

JULY/SEPTEMBER • 1974

**UFO
QUARTERLY
REVIEW**

A NICAP PUBLICATION

UFO QUARTERLY REVIEW

Vol. II, No. 3

July-September 1974

IN THIS ISSUE:

"ABDUCTION" IN PASCAGOULA

Philip J. Klass 2

THE UFOs AS EXTRATERRESTRIAL MACHINES

Frank Salisbury 10

UFO QUARTERLY REVIEW

Copyright © 1974 by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena, Inc. (NICAP). All rights reserved except 200 words or less, with credit. Published quarterly at Kensington, Md. Subscription rate: \$5.00 per year. Address all correspondence to NICAP, Suite 23, 3535 University Blvd. West, Kensington, Maryland 20795.

Philip J. Klass, author of *UFOs Explained*, is senior avionics editor for "Aviation Week and Space Technology" magazine. His investigatory technique draws on his formal training as an electrical engineer (Iowa State, 1941) and ten years in industry at General Electric.

Because of his scientific, painstaking approach, he has provided new insights into UFO cases that others have deemed "unexplainable" except in terms of extraterrestrial space ships.

Mr. Klass resides in Washington. In 1973 he was named a Fellow in the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. He is also a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Aviation/Space Writers Association, and the National Press Club.

The following chapter is reprinted from *UFOs Explained*. A complete copy of the book is available at your local book store.

"ABDUCTION" IN PASCAGOULA

by Philip J. Klass

Copyright 1974 by Philip J. Klass; reprinted with permission by Random House, Inc.

The most famous UFO case to emerge during the 1973 flap involved two shipyard workers from Pascagoula, Mississippi, who claimed that while fishing in the Pascagoula River on the night of October 11, they had been abducted by three strange-looking creatures, carried aboard a flying saucer for examination and then released unharmed. Coming in the midst of a nationwide UFO flap, at a time when the national news media had begun to tire of publishing simply more reports of strange lights in the night skies, the Pascagoula case had great appeal. Within forty-eight hours, thanks to wire-service and TV network coverage, the two men were internationally famous—

and they had acquired an attorney who would serve as their agent. The attorney, Joseph Colingo, told me that during a single day he had received "some three hundred phone calls right in this office—television stations, radio stations. I even got calls from London, South America, Canada, Mexico and all over the country inquiring about this."

The incident involved Charles Hickson, age forty-two, employed in the small Walker Shipyards, and nineteen-year-old Calvin Parker, who had recently come to work in the same shipyard from his home in Laurel, Mississippi. Parker was living with the Hicksons at the time. The men's story, told principally by Hickson, was extremely sketchy and lacked the detail that had characterized the Barney and Betty Hill UFO abduction story that had achieved similar fame just seven years earlier. Nor was the Pascagoula account as colorful as another abduction story, well known to UFO-logists, told nearly a decade earlier by a Brazilian farmer named Antonio Villas-Boas. He said he had gone outside his house one night to investigate a UFO that had landed there and that he had been set upon by several men who carried him aboard a flying saucer. Inside, Villas-Boas reported, he had been *forced* to make love to a spacewoman whose body was "much more beautiful than that of any woman I have ever known before."

Hickson said the two men had been fishing after dark, within several blocks of downtown Pascagoula, when they heard an unusual buzzing or zipping sound. When they turned toward the sound, Hickson said, they saw a flashing blue light coming from a craft that was hovering several feet above the ground. In a "first-person account" published in the December 2 edition of *The National Tattler*, Hickson said the craft was "sort of rounded or oval, was about eight to 10 feet wide and about eight feet high." When Hickson appeared on the "Dick Cavett Show" on the American Broadcasting Company's television network, he said the craft was "around twenty feet long, the overall of it." But several weeks later, on the National Broadcasting Company's "Mike Douglas Show," Hickson said the UFO was "twenty or thirty feet long." In an earlier interview with an Aerial Phenomena Research Organization investigator on October 13, Hickson said the UFO was sixteen to eighteen feet long. The first newspaper accounts said the incident had occurred around 7 P.M., but during the Cavett show Hickson said it was between 8 P.M. and 9 P.M. Later, on the Douglas show, Hickson said the incident had occurred "around nine o'clock."

