fifteen miles in twenty seconds or whatever, instead of the probably three hundred yards that it traveled until it disappeared.

The women also said they saw a large black object below the light. I've thought maybe that represents reality too, some way—a cloud of black smoke or something. I don't know for sure. I strongly consider the possibility that the women were extremely desirous of witnessing a UFO and therefore imagined the large black object. It's apparent that witnesses can imagine details that are not there, even extremely important details. These would certainly be mind

phenomena that might represent part of the UFO experience. But I'm personally impressed with the abilities of witnesses to observe and accurately report details of a UFO sighting. I surely don't think that this is always the situation. I'm not trying to argue against the idea of UFOs as mind phenomena because I'm intrigued by the idea that there may well be cases when they are indeed. But at the same time, my feeling is that witnesses are amazingly good observers.

Stanton T. Friedman, Nuclear Physicist

Mind phenomena may be involved in some UFO sightings, but Friedman believes UFOs are nuts and bolts.

The reason most UFO sightings can be explained as Identified Flying Objects instead of Unidentified Flying Objects is that the witnesses' descriptions are accurate although their interpretations may be wrong. One man wrote me describing two very bright objects night after night, getting closer in the western sky—a perfect description of Venus and Jupiter at that particular season of the year. I had another case where thirty independent witnesses in Los Angeles described a bright red light in the sky. When I finally pinned it down, it was a plastic bag with car flares, and I even found the firemen who retrieved it from the Wilshire Country Club lawn. The thirty witnesses were right-on.

So we must make a distinction between description or observation and interpretation. Very often we find that the problem lies with the interrogator, not with the witnesses . . . putting words in the witness's mouth and then quoting him as to how big the UFO was, how high it was, how far away it was—when he had said he didn't know any of those things. The next day the newspaper reports that it was thirty feet in diameter, a quarter of a mile high, half a mile away. And everybody says, "That's a bunch of baloney, no one can estimate any of those things." Don't blame the witness.

It's important that we stay away from interpretation.

I'm convinced that some UFOs are somebody else's spacecraft. In other words, I believe we're dealing with hardware. *Some UFOs.* I think one of the problems is that we ask the wrong questions. As a physical scientist, my way of looking at the way the question ought to be stated is; "Are any UFOs extraterrestrial spacecraft?"

Now those of you concerned strictly with mind phenomena have a right to ask; "Are any UFO sightings mental constructs?" Note that I said "sightings" and not "UFOs." The answer there is probably yes, too, but as a physicist, I don't know what to do about those. I don't believe their significance for mankind is the same as the significance of some of them being intelligently controlled extraterrestrial vehicles.

I can't accept the reasons why some people jump to a kind of fourth-dimensional parallel universe or a three-dimensional hologram kind of explanation for UFOs because I find that usually those reasons are a deduction from a wrong set of assumptions. In other words, if you accept as truth that you can't get to earth from another star system; that, having gotten here (even though you can't!), your craft couldn't behave the way these things are observed to behave; and that, having somehow surmounted these first two objections, you wouldn't personally behave in the manner that these beings do behave, then you seek nonphysical explanations. If you start from such assumptions and throw in a fourth, that is, that people are mostly honest and sincere and not pulling your leg all the time—if you accept the last one and you also accept that first one—then you're stuck with saying people are seeing something. Now, by this line of reasoning, it can't be a spacecraft because you can't get here from there, and if you could, you couldn't act this way, so what could it be? You then conclude that it must be something projected from your mind, or something like John Keel's holograms. If so, I say, "Who's running the machine?" I find there are no good physics objections to some UFOs being extraterrestrial spacecraft—some, I'm certainly not saying all.

Now, when I say some UFOs are extraterrestrial spacecraft, that's not because I throw up my hands and

say people are seeing something crazy and what else could it be? It must be that they're vehicles from someplace else. Now, there are a number of skeptics who say that's the only reason those of us who hold that viewpoint get there. What else can they be? They must be spacecraft.

I say that some are extraterrestrial spacecraft because of a combination of two things. When you take the best reports available and sort and sift through them, you wind up with a hard core of reports of objects of definite size, shape, surface texture, and physical characteristics indicating that they are manufactured. Now, lights in the sky don't meet that criterion, no matter how bright. The second thing is that the UFOs' behavior has to include certain aspects that we cannot associate with the behavior of the things that we know how to build down here on planet earth. For example, the steady, slow rising of an object in the atmosphere doesn't qualify as evidence for an extraterrestrial spacecraft, though it doesn't exclude it. But the ability, for example, to move at right angles at a few thousand miles an hour, and to move very fast and very slow and without noise, and up and down and back and forth without turning around does help qualify it. Those things, coupled with its appearance, coupled perhaps with physical manifestations, such as landing-trace cases, lead me to say that we're dealing with manufactured objects behaving in ways that we can't duplicate on earth.

I'm not saying that there are no reports of UFOs that aren't secret government projects from here or Russia or anyplace else. Certainly an airline pilot fifteen years ago seeing a YF-11 or an SR-71 zipping along at eighty thousand feet at Mach 3 would say, "We don't have anything that flies like that." As far as he knew, we didn't. That doesn't mean we didn't—as far as he knew, we didn't!

Now, I am confining this part of my discussion to manufactured objects behaving in ways that we can't duplicate. Let's back away a little bit and look at the physics objections and see if they make any sense. The first objection is that you can't get to here from there. That's the easiest one to deal with, because it is true that you can't get here from other solar systems on a bicycle,

let's say, or even in a good motor boat or in a balloon or a 747. But for that matter, you can't get from here to Sydney, Australia, exclusively on a bicycle. That doesn't mean you can't get to Sydney, Australia.

So, when I look at the question of getting here from there, I don't want to restrict my attention to distant galaxies—to say, "They can't be coming here because look how far it is to Andromeda, or the limits of the universe." This is a sly trick—I don't know what else to call it—this switching away from our local galactic neighborhood, which objectors often use. If you go out fifty light years there are a thousand stars. That's enough for me to be worried about. That's a big enough chunk of space. Let's not make the mistake of going from there to other galaxies. The objectors set up a straw man. They say UFOs can't get to other galaxies so they can't get here from someplace else. That is illogical and irrational. Can you get to other stars in the local neighborhood? That's enough to worry about without worrying about other galaxies.

Let me say that there are published papers which show that trips to nearby stars are feasible—trips to nearby stars, down-the-street, around-the-corner kinds of things, are feasible with a round-trip time shorter than the average person's life span, without invoking fourth-dimensional space-time warping. I would even accept the notion that such warps may exist. But they aren't required to get here from someplace else. Staged fission and fusion-propulsion systems, on both of which I have worked, will do the job very nicely, if you want to spend enough money—say fifty to one hundred billion dollars. It's a political choice. We know how to proceed if that's what people want to do, and I can think of half a dozen other schemes besides fission and fusion which also ought to be able to do the job.

I find the same problem—this setting up of straw men and making inappropriate assumptions—universal among the critics. It is certainly true that conventional systems for moving people and things can't duplicate UFO flight behavior, can't make right-angle turns, can't go fast without making sonic booms and so forth. But that's only

because of the limitations of the particular systems we are using. You can't make a pocket calculator using vacuum tubes. That doesn't mean you can't make a pocket calculator. You can do it very well using micro-integrated circuits. Right-angle turns cannot be made with conventional jet or rocket airplanes—because they're not designed to make right-angle turns. They're not designed to be able to hover, to be able to move straight up and down and back and forth. It's just that the critic looking at these cases isn't aware of other techniques for doing these things that he believes can't be done. That doesn't mean that there aren't ways of doing them. You have to look at the advanced technology and most of us don't.

Some strange things happen with UFOs and I'm sure the psychiatrists present would agree that 2 to 5 percent of the public can be expected to be rather weird in the first place. I like to tell people that the American Physical Society said that 2 percent of the papers submitted one year were crackpot papers. That means, I presume, that 2 percent of physicists are crackpots; however, I expect the rate is higher than that. So it is certainly to be expected that among the general population one will find some bizarre reports, descriptions, experiences. I think Alvin Lawson's work with Dr. William McCall (see page 195) is enlightening. They induced UFO sightings and abduction descriptions hypnotically, and I found that work very interesting but not surprising. Fiction writers have been creating unreal worlds for a very long time. We know the mind is capable of projecting and creating exciting, interesting, bizarre phenomena. I don't agree with Jim Lorenzen's view that sometimes the phenomena seem like an insult to human intelligence.

