

cigar-shaped discs and circular discs and so forth. I'm also somewhat suspicious of the big-broadcast kind of theme—that somehow there are some mystical folks out there who are tuning in on us and confusing us and causing us psychic befuddlement and confusion. Theoretical constructs like this are necessary at some point in science, and all sciences have them. Sometimes you have to postulate something that you can't prove. But if we follow some of the rules of science we should not introduce these until it's absolutely necessary. I'm suggesting caution. I'm not against such speculation but I suggest we move slowly. I think that much of what is going on now can be explained by looking at not the subconscious mind but the unconscious mind. I also, by the way, don't believe that it's necessary to postulate a subconscious mind, which puts me in another minority.

Question: Would you distinguish between the unconscious mind and the subconscious mind?

Stupple: Well, this gets into some problems, but the subconscious mind is something that is unavailable to us without some kind of probing by somebody else who isn't a part of our awareness or can be part of our awareness. It's . . . I have in the back of my mind Freud's basic model that there's an id, a body of vital energy that somehow pushes us and we don't understand it and basically it's an irrational set of desires.

However, I want to talk about the conscious mind and what I want to suggest to you is that there are parts of the conscious mind that are below the threshold of awareness but are still part of the conscious mind. I'll get into this and describe the conscious mind as I see it.

Most of us feel that everything in the world changes except thought itself. The idea is that thought never changes, but if you look at the history of ideas you find that this is nonsense. There's a particularly fine book by Carl Becker called *The Heavenly City of 18th-Century Philosophy* which shows that what the eighteenth-century philosophers said is really quite different from what we now understand them to mean. So the modes of thinking

that we have in society change and we don't always comprehend them fully.

I want to make one postulate here and that is that the modes of consciousness that we have are produced by our experiences. This is axiomatic for sociologists. There are modes of thought, ways of looking at things, that reflect our personal experiences and also our collective experiences.

Man, as I see it, is a rational animal who makes sense out of nonsense. We routinize the world; we organize it. If you throw people together in a nonsensical world they will make sense out of it. People living in different environments make sense out of their worlds depending on the way that they organize them. Therefore, people from different social locations come up with different modes of thinking. Historically, different societies and different cultures produce different ways of conceiving of the world.

All right. Now, I want to get into the question that you really anticipated. It's really to the point.

I want to suggest that there are four—and these are my arbitrary distinctions—four levels of the conscious mind. The first is the level of consciously planned action. For instance, I may say I am going to go to the store tomorrow. This is my plan, this is something I think through, something that I do.

The second level, and this is at the level of conscious awareness—above the threshold of awareness—is a certain set of commonsense ideas. A stock of knowledge. It's a set of bits of information that I know to be true. They may be untrue objectively; they may be falsehoods; but they're things that I assume to be true and that I use in making my decisions. For instance, there's food in the store and I know there's food there; therefore I shall go to the store.

Now, what I want to do now is drop below what I'm calling the threshold of awareness. I'm still talking about the conscious mind, but now I'm talking about the third category, which I will call the world taken for granted. This is a world that we live in every day, and it becomes so available to us, becomes so mundane, that we don't reflect upon it; we simply use it. For instance, the rule that

we look at each other when we talk. This is something that we know—yet perhaps we may not be aware of it until someone calls it to our attention. This is a lot of what anthropology and sociology is about now—investigating the everyday world, the world that we know so well that we don't know it. There's a group of sociologists, for instance, called ethnomethodologists. They go about disrupting things to see how people will reorganize their world, reorganize themselves, based on this set of ideas that are simply taken for granted and are below the level of conscious awareness until the fact is pointed out. Then they say, "Oh, yeah—hey, I understand that." For instance, Americans have a different conception of social space from Mexicans. Mexicans stand and talk close together, but if a Mexican comes close to talk with an Anglo, the Anglo will back away. These things can become raised to the level of conscious awareness. But what I'm suggesting is all part of the conscious mind. It's not a black-box type of thing.

Now, the last level that I want to talk about is the level that I will call the pretheoretical world. It's also been called the unconscious—the collective unconscious—but I want to avoid that word because Jung also uses it. This is a term that's been introduced by the German philosopher and sociologist Carl Manheim. But a more available term is *Weltanschauung*—our world view. All societies develop a basic way of viewing the world, and this basic way is the hardest to get at and yet it is part of our conscious mind. For instance, the English language is built on nouns and verbs. Things act. Things move. The Hopi language doesn't have such comments and therefore Hopi's talk about houses that house, and so forth. But we structure the world around certain conceptions that we have built up collectively, and this basic *Weltanschauung*, this basic world view or basic way of conceiving of the world, is very difficult to get at. There are procedures that some folks called social phenomenologists are using to investigate the problem.

How are *Weltanschauungs* created? Well, they're created the same way that manufacturing plants make automobiles. Nobody understands the whole thing, you see.

Nobody understands the entirety but somehow there's a social development of the collective *Weltanschauung*.

