

The Case for the Extraterrestrial Origin of Flying Saucers

Stanton T. Friedman
Nuclear Physicist / Author / Lecturer

*79 Pembroke Crescent
Fredericton, NB Canada E3B 2V1
Copyright 1995*

Abstract

Careful review of a vast array of relevant evidence clearly leads to the conclusion that *some* unidentified flying objects are intelligently controlled vehicles whose origin is outside our solar system. All the arguments against the extraterrestrial origin seem to be based upon false reasoning, misrepresentation of evidence, neglect of relevant information, ignorance of relevant technology, or pseudo sophisticated assumptions about alien appearance, motivation, or government secrecy.

Introduction

The most important step in the determination of the origin of flying saucers is to ask the proper question. That question is not “How can they get here?” or “Where do UFOs come from?” or “Are all UFOs ET spacecraft?” or even “Why don’t they do this or that?” The proper question is “Are *any* UFOs ET spacecraft?” To answer this question requires review of both the evidence indicating *some* flying saucers are ET vehicles and the arguments raised in objection. While all flying saucers are by definition UFOs, few UFOs are flying saucers. Thus, the definition of Flying Saucer is “an unusual object in the sky or on the ground whose appearance clearly indicates it was manufactured and whose behavior, in conjunction with its appearance, clearly indicates a non-Earth origin.” It is very important to recognize that determining that *some* flying saucers are of ET origin is much simpler than determining the mode of propulsion, home base, or purpose of the visit of each individual saucer. There is no easy way of obtaining answers to these and many other important questions. But they need not be answered to establish the ET origin of *some* flying saucers.

It must also be acknowledged that there may be as wide a variety of origins, alien humanoid types, alien motivations, and vehicle models as there are types of vehicles, people, and travel motivations at O’Hare Airport. Furthermore, our present inability to duplicate UFO flight behavior in the atmosphere or to buy tickets for a quick interstellar trip tells us nothing about whether or not a more advanced civilization has been accomplishing these difficult-to-us feats for a long time. It is also extremely important to recognize that a particular vehicle and its inhabitants may well originate in another solar system without necessarily having just flown to or from that solar system in the observed vehicle. Our own navies have for many years used huge aircraft carriers to carry dozens of very much smaller aircraft to the local area in which the aircraft make frequent short-haul trips. That the residents of the area over which the aircraft fly rarely see the carrier doesn’t mean it isn’t nearby just as the fact that the airplane is incapable (by itself) of returning to its nation of origin doesn’t mean it can’t get there “piggy-back.”

Evidence

The primary UFO evidence consists of UFO sighting reports, multi-witness close encounters, still and motion pictures, radar trackings, simultaneous radar-visual sightings, physical traces (environmental changes in dirt, vegetation, trees, etc.) produced by UFOs, abductions by aliens of Earthlings, and very likely (in hidden locations)

crashed UFOs and preserved alien bodies. The worldwide origin of the various data collections indicate similar experiences occurring and being reported independently all over the planet. The overall quality and quantity of reports is far better than most people—especially open-minded skeptics and scientists and newspaper reporters—are aware.

The primary difficulty is that there is too much data, not too little, and that it is scattered and uneven and not readily available at most libraries. The good evidence is mixed with a much greater number of low quality reports of lights in the sky and small numbers of crackpot and hoax reports. That there are a few such reports should come as no surprise considering the fact that police everywhere receive a multitude of useless tips in which are mixed a few very important leads. Also, as any police artist would testify, most people are far better at recognizing unknown persons and things than at describing them.

It is a fact that most sightings are not very exciting and that most can be explained in relatively conventional terms. It cannot be stressed too strongly that this fact is quite irrelevant to the search for truth about UFOs. It is certainly a fact that most chemicals cure no disease, that most people are not seven feet tall, that most isotopes are not fissionable, that most people cannot run a mile in less than four minutes, that most people do not commit murder, and that most metal is not gold. All of these facts in no way change the real facts that some few chemicals do cure diseases, some few people are seven feet tall, some few isotopes are fissionable, some few people can run a sub-four minute mile, some few people do commit murder, and that some metal is indeed gold.

It is simply irrational and illogical to assume that since most sightings turn out to be conventional phenomena seen under unconventional circumstances, then all must be.

It may be appropriate to ask the question “Aren’t most people poor observers?” The answer is clearly *no*, since the only reason most UFO sightings can be explained is that the witness descriptions are usually quite accurate. The problem is with witness interpretation. The skeptic seems to want to play both sides of the street. He knows a particular UFO was Venus because the direction, time, angle above the horizon, and brightness as reported by the witness all match Venus. But, when a witness describes a metallic appearing disc shaped object with a dome and alternately hovering and moving very rapidly with no noise, he must be mistaken and it was just a helicopter.

The notion that most sightings of Unidentified Flying Objects are dimly seen under poor circumstances by incompetent observers for a very short time is both irrelevant (even if it were true) and demonstrably false on its face. A look at the data from the rarely mentioned Blue Book Special Report Number 14 (Ref. 1) provides a much better basis for data evaluation.