I think it's a challenge to the imagination, not an insult to the intelligence. I think that you have to back up a step when you say "weird variety." On what level are you dealing with weirdness? I mean, if you've seen *Star Wars*, there're a lot of weird characters. On what level are we discussing "weirdness?" If one looks at abduction cases, it appears that most abductees are treated as specimens. That covers a large number of abduction cases—even

though not all the abductors are identical in appearance. But how many of us are identical in appearance? What's an Earthling look like, for example? Obviously he's got to have hair on his face and hair on his head, right? (Editor's note: Friedman has a heavy beard but is bald.) I think we need to move up to a level of abstraction and look at the problem dispassionately. I read an article once asking "What do Frank Sinatra, Cher, and—I think the third party was Dean Martin—all have in common?" The answer was that none of them finished high school. You could look at those three and their life histories for a long time and come up with all kinds of crazy explanations, but the real explanation isn't nearly as crazy as most of the ones you might come up with. Who is the most weird—we or our Visitors?

I know that Jacques Vallée has documented a couple of cases that look as if we're dealing with psychic healing or, for want of a better phrase, "parapsychological healing." It would amaze me if alien beings from an advanced civilization didn't have that ability. If they are sufficiently advanced so that they can get here it would amaze me if they hadn't explored the many areas of parapsychological techniques. It seems to me any sensible civilization would, and so it would not surprise me if many occurrences might be explained that way. Betty and Barney were apparently under thought control; there was some kind of telepathy. We do it, too. Their physician, Dr. Simon, was guilty of thought control. He induced amnesia after each session. There's an example. I don't see it as being terribly mysterious.

As for healing, a lot of exciting work is going on involving the use of electromagnetic fields. Dr. Robert O. Becker in Syracuse, New York, has done some fascinating work that enhances bone growth. When the bones won't knit, you attach a little device and get a low-level current and the bones heal. Now, that might be considered rather weird if you didn't know what was going on. The curing of cancer by exposure to cobalt sixty is another example. They use a sophisticated chamber where they rotate the person. You don't see anything, smell anything, feel any-

thing. A century ago all this would certainly have been considered mind-blowing mumbo-jumbo, or whatever other far-out word you want. We call it "technology" and let it go at that.

So I am not willing to bypass the nuts-and-bolts explanations for some UFOs. I expect that there's plenty of material in any field for the psychiatrist or the parapsychologist. If you look at the press treatment of UFO people, any of us, or any of the contactees or any of the abductees, you find that standards of journalism are not very high—that a guy can get Robert Spencer Carr exposure . . . the story about the bodies, you know, at Wright Patterson. He was not carefully interrogated. He got enormous publicity without having to provide anything other than a good story. Any science-fiction writer could provide a better one, I'm sure.

So, let me conclude, I'm for hardware; I'm for mind-blowing in a different kind of way, and I'll wait and see whether I want to throw out the nuts and bolts. Before I do that, I'd have to see a lot more than I've seen so far and I've been looking pretty hard.

David Jacobs: I've been wondering about what Dr. Salisbury said: that people by and large accurately describe what they see, and I think Stan Friedman backed him up on that. How does this relate to the 1890s sightings? One of the central ideas about these sightings is that people were seeing something within their technological outlook. It is proposed that their technological outlook had distorted their perceptions to the point that they were describing something that might not even have come close to what they actually were seeing. Yet all our research indicates that people do by and large accurately describe what they see and there's no reason to believe that people living in 1897 would be any less accurate. My other point is that if, in fact, they are accurately describing what they see, then we are led much more deeply into the concept of the UFOs having some sort of psychic connection because of the form in which they appeared. In other words, the objects did in fact appear to be airships but obviously were not.

Salisbury: Why do you say that?

Jacobs: Well, I say they're obviously not airships because all the research that everybody has ever done on the subject has failed to come up with a single airship.

Salisbury: You mean there were no airships in the country at that time?

Jacobs: There was one airship in the country in May 1897. A Professor Barnard at the Tennessee Centennial Exposition fabricated a pedal-powered airship and flew a few miles.

Salisbury: Well, I think that's the point of the whole business. I don't consider myself any kind of authority on this area of UFOs as Mind Phenomena, but in my limited experience I'm impressed with the idea that people describe accurately what they see. Consequently, I have to entertain the idea that they really saw some kind of airship-looking affair. The question then would be why. The possibility is that the phenomenon is controlled by some kind of intelligence, extrahuman, extraterrestrial, whatever. For the reasons known to that intelligence and apparently not discernible by us, they like to let people see what they expect to see, according to their time and sociological situation and so on. It's a kind of mind-boggling thought.

Friedman: I take an entirely different approach to that, Dave. I think you're presuming absence of evidence as evidence for absence of evidence. Airship is a very general word. People are much better at recognizing them than they are at describing them. They normally describe in terms of what they know, you know, football-shaped. Now what is football-shaped? It can mean ten different things, especially if you're from England instead of the United States. I would say that there were no sightings in 1897 that truly match cases of the sort I have been trying to set up with extremely high-speed performance, metallic surfaces, that sort of combination. The 1890s UFOs certainly had an appearance indicating manufactured objects, but not the behavior we witness today in

some UFOs. Now, you say there were no airships in the country. There were certainly lighter-than-air craft in the country.

Jacobs: There were no powered airships, but there were balloons.

Friedman: Well, okay, but if you hook an engine of any kind to a balloon, what are you dealing with? There were patents granted. There were . . . certainly there was an awful lot of research going on by private inventors trying to develop powered airships. It's just a happenstance that they were using hydrogen instead of helium in those days that we don't have an awful lot of zeppelins going back and forth across the oceans instead of airplanes today. The technology went into a different direction. So I don't think that those descriptions need to be thoughts that were put in mind by some mysterious beings. I think there really was a stimulus for those observations. I feel that people were accurately describing what they saw.

Salisbury: It's a question . . . I don't know all the details of this 1897 business. I know mostly what I read in Jacques Vallée's book, but I have the impression that they did do strange things. There were rapid takeoffs and brilliant beams of light and behavior that was not explainable in terms of 1897 airships anywhere.

Melton: Let's let Jerry Clark get into this discussion.

Jerome Clark: I spent a lot of time looking into this airship business. I have personally examined thousands of those reports and there is no way that anybody can tell me they were manufactured or flown by an American inventor unless there was some kind of massive conspiracy going on. It was impossible. There were thousands and thousands of sightings all over the country. It was a nationwide. . . .

Friedman: Of one thing? Seen by many people in many places or—?

Clark: No, these things were generally described as airships, but the descriptions weren't all the same. There was variety just as there is in modern UFO reports. Now, the objects were landing. Most often, the people who got out of them appeared to be normal human beings and they gave names, dates, places. They would say that they had a patent on the airship, which Dave has shown to be completely untrue. They told a number of absurd contradictory stories. There were parapsychological elements in some of these accounts. There are some very strange stories, equally as weird as the stories we have in our own day. But there's one particular episode that's particularly interesting.

This involves the Wilson reports of 1897 in Texas. Dave Jacobs and I had a long conversation about the 1897 airships at one point. He said to me, "There's a purity in these reports that we don't see in modern UFO phenomena." Well, this isn't true. With modern UFO reports we have innumerable accounts of occupants that don't add up. The 1890s reports don't add up either, but we don't seem to be dealing with the same objects. We seem to be dealing with a thousand different manifestations which are only generally similar.

Well, the Wilson reports are very interesting. They are sometimes pointed to by people who try to claim that there must have been an airship inventor whose name may have been Hiram Wilson. They base this idea on about eight reports from 1897. Most of them came from Texas, though there's one from Lake Charles, Louisiana, which is just across the border.

In these incidents the airship would land, a man would get out, and he would say, "My name is Wilson. I've invented this airship. You're all going to hear about it because I'm going to start an airship company. We're going to have transportation all over the country." All this sounds credible. In one of the places he said that he had stopped to see his old friend Captain Akers. It turned out there was such a Captain Akers, but he was out of town at that exact moment. When Captain Akers was later contacted by the newspapers, he said, "Certainly, twenty years ago, when I was living in Fort Worth I knew a

young man named Wilson who was extremely interested in aviation, and I thought he was nuts, but apparently he's onto something."