Okay, I have a second postulate now. As our objective world—that is, the world of things and our world of experience—changes, our subjective world changes. I'm saying that our minds, our concepts, our modes of thinking reflect our experience—what goes on around us. And as new things come about, like technological changes, our modes of thought change.

I believe that this has possibilities for explaining some of the new ways of looking at the UFO experience. I'm not prepared at this point to go too far into that but it is possible, because of the changes and the objective structure of our society, that we are developing new *Weltanschauungs*. I don't think that we have to go farther and assume that some unalterable, hidden subconscious effect or an unconscious racial memory or whatever is out there. I don't think it's necessary to assume that. It's more economical to assume simply that the basic way we conceptualize the world is changing because our collective experiences are changing.

I have talked about four different levels but there is another way of looking at the UFO experience than the fourth level of *Weltanschauung*. That is to look at the mystery from the second level, which is the level of common sense. We live in a commonsense world. We live in a basic world that is terribly obvious to us, but we also have other worlds that we get into episodically. We get into a world of dreams, we get into a world of religious ecstasy, we go to the movie and we get into that reality, but we always come back to the everyday life—a world built up around our sensual experiences.

Another one of these auxiliary worlds is the world of science. Scientists don't describe reality. What they do is develop models that necessarily imply uniformity to nature. They capture pictures of reality, leaving out all kinds of anomalies. Some scientists may assume that such scientific structures are reality—but that isn't the way science works. Although we have episodic subuniverses of experience, we come back to the world of common sense. Now the world of common sense has said that flying saucers

don't exist and that other things don't exist—and that people who experience these things are crazy. It may be that the world of commonsense reality—or the commonsense baseline—is changing to accept flying saucers, UFOs, paranormal events, whatever. So these are basically different ways of looking at the mystery.

Dr. Berthold Eric Schwarz

I'll try to be brief. UFOs may be a psychic phenomenon. But first we ask, "What is the evidence for the physical reality?" Many fine brains are involved in studying the so-called physical evidence, of which there is admittedly very little. On the other hand, there's an enormous amount of so-called psychic data but there's been very little in-depth study. I know of very few psychiatrists who have published in this area. Yet these people cannot all be deluded or hallucinated.

What are the alleged psychic data in association with UFOs? They're contaminated data, too, but we as physicians deal with contaminated cases. People come in as they are—human beings—we take man as he is. Clairvoyance, precognition, spectacular cases of hauntings, telekinesis, alleged or possible materialization, dematerialization, possession. These are the things we find in these close-contact cases.

As a psychiatrist I am totally, as my papers indicate, unqualified to evaluate anything of an astronomical or mathematical nature, or, I'm sure others would say, of an optical nature. However, on the close sightings and encounters we're dealing with human beings, and the personal part of the equation, to my mind, should be explored in depth. Unfortunately, the cases are poorly studied, poorly documented; you can't sink your teeth into them. Yet perhaps they are still worth looking into.

One thing that has been outstanding to me personally in many of these cases, and all too little has been written about it, has been synchronicity, the term coined by Jung. I'm talking about meaningful coincidences. For example, years ago before I'd ever met Jerry Clark, he phoned me from Moorhead, Minnesota. I was in New Jersey and on

the eve of deciding whether to go to the wedding of my nephew in Minot, North Dakota. I had never been out there, and Jerry described Dr. Hynek's best case, something that happened near Minot, North Dakota. So the phone call decided for me; I'm going to the wedding. I bring my camera and tape recorder, just on a hunch. You know the size of North Dakota. Population might not be much, but it's a big state. I go to the wedding. I ask about the UFO sightings. Someone says, did you talk to Mark? He might know about it. Mark says, "Oh, yeah, yes, I heard of a case like that. As a matter of fact, he's a member of my father's church and we played baseball together."

So I, as a psychiatrist, spend two or three hours at night in my brother-in-law's chaplain's office in the Trinity Hospital in Minot and get quite a story from the man Jerry will call "Paul Miller" in his lecture later on. It was written up by Jacques Vallée and Allen Hynek in their book *The Edge of Reality*. Now, two hours isn't very much, but if I just scratch the surface of the story there's more stuff than I know what to do with on the paranormal. I later learn from other sources there's much, much more to it.

Here's Stella Lansing, a lady I studied, and she gives me a picture she took of her baby sister and cousin in 1942. There's something in the sky above it. Maybe it's . . . isn't an artifact. But it's awfully suspicious-looking. Maybe it's a bird, a plane, a man, a superman. I don't know. But it's worthwhile.

How about the Meers case? Typical sighting. Hundreds of people witnessed it. A broadcast fifteen minutes later, I assume of the same sighting, over an FM radio station in northern New Jersey. A young lad chased on his motorcycle—multiple witnesses. We get back into the Port Monmouth case, by a naval ammunition dump. Now, is that an Operation Trojan Horse, a red herring, or are there other reasons we were led off the track? To show you the complexity—that's the whole thing, the complexities. I'm just saying these things are horribly complex, and I may sound like a fool shooting my mouth off this way but I want to get that point across.