In any event, as soon as the UFO appeared nearby, Hickson said, three strange-looking creatures suddenly emerged from the craft and "floated" toward the two men. Two of them, he said, grabbed him, and the third was left to handle young Parker. According to Hickson, he and his friend were "floated" into the UFO through a door which "didn't open like a door opens—it just appeared, the opening just appeared." Hickson said he was floated into a very intensely illuminated room and that Parker, apparently, was taken to another. Hickson said he was "levitated" in a horizontal position while a large round object floated back and forth over his body as if giving him a physical examination. At one point, according to Hickson, the two creatures left the room, but he made no attempt to escape because he seemed to be completely paralyzed except for the ability to move his eyes.

The most detailed part of Hickson's account was his description of the space creatures, although it is difficult to understand how he could have observed so much detail. Outside, the night was dark and the abduction had occurred so quickly. Inside, Hickson said, it was so intensely illuminated he could not make out any details of the room. In fact, more than a month after the alleged incident, when Hickson and Parker appeared on the Douglas TV show, Hickson disclosed for the first time that the interior illumination was so bright that he had suffered severe eye injury, which he compared to "a welding flash." Hickson said it persisted "for about three days."*

Despite the intense illumination and reported eye injury, Hickson somehow managed to note that the creatures were about five feet tall, with no necks, had gray wrinkled skin "like an elephant," long arms and lobsterlike claws for hands. Their legs never separated for walking; instead they "floated," Hickson said. On their heads, where human ears and a nose would be located, were small cone-shaped appendages. Below the "nose" was a "mouth" which Hickson first described as being a "hole," but in a later interview as a "slit." When Hickson was interviewed by an APRO investigator shortly after the incident, he reported that the creatures had "slits" where human eyes would be located. But later on the Cavett show, he said they had "no eyes. I didn't see any eyes." When Cavett asked whether Hickson had heard anything resembling speech, he replied "no." But later, when Cavett asked if the

*Hickson never mentioned an eye injury when he was being examined for possible radioactivity by USAF doctors at Keesler Air Force Base the day after the incident had allegedly occurred.

creatures had tried to communicate with the two men, Hickson replied, "I did hear some mumbling, some type of mumbling from one of the things . . ."

After the two men were carried aboard the UFO, Hickson reported, he did not see his friend until sometime later when the two men were floated out and deposited on the riverbank. Parker proved unable to supply even sketchy details of his experience because, as Hickson explained, the youth had fainted at the start of the incident and had not regained consciousness until it was over. Hickson said the creatures had quickly boarded their UFO and it had zipped off into the night. All this, allegedly, had occurred within several hundred feet of U.S. Highway #90, yet none of the passing motorists had reported seeing the glowing flying saucer hovering a few feet above the ground where it should have been readily visible.

During the next several hours, according to Hickson, the two men had debated whether they should even report the incident because "people wouldn't believe us." After bolstering their nerve with a few nips of liquor from a bottle that Hickson had in his car, he said they first visited the offices of the local newspaper, only to find them closed for the night. Finally, around 11 P.M., Hickson called the Jackson County sheriff's office, which dispatched a deputy to bring the two men in to make a firsthand report.

Hickson says that he "asked the sheriff not to let it out to the news [media]," despite his earlier statement that he had first tried to report the incident to the local newspaper. In any event, by the following day the abduction story was being publicized widely, not only in Pascagoula but across the nation. A UPI dispatch quoted Sheriff Fred Diamond as saying "something" had happened to the men because they were "scared to death and on the verge of a heart attack." Another newspaper account quoted Deputy Sheriff Conrad Clark as saying that Hickson's employer described him as a "good steady worker." Had reporters checked with Hickson's former employer, the large Ingalls Shipyards, they could have learned that he was fired on November 20, 1972, for "conduct unbecoming a supervisor," involving financial hanky-panky whose details Ingalls officials decline to discuss.* Then on July

*According to a penetrating account of the Pascagoula case, written by Joe Eszterhas, that appeared in the January 17, 1974, edition of *Rolling Stone*, Hickson had been fired "because his superiors alleged that Charles Hickson, expert shipfitter, was borrowing money from the boys working under him, then paying them back by trying to finagle them promotions."