All this sounds superficially evidential. Unfortunately, when you study the reports it all breaks down. In almost all the cases in which Wilson was physically described he has a different appearance. In almost all the cases, the descriptions of the ship that he arrived in don't agree. The estimates of its size are wildly at variance with each other. And remember, these were not cases where the object zipped quickly overhead. These airships were supposedly on the ground. In some of them the witness allegedly entered the craft. The size of the crews was different; the descriptions of the crew members, the things that Wilson would tell the witnesses were different. Sometimes he would tell them one thing, sometimes another—things that were completely contradictory. The implication seems to be that the airship phenomenon was as absurd and as complex as the modern UFO phenomenon.

Salisbury: Would you comment on the suggestion that these were hoaxes written up by the media? Menzel talked about how some newspaper syndicate worked up these stories. They were supposed to be hoaxes, not actual witness accounts.

Clark: Again, I think that's one of the problems with the skeptics. Ultimately the case of UFO skeptics in general is founded on an obsession with conspiracies.

Friedman: That's an interesting way you put it.

Clark: I think there certainly were a lot of hoaxes. In fact, some of the most famous 1897 airship stories are hoaxes, such as the Alexander Hamilton calnapping case, which I was recently able to show was completely fictitious. It was a story made up by a local liars' club and there are a number of similar problems; for example, I got a call last week from a researcher who has been able to establish that the Merkel, Texas, case where the airship had the anchor that caught in the church is a complete hoax. So a number of these stories are breaking down.

However, we have the fact that similar sightings

occurred in Britain in the early part of the twentieth century, in New Zealand, in Sweden, in Australia. This really was a worldwide phenomenon. There were sightings in South Africa in 1914. Ruppelt mentions in his book that he interviewed an old man who had been one of the witnesses to the 1896 airship that had passed over San Francisco. Also, my friend John Musgrave, a brilliant Canadian ufologist, interviewed a family who had a story that their grandfather had been aboard such an airship. A man from Portland two or three years ago said that UFOs were nothing new to him because in 1906 he had boarded an airship which had landed near Mitchell, South Dakota. So there are people who remember these kinds of events from that period.

Among the witnesses of the airships were people like Mayor Adolph Sutro of Sacramento, California. Some very prominent people witnessed these airships, and also the sightings involved thousands of people. Airships flew over Omaha and San Francisco, where many, many people saw them and reported to the papers. It seems to me that no newspaper could get by with a hoax of that magnitude.

Coral Lorenzen: In all the years that I've been dealing with newspaper reporters, not once have I been accurately quoted. I've been misquoted, quoted out of context, and even in those instances when I was sitting with the reporter and saying "No, don't put it that way," he still would go back to his office and change what I said.

Friedman: Even when you give them something in writing.

Coral Lorenzen: So I view the 1897 wave as partly hoax, partly misrepresentation of what the witness said, all down the line, just like the manifestations we have now—but something was seen.

Jacobs: But you haven't checked on that, though. In many of these newspapers there were letters to the editor which described airship sightings. We would assume that they wouldn't be changed.

Coral Lorenzen: You have to assume that somebody actually wrote it in the first place.

Fuller: Other than the editor.

Jacobs: One of the central problems of the 1897 airship cases which I find absolutely incomprehensible if we are, of course, dealing with a true wave, is that we don't have a single witness to an 1897 airship sighting. Not one—in the entire country. That's odd, because it wasn't that long ago. It's long, but there should be a few old-timers around.

Friedman: You presume that because you don't know of one, there isn't one.

Jacobs: We don't know of a single witness.

Friedman: How much real effort has been made to find those witnesses?

Jacobs: Unfortunately, probably none, but I would suggest that if people are near any nursing homes or anything like that, you might run a little article requesting witnesses. . . . Hynek got on the radio in New York City in 1967, I think it was, and made a plea for any UFO witnesses of the 1890s to come forward, and he's never received a single response. I think one of our priority items would be some sort of search for some witnesses.

Ray Palmer: I am basically a science-fiction writer. That's what I want to talk about in relation to the 1897 airships. When Jules Verne wrote his story, he described our launching to the moon almost to a "T." He even had the location right—Cape Canaveral. Several authors of that period wrote stories and described airships. Jules Verne wrote many. I suppose there were probably thousands of stories written that concerned powered airships, although none had ever been flown. I think that when we try to establish why people saw those airships, we'll find they were science-fiction readers. I think that we're not arguing about whether we have a mental phenomenon here or a real airship. We're talking simply about the human desire to imitate or mimic behavior. There are

probably thousands of stories that fall into that same category. I think this is irrelevant to whether there was an airship or not.

I could take Kenneth Arnold's own sighting. He never heard of airship sightings or flying saucers or whatever before he made his sighting. He was flying along and suddenly he saw these things. That is the kind of sighting that doesn't fall into this classification. But when we talk about the 1897 sightings we're simply speculating. Jules Verne wrote it first, and even I have invented some stories based on his imagination. I don't have to have any psychic explanation for it, I don't have to have mental hallucination, I don't have to have hypnotic suggestion. I don't have to believe there was such an aircraft. And I think that people who read Jules Verne in that time might even have passed his story down through the family as something that happened to grandpa. I don't think there's anything unusual about that type of story at all.

Alvin Lawson: I don't think we can answer the 1897 problem here but I would like to ask two questions. They're associated. First, I'd like to know why there are so few (I don't know of any) interrupted abductions. Each one seems to be integral—complete. We know of CEIs (close encounters of the first kind) that are interrupted—a truck comes along and the thing takes off. But we don't know of anyone's pancreas which is in the process of being examined when the subject is suddenly dumped out and the craft takes off. And this suggests a mode of proceeding that would be consistent with a mental rather than a physical event.

My second question is related to the first. In most abduction cases that I've known about, there seems to be a dominant witness. There is one person who seems to be more alert, perhaps more interested, more observant, and ultimately more cooperative with the investigator. The other witness or witnesses are not as helpful and don't seem to possess information that is helpful directly.

Not being a psychologist, I can speculate endlessly here, and fearlessly, but this suggests something in the

way these things are perceived and sensed that we cannot trust altogether. I think they're good questions and need to be confronted.

Jim Lorenzen: I want to observe that professional people expressing public opinions or speculations on the UFO subject very often tend to place the mystery outside their own area of specialty.

Friedman: Lawson is an English professor. What do you want?

Jim Lorenzen: It's really a trend. For instance, Dr. Hynek likes interdimensional UFOs. That places it outside physics.

Friedman: I'm an exception.

Jim Lorenzen: There are always a few exceptions. But I have an idea on this. Menzel was a good example. He was within his field when he talked about astronomical things being mistaken for UFOs. But when these explanations failed, he went immediately into psychology or behaviorism to explain the cases. I want to make one comment. When a person places the subject outside his own field of specialty, then he can approach it as an amateur and he can also avoid the responsibility of making responsible statements.

Friedman: If we keep it in our fields, it's okay?

Jim Lorenzen: You're okay, Stan.

Melton: It's a real problem you're hitting upon. Once anyone operating as a professional academician steps outside the narrow field in which he was trained, he's no better than Joe Blow on the street. That's a very real problem with UFOs because they're an interdisciplinary study.

Coral Lorenzen: I have a question for Dr. Lawson. When you asked why are there no abductions which are interrupted—by what?

Lawson: Halfway.

Coral Lorenzen: By what?

Lawson: By anything.

Coral Lorenzen: It seems to me that if this is a nuts-and-bolts situation, in a way we've got extraterrestrials messing around, they would take the abductees where they would be safe—so that they could carry out the research.

Friedman: That's why they don't land in Times Square.