Just ask the simple question in a tactful way. Don't come on strong. Is there a past history of emotional ill-

ness? If there is that does not necessarily invalidate the experience. It might make it a lot stronger. We get into all types of psychopathology and particularly the disassociated states, hysteria, trancelike states, altered state of consciousness. I say get to know the patient, get to know the family, go out into the field with them. So many of these people have situations where Antron or whoever it may be comes through in trance. How do we explain it? How do these things tie into classic cases of multiple personalities?

How are these things applicable to UFOs? How about the many pictures that are called frauds and hoaxes? Maybe many of them are. Many of Stella Lansing's artifacts are connected with UFOs. They look like dead ringers visually. Her honesty is impeccable, but there's a technique. She's not the only white crow. I would guess that many people in this room would have the ability.

What I'm saying is that experiments can be designed differently from the wonderful computerized experiments—experiments having to do with human beings. Take advantage of their psychopathology, their hang-ups. You're studying a human being. All kinds of complications can happen. Betty Hill has been most gracious and kind in telling me much of her story, which involves her family history. And it's not hard evidence which involves Jim Harder. He's aware of it at least. Things missing. They come back in strange ways. Strange visits to the house. A lot of monkey business, too, with our fine-feathered friends in Washington and elsewhere.

There is an unconscious resistance to psi—a prejudice which is deep down and buried. We don't want to talk about it but it's a very subtle and sophisticated thing. Just as it takes those of you in your own careers a whole lifetime to acquire the skills and methods of eliciting information and developing an awareness, it takes a psychiatrist a fair amount of time.

Then what is this thing we're dealing with? We're getting back to the original question. Psychic phenomena or what? We find people are awestruck; they're terrorized by these experiences. And in the wake of such experiences, they are spontaneously entranced. They're in a hypnotic trance, in a sense, and it recurs and recurs. Again and

again and again. Did their psychic phenomena come from the substrate of an ideal culture? Could the disassociation and the distorted perceptions be a defense against the entrancement, the terror? There are complexities begging for help from behavioral scientists.

We still have a few final questions. Is the UFO force identical with psi? Are they not related at all? Are they related in part? If so, how much? Why is it that we have all these data and nothing's done about them by those who spend their lives and careers and are supposed to know something about them? How can we go about answering these questions? I think by work. What constitutes a control? Everyone in this audience here, skilled investigators, can think of any number of examples which contradict this. You think you have a discovery and then you think of two examples that invalidate it. You have to throw it away. It's no good. Awhile back I saw Karlis Osis, director of research for the American Society for Psychical Research. I hadn't heard from Karlis for many years and he asked me if I was still involved in psi investigation. I threw my hands up and said, "What in the world do you think I've been doing in ufology?" Psi and ufology interface; the lock between them is enormous.

We're like the three blind men and the elephant. We all grope. We're just getting the tail or the ear or the leg and we can't see the other guy's point of view. The irrational richness of life has taught me never to disregard anything, even though it may violate all our short-lived theories, or may at first glance look completely inexplicable.

Dr. Jacques Vallée

Let me share with you a couple of things that bother me about what we're doing now in UFO research in general. First, I'm disturbed by something that we're all guilty of, and that's confusion of terminology. We're using terminology at different levels. We're using words that seem to apply—words like "psychic," for example. That means different things to different people. When applied to the UFO phenomenon it may describe some aspects of it and

not others. All of us have been trying to clarify what we mean by psychic—but we don't have a collective description of what that means.

Yesterday Stan Friedman obviously presented us with a very serious challenge, and if we are going to talk about UFOs as mind phenomena we have to take up that challenge. Stan made one statement that has a lot of meaning and a lot of things hidden behind it. He said when you take the best sightings you find they are physical—and you don't need to invoke any paranormal explanations to deal with them. Well, I agree that if you take what he describes as the best sightings then you don't need to invoke the paranormal. However, again the word "best" is a very dangerous word to use in any field, especially in the scientific field where you don't have a precise definition of the protocol by which you arrived at selecting the best sightings. And I did a lot of that in the sixties when I was working with Dr. Hynek, creating computer catalogs to try to come up with patterns. The idea was, "Let's look for a variance."

This is a standard procedure in science. You look for what it is about the data that stays invariant through transformation. So I was looking for a pattern such that I could say, "On my left, ladies and gentlemen, are the bad guys; on my right are the good guys—the best sightings." And I've never been able to do that.

Every time I've tried to do that, tried to draw the line anywhere, it has been an utter failure. So I think we should challenge Stan on that and ask, "How did you define the best sightings?" I think that for any case that he gives me, where the data are purely physical, I can find a case that matches that one exactly in credibility of witnesses, traces, radar things, photographs, and so on, and also has paranormal and psychic elements. Now, I'm getting back into confusion of terminology again, using words I haven't defined, like "psychic" and "paranormal."