Table 1. Categorization of UFO Sighting Reports as Given in Project Blue Book Special Report 14

Designation	ALL SIGHTINGS	
	Number	Percentage
Balloon	450	14.0%
Astronomical	817	25.5
Aircraft	642	20.2
Miscellaneous	257	8.0
Psychological Manifestations	48	1.5
Insufficient Information	298	9.3
UNKOWN	689	21.5
Totals	3201	100.0%

Table 1 summarizes categorization of more than 3,000 (ALL sightings as opposed to UNIT) sightings investigated

by Battelle Memorial Institute under contract to Project Blue Book—one of several military and intelligence agencies concerned with UFOs. The only sightings of real interest are the Unknowns. The definition of Unknown: “Those reports of sightings wherein the description of the object and its maneuvers could not be fitted to the pattern by any known object or phenomenon.” It is worth mentioning that the Project Blue Book Special Report 14 includes only 1.5% psychological aberrations and only 2% hoaxes. Every psychiatrist will state that more than 2% of any large group is aberrant in one or more ways. It would be amazing indeed if there were no hoaxes or crackpots associated with UFOs.

Table 2. Quality Evaluation of UFO Sighting Reports as Given in Project Blue Book Special Report 14

	ALL SIGHTINGS					
	Sightings		Unknowns		Insufficient Info.	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Excellent	308	9.6%	108	35.1%	12	3.9%
Good	1070	33.4	282	26.4	33	3.1
Doubtful	1298	40.5	203	15.6	150	11.6
Poor	525	16.4	96	18.3	103	19.6
Total	3201	100.0%	689	21.5%	298	9.3%

Table 2 summarizes the quality distribution of the same sightings as categorized in Table 1. Of prime importance is the fact that the better the quality of the sightings, the more likely to be an Unknown and the less likely to be listed as Insufficient Information. These results are precisely what one would expect if the Unknowns were fundamentally different from those reports in the astronomical, balloon, aircraft, or other categories and also completely contradict the oft made statement that “There are no interesting UFO sightings that are reliable and no reliable sightings that are interesting” (Ref. 2). The fundamental question raised by these data is “If the Unknowns are *not* aircraft, balloons, astronomical, or miscellaneous, or even the ones for which there was insufficient data, then just what are they?”

The first question to ask in attempting to determine the identity of the Unknowns is “Is there any difference between the characteristics of the Unknowns as described by witnesses and the characteristics of the Knowns? If on the average the two groups are similar, then one might be justified in concluding that the Unknowns are just “missed” knowns. Several different chi-square statistical analyses were conducted to check this aspect. The characteristics included were size, shape, color, speed, duration of observation, and brightness.

Very unfortunately, maneuverability was not one of the characteristics included in the chi-square test, though it is certainly one of the more distinguishing characteristics of the Unknowns as compared to the Knowns. Many attempts were made to load the comparison by, for example, including the “insufficient data” cases and the “probable” knowns or by deleting the astronomical sightings (which had an excess of green objects) in the color comparisons. The results consistently showed that the probability that the Unknowns were just missed knowns was less than 1%! This point cannot be stressed too strongly: Unknowns are *not* the poorly reported sightings, are *not* the ones for which there is insufficient data for a professional investigator to identify and are clearly and distinctly different from the Knowns.

As a class, the Unknowns also are observed for a longer time, on the average, than are the KNOWNs despite frequent claims to the contrary. More than 60% of the UNKNOWNs were observed for longer than one minute. More than 35% were observed for longer than five minutes and more than 10% for longer than 30 minutes.

The great majority of Unknowns were found to be different in shape from conventional aircraft such as balloons, airplanes, helicopters, blimps, etc. Typically, they were described as metallic symmetric discs or, in some cases, much larger cigar-shaped objects into and out of which the discs would fly. In general, the Unknowns lacked wings,

external engines, tails, propellers, rotors, jets, and red or green blinking lights. Usually they had little if any exhaust, made very little noise in comparison with conventional aircraft, and rarely created sonic booms even though moving at extremely high velocity compared with aircraft of that day.

Perhaps most important of all were the flying capabilities of these Unknowns. Many flying saucers have been observed to be capable of hovering motionless, of moving straight up and down both rapidly and slowly, and back and forth without turning around. Some moved at extremely high velocity (thousands of miles per hour as observed visually and on radar) horizontally. Frequently there were reports of the Unknowns making very sharp turns at very high speeds. Often there is a glow around the object unlike any produced around conventional aircraft, balloons, missiles, etc., except upon missile reentry. Sometimes the color and brightness of the glow are observed to change as the velocity changes.

Usually the flight pattern is very different from that of conventional aircraft, i.e., steady high speed coupled with very short periods or very high acceleration or deceleration rather than long periods of relatively low deceleration and acceleration such as our vehicles normally use. This difference is very important since it is much easier to avoid capture or destruction when one can apply very rapid changes of velocity and direction and because the shorter the duration of the acceleration, the higher the acceleration rate which can be withstood.