Betty Hill: In regard to interruption of abductions, I have a woman friend named Lyndia Morel who was saved from being captured by a UFO. She was followed for several miles and the UFO was coming in on her. She could see the alien looking down at her telling her not to be afraid, no harm was going to come to her. It was four-thirty in the morning. She panicked and drove her car over the lawn right up to the door of this house. Meanwhile, she was getting tremendous sounds in her head. She was holding her head and was banging on the door to be let in. Meanwhile, their guard dog jumped at her. She was so frightened that she hit the dog so hard she knocked it across the yard. She kept pounding on the door and they let her in. The people living there went outside. They saw the UFO. They called the police. The police saw the UFO; her husband came along and saw it. Her house was only about two houses down. She was so terrified she never went back to her own home; she moved immediately. This happened in Goffstown, New Hampshire. And as a footnote, the man who opened the door to let her in died three weeks later of a heart attack at age forty-two.

Palmer: Did this woman you're talking about have this experience after you talked to her about yours?

Betty Hill: Lyndia Morel? No. In fact, when she had this experience, she knew nothing about UFOs. I met her quite a few weeks after it happened. She knew nothing about my experience at the time this happened.

Palmer: What I was trying to get at is that here, again, I would be looking very seriously into the possibility of suggestion, which relates to what I said before about the airships. People hear a story like this and they want to get in on the act. It's very real that she could go home and say, "There's a UFO following me," and so people in the house come out and they too can see the UFO.

Betty Hill: But this is not true of Lyndia. She was not influenced in any way by my experience. For one thing, our UFOs were completely different.

Palmer: They're always different, depending on the suggestion. The person interprets it differently.

Friedman: There's another point here. Lyndia's job was not one she was very proud of at the time. She was not anxious for publicity.

Hill: Okay, everybody said, "Lyndia was a masseuse." Now, in New Hampshire—I don't know about the rest of the United States, but in New Hampshire—a masseuse is a masseuse, and other things have their names, too. Lyndia is a decent, respectable person.

Friedman: We didn't mean she wasn't.

Hill: She needed a new job, too.

Friedman: She massaged people, really.

Jacobs: I read the newspaper reports of that case as it first came out. Then the investigator from MUFON, I believe, investigated it and wrote it up for the *Mufon Journal*. I was impressed with that case in many ways. The woman was apparently hysterical when she jumped out of her car, which was driven onto a neighbor's front yard and left running with the lights and engine on as she ran in a panic to the nearest house to try to get help. Of course, the point here is that there wasn't an abduction. It wasn't a follow-up on Betty's case. We don't know whether there would have been an abduction, really, and the only similarity is with the preliminary part of Betty's

and Barney's case, when they saw a person leaning out of a window of the UFO and looking at them. That is one of the few parallels. But I found it a very interesting case and one that definitely needs follow-up.

Hill: If I could add here, about Lyndia and her experience, that in the area where Lyndia lived, there were also two other experiences, all within three nights. In one an elderly woman heard her trash barrels rattling and she thought it was dogs, and she picked up a broom and opened the door quickly and almost hit an alien going through the trash on the head. She called the police. Then half a mile from there, there were two aliens picking up soil and rock samples from Mr. Snow's back yard in the middle of the night, and in this case, he had a German shepherd attack dog—we have a lot of them in New Hampshire—but he gave the dog the order to attack and the dog leaped and fell down and got down on his stomach and crawled around, crying. He ordered the dog again to attack and the dog repeated that, and now he says the aliens ruined his dog because now every time he gets the order to attack, the dog gets down and cries. But these things all happened within three nights in the same area.

Jacques Vallée: I'd like to start from what Ray Palmer was saying a little bit earlier about Jules Verne because I've been very interested in science fiction, and in French science fiction especially. Jules Verne was an extremely well-informed man and he was getting clippings and letters and gathering reports from all over the world that he used in formulating his stories. It's not an alternative explanation to what you're . . . we're suggesting. Jules Verne got earlier reports of airship sightings and in fact, as Jerry Clark was pointing out, most studies of sightings can claim that there were many reports not only in 1897 but from 1870, 1880, 1885 and so on, so we should not discount entirely that Jules Verne in fact was using actual reports of that era.

Clark: I have two things to say to that. For one thing, the reports of airships began long before Jules Verne ever wrote *Robur the Conquerer* and *Master of the World*—his

two airship novels. They really began in the middle part of the century.

During the 1897 airship wave, a number of German immigrants in Illinois told newspaper reporters that they remembered similar reports from their country. Ever since I read that I've been trying unsuccessfully to interest German UFO researchers in going back to the old newspapers. They all tell me they're just too busy to concern themselves with those things, but I think that would be extremely interesting. However, I have checked out the possibility that Jules Verne was influenced by other reports of unidentified airships. I'm corresponding with a man who is writing a biography of Jules Verne and he says that is not true, that the source of Jules Verne's interest in airships arose because he was secretary of some kind of ballooning club. The club members were talking in terms of developing dirigibles or powered airships, and apparently that is the source of his stories.

Question: When were his two airship novels published in the United States?

Clark: I'm trying to remember.

Vallée: I think *Robur the Conquerer* was published in 1885.

Clark: Yes.

Question: People have suggested that the influence of H. G. Wells was also part of the airship mystery but . . .

Clark: *War of the Worlds* appeared in 1898.

Question: Wells had a short story called "The Crystal Egg" which suggested life on Mars, and that came out in 1897, after the airship sightings.

Clark: I think this whole thing of suggestion goes a little too far because you can always say to a witness, somebody, say, who has witnessed a crime, "Gee, we hear about crime all the time. Half the television shows are about crime. We read about it in the newspapers. Obviously you are just very suggestible." It simply really

doesn't explain anything, in my opinion. In fact, many skeptics have said that our modern reports of UFOs are caused by suggestion. After all, there was a great boom in science fiction after World War II and at the same time a number of prominent scientists started talking seriously about intelligent life on other planets and the possibility of visitors. So a number of skeptics have said, "Obviously this just inspired people to imagine they'd seen a spaceship."

Jacobs: I want to make an addendum to what you said. The science-fiction wave started in the late twenties and early thirties and not after World War II—Buck Rogers, Flash Gordon are all from the thirties.

Clark: That's right, but there was a particular boom after World War II, although magazine science fiction began in the twenties.

Jacobs: But you also have to differentiate what kind of science fiction. Up until 1951 virtually every kind of science-fiction film with one or two exceptions had to do with mad scientists implanting brains of criminals into other people.

Melton: The Frankenstein syndrome.

Palmer: I didn't make myself clear. I'm not saying that these were matters of suggestion. What I wanted to point out was that Jules Verne was a fiction writer to begin with and a respected, reliable, and dependable sort of person. But I'd like to suggest that some of this fiction may have been based on reports from people who actually saw, say, airships. Jules Verne, however, did not present the accounts as true. He wrote them as fiction. All of which we can boil down to the original starting point, which may have been those reports that Jules Verne collected. It's a basic weakness that we like to fool ourselves—we go out and catch a fish, it's always a big fish, and the bigger it is the more it gets away.

Salisbury: The thing that impresses me is that we do indeed embellish and interpret and yet the core of what's

actually reported pretty well matches reality. That is the point that I was trying to make. The guy who watched Venus didn't claim that it had beams of light that projected to him and little green men who got out and chased him.

Ben Jamison: I'd like to apologize for using what is a question period to ask a question and make a comment. [Ben Jamison is Professor of Mathematics at State University of New York at Albany and the University of British Columbia.]

My question concerns two types of mind phenomena. The first is the apparent acquisition or enhancement of psi talents or abilities after a UFO sighting. I would like to know if this is common. In three years I have come across one case of this sort, in which a woman, after having had three sightings of a rather conventional UFO with revolving lights and all that, first began having prophetic dreams which came true. Sometimes they came true in a frightening fashion because they involved the death or maiming of people she knew slightly. Second, she began having a compulsion to heal and claimed a talent for healing—a compulsion which would take her from her house up in the Helderbergs down to the hospital in Albany below, where she would find, for example, that one of her friends was in a hospital room with a fever of 104°. She feels that this sort of thing is an affliction and now will not talk to me any longer about it. I would like to know whether anyone here has run into other cases of this sort.

The second type of mind phenomenon I'd like to ask about is also unique, in my experience. This concerns a person who, after seeing not a UFO but a light in the sky which followed her about, began hearing messages as she went from one room in her house to another. Now, these messages differ from the typical contactee message in that they occasionally have a technical component, in this case regarding satellite launchings. It's a mixture of garbled technological information or misinformation with the usual philosophical and quasi-religious stuff that is more typical of contactee transmissions. Has this hearing of

messages arisen in other cases any of you have personally investigated? Have such messages often had a technical component?