I would like to propose that we look at the UFO phenomenon as really three phenomena that are embedded one inside the other. The more I look at UFO data, the more it seems to me they're built like those Russian dolls you open and unscrew to find another one like it

inside, and you unscrew that one and there's another one like it, and you keep going forever. There seems to be a consensus among us that there is a nucleus; there's a kernel of physical parameters; there's a physical object there; what seems to be a technology that uses physical manifestations. And that's all we can say about the technology—that it appears to center on the UFO as a region of space where certain things happen. There's a lot of electromagnetic energy in a very small concentrated volume, there is a lot of light energy.

I did a semantic analysis of close-encounter cases using a technique of full-text search on a computer in which portions of texts were coded according to what they referred to. I wasn't using a straight code but using content analysis, if you will, with the actual words of the witnesses. And when I let the computer go through that, one thing came back that I had never realized before. I had always dealt with these sightings as descriptions of objects. I thought that the witnesses were basically describing an object and that the object had certain attributes and light was one of those attributes. Not so.

All these people were describing light. They said, "The first thing that struck me was that I first saw a flash of light." Kenneth Arnold yesterday described something like that. The light is the overwhelming thing. It's the origin of the sighting, it's what attracts them to the object. That light is not the kind of light that comes from that lightbulb over there. It's pulsed, very strong. There are cases of witnesses who are physicists who backed away from it rather than going to investigate it because they realized what amount of radiation the thing was sending.

We know very little about the effect of light, of very strong pulsed light and other kinds of electromagnetic energy, on the human brain. That research is just beginning. Research on using maps of the electromagnetic mass of the brain and so on is just in its infancy. However, it should be investigated by people who just look at the physical parameters and leave aside all the paranormal aspects. It's a valued line of research to follow.

The second way to look at the phenomena, the second "doll," in other words, is the one that we're exposed to—

which is the only way we have of dealing with the phenomena. That is what the witnesses give us. It is the perception of the thing, whatever it is, by witnesses. It's debatable whether anybody has ever seen a UFO. What is seen is an image. A number of those of you who are trained in psychology and social psychology have stated that again and again in various ways. All we can deal with is the processed object after a witness has been exposed to whatever the phenomenon is. And that comes back with all kinds of elements that come from the unconscious, the subconscious—you pick your own terminology and I'll go along with it. The fact is that what we perceive is a restated vision of some reality. Now, that's what we deal with when we deal with the reports.

The third level of approach, which I'm beginning to think is perhaps the most interesting (at least it's becoming the most interesting to me), is the third "Russian doll"—the bigger one that the other two are inside. And that's the social impact. Over the years—I think it was John Keel who said that if you can't trust anybody over the age of thirty, you certainly can't trust the UFO phenomenon any more—over the years, all of us who have been involved in watching this phenomenon have observed data that are more or less always basically the same. People see those UFOs and there are contact claims and those reports keep coming in in various ways.

What changes is the social reaction to them. There is very little change in terms of scientific awareness, but a lot of change in terms of public awareness. If we are to believe the polls, 51 percent of the American population now believes that the phenomenon is not explainable by natural causes. If another 14 percent (I think) of the public say they have seen something they regard as a UFO, if we consider the tremendous investment that is made by Hollywood in the whole UFO story, I think we're faced with a social situation in which the idea of doing objective research on the phenomenon may be obsolete. We may be dealing with something which is going to be socially real, whether or not it is physically real. I'd like to call your attention to the fact that reality is defined differently by sociologists and by physicists.

To sociologists, something is real if enough people believe in it. And that's especially applicable to the sociology of religion. A physicist has a different criterion whereby to judge whether something's real. I think we have to deal only with that and when we talk about the paranormal and the psychic components we have to clarify at what level of what interface we're addressing the problem. In that regard I also have problems with some of the things we're doing with hypnosis and with lie detectors. I think the dangers of amateur hypnosis have been dealt with in several of the presentations this morning.

I think a lot of the complexity of the problem with Uri Geller comes from psychic pollution under hypnosis. There's a double problem there. If you have a hypnotist who doesn't know anything about UFOs he's going to ask the wrong questions. If you have a hypnotist who knows too much about UFOs then you have to suspect some kind of psychic pollution or contagion. However, that hypnotist may not be aware of the research which is done in the paranormal and parapsychological areas.

I would like to refer you to a House of Representatives investigation of lie detectors chaired by Bella Abzug that has been contested on both sides. It was immediately attacked the moment it was published. However, there was a lot of expert testimony on the use of lie detectors, including their use by police and intelligence agencies. Some recommendations were made to discontinue their use even in criminal investigations. They cited a number of situations in which the use of lie detectors or psychological-stress analyzers was dangerous or misleading. Among the questions raised were some like this: Had the witness been heavily interrogated before on the same thing? Did the witness and the investigators share a common terminology on what the question was? If I ask, "Did you steal Joe's car yesterday?" we may disagree on whether you stole it or not, but the fact is that we both know what that car is. But if I ask, "Did you see a UFO last night?" there is no evidence that we share the same definition. The report cited nine criteria that I think are applicable to the UFO phenomenon. I would like to recommend that whenever we have a choice between possibly acquiring useful UFO

data and messing up someone's life we give up the UFO data. That is my firm opinion.