6, 1973, Hickson had filed for bankruptcy because of his hopelessly high personal debts, in the U.S. District Court at Biloxi. This I learned from Richard Glacier, a reporter for *The Daily Herald* in Gulfport.

Pascagoula attorney Colingo told me that he became involved when the head of the Walker Shipyards, which was his client, called for his help because newsmen were hounding the company in seeking interviews with Hickson and Parker.† I learned that Colingo now had a contract with the two men to handle their TV appearances and other commercial ventures.

APRO headquarters learned of the Pascagoula incident the morning of October 12, when the news first broke, and asked one of its most experienced and distinguished investigators to hurry to the scene. This was Dr. James A. Harder, professor of civil engineering at the University of California at Berkeley, who arrived in Pascagoula later that same day. Dr. J. Allen Hynek, hearing of the incident, also hurried to Pascagoula, and the two famous investigators jointly interviewed the principals in the presence of Colingo and members of the sheriff's office. Harder later reported his opening remarks to the two shipyard workers: "I said that they were one of a very small number of persons who had had such an experience." (*The A.P.R.O. Bulletin*, September-October, 1973.) This would indicate that Harder already accepted their story as fact even before the interview. Later, Harder said, he told the two men about other famous UFO abduction cases, including the one involving Villas-Boas.

Harder, who has acquired some skills in hypnosis for use in his UFO investigations, to probe for details which the principals might not otherwise recall, employed this technique during part of the Pascagoula interviews. He admitted in his APRO report that "both Hickson and Parker were fearful of hypnosis." After Harder had demonstrated hypnosis on an attending doctor and a fellow shipyard worker, he said, Hickson was finally persuaded to try it "but only as a dry run. He was very nervous but finally did calm down." On October 14 the two men were again interviewed by Harder and Hynek. After two days of interviews the two experienced UFO investigators reported their conclusions. Harder said: "There

†A different version of how Colingo got involved is described by Eszterhas in *Rolling Stone*. He said that when Colingo chanced to call his brother-in-law, an executive at the Walker Shipyards, the latter suggested that Hickson and Parker might need an "advisor." He went on to explain, "Hell, if they seen what they says they seen, it's probably worth only about a million dollars." Colingo promptly arranged to meet with the two men.

was definitely something here that was not terrestrial . . . Where they came from and why they were here is a matter of conjecture, but the fact that they are here is true, beyond a reasonable doubt." Hynek was slightly more qualified in his endorsement. "There is no question in my mind that these two men have had a very terrifying experience." (A UPI dispatch erroneously attributed Harder's statement to Hynek and vice versa. The attributions and appraisals here are correct, as verified by my discussions with both men.)

These ringing endorsements by the two experienced UFO investigators were carried by the wire services and published around the nation. One typical newspaper story carried the headline "Two Men Claim to Have Been on UFO; Scientist Believes Them." Newspaper readers could not help being impressed with the academic credentials of the two scientists, especially since Hynek had been a long-time UFO consultant to the USAF (which invariably was mentioned in the newspaper articles) and since he was the head of the astronomy department at Northwestern University.*

It is hardly surprising that the citizens of Pascagoula developed a case of the jitters. If the story was true, as Harder and Hynek believed, and if the same UFO was still in the area, it might return for more victims at any moment. But the next victims might be carried off to a distant world, perhaps to be exhibited there before crowds of strange-looking creatures of the type that Hickson had described, or worse, the victims might be stuffed and placed in a museum. An unknown prankster filled a large plastic balloon with helium, painted it with psychedelic colors and released it to float across downtown Pascagoula. The minister of one local church posted a sign announcing that his next sermon would be entitled "Visitors from Outer Space: What Sayeth the Lord?" Later, the minister offered a tape-cassette recording of his sermon for sale for the modest price of two dollars.