Vallée: Well, for your first question, I know of several parapsychological investigations in which it was confirmed that the subjects did seem to have paranormal abilities. When the investigators asked them, "How do you believe you developed those talents?" a high proportion of people answered, "I wasn't aware I had that talent until I saw a UFO," and they traced these abilities to a UFO experience. I've discussed this with parapsychologists, and it's an open question among them whether the UFO sighting gives a person any talent he or she didn't have before or whether it's just like any traumatic experience that might create a sufficient mental unblocking to release the talent already there. I'm not competent to decide which explanation is the right one.

On the second question, there are several people here who can answer that better than I can. I do know of several cases where garbled technical information, as you put it, was given to contactees. I've personally investigated one case where a young woman was driving south of Santa Barbara in California with three other people when they saw a light and they had the feeling—this is again what they reported—they had the feeling of "floating out of the car," and ever since that incident she has wanted to build a motor; in fact, she contacted me because she wanted information on how to build a motor physically. A motor designed on such physical principles would not work and I found that by using very light hypnosis with her the information about the motor was acquired by her during what she perceived to be a contactee inspection. Again, that's one case typical of pseudotechnical information, misleading technical information mixed in with various kinds of religious symbolism and perhaps typical of what one finds in an obsession.

James Harder: When I was asked to participate in this conference on UFOs and the mind, the first thing I thought the topic might really involve was whether we were going to discuss the controversy of whether UFOs have nuts-

and-bolts reality or whether they are some figment of the imagination, or perhaps both. Some critics of the nuts-and-bolts theory believe that because UFOs seem to disappear and have many PK and telepathic characteristics, that this at least suggests they might be some kind of psychic phenomenon.

However, by the principle of parsimony, we have to take the simplest explanation. That is, when we find actual physical fragments and evidence, we have to say that at least they are physical, and whether they are mental or psychic would have to be an addition to that. So at a minimum we could say, I think, that they could possibly be both.

Over the years I have come to the conclusion that what we see in the UFO phenomenon that appears to be psychic or psychokinetic is, in reality, something which is an exploitation of a natural law, perhaps, which civilizations that have flourished for perhaps hundreds of thousands of years have managed to perfect. Psychic, telepathic, and other abilities that people here on earth have are but stumbling imitations of what the possibilities are. For that reason we don't have to believe that telepathic communication is something that's entirely in the mind. It's just another form of communication not entirely different, perhaps, from what radio communication would have seemed to us several hundred years ago.

I might say for those of you who are technically inclined that there has been recently discovered in the human brain and other places—particularly in the skin—a switching semiconductor which will switch in less than one microsecond from a high resistance forward to a low-resistance condition at a relatively high three hundred volts-per-centimeter voltage gradient. This might give a clue as to some part of the frequency spectrum we could be sensitive to without being consciously aware of it. Just another possibility . . . perhaps involving a physical aspect of telepathic communication. I know that for myself occasionally I suffer from clairvoyance that is statistically separable from chance by a very large factor. But it's sporadic and I never can count on it.

I believe the disappearance of UFOs can be ade-

quately explained by the fantastic accelerations that have been in a sense measured or at least observed in most close-encounter observations. A friend of mine, a member of APRO, one of our field investigators, a high-ranking manager for NASA until he retired, told me about a sighting he had never told anyone about before. It was over Chesapeake Bay and he was within a mile or two of a large dirigible-type UFO. He said it was about the size of a small ocean-going freighter, a big fat aluminum cylinder pointed at one end, tooling along at about one hundred miles an hour at about one thousand feet altitude. It arrived parallel to where he was traveling as an automobile passenger and suddenly tilted up at about a 5° angle, emitted a soundless, straw-colored plasma exhaust, and started going. He estimated that where it went through the cloud cover, it covered five miles in four seconds, accelerating at one hundred Gs and reaching nine thousand miles an hour. The time was about four in the afternoon. Visibility was good; it had just cleared after a rainstorm. Now, he is an aeronautical engineer, and as a matter of fact, he was sufficiently well thought of that the government sent him to help General Electric design the supersonic atomic-powered aircraft. He is a man who knows angles and how to calculate things, at least approximately, in his head. If it had only been fifty feet per second and if that object had been nearby within a hundred yards or so, it would have gone out of sight, at least as far as anyone would normally perceive it, in the blink of an eye.

Other pieces of evidence that we have indicate even higher accelerations and higher velocities, but for smaller objects. So the idea that something appears to disappear doesn't really support a psychic explanation of its appearance. It's entirely possible, of course, that UFOs could be some kind of holographic projection. It's also possible that something influencing atmospheric refraction in their immediate vicinity could make them seem smaller, larger, change shape, or seem to be different than they actually are. But those are, after all, things that we could explain even without present-day physics.

In a kind of conclusion, let me talk about mind phenomena in relation to abduction cases I have been

privileged to investigate. Last time I counted there were sixteen or twenty cases involving twenty or thirty people, most of whom I've had under hypnosis. The problem is that there are very few people who are both reliable and willing to be exposed in public. A lot of really straightforward people don't want to be known. Many are of a high social-economic status, and although they come to talk to me—they probably come to talk to Jacques—they don't want their names to be used in public. Now, these people give some extraordinarily reliable testimony but its usefulness suffers from its anonymity.

On the other hand, we have a large number of people who may be less reliable. Certainly they're less able to interpret what they experience and they're more likely to be publicly exposed, either out of their own inability to defend themselves from the news media or out of some kind of idea that this is a way for them to become important.

Let me conclude, then, that the information we can get from the abducted persons is remarkably fertile and rich—it's just relatively unavailable. If there was less ridicule and more scientific openness, if things became a little more respectable, then perhaps some of these people would feel they could come forward publicly and say some of these things.

Jamison: I was simply asking whether other investigators run across increased psychic ability in the course of abduction sightings or not.

Harder: Of course. The fact is that many people who have been abducted do subsequently have psychic and sometimes psychokinetic ability. I believe it is connected with their experience, because they're not always really traumatically disturbing experiences. In many instances it seems to have preceded the UFO sighting but also seems to have been much enhanced afterward. Let me do a bit of blue-sky speculating.

It may be that people who have belonged to a civilization that's been around for a million years have developed psychic abilities to a very high extent, to the

point perhaps where it's more highly prized than intelligence. Visiting a strange new planet like the earth, looking around for the most likely candidates for high status and advanced development, they would latch onto the psychics rather than the prominent scientists. And certainly there does seem to be some evidence that if you have some kind of a psychic- or telepathic-communication ability, you're more likely to get beamed in on, so to speak. So that's the predisposing thing.

Allen Hynek: I simply feel that what we call parapsychology may very well be a part of somebody else's super-technology. I think there's enough evidence today for a psychic-component theory for the UFO phenomenon. It simply cannot be disregarded. Particularly I've always been worried about the repeaters—the people who have sighting after sighting after sighting. If it's pure nuts-and-bolts and only nuts-and-bolts, I don't quite know how these people would be chosen to see so many UFOs. I'm assuming they're not crackpots, and I believe there are quite a few people who have had multiple sightings who are not crackpots. Yet it just violates ordinary laws of statistics. I'd like to have any comments on that.

I don't know if I should ask the question now or later but I do want to ask Jim Lorenzen and Stanton Friedman about some of the witnesses they quote. They say, "I was talking to a high military official, or I was talking to a military pilot, or a top engineer in NASA who told me such and such." I always ask myself, "What are the chances of bringing that guy before a congressional committee sometime?" And yet in the few times that I have talked to people like that, they back out. They say, "Oh, of course, we can't say anything."

We're not going to get anyplace until we get some of these people who really seem to have important information to stand up and be counted. Jim, is there any chance of getting this gentleman to come forth?

Jim Lorenzen: I might ask Coral if we're going to publish in the *APRO Bulletin* the story that I just related.

Coral Lorenzen: Yes.

Jim Lorenzen: I think we're going to use his name, aren't we? Shall we say who it is now?

Coral Lorenzen: Go ahead.

Jim Lorenzen: It's Paul Hill, who is now retired, of course.