Melton: I just reviewed a book in which a guy used a psychological-stress evaluator to prove that fifty psychics he interviewed were all possessed of the Devil!

Statement by Jule Eisenbud, M.D.

Famed psychiatrist raises fundamental questions about the nature of reality, including UFOs.

One of the impressions I received at this meeting is that several of the speakers seem still to be laboring under a traditional mind-matter dualism whereby thoughts can be categorically differentiated from things, and reality from fantasy. In this view psychic components of UFO experiences are limited largely to suggestibility in predisposed persons, while "psychic projection" is seen as akin to hallucinations. It is superficially obvious that phenomena on this order can be clearly distinguished from what one speaker referred to as "nuts-and-bolts" reality.

Nothing, however, is less obvious to philosophy and science. A central preoccupation of philosophers from pre-Socratic times has been, so to speak, "What is a nut? And what exactly is a bolt?" As for science, the identification of "hard" ("nuts-and-bolts") matter with an easily defined "reality" passed out of style in the twenties and thirties with Eddington, Jeans, Jordan, and Schroedinger. Relativity physicist John Wheeler, of black-hole fame, has shown in terms of his own and others' computations that even the fundamental constants and numbers of the world picture do not make sense apart from the consciousness that both creates and evaluates the universe.

There is a small but solid core of parapsychological data indicating that both animate and inanimate entities can be created (presumably under mental auspices) not only piecemeal, as a sort of intrusion into a more ordinary reality, but as a complete coexisting reality.

Study of both drug-induced and spontaneous out-of-

the-body experiences indicates that it is possible to do more than simply see oneself lying on a bed after ordinary consciousness has been altered; some persons enter another "material" world entirely, a sort of Alice-in-Wonderland experience in which, unlike the case with hallucinations, the "nuts-and-bolts" quality of the new reality is indistinguishable in every particular from the reality of general agreement.

It would be unwise to neglect these data when considering the alterations of ordinary expectable reality that constitute UFO phenomena. Ken Arnold observed a UFO which was semitransparent. This may have been a real material entity which was simply in the process of becoming (or un-becoming).

It is conceivable that, as many philosophers have held, the world is essentially made up of ghosts, some merely more substantial and regular in appearance and habit than others. Evolution and the development of complex causal systems may have regularized the manner in which most "ghosts" come into being and disintegrate but it is conceivable that, under certain circumstances, a regression to earlier ways of coming into being (and passing out of being) is effected. None of this, incidentally, precludes an extraterrestrial hypothesis.

Einstein is reported to have said that "it is not a long step from thinking of matter as an electronic ghost to thinking of it as the objectified image or thought."

Too bad that more Einsteins don't get to observe UFOs—or even become contactees. Lacking that, it might be well for all ufologists to become contactees—of the best past and present thinking on the mind-matter problem.

Melton: We want to take a final few minutes to hear one more person before we adjourn. Bill Pitts has been working with the government on releasing additional UFO data.

Pitts: What I have to say pertains to an alleged announcement by Private Citizen Jimmy Carter that, if elected to the presidency, he would release to the American people all that our government knows about UFOs. Last February 11 (1977) I received a phone call which lasted approximately forty minutes from an office in the Pentagon. Last

night in my absence a call came to my home from the Executive Office of the President—Dr. Press's Office of Science and Technology Policy. I will be meeting with that office next week to discuss sources of UFO information. If you have background information on a particular agency that you think has been studying UFOs through the years unknown to the CIA or the FBI or otherwise, let me have this information, because I will confront them with it.

Question: Why did they call you?

Pitts: Part of the reason, I understand, was because I sponsored a UFO conference in Fort Smith, Arkansas, in 1975 to which I invited not only the UFO organization but government agencies. As far as I know it was the only such conference that government personnel did attend officially. People were there from NORA, NASA, and the Air Force.

Clark: The question that occurs to me, and I'm sure other people must have thought about it, is that the leading ufologist in the United States and perhaps the world is Dr. Hynek. Do you have any idea why Dr. Hynek wasn't asked?

Pitts: I don't know why unless it could be his previous identification with the Air Force and the government, and so forth.

END OF SYMPOSIUM

PART SEVEN

Where It Goes from Here

Who's Who

Kenneth Arnold heads the Great Western Engineering Company in Meridian, Idaho. He is coauthor (with the late Raymond A. Palmer) of *The Coming of the Saucers* (privately published, 1952).

James A. Harder, Ph.D., holds degrees in civil and mechanical engineering and fluid mechanics. A professor of engineering at the University of California at Berkeley, he serves as research director for the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization.

Ted Phillips is an engineer with the Missouri State Highway Department and the author of *Physical Traces Associated with UFO Sightings* (Center for UFO Studies, 1975).

Frank B. Salisbury, Ph.D., director of the plant-science department at the State University of Utah, is the author of *The Utah UFO Display* (Devin Adair, 1974).

Stanton T. Friedman, a former nuclear physicist, lectures full time on UFOs and space travel.

David M. Jacobs, Ph.D., is assistant professor of history at Temple University and author of *The UFO Controversy in America* (Indiana University, 1975).