Some of the early press accounts on this case reported that Hickson and Parker were willing, even eager, to take a polygraph examination ("lie-detector test") to verify the truthfulness of their story. Yet during the subsequent days there was no follow-up report that the two men had done so. Then, on October 31, the national news media reported that

*In the spring of 1974 Hynek acquired still another impressive-sounding title: Director of the "Center of UFO Studies." According to one newspaper account of March 17, 1974, the new organization was set up by Hynek himself and is "currently [a] one-man operation [run] out of his home . . ."

one of the men, Hickson, had finally taken the test. And he had passed it with flying colors, according to the New Orleans polygraph operator, Scott G., who had administered the examination. One typical newspaper headline for the UPI story reporting this remarkable new development read: "UFO Story Stands Up in Lie Test." The article quoted a statement issued by the polygraph operator: "It is my opinion that he [Hickson] told the truth when he stated that he believes he saw a spaceship, that he was taken into the spaceship and that he saw three creatures." The test had been run just in time so that Dick Cavett could read the impressive-sounding statement before introducing Hickson on November 2, on the latter's first feature TV network appearance. The UPI story said the test had been "administered in cooperation with the Jackson County sheriff's office at the request of an attorney for Hickson and Parker."

The fact that Hickson had been willing to take a polygraph examination suggested that he had nothing to hide. There was no explanation for the fact that Parker had *not* taken a test at the same time, but when Hickson appeared on the Cavett show, he explained that the young man was in the hospital. Later, Colingo informed me that the young man had suffered a "nervous breakdown" and this explained why he had not taken a lie-detector test.

When I returned from a month-long trip in mid-December, I launched my own investigation of this now-famous case. The announced results of the polygraph tests on Hickson gave this case an element of respectability and credibility that other such fantastic UFO "contactee" cases lacked. From my very limited knowledge of polygraph tests, I knew that it is *not* an infallible technique for determining if the subject is telling a falsehood. (If it were even close to being infallible, polygraph tests could eliminate the need for many long court trials and could be substituted for a jury.) But before I could probe the Pascagoula case and the validity of Hickson's examination, I needed to strengthen my knowledge of polygraphy. To do this, I sought the assistance of a long-experienced specialist in the Washington area—Glenn Maggard, who operates the Atlantic Security Agency. Maggard is a licensed examiner and a member of the American Polygraph Association.

Maggard emphasized to me that the "charts" which are generated by a polygraph, to show the subject's physiological reactions to questions, are *not* in themselves the sole mechanism that indicates whether the subject is telling the truth. The

effectiveness of the polygraph depends principally on the skill and experience of the human examiner, and on the questioning techniques he employs, Maggard emphasized. He told me that some persons, for physiological or psychological reasons, are not "good subjects" because they can tell a falsehood without having physiological responses that can be detected on the charts. For this reason, Maggard said, each subject must first be tested by the examiner to be sure that he responds when telling what is known to be a falsehood. Maggard then gave me approximately a dozen questions to pose to the New Orleans polygraphist who had tested Hickson, so that Maggard could evaluate his expertise.

This chapter will be continued in the October-December, 1974 issue of the UFO Quarterly Review.

Frank Salisbury's interest in UFOs developed from an interest in exobiology, the infant science devoted to a consideration of life (if any) on other planets. His book, *The Utah UFO Display, A Biologist's Report*, is fascinating reading. There are well documented accounts of a variety of people—all who pass normal tests of credibility—who have viewed a display of UFOs in the Uintah Basin area in Utah.

The following chapter is an excerpt from Dr. Salisbury's book. A complete copy is available at your local book store.

Dr. Salisbury is from Utah State University. He received his degree in botany and biochemistry from the University of Utah, and earned his Ph.D. from the California Institute of Technology.

Dr. Salisbury is a member of NICAP's Board of Governors.