Hynek: Well, it's tremendously valuable when people like that stand and are counted. You can have dozens and dozens of perfectly good people, taxicab drivers and so forth, but damn it, they're not going to be believed. It's the people that you have found there, and some that I have, who carry more weight. Stanton, you've come across people after your lectures. Why don't you say something about that?

Friedman: I've talked to six dozen or more former servicemen who told me about good sightings that occurred when they were in the service, where the data didn't go to Blue Book and did go, typically, to ABC, where the security lid was clamped down. In some instances, I'm not able to get names because they're out there in the audience and I'm on the platform and I don't like to ask anybody's name publicly. But I think the following things need to be taken into account:

(A) The penalties for breaking security are very severe. The fact that there's been only one Daniel Ellsberg is a good indication that people don't think very lightly of breaking security.

(B) Along with that, when you're in the military, you do sign papers that promise you'll forever hold your peace, so to speak, and not reveal what you learn while you were under security, and that goes on in perpetuity.

(C) It's also illegal to try to get people to break security. So if you are interrogating somebody and you are trying to coerce technical or classified information out of him, you are yourself risking being caught in the same vise that these guys are caught in.

Some of them are willing to talk privately or with their backs to the camera. But I've talked to many groups which I've asked, "How many of you had high-level

security clearances?" When I get a response I ask whether they believe the government can keep secrets. It's been almost a 99 percent unanimous yes because they are individually aware of specific instances where secrets have been kept. So it's not easy to bring these guys out of the closet and get them before a congressional committee. I don't think we can count on that at all.

We're dealing with something that seems to be top secret or above, and it's interesting that in the national archives and the material that I looked at from OSI which is in the national archives now, I could find nothing that had ever been higher than secret. Yet surely there must have been such cases. I'm thinking of the one in Milwaukee of three UFOs flying down the runway of a SAC base, getting to the end of the runway, taking off at a 45° angle, and going straight up, with maybe fifty witnesses and radar confirmation. I would think that any indication that somebody could penetrate our security and fly over a SAC base would be top secret.

Now, where's that information? It hasn't been declassified. The rules for declassification, automatic downgrading after X years, do not apply to top-secret stuff. So we've got a real problem here in trying to drag out material that is sensitive by its very nature. It would be like having an atom-bomb designer stand up publicly and describe the latest-model atom bomb he's been working on. Anybody who's going to do that is stupid. It's risking a great deal.

Jim Lorenzen: We seem to be digressing from the planned subject here, but I want to comment that there do seem to be quite old cases where people claim to have very specific information but are under security. The problem seems to be that at one time these people were told not to talk. Well, we know that classification is automatic, declassification seldom is. We need to try to get a determination from authoritative government sources that cases involving UFOs only and not involving our military development are now automatically declassified—that people who know about them can henceforth talk about them.

Friedman: I have a letter from a Senator Frank Moss of Utah. He says that the Air Force tells him there's no longer anything classified about UFOs. The letter dates back about four years, I think.

Jim Lorenzen: I've been told by people in this position that very special pressures can be brought against them because of the special oaths they've signed. They won't accept a written permission such as you've described because they feel they'd be gotten at some way, and there's the threat that organizations like the CIA do all sorts of unauthorized things to get at people who don't play it right. So that's part of the thing we have to fight against.

Melton: Let's hold it at this point. Our third presentation this afternoon will be by Dr. Leo Sprinkle.

Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle

I was so pleased to hear Allen Hynek say that he doesn't think repeaters are necessarily crackpots because I claim to have had two UFO sightings, and I would rather claim not be a crackpot than I would to be a repeater.

I would say, yes, UFOs are mind phenomena, but I'd say yes, they are also physical phenomena, biological phenomena, and I'd also say yes, they're also psychic or spiritual phenomena. Like Charlie Brown, I can say yes to all questions. The evidence is not so clear-cut that people can dispute that viewpoint. So far it's all right to take the position that there are hierarchies.

We're trying to define UFO phenomena in one of two ways. I think Jim Lorenzen alluded to the fact that we define them by saying they're somebody else's responsibility because we can't figure them out, or else we line up our own skills, our own faculties and our own disciplines. That usually means trying to turn the problem into something that we can manage because of the tools or the methods which we use to study these phenomena. I suppose I'll be forced to do the same kind of thing, which of course leads me to the idea that if we cannot study these

things in terms of traditional views we must try to find some other methods or some other approaches to understand the UFO phenomenon.

Next, I'd like to respond briefly to the question raised about ESP and psychic phenomena because it fits right in with the view that I propose.

Yes, I personally have talked with individuals who claim with some supporting evidence that either they were interested in psychic phenomena or had psychic abilities prior to the UFO sighting or after, or there was an enhancement of their abilities. Herb Schirmer, for example, Carl Higdon, and other people claim this happened to them. Dr. Max Edwards of British Columbia says he has talked with people who also exhibit such changes. The Argentina gaucho case reported in *Flying Saucer Review* is another indication of this observation.

In regard to the second question about people getting messages concerning technical and spiritual phenomena, yes, some messages are related to topics which sound quasi-scientific or maybe again they are superspiritual, superreligious.

My own point of view is that whatever direction a person takes in UFO research, he or she is constantly forced back into what I consider to be the mainstream. One person says, "Hey, landing traces." Off they go to landing traces, and we find a lot of evidence. Ted Phillips, I understand, has found over a thousand cases. Somebody else goes after evidence for radio transmissions which apparently are indications of an intelligent communication. It goes a ways and then it falters. So a person is forced to double back. There's a constant movement toward a topic and then back. It reminds me of the story about the boy who arrived at school late one day and the teacher asked, "Why are you late?" "Well, the streets were icy and every time I took a step forward, I slipped two back." She said, "How did you get here?" and he replied, "I turned around and went home."

It might be profound to consider the possibility that we're going to have to arrive right back where we started—right in our own backyard—to learn the truth about UFOs. But I do know that over and over, whatever direc-

tion a person takes in UFO research, sooner or later he or she is not able to go any farther until something else comes in. I'm not sure what that mainstream is except sooner or later, I think we're forced to consider the possibility that either we're being taught that science and religion are one, or we're being forced to consider that we ourselves are in control of our destinies and that we are being taught or counseled or pushed around by intelligent beings who want us to be responsible for what's happening here.

I can't speculate beyond that because that's as far as I am mentally able to go. But I'm very excited about the possibility that yes, UFO phenomena are physically real, there are spacecraft, nuts-and-bolts, propulsion systems. Yes, there are biological beings operating them. Yes, I think there's evidence to suggest that UFO phenomena are mind phenomena, that we're being presented with information. Yes, I believe all this is possible because the evidence is persuasive to me. Yet, because it's so confusing as to why all of these things are happening in the absurd, silly, crazy way that they do happen, I can only speculate that there is a Purpose. I propose that the Purpose is bigger than this little bit of humankind on earth and that we won't know the final answer until it's ready to be told to us. That is exciting and interesting enough to me so that I jog and keep in shape because I want to last long enough to be around and find out what the hell the rest of this story is.

Friedman: Two comments, really. They're interrelated, although they didn't seem like it when I put them down. Dr. Hynek's comment about repeaters and statistics. I don't see how it can apply. If you're going to assume a random distribution, then you can talk statistics. But there's no reason to assume a random distribution. I know a family with five hemophiliacs in it. Hemophilia occurs in one of every ten thousand persons, and you might say it's incredible that there would be five in one family. But there are genetic reasons why this happens. In the same way, once a person has had a sighting, he may be much more likely to have more sightings. In other

words, there's no reason to say that it's a completely random event, that you have to be in the right place at the right time. It's like variable stars. There are some astronomers who have observed some five hundred variable stars; there are others who have observed none.

Hynek: It doesn't logically follow.

Friedman: How can you evaluate the statistical likelihood of having a UFO sighting? Those who have them have them. Those who don't don't. Maybe the second sighting happened because that person spent hours out looking. In addition, UFOs aren't spread evenly around the country. There are concentrations of sightings.

Hynek: We have many reports of people who are led to go to the window and look as if they had a psychic urge to look.