Jacques Vallée, Ph.D., is trained in astrophysics and computer science. His books include *Anatomy of a Phenomenon* (Regnery, 1965); (with Janine Vallée) *Challenge to Science—The UFO Enigma* (Regnery, 1966); *Passport to Magonia* (Regnery, 1969); *The Invisible College* (E. P. Dutton, 1975); (with J. Allen Hynek) *The Edge of Reality* (Regnery, 1975); and *Messengers of Deception* (And/OR Press, 1979). He has also published several science-fiction novels in France.

J. Allen Hynek, Ph.D., is professor emeritus of astronomy at Northwestern University. For twenty years the Air Force's chief scientific consultant on UFOs, he is founder and director of the Center for UFO Studies, Evanston, Illinois. He has written three books on UFOs: *The UFO Experience* (Regnery, 1972); (with Jacques Vallée) *The Edge of Reality*; and *The Hynek UFO Report* (Dell, 1977).

Ted Bloecher, who has been investigating UFOs for over twenty-five years, wrote *Report on the UFO Wave of 1947* (privately published, 1967) and (with Isabel Davis) *Close Encounter at Kelly and Others of 1955* (Center for UFO Studies, 1978).

Betty Hill, a retired social worker who lives in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, received international attention when she and her late husband Barney were allegedly abducted by a UFO. The case became the subject of John G. Fuller's *The Interrupted Journey* (Dial, 1966) and of the NBC television movie *The UFO Incident* (shown originally on October 20, 1975).

Alvin H. Lawson, Ph.D., is professor of English at California State University at Long Beach.

Curtis Fuller is cofounder and publisher of *Fate*, 500 Hyacinth Place, Highland Park, Illinois 60035.

Jim Lorenzen is international director of the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Tucson, Arizona. With

his wife Coral he is the coauthor of *Flying Saucer Occupants* (Signet, 1967), *UFOs over the Americas* (Signet, 1968), *Encounters with UFO Occupants* (Berkley, 1976) and *Abducted!* (Berkley, 1977).

David Stuppel, Ph.D., is assistant professor of sociology at Eastern Michigan University.

Jerome Clark, associate editor of *Fate* and a longtime UFO researcher and writer, is coauthor (with Loren Coleman) of *The Unidentified* (Warner, 1975); *Creatures of the Outer Edge* (Warner, 1978); and (with D. Scott Rogb) *Earth's Secret Inhabitants* (Tempo, 1979).

R. Leo Sprinkle, Ph.D., associate professor of psychology, is director of counseling and testing at the University of Wyoming and is a specialist in the use of hypnosis in UFO investigation.

Berthold Eric Schwarz, M.D., is a psychiatrist, parapsychologist, and consultant for the EEG Laboratory of Essex County (New Jersey) Hospital Center. A frequent contributor to England's *Flying Saucer Review*, he is the author of *Psychic-Dynamics* (Pageant, 1965), *The Jacques Romano Story* (University, 1968) and *Parent-Child Telepathy* (Garret, 1971).

J. Gordon Melton, Ph.D., directs the Institute for the Study of American Religion in Evanston, Illinois. A Methodist minister, he serves as *Fate's* book-review editor. He is the author of *A Directory of Religious Bodies in the United States* (Garland, 1977) and the two-volume *Encyclopedia of American Religions* (Consortium, 1979).

Glossary of Names and Terms Not Explained in Text

Aetherius Society. A religious organization founded by contactee George King. The society "numbers its supporters in the thousands, has branches in most English-speaking countries and offers a complete religious package—deal including prayers, chants, complex rituals, arduous pilgrimages and a fantastic and farflung philosophy geared to the terminology and iconography of the space age" (Christopher Evans, *Cults of Unreason*).

Aho, Wayne. Contactee who first communicated with space people, he says, at George Van Tassel's Giant Rock convention in the 1950s. He founded and still heads the New Age Foundation in Eatonville, Washington, at the foot of Mount Rainier, where Kenneth Arnold's June 24, 1947, sighting ushered in the UFO Age.

Bethurum, Truman. A celebrated contactee, now deceased, who one night in 1952 supposedly met with the beautiful Aura Rhanes, commander of a "scow" (flying saucer) from the planet Clarion, a world "entirely invisible from earth,

since it was on the other side of the moon." Bethurum's wife later sued him for divorce, citing his involvement with the spacewoman.

Carr, Robert Spencer, Florida UFO enthusiast who claims to have evidence that the United States government has recovered crashed UFOs and has stored the bodies of dead humanoid beings at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio.

Coyne helicopter case. Classic close encounter of the second kind which occurred over Mansfield, Ohio, on the night of October 18, 1973. From their Army Reserve UH-1H helicopter Captain Lawrence Coyne and three crew members saw a dark gray oval-shaped object; as they watched the UFO, their helicopter inexplicably climbed 1800 feet. Five members of a Mansfield family witnessed the episode from the ground.