THE UFOs AS EXTRATERRESTRIAL MACHINES

by Frank Salisbury

Are we alone in the universe? Or are there planets orbiting distant suns where proteins and nucleic acids have come into being and cooperated to form cells, tissues, organs, and organisms; where plant-like creatures absorb their luminary's light energy for photosynthesis, and where animal beings consume these organisms to obtain the energy needed for movement—and perhaps for thought, for happiness and misery, love and hate, compassion and aggression? Do the planets of Tau Ceti or Zeta Reticuli and/or some other cosmic orb support a race of intelligent beings who have learned to

communicate with the stars, to travel through the vastness of the galactic expanse, encapsuled with their life-support systems in shiny space ships that are propelled by hyper-drives capable of rushing through space with nearly the speed of photons themselves—or faster, perhaps, by some ultraphysics not yet known to us, yet to be dreamed of by our best brains? Have these beings with their marvelous vehicles—and their unthinkable purposes and psychological-sociological-ecological abilities—entered our atmosphere on many occasions and for many years to be seen by some of us?

These are the kinds of questions that have long sparked the interest, even the consuming passion, of many UFO researchers. These are the things implied by the much simpler question: Are the UFOs extraterrestrial machines?

How do we go about answering even the simple question? It has not proven to be an easy task. Some approaches are summarized in this chapter.

To Prove or to Disprove

In principle, it should not be difficult to prove the reality of the UFOs. We only need to catch one and take it to our laboratories for study. But such proof has not been forthcoming (as we discussed in Chapter 3), so most of the scientific comments on UFOs have been aimed at disproving them. Yet a little philosophical reflection will indicate that this approach is doomed to failure. Probably the only really valid way to disprove that the UFOs are extraterrestrial machines would be to demonstrate this in each and every UFO sighting. We have seen that in many cases it is possible to prove that a UFO is not an extraterrestrial machine (the UFO is identified as the planet Venus, a weather balloon, etc.), but it is equally apparent that this will not be possible in all cases—if only because data are incomplete.

The first alternative to proving that all UFOs are not extraterrestrial machines is to prove that *most* are not, and then to infer that since most are not, probably all are not. It should be quite apparent that this approach is not logically valid. It is an example of induction proper. If we examine 90 percent of the chairs in a given school, for example, and find that they are made of wood, we are still not entitled to the

conclusion that *all* the chairs in that school are made of wood. Off in some closet somewhere might be a metal chair. Proving that 99 and 44/100 percent of all UFO cases do not involve extraterrestrial machines still isn't sufficient. Of the thousands or millions of sightings, only *one* needs to involve an extraterrestrial machine to provide us with a point of real interest.

The trouble with the application of the inductive or statistical approach to the UFOs is that the cases that are clearly explained may not be *representative* of all UFO sightings. Typically, they are not. Just because many witnesses have mistaken the planet Venus for a UFO, we cannot conclude that a saucer-shaped object fifty feet in diameter with windows and landing gear that put down in someone's back yard was really the planet Venus. The important thing to remember about many unexplained sightings is that they have so little in common with those that can be explained.

The Impossibility Theory

How about proving the UFOs *cannot* be extraterrestrial machines? This second approach is also full of logical pitfalls, although it is one that has often been taken. Obviously, it assumes that we know enough about the operation of the physical universe to say in every case what is possible and what is not.

For example, William Markowitz (1967) argues in *Science* that the UFOs could not be extraterrestrial, since interstellar rockets are impractical. He says that the energy requirements for interstellar travel necessitate a rocket of such huge dimensions or with expulsion of material at such high temperatures (85,000°C) that no resemblance to the commonly reported UFOs could be imagined. He describes the Apollo Saturn 500-F space vehicle used to launch our moon rockets and goes on to calculate the ratio of the initial to the final mass and the time required for various interplanetary and interstellar trips based on known propulsion systems. Then he tells of his troubles in finding reliable reports of UFOs landing and taking off, apparently assuming that every UFO takeoff would represent a departure for the home planet; that is, that all UFOs must be interstellar spacecraft. He then points out

that UFO takeoffs do not resemble a launch from Cape Kennedy. (There actually is some resemblance in Kent Denver's account of his sighting at South Myton Beach.) He further mentions that it would be foolish to expend such efforts on interstellar travel, only to arrive at the new planet and then not make contact with its inhabitants. He dismisses metaphysics (i.e., physical laws that we do not understand but that could allow interstellar travel).