Friedman: Maybe they're more sensitive. Some people can hear higher sounds than others. Maybe there's something about a UFO that some people respond to. Some people hear radio programs from their teeth. We don't know what the causative factors are here. Maybe it's like the animals that sometimes react before earthquakes. They're sensitive to something; we don't know what it is. Well, take earthquakes. They don't occur equally any place in the United States. The reasons for them occurring in California continue to hold. The reason why persons in some places see UFOs over and over again is that maybe there are more UFOs there.

Hynek: Well, then, more people in those communities should see them also.

Friedman: But absence of evidence is not evidence for the absence of evidence. You don't know that more people haven't seen them. That's the problem. If you go digging for sightings, maybe you'd find them.

Coral Lorenzen: There are probably a lot of people who see them and never report them. I've had three sightings in my life. There was no indication that I wanted to see them. It was always accidental.

Friedman: In the right place at the wrong time.

C. Lorenzen: The first one got me interested in astronomy, and I was out watching for meteorites when I saw the second one.

Lawson: One thing that I find interesting is that you're saying that some of these avenues turn into blind alleys. You could also say that we tend to find what we are looking for in a way, too. I have studied free will and a little bit of philosophy and I'm seeing things here that answer yearnings, and I'm sure that Stan searches also. So there are also things that make us persist, and as I said somewhere a long time ago, when I began this, four years ago, it's like searching for the knowledge of God. I don't think the analogy is as strange as the one you just made, Stan.

Friedman: He can't stand my analogies.

Mary Fuller: I thought some of the things he said there toward the end sounded like an acceptance of Christianity, for instance, or any religion. I am referring to Dr. Sprinkle's comments.

Sprinkle: I accept God in all Her glory.

Harder: I think Allen's right to be suspicious of repeaters because it does suggest perhaps they're imagining things. We all know there are enough people who live in Berkeley alone to account for all of the stories we've heard. But let me relate my own experience with abduction cases.

In about half of my cases I systematically search back through a person's memory through hypnosis, looking for earlier experiences that he may have had. I do it in a somewhat tricky way. I don't ask the witnesses about UFOs; that would be a great mistake. I usually will say something like this, "Is there anything that ever happened to you that was very important but that you cannot remember consciously?" Very often, the autonomic finger movements that Leo Sprinkle taught me will say yes, even though they themselves say no. They will say no verbally

but their yes finger will come up. One woman said, "Yes, I remember now. It's something I saw when I was walking through the woods. I met this group of Quakers."

"Very interesting. How tall were they? Were they as tall as you were or were they short?"

"They were about as tall as I was."

"How old were you at the time?"

"I was about six."

I said, "How did you know they were Quakers?"

"Because they were wearing black hats."

And you keep on a line of questioning like this and you'll discover these weren't Quakers. The woman then thought she recognized one of them whom she had seen on a subsequent abduction. And she would never have remembered that experience because she was told to forget it.

In my experience people in about 50 percent of abduction cases will have a memory of that sort, where they seem to have been picked out, believe it or not, at an early age and then were followed up at a later age and had more than one experience. They would be classified as repeaters. We have to be very careful to separate reality from fantasy to be sure, and I don't know how we can tell who's a loony and who's not. But somehow we've got to open up our consciousness to realize that repeaters may actually be a real part of the phenomenon.

Question: I think they are a real part of the phenomenon.

Harder: I mean a part that's not psychologically unsound.

Ben Jamison: I'd like to make a couple more comments on the subject of repeaters. There were three repeaters, the cases that I and David Moyes investigated. Two of the three could be distinguished from the people who lived close to them and who had never had a UFO experience by a habit of spending a certain time each evening, in one case maybe fifteen minutes, in another case about two hours, looking at the night sky. One of these people had absolutely no psychic component in any

of her UFO experiences, including her landing. It's the only landing case I've had and she was one of the main witnesses. Nothing happened to her afterward and the sighting was preceded by no signs that it was going to happen.

However, the other repeater had been, all her life and especially after her initial UFO sighting, "afflicted" by psychic phenomena. You have two different types of personality structures represented by these two people, both of them repeaters and both of them distinguished from their neighbors by looking at the sky a lot.

My second observation refers to apparent repeaters. These were people who seemed disturbed by something they took to be a UFO which later turned out to be very easily explained—sometimes an airplane seen in the night sky, near sunset. We were quite puzzled as to why these people, who were very bright, one with a Ph.D., one with a master's degree, interpreted such easily explainable, conventional objects as UFOs. In both cases, there was in their past what seemed to be a genuine UFO sighting that they had never reported but which had bothered them ever since. So it seems to me that in some cases apparent repeaters are people who have an increased probability of reporting a peculiar event as a sighting because of a previous genuine sighting that they had not reported.

Bill Pitts: On some occasions, I've been called by people saying they have seen unusual lights in the sky. I'll go to their place and they'll point in the direction of a bright star or planet. They describe it as having moved around and then returned to its present location. One possibility is that they're wrong, but I sometimes wonder if these persons actually saw something unusual that then was "covered" by a natural explanation.

Jacobs: I once was given a call in Philadelphia, by a journalist, now retired, who told that on a regularly routine basis he was observing an unusual object that was dancing about, performing all sorts of unusual maneuvers, and that he could see it from his high-rise apartment window. I said if you ever happen to see it again, I live only two blocks away and I'll rush over there with my

telescope. He called me over before long and pointed it out. It was quiet now, but normally it performed unbelievably erratic movements. When I told him it was Jupiter—and that the apparent motion was caused by refraction and atmosphere and pollution and so on, he had a very difficult time believing it, and yet he told me absolutely that that was the object.

Vallée: There is another case that illustrates that, going all the way back to 1897. People observed the "airship" that maneuvered over the Chicago suburbs and rushed to Dearborn Observatory at Northwestern University. The director of the observatory was having dinner at the time and he didn't want to be bothered with any airships. So he finished dinner and twenty minutes later came out and asked where it was. People pointed at something in the sky, and he opened the dome of the observatory, pointed the telescope in that direction, and identified the object as a star. There was no question that it was a star. The problem is that in many of these cases the object maneuvers and goes away into the night sky, and we all know the illusions that can be created under those conditions. And then people will, in good faith, point to a star as the object that they've seen.

Jacobs: It's fascinating to swap stories like this, but to complicate the problem immeasurably, I once took the testimony of a friend concerning an experience he had had when he was fourteen years old. He had a paper route and he was sitting on a friend's steps at 4:30 A.M. and he was looking out into the sky. It was a clear, brilliant sky, and he suddenly saw a somewhat triangular-shaped object with square edges that had many blinking white lights on it. Beneath the triangle he observed a circular object slowly ascending, climbing toward the bottom of the triangular object, which was still in the air. As soon as the circular object reached the triangle, there was an explosion and it just disappeared. The triangular object then slowly faded from view. He could still see its outline and then suddenly it was gone. But the light, he claimed, took on the formation of the stars in the background. How do you explain that?

Curtis Fuller: I'd like to bring this back again to our basic topic for today, which is physical sightings and physical theories. I want to ask Ken Arnold to describe a particular sighting he had over Mount Lassen in California which raises some very interesting questions about what is physical and the nature of reality.

Ken Arnold: This happened in April or May of 1952. To clarify my background a bit, I quit logging flying time at twelve thousand first pilot hours. I know this much about pilots. If their eyesight isn't very good they don't live long.

I left San Francisco at dawn en route to Boise, Idaho. I was letting down, from about ten thousand feet to seven thousand feet, as I was approaching Susanville, California, from Westwood and across the little divide just to the south of Mount Lassen when I saw a terrific flash out on the desert, way ahead of me—clear out in the Nevada desert. And I knew it was one of these things because the flash simply lit up the sky and they were coming toward me. I was at about seven thousand feet when they passed under me, but these were flying right at treetop level and they flew right over the city of Susanville. They flew directly beneath me, across a little body of water and up and down the canyon, and they were fluttering and pulsating probably every twenty or thirty miles—one of them was pulsating. I was flying my plane alone, and the morning air was a little rough. I aimed my camera at them—they were coming right under me—and I was tipping my plane to try to get them in the lens. My camera had a six-power lens and I was taking sixty-four frames a second. I figured for sure I ought to get some good movies. Meantime, I had both eyes open because I was flying at the same time I was photographing. The thing that impressed me most about what I observed was that the first one was just as solid as a Chevrolet car, but the second one, which was following directly behind it, was transparent and I could see pine trees right through it. I realized right then that these things can change their density! I've given this a lot of thought, and I think the simplest comparison would be with fish in our ocean. There are a number of different

fish which can change their density. Probably the simplest one is the jellyfish. I've stuck my finger in the waves to test the water and got stung by objects I couldn't see. All this may seem far out, but the impression I had is that these things were alive. This configuration of the thing gives me the impression that it was alive.