Fry, Daniel W. Contactee who says he met with flying saucer on July 4, 1950, near White Sands, New Mexico, and later would allege other contacts with benevolent extraterrestrials. Responding to challenges to prove his sincerity, Fry took a polygraph test and flunked it. Still active, he directs Understanding, Inc., which publishes and publicizes his brand of contactee metaphysics.

Green, Gabriel. Contactee, director of the Amalgamated Flying Saucer Clubs of America and occasional political candidate.

Higdon, Carl, A Rawlins, Wyoming, man who allegedly experienced a weird UFO encounter while elk-hunting in the Medicine Bow National Forest on October 25, 1974. Higdon said a UFO being who identified himself as "Ausso" gave him a pill; the next thing the hunter knew, he and "Ausso" were flying through space in a "cubicle." After "163,000 light miles" (sic) they landed next to a huge tower. "Ausso" took Higdon inside, then told him he was not what they needed and flew him back to earth. Higdon was found in a dazed, confused state by searchers who saw mysterious lights in the area while looking for him. Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle, who conducted interviews with

Higdon and his family, hypnotized the percipient and got additional details. Sprinkle stated, "Although the sighting of a single UFO witness often is difficult to evaluate . . . Carl Higdon [seems to be] reporting sincerely the events which he experienced."

Jessup, Morris K. An early proponent of UFOs and one of the first to possess some scientific background. Jessup wrote four books on the subject: *The Case for the UFO* (1955), *The UFO Annual* (1956), *UFO and the Bible* (1956) and *The Expanding Case for the UFO* (1957). Remembered now as little more than curiosities, they borrowed heavily from the works of Charles Fort (d. 1932), an early collector of reports of aerial objects, falls of matter from the sky, creatures, mysterious disappearances, and other such phenomena since labeled "Fortean" in his honor. Jessup's main claim to fame is as an early advocate of what in the 1970s would be called the "ancient astronaut" theory. Jessup died on April 20, 1959, an apparent suicide.

Jung, Carl G. Noted Swiss psychological theorist who wrote, among many other books, *Flying Saucers: A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Skies* (1959), which explored the possible symbolic significance of UFO reports, rumors and dreams. He believed that some UFO stories are visionary in nature, "archetypal images . . . involuntary, automatic projections based on instinct," and representing mankind's need for spiritual fulfillment in a materialistic age. He conceded, however, that such a theory could not explain all UFO reports and remarked that such skeptics as Harvard University astronomer Donald Menzel had yet to offer "a satisfying scientific explanation of even one authentic UFO report."

Keel, John A. New York City-based writer and investigator whose theories that UFOs, creatures, and other unexplained phenomena are hologramlike projections from a "superspectrum" composed of unknown energies have sparked considerable debate; author of five books on the subject, the most important of them *UFOs: Operation Trojan Horse* (1970) and *The Mothman Prophecies* (1975).

Kraspedon, Dino. The pseudonym of Brazilian contactee Aladino Felix, who claimed repeated meetings with Venusians, beginning in 1952. In 1959, as "Dino Kraspedon," he wrote *My Contact with Flying Saucers*. In 1968 Brazilian police arrested him and accused him of leading a terrorist gang. Felix told the authorities that the Venusians, who had appointed him their ambassador to earth, would invade the planet if he was jailed. He was and they didn't.

Lansing, Stella. A Massachusetts housewife who says she has undergone a wide range of UFO and paranormal experiences: "strange little men, voices appearing out of nowhere, creatures, loss of consciousness, 'electric shock' from a shimmering figure, a gaping round hole in the ice, a craft possibly surfacing from under water, minuscule footprints, religious symbols, bizarre harassments, etc." (Berthold Eric Schwarz, *Flying Saucer Review*, January/February 1972).

McDonald, James E. Senior atmospheric physicist at the University of Arizona's Department of Atmospheric Sciences and an outspoken advocate of UFO reality. A harsh critic of the scientific establishment's refusal to consider the UFO phenomenon, he tried and failed to persuade the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to investigate reports. Dr. McDonald was subjected to scathing attacks by everyone from Philip Klass, who attempted without success to prove McDonald was misusing government funds to study UFOs, to Vice President Spiro Agnew, who used the scientist's UFO interest to discredit his testimony against the proposed Supersonic Transport aircraft. In June 1971, at fifty-one, McDonald committed suicide.

Monsieur X case. A famous case of a French doctor whose identity investigators have kept secret at his request. Awakened at four in the morning on November 2, 1968, by the cries of his fourteen-month-old baby, the witness saw two bright discs flashing lights; suddenly the two objects merged into one, which continued to fly toward the doctor's house, then shone a beam in his face before dematerializing with a "bang." The doctor discovered soon afterward that his leg,

which he had injured while chopping wood three days earlier, had suddenly healed; so, in the days to come, would other, more long-term physical afflictions from which the doctor had suffered. A triangle-shaped red mark soon appeared on the abdomens of both X and his infant son and thereafter came and went at intervals without warning or apparent reason. X and his wife felt that after the UFO event they both became psychic; friends and acquaintances said they had changed as people, acquiring "an almost mystical acceptance of the events of life and death."

