

The point we think Vallée is making is that so far no trained mind claims to have seen a landed saucer and its occupants emerge from the contraption. Perhaps this is true. Trained minds are very much rarer than the other sort and we have no doubt that statistics can be found to prove this assertion. Vallée has discovered that nocturnal visits are commoner than others and untrained minds, it must be remembered, follow the more menial tasks and often work by night while the well trained mind is enjoying a good sleep. The rare astronomer who may be awake is gazing at a distant star and not at a railway line in France.

Marius Dewilde, who seems to have been believed by *all* the saucer students, did not possess a trained mind. But what sort of training does one need to see a circular object squatting on the permanent way? What special study must one follow to see a dwarf in a diving suit? Was the witness emotional? Well, Marius was very shocked as well he might be, but he stuck to his story and corroborative evidence was forthcoming. As far as we know he offered no explanation of what he saw. He made no claim to have seen the hand of God in the sky or an angel on the ground (two manifestations which the scientific approach rules out completely, though for reasons that are obscure). Marius, however, did have one inestimable advantage over the trained mind. He had seen what he had seen while the trained mind was elsewhere and asleep.

But let us suppose that the trained mind had been awakened from his slumber. What would have happened? Much would have depended upon the type of trained mind. Had Dr. Menzel's alarm gone off he would probably have declared that an under-sized deep-sea diver had emerged from a temperature inversion. Jacques Vallée, on the other hand, would have made a notch in a French straight line. An expert from the Air Ministry or its French equivalent would have declared that it was a weather balloon released

by either Great Britain or Germany, depending on the direction of the wind. Now let us suppose that some sleepy head with a trained mind had arrived on the scene, one that had never harboured any preconceived notions about flying saucers, Martians and the like. Utterly astounded, he would in all probability have decided to keep his mouth tightly shut. Trained minds, it should be noted, do not as a rule like to be laughed at by their inferiors. It may not just be statistics that keeps the trained minds out of Vallée's list: it could also be fear of ridicule.

If, for a moment, we return to our meteors, we learn that when they became fashionable, scientists began to study them. They listed them and they discovered laws which these objects seemed to obey. The world had a new word which was accepted not only as a new word but also as an explanation of the hitherto impossible. Anything seen in the sky which didn't fit became a meteor, regardless of its behaviour. It might proceed on a zig-zag course, it could suddenly reverse direction, remain stationary and start off again — all this mattered not. It must be a meteor. What else could it have been? It is only now that we realise that it might have been a flying saucer — or a complete mystery. The latter explanation, however, is not one that appeals to the mind that has been thoroughly trained.

Poor, simple Marius Dewilde! His education was neglected and his mind undisciplined. It is no use asking him to explain one of the mysteries of the universe. Had he indeed met men from Mars? He will probably never know and nobody would think of asking him. His only claim to recognition is that he has become a statistic in a scientific survey and even then he must be regarded with some suspicion. Can he be relied on? Would it not be better if some psychiatrist gave him a going over? We think, however, that Marius was superior as a witness to many who might have been called to the scene. He had an untrained mind and that is the main reason why we believe him implicitly.

" FARCE " IN RAF

Labour M.P. Mr. George Wigg, complaining of farcical security classifications in the RAF, listed the following documents stamped "restricted":

- An announcement of an RAF church service;
- An advertisement of a vacancy for a superintendent of typists;
- A memorandum advertising a vacancy for a welfare officer at the Treasury;
- A notice of a vacancy in Hong Kong for a Civil Servant.

(See London "Daily Mirror," March 9.)

It is small wonder that a controversial subject like UFOs is still shrouded in mystery.

ENTITIES ASSOCIATED WITH TYPE 1 SIGHTINGS

PART TWO

THE SCIENTIFIC INTERPETATION

by Jacques Vallée

IN the first part of this article, published recently in the *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW* (January-February, 1964) we have taken into consideration a certain number of popular accounts of "landings" and we have tried to present a clear statistical picture of the "entities" described in these reports.

In order to make this description, we had to refrain from judging the reports, and from discussing the reliability of the accounts, except in a few extreme cases where obvious hoaxes and misinterpretations of the evangelist type were involved. Having now established such a general description, we can review the statistical characters we have found and discuss them in terms of scientific interest.

1.—Description of "giants" and "men"

We have already noted, in the first part of our article, the high probability that the descriptions of "giants" were misinterpretations due to psychological causes, pure imagination or effects of perspective. The descriptions of "men" were more reliable.

It has been shown that fifty-two "men" had been mentioned in nineteen cases of alleged "landings." We will obviously be inclined to evaluate these cases in the light of the most detailed and well-known among them, i.e. the eight French cases. Their analysis is very unrewarding. The more one tries to go into the details of the facts, the more contradiction one finds in the descriptions.