This article is so patiently naive about UFOs, and its arguments are so unconvincing, that it is amazing that the article was ever published in *Science*. Philip H. Abelson, the editor of *Science*, is an outspoken opponent of UFOs as extraterrestrial machines. J. Allen Hynek, after eighteen years of UFO investigation, was probably the most competent scientist in the United States to write on this topic, but his *carefully prepared letter* to the editors of *Science* (Hynek, 1966), suggesting that the UFOs might be worthy of scientific study, was accepted only reluctantly by Abelson.

By an interesting coincidence, on the very day (October 21, 1969) that I was reworking these pages in the original manuscript, Markowitz was on our campus presenting a Sigma Xi National Lecture entitled, "UFO Mania." He discussed most of the arguments summarized in my text plus some added approaches. For example: not only is interstellar travel in reasonable time an impossibility, but UFOs are not worthy of scientific study because alchemists wasted time searching for the philosopher's stone or the elixir of life, and other people have spent time building perpetual motion machines. He then talked at length about how scientists really are open-minded, willing to investigate anything, always motivated by *free and open inquiry, etc.* Yet at the end of the lecture, he refused to "argue" with anybody (that is, answer any question that intimated a viewpoint opposite to his own), and he stated that he had never personally investigated a UFO sighting, nor would he ever do so (which sounds a trifle like an astronomer who refuses to look through a telescope). He would never believe the extraterrestrial hypothesis until he was personally confronted with an extraterrestrial being. A most interesting, open-minded, scientific attitude.

Is interstellar travel *really* impossible? To make such a negative statement (formulate a so-called *impotence principle*), it would be necessary to provide rather rigorous proof. Remember that it took centuries to demonstrate to everyone's satisfaction that it is impossible to square the circle, trisect an angle with compass and straight edge, or build a perpetual

motion machine (in modern context, to break the second law of thermodynamics). Hence it appears a bit presumptuous to make such an all-inclusive negative statement in relation to space travel. After all, our first real step into space was taken less than two decades ago, and Einstein's relativity, which limits the absolute velocity of any object in the universe to some speed less than that of light, has only been considered by a handful of scientists for about seventy years. (One continues to hear reports of exceptions.)

Anti-gravity devices could account for some UFO behavior, but then they seem fantastic. Yet we don't know what gravity is, so it is somewhat difficult to disprove anti-gravity devices. Much of Markowitz's argument is based on the laws of inertia, but we don't understand the physical basis of inertia; we merely apply empirical equations that describe our experiences. What unknown energy sources could be tapped in the space between the stars?

We have never been there, and so it is difficult to say. It is probably a little premature to state the impotence principle that interstellar travel is impossible. We recognize that impotence principles exist, that some things in the universe are impossible. But we should also recognize that at this stage of our development, we have only been able to state a very few such principles with certainty.

Yet one aspect of the impossibility argument remains impressive: the UFOs appear to do impossible things. Of course this is no more logically valid than saying that interstellar travel is impossible. Nevertheless, it provides a real stumbling block for the scientist who would investigate UFOs. Numerous impressive examples are provided in the Uintah Basin sightings. Not only do the UFOs hover with no sign of spinning helicopter propellers, but they move in the atmosphere at extreme velocities without a sonic boom or burning up with frictional heat. And they accelerate from a standstill to these velocities in a fraction of a second. The accelerational forces that are generated would be expected to disintegrate any man-made vehicle.

In the March-April 1973 *APRO Bulletin*, for example, Dr. James Harder tells of his analysis of an interesting photograph. The witness, Mr. C. Dwight Ghormley, saw a large "tank" about three quarters of a mile from the road near Sedona, Arizona. Because it appeared to be in an inaccessible spot, he decided to stop and photograph it. After snapping the picture, he noticed that the object was gone, leaving nothing but a cloud of smoke or dust behind. The photograph showed only a

long, broken streak of light. The owner of the photography shop that developed the film noticed this and brought it to the attention of APRO. Harder assumed that Mr. Ghormley had photographed the object as it took off, in which case the streak of light would represent the distance it traveled while the camera shutter was open—about one sixtieth of a second! Knowing the distances involved, the characteristics of the cameras, etc., Harder could calculate the speed the object was able to achieve essentially from a standstill. This proved to be on the order of 16,000 miles per hour!

