

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 Conqueror* 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 bumbling 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 to 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

# 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 PÁGINAS