When I first noticed them they were stacked in echelon formation, with the lead one higher than the rest. I thought at first they must be a group of missiles of some kind, robot—controlled. They would flutter and sail and they would go on edge just as easy as they did flatwise. Their bottoms were definitely of a dark color, I would say black, and the top sides looked silvery. The sun was behind them—I was flying from west to east at about three in the afternoon—and my interpretation was that every time one tilted a wing, it reflected the sun and caused the terrific flash I had seen. Now, these were not as large as the first ones I saw because they were flying right at treetop level and there were two pine trees that I used as a yardstick. I made a circle before I landed and estimated that the two trees were about probably seventy feet apart. The UFOs were right above them so I can safely say they were about sixty feet in wingspan. There were just two of them, and when I got to Susanville I landed and called up Westwood.

Westwood is a little lumber town up here in the California mountains. I've been there, driven at times, and somebody said, "Yes, we had a terrific flash. We must have blown out a transformer up here."

Well, I waited around for a while and no transformer had blown and then I knew what it was and I asked the operator if he had seen anything. He said he hadn't. But you see they were doing one thousand miles an hour. When I saw them way out in the distance I only saw the flash but when I saw the flash the second time as they got closer to Susanville, I knew that they were something unusual and that this was an opportunity of a lifetime. I sent the films to Ray Palmer. I never heard from Ray, whether Ray was able to figure them out or not. Ray, did you actually . . . could you see what I was talking about?

Ray Palmer: Would you like to know right now what happened?

Arnold: Yeah. I'd like to know because you didn't write me, you know, and . . .

Palmer: This is going to shock a lot of people. I used your film as a sort of test. I sent it to Wright-Patterson Air Force base; I explained what was on it and I asked them to investigate it and report. After six months they returned the film to me and said there was nothing on it such as I reported. When I showed it back on my projector, they had carefully cut out the forty frames that your UFOs appeared on. That's what happened to your film.

Arnold: No kidding?

Friedman: How long ago did you look at that film?

Palmer: 1952.

Arnold: I had dreamed about getting a close-up like that because I knew these things were around and I was ready to photograph them, but this brings up something else that I would like to tell you, although it's the most stupid thing I've ever done in my life.

It was 1951 and I was at McDermitt, Nevada, and Joe Cordoza, a rancher there, wanted me to fly for some cattle for him. He had a big ranch there and wanted to go with me. McDermitt is where the Corderro mine was; in fact, I helped build that mine in 1941. I had picked up Joe and he left his pickup truck there and my camera and all my gear were in the plane. I went out to be sure to check the oil because we fly a lot of desert country and there's lots of places to land but it's a long walk back. It was a hot afternoon and under those conditions on the Nevada desert you have whirlwinds that pick up pieces of sagebrush and lots of other things. However, Joe was mentioning something about the Gavikas—I think that was their name—a Basque family that owned a ranch about six miles out of McDermitt who had built a new sheep barn.

A sheep barn houses the sheep during lambing season and is about one hundred feet long. This one had a metal roof. Anyhow, I was out checking the oil and we both looked up and Joe said, "Oh, my God, somebody's lost the roof of their barn." It looked like the roof of a barn and it was falling. It was as if a barn roof had been lifted off by a whirlwind and taken up a ways and then began to fall. I thought it was going to crash about a mile and a half outside McDermitt and so did Joe. I thought of taking a picture but my camera had been stashed in the plane. Then just as I thought the thing was going to crash it turned on edge and it went . . . just . . . like . . . that. . . . In about four seconds it was nothing but a little dot in the sky. I had managed to get my camera and I got the picture of the little dot and I've kicked myself ever since that I didn't film the whole sequence. Now of course it could not have been a sheep-barn roof. In thinking about it there wasn't any time we could see all four corners of the roof. I only know that I saw the triangle of how a four-cornered roof might look.

Joe and I stood there with our mouths open and finally Joe said, "Gee whiz, I don't think I want to go out and look for cattle today."

Now this object didn't pulsate or anything of the sort and it didn't even show a bright metallic color or light until it got way up in the sky. And that's the truth, so help me God, and I missed photographing it.

You have to realize that in those very early days there weren't too many people who believed what we pilots were reporting. I tried to keep Ray Palmer pretty well posted, and he was very sympathetic with my problems and shared my interests in trying to find out what was going on.

But in those days we felt we had to defend ourselves. A lot of pilots were seeing things, and we were pretty cautious about reporting what we saw. The pilots that I know are pretty well-respected people. A lot of passengers' lives depend upon the vision of the commercial and transport pilots who fly our airplanes.

I said one time, "I don't know how many lives are

depending upon astronomers but I know a damned good many are depending upon the eyesight of pilots." You don't live long if you don't see good in our business and I sure as hell can tell the difference between a temperature inversion or a cloud and an Unidentified Flying Object. If I couldn't, I wouldn't be here.

I no longer have motion-picture equipment—someone broke into my hangar and stole it—but I've still got all my films. Some of them show some unexplained things. Like an explosion they had in Baker. It couldn't have been more than a hundred feet above the courthouse in town, and it just went like a firecracker. It made a wide swath of smoke and just disappeared in the distance, way past Strawberry Mountain, and I don't know what it was, nobody else knew what it was, but that was it.

Then I have another movie. It's a good one. I've got probably two or three hundred feet of film on it that I took in Idaho Falls. I'm not sure what it is. I have never seen an atmospheric balloon, but I have seen pictures of atmospheric balloons partly inflated, which this possibly could be. This thing was way up in the air traveling west. The winds aloft in Salt Lake, in Wyoming, and every place that had winds aloft reports were saying the winds were blowing from northwest to southeast at fifty, sixty, seventy mph way up past a hundred thousand feet. But this blame object, which was kind of translucent, just kept moving west. A couple of the boys jumped into what I think was an AT-6 and climbed up to fifteen thousand feet but the object was just far away in the sky. It was awfully high and you could see it moving down the valley. But it wasn't the planet Venus, I can guarantee that.

Let me give you a little hearsay. A friend of mine was attending a law-enforcement meeting in Seattle. A test pilot for Boeing Aircraft spoke at the meeting and described an experience he had had. He was flying a test ship that would go in the vicinity of 1,500 mph. This was long before we ever announced we had a plane that fast. He was flying to Mexico City and returned in the same morning, and he ran into or came upon a group of these things of all different colors. A black one came out

of this group and stayed within ten feet of his canopy for probably six to eight minutes. He said it was black and he could see the wings ripple just like a rayfish in the ocean. Now as I've said, I have the same sort of feeling about these things.

I made a wooden model of one of the objects I saw over Mount Rainier. I was requested to make the model for Wright-Patterson Field to show what they looked like. The one I chose was second from the last in the chain of nine UFOs I saw there because I was able to get the best angle on it. After I made the model, an artist made an airbrush copy of it. I made the model long before any photographs were taken of UFOs.

To this day I haven't quite been able to tell whether all the objects I saw over Mount Rainier had this particular shape or whether some were actually a little bit larger or had a wider wingspan or were a little darker color than the one I used as a model, although I got a good look at them from the rear. Of course they were moving rapidly and they were pretty big.

(Editor's note: The Mount Rainier objects were crescent-shaped, not saucer-shaped. Although the term "flying saucer" originated from Kenneth Arnold's original sighting over Mount Rainier, it was the invention of a newsman. After Arnold landed he described the objects as being "like saucers skipping across water." He at no time ever implied they were shaped like saucers.)

I've tried to tell you straight what happened to me and later on I'll be describing my original sighting and my involvement in the Maury Island affair. I have remained intensely interested in these things for thirty years, and I hope some day we can get some sensible answers to this mystery.

END OF FIRST DAY OF SYMPOSIUM ON
MIND PHENOMENA