Still, we can't say that it's impossible. We can even imagine how it might be done. All that's really required, perhaps, is an understanding and a control of gravity. Accelerational forces tear apart our contemporary machines because they are applied to one part of the machine and transferred to the other parts through stresses and strains in the material. The wheels drive an automobile, or the jet engine an airplane, and the forces must be transferred through the strength of the material from the axles and the hubs to the rest of the automobile, or through the wings to the rest of the airplane. The acceleration is transferred to the passenger through the seat. Say that we could apply some kind of artificial gravitational field to a vehicle. If the source of the field were to the front of the vehicle, each individual atom in the vehicle and its occupants would be accelerated equally, and the vehicle would move ahead in such a manner that a passenger inside would not even be aware that he was being accelerated. If the strong gravitational field should suddenly be reversed so that its source came from behind the vehicle, the vehicle would stop and move off in the reverse direction, again with no stresses or strains in the vehicle and with the passenger not being aware of any acceleration, let alone change of direction. A gravitational field equivalent to that produced by the Earth at its surface would accelerate our vehicle only about thirty-two feet per second (the acceleration observed in free fall). But if the gravitational field could be increased to values hundreds of thousands of times that produced by the Earth at its surface, then the reported behavior of UFOs would be accounted for.

There is only one difficulty: we haven't the slightest idea how we could produce such a field, let alone control its direction in relation to the craft. Lately I have been wondering about another possibility. Say that the gravitational forces produced by all the matter in the universe are extremely high, but that they come equally from all directions so that the only

gravitational force of any real importance to us is that produced by the Earth. If this were the case, then it wouldn't be necessary to produce high gravitational fields, only to shield from them. When the UFO wanted to accelerate in one direction, it would shield out the forces of gravity coming from the opposite direction. Thus the forces coming from the desired direction would be extremely high and would move the vehicle in the manner described above. Of course we also haven't the faintest idea how one might go about shielding from gravitational fields, but intuitively it seems that this would be easier than producing them.

(Many such speculations have been presented. A recent and well documented one concerns diamagnetism, a little known phenomenon that just might be applied in a UFO propulsion system. See Burt, 1970.)

Lack of Formal Contact

An impressive argument against the UFOs as extraterrestrial machines concerns their *social* behavior. After all, it is said, if we were able to achieve interstellar travel and discover another planet supporting intelligent beings, wouldn't we want to land and get acquainted? Certainly one of the most baffling aspects of the UFO enigma is the lack of formal contact. All right, so there are dozens, maybe hundreds, of Adamskis claiming contact, but why *doesn't* a UFO land on the White House lawn, its pilot approaching the nearest White House policeman to utter in the expected metallic voice: "Take me to your leader!"? Why haven't "they" established an embassy at the United Nations?

With a little effort I can do a pretty good job of talking my way out of this argument. The approach is to reason that it is quite impossible for us to be certain that we can guess the motives of an extraterrestrial intelligence. One can imagine any number of reasons why they might not want to establish formal contact. Perhaps they want to conquer us for our natural resources, in which case there is no reason to be friends—but then why have they observed us for so long? Will conquering require such an extended reconnaissance? Perhaps

we are an ecological experiment, established by them some 6,000 years ago. This would at least explain why most witnesses of UFO occupants claim that they are humanoid in appearance. We might have begun as a colony of outcasts, placed here under primitive conditions to see how long it would be before we developed a technology on our own. Civilization had been in such an advanced state for so many millions of years on the home planet that such an experiment into origins seemed appropriate. This, of course, would account for the *continual surveillance*, and it might even account for some religious events. The Mother Civilization might intervene occasionally in "supernatural" ways, subsequently studying the effects of such interventions.