Mundo, Laura. Longtime supporter of the late George Adamski's claims and teachings. She regularly issues self-written books on flying-saucer theology as well as the monthly *Mundo Monitor* from her suburban Detroit home.

Pascagoula case. Much publicized UFO abduction case in which two Mississippi fishermen, Charles Hickson and Calvin Parker, claimed that on the evening of October 11, 1973, robotlike entities floated them aboard a UFO and subjected them to a physical examination. Some time later Hickson is supposed to have had a second encounter which he refuses to discuss; he also believes he has had occasional "mental" communications with the beings.

Port Monmouth case. New Jersey landing-and-physical-trace episode with apparent paranormal aftereffects. During the early hours of July 4, 1970, a Port Monmouth housewife woke up to see mysterious lights "bouncing back and forth across the meadows" nearby. The next day members of the family discovered strange marks and tracks in the meadow grass. Exactly one week later the same woman awoke sure that "something was going to happen." Five minutes later the street light went out; then a disc-shaped UFO sailed out of the sky and landed in the meadow for a short while before flying away. For some time afterward the house was afflicted with peculiar telephone and electric problems and poltergeistlike manifestations. The housewife suffered from strange, frightening dreams.

Ruppelt, Edward J. An Air Force captain who headed Project Blue Book, the service's UFO investigative body, from 1952 to 1953. He wrote the classic *The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects* (1956) and died in 1960.

Samford, Gen. John A. Director of Intelligence for the Air Force in the early 1950s.

Schirmer, Herb. Ashland, Nebraska, policeman who in the early morning hours of December 3, 1967, spotted a hovering UFO and unaccountably "lost" twenty minutes. Later, under hypnosis, Schirmer claimed to have been taken aboard the UFO and to have communicated with its humanoid occupants.

Schmidt, Reinhold. Kearney, Nebraska, businessman who on November 5, 1957, reported he had seen a UFO land. He said he had spoken with its occupants, four men and two women, who conversed in fluent German and German-accented English. The next day the local authorities locked Schmidt up for "observation" after accusing him of engineering a hoax, but then released him when they could not prove the charge. Schmidt became a professional contactee but his career ended when he was arrested in California for selling shares in a nonexistent quartz mine. He explained that the space people had told him the quartz would cure cancer.

Stranges, Frank. A minor contactee and sometime small-budget-movie producer who claims to have met a Venusian named "Val-Thor" in the Pentagon.

Swamp gas. Two words J. Allen Hynek wishes he had never uttered. On March 20, 1966, numerous persons at a college in Hillsdale, Michigan, saw a large glowing object hovering over a swamp. The next day, at Dexter, sixty-three miles away, five persons, two of them police officers, saw a glowing disc ascend from a swampy area. These were two of many UFO sightings made in Michigan and across the country in the course of a major UFO wave. Soon afterward Dr. Hynek, then Project Blue Book's chief scientific consultant, suggested the phenomena might be caused by decaying vegetation that spontaneously ignited:

swamp gas. The explanation was greeted with massive ridicule from a public fed up with unsatisfactory Air Force explanations of UFO reports. In later years Hynek would admit publicly that he had been wrong.

Van Tassel, George. One of the best-known and most active contactees. After his first alleged contact with friendly space beings on August 24, 1953, Van Tassel would claim numerous other adventures, during which space people provided him with philosophical concepts which he went on to teach at his College of Universal Wisdom in California. He also organized yearly contactee conventions at Giant Rock, California, and for years has collected funds to build a massive "rejuvenation machine."

Venezuelan humanoid encounters. Classic cases from November and December 1954, when Venezuelans reportedly experienced violent run-ins—sometimes involving hand-to-hand combat—with "remarkably strong," hairy little men from UFOs. On one occasion, as humanoids attempted to drag one witness into a UFO, his friend hit a being over the head with his shotgun. "The gun seemed to have struck rock or something harder, as it broke in two," Lorenzo Flores reported.

public respect, we've got to make sure that we know what we are talking about. We must do our best to be sure that the data we present are tested and correct.

Over the last thirty years UFO research organizations have recorded thousands and thousands of sightings. But I sometimes wonder what good it will do. We need them catalogued, of course, to study chronology, trends, geographical distribution, and so forth. But what we should aim for—and I think all the UFO organizations should cooperate to this end—is a dozen or two dozen cases which simply cannot be torn down. Presenting even a handful of truly solid cases to a congressional committee would convince the Phil Klasses of this world.

If ufology is to be respected by the media, the public, and particularly the scientific fraternity we must conduct ourselves as respectable people. Let us remember that everything that glitters is not a nocturnal light.

Proceedings of the First International UFO Congress

CHICAGO, 1977

compiled and edited by
Curtis G. Fuller
and the editors of
FATE Magazine—
Mary Margaret Fuller,
Jerome Clark,
Betty Lou White

ATTENTION: SCHOOLS AND CORPORATIONS

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

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

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



WARNER BOOKS

A Warner Communications Company

1980, 440 PAGINAS