First of all, we should exclude the Carcassonne case and the Chemin-Long case, on which we have at present very little information. In the Guyancourt case, the examination of the facts

shows that the reliability of the witness is poor. In Herblay there was only one witness, a twelve-year-old boy. In Diges, the case has already been the subject of a considerable amount of discussion. Nobody disputes the fact that the witnesses observed the landing of an object. But this object could have been a Bell 47 Helicopter. Of course, it is very difficult to undertake a new investigation now: these cases certainly show the necessity of a local official organisation (such as the American A.T.I.C.) to check the facts as soon as they are reported and to evaluate precisely the reliability of the witnesses and the conditions at the time of the observation.

As far as the French cases are concerned, we are left with only three sightings: La-Roche-en-Breuil, Bouzais and Chaleix: they give very little information on which a serious investigation could be based. No official file has been established; and the accounts published in the newspapers do not provide any evidence tending to indicate that these observations are other than misinterpretations or hoaxes. They certainly do not provide any evidence of the extraterrestrial origin of the phenomena.

2.—Description of "dwarfs"

The problem of the descriptions of "dwarfs" is different. When the American astronomer C. Sagan evaluated the mathematical probability of visitation of the Earth by extraterrestrial civilisations, he found that such a visitation could be expected once every 1,000 years: could our accounts of "landings," and the descriptions of "little men," be interpreted in the light of these calculations? Does any proof exist of the reality of the "entities" so described? From the data

we have at the present time, the answer is negative.

If we first consider the "Erchin entity," we find that the best description was made by Starovski: unfortunately, the witness was alone, and his reliability can be challenged. The Loctudy case is known only indirectly. More generally, we find similar reasons to eliminate all other descriptions as being due to pure imagination. We are left with only one type of "dwarfs": those in a "diver's suit." Can imagination account for them?

A typical case is that of Quarouble. For many students interested in the phenomenon who were in France when the "Quarouble psychosis" developed, there is little doubt that imagination alone is not the cause of the rumour. Marius Dewilde had "seen something." Whether he really saw a craft from outer space and two "pilots," or some classical phenomenon seen under unusual circumstances, is another question. In order to evaluate such an account on a concrete basis one would need a complete psychological description of the witness. This experiment, to the best of our knowledge, has never been done.

3.—Science and the Fantastic

In the first part of our article, we carefully noted all features, devices and characters associated with the apparitions. We have found a certain number of "space suits," luminous glows, flashing lights and "balls of violet fire." We have found "luminous men" and small people "grunting like pigs." The fact that these descriptions come from the layman, and not from trained science-fiction enthusiasts, is interesting in itself to the psychologist, and we followed the psychological approach in this preliminary description. (Obviously, no physicist will discuss these aspects of the descriptions unless he is given material elements on which to base an investigation, such as physical evidence or photographs.)

There exists one theory which can explain all descriptions of "landings": in this theory it will be said that the witnesses either have misidentified classical phenomena, or have perpetrated hoaxes. This has already been shown to be true in many cases of "Venusians" and it is obviously a convenient explanation in many cases included in our present survey.

However, we feel that a complete rejection of all sightings on this basis would be dangerous. We have no indication that the descriptions are related to "extraterrestrial" phenomena. But we have no proof, on the other hand, that they are *not* related to an interesting natural phenomenon

of some sort: many accounts of "landings" or objects close to the ground have been shown to relate to ball lightning and electrical effects; in such cases the "entities" could have been imagined by emotional persons.

During the Middle Ages, comets were described in a very fantastic manner. Rains of blood were said to accompany them, and Flammarion quotes a description of a comet in which people saw the hand of God, holding a sword, and surrounded by numerous heads of angels. Behind these "fantastic" popular descriptions was a scientific fact. Rejecting them because of their highly imaginative details would have resulted in a loss of information on the (now) ordinary natural phenomenon which was the origin of the rumour. In our opinion, UFO accounts present a similar situation to the modern scientist: angels armed with swords have been replaced by spacemen in diving suits armed with electronic guns.

4.—Conclusion

We will resume the general survey of the accounts of landings with "pilots" by the following statements:

- 1/In this survey of 80 sightings of "pilots" (where 153 "entities" have been described) we have not discovered any evidence of the extraterrestrial origin of these "entities."
- 2/We have found serious indications of the "nocturnal" character of the apparitions (Part I, figure 1, of my article in the January-February, 1964, issue).
- 3/We have estimated the descriptions of "giants" as extremely unreliable.
- 4/We have been unable to show that the descriptions of "men" were other than misinterpretations of ordinary landings of, say, helicopters due to psychological causes.
- 5/In our investigation of descriptions of "dwarfs" we have found more agreement between the witnesses, but a very small amount of data which could be used in a more elaborate theory of the origin of these "entities," if their existence is accepted. In our opinion, *the witness himself* is the most interesting element in these cases and his psychological character should be investigated before any new hypothesis is put forward.
- 6/We admit that the attribution of all the cases to hoax and hallucination is a logical explanation. Sightings prior to 1954 seem especially unreliable.
- 7/However, we wish to point out that the "fantastic" character of a popular description cannot be taken as a criterion for the rejection, by the scientist, of that description. A