We could multiply these science fiction tales at length, but suffice it to say that the extraterrestrials might simply have their own reasons for not wanting to make formal contact, and that we, in this stage of our development, simply cannot fathom those reasons.

Unfortunately, I am no longer totally convinced by my clever argument designed to account for the lack of contact. The fact of the matter is, the lack of formal contact is only one small aspect of the strange behavior associated with UFOs and their occupants. As Vallee (1969) has pointed out, legends associated with the fairy faith and with the angels and demons of many religions have a great deal in common with UFO stories. If one is going to be open-minded enough to consider the possibility that UFO witnesses are telling the truth (although somewhat distorted, perhaps), then one must be prepared to examine the evidence connected with the stories of fairies, angels, and demons. The evidence is clearly similar in both cases, so what do we do about that? We could reject all of the UFO stories along with the fairies, angels, and demons—or we can accept them all together. Vallee has argued that there is logical inconsistency in accepting the one and rejecting the other. It is a hard paradox. (We might get out of it by arguing that the evidence relating to fairies, etc., is *not* as good as that relating to UFOs.)

Even if we reject the fairies, angels, and demons, we are left with a vast residual of UFO stories that make little sense in terms of our visitors-from-another-solar-system idea. Granted, a highly superior intelligence might not survey a new planet in quite the manner that we would at this stage of our civilization, but would any intelligence, anywhere, ever do many of the things that UFOs are reported to do? We shall consider some of the more bizarre examples in Chapter 8.

Are We Alone in the Universe?

Let's close this discussion on a somewhat more scientific note. What can science tell us about life in the universe beyond the confines of Earth? Very little. There is some rather skimpy and inconclusive evidence for traces of life in meteorites—or at least the chemicals that seem to be characteristic of life (Sullivan, 1966). We have fairly good reason to believe that some form of life might exist on Mars. There are large areas on Mars that intensify in color with the development of Martian spring and summer, fading again during the autumn and winter. This has long been suggestive of vegetation, although the more we have learned about conditions on Mars, the more difficult it has become to imagine any form of life there having much in common with our own. The atmosphere is extremely thin, consisting almost completely of carbon dioxide. Temperatures drop way below the freezing point every night all over the planet. Table 3 summarizes some of the conditions on Mars. Mars has now been photographed in intricate detail with the Mariner spacecraft, and no signs of intelligence have been detected in the pictures: no farms, freeways, landing strips, towns, football fields, pyramids, etc. It is conceivable that the UFO drivers have camouflaged spaceports somewhere on Mars, but it is inconceivable that Mars supports its own indigenous civilization.

Although numerous details could be added, that's about the extent of our knowledge of extraterrestrial life. Because there are so many stars visible to us beyond the solar system, and because our present theory suggests that planets must be the rule rather than the exception (virtually every star must have its planetary system), we seem to be overwhelmingly forced into the conclusion that there is life elsewhere in the universe—indeed, even intelligent life. It would be an incredible coincidence if, of the billions of billions of planets in the universe, life occurred only on the planet Earth.

Nevertheless, we should strongly emphasize that (ignoring the UFOs, perhaps— we know *nothing* about life beyond Earth's limits. We can speculate to our heart's content about the kinds of possible planets and the life forms they might be expected to support (and I find it most entertaining to do so), but the facts of the matter are that there are no facts. Loren Eiseley (1959), George Gaylord Simpson (1964), or I.S.

Shklovskii and Carl Sagan (1966) can formulate intricate and involved theories to convince us that humanoids could not exist anywhere else in the universe. Evolution is so capricious that a man could be expected to come into being only once. That's fine, but just remember that neither Eiseley, Simpson, nor Sagan really know. They're guessing. Guessing is fun, but facts tell the tale. Accounts of UFO occupants usually involve humanoids.

The message of this discussion is that the UFO reports, taken as a whole, and considering the expected distortions, might well provide a body of facts far more impressive than the speculations of the skeptics. It would seem to be much more profitable to apply our scientific efforts in trying to understand what the UFOs are, rather than wasting a great deal of energy trying to argue that spaceships don't exist.