Since the single most important aspect of a flying saucer from any government's viewpoint is its potential for military utilization especially back in the late 1940s and early 1950s, one has to say that the Unknowns could not have been manufactured on Earth. If they have been, no Earth nation would now be building F-15, 16, 17, 18s or MIG 25s or 29s, or Mirage 5s, etc. These data, coupled with the abduction cases, creature reports, physical trace cases, etc., clearly indicate that *some* of the Unknowns are manufactured vehicles whose origin is somewhere more technologically sophisticated than Earth, since we have only had technology for about 100 years on a planet having had life of some sort for over a billion years in a galactic neighborhood at least 10 billion years old. Considering the huge times available prior to when we began space travel, it would be extraordinary if our planet has the most advanced civilization in the neighborhood.

In terms of where I think these ET vehicles originate, I would have to say in nearby solar systems. After all, there are about 1,000 stars within 55 light years of us. At least 46 are single, non-variable sun-like stars which could very well have planets and support life either originating there or migrating and colonizing from older civilizations. A planet around either Zeta 1 or Zeta 2 Reticuli would be my first suggestion for the reasons outlined in Refs. 3 and 4, which describe Marjorie Fish's outstanding UFO research. They are only 37 light years from Earth and only a few light weeks from each other and just happen to be about 1 billion years older than the sun.

Despite the fact that Project Blue Book Special Report 14 contains an enormous amount of relevant data in addition to that tabulated above (more than 240 charts, tables, graphs, maps, etc.), and that it covers far more sightings than any other official compilation, it is not even mentioned in the 11 anti-UFO books that have been written (though the authors of all 11 were well aware of it) or in a later much more limited, but more widely publicized Air Force sponsored UFO study document "The Condon Report" (Ref. 5) which is discussed below.

It is important to mention that Project Blue Book Special Report 14 was never publicly distributed by the Air Force, either when it was completed in 1955 or anytime later despite enormous public interest in UFOs. There was a grossly misleading press release issued on October 25, 1955. It received very wide distribution. It gave no information about who did the work, where the work was done, or even the correct title for the document. No newsman asked any of these relevant questions. An accompanying "summary" of this study somehow managed to avoid including any of massive amount of factual data in the report.

No one questioned the totally false statement by Secretary of the Air Force, Donald Quarles, who said "On the basis of this report we believe that no objects such as those popularly described as flying saucers have overflowed the United States. Even the unknown 3% could have been identified as conventional phenomena or illusions, if more complete observational data had been available." This statement certainly implies that there are no good sightings by

competent observers that cannot be identified by competent investigators. Tables 1 and 2 clearly illustrate that the Unknowns were 21.5% of those cases investigated and not 3%, and that they were completely separate from those sightings listed as Insufficient Information.

Perhaps the most serious misrepresentation by the Air Force and swallowed whole by the journalistic and scientific communities is that Project Blue Book and its predecessors was a serious scientific effort to get to the bottom of the UFO mystery and that it was the only government organization studying UFOs. How anybody could swallow this nonsense given the small size, low budget, and limited scientific expertise of Blue Book (at least from 1955 to its closure in 1969) is one of the mysteries of the mid-twentieth century. Blue Book normally had a major, a sergeant or two, a couple of secretaries and a lot of filing cabinets. It had no aircraft at its disposal, no radar, no computers, no closed communications and most important no need-to-know for the data obtained by those agencies such as the Aerospace Defense Command, the National Security Agency, the CIA, the FBI, etc., which had far bigger budgets, much larger staffs, and much greater ability to investigate UFO sightings and collect data both in the U.S. and overseas.

As a matter of public policy, data relating to military observations of unidentified flying objects were subject to an entirely different set of reporting requirements than optionally reported civilian data. That this is a fact rather than merely conjecture is clearly established by a memo written on October 20, 1969, by United States Air Force Brigadier General Carroll H. Bolender. General Bolender had a very distinguished record prior to being transferred to Washington, shortly after our successful landing of the Apollo astronauts on July 21, 1969. He had been in charge of Apollo and then of the lunar excursion module program.

He was asked to make recommendations concerning the future of Project Blue Book in light of the recommendations by Condon that it be discontinued, since it seemed to be making no contribution at all to the intelligence gathering activities of its parent organization, the Foreign Technology Division of the Air Force, and since it also seemed to be making no scientific or defense contribution. The unclassified memo (Ref. 6), which was obtained by Robert Todd of Ardmore, Pennsylvania, contains the following statement:

“Moreover, reports of unidentified flying objects which could affect national security are reported in accordance with JANAP 146 and Air Force Manual 55-11 and are not part of the Blue Book system” two paragraphs later.... “However, as already stated, reports of UFOs which could affect national security would continue to be handled through the standard Air Force procedures designed for this purpose.”

JANAP 146 has been revised a number of times, but is still in effect. Air Force Manual 55-11 has been replaced by Joint Chief of Staff Publication 6, Volume 5. Both spell out explicit instructions, procedures and channels for the reporting by military (not civilian) personnel of observations of unidentified missiles, unidentified aircraft, unidentified surface ships, unidentified submarines, and *unidentified flying objects*. Special emergency communication procedures are specified for immediate transmissions concerning these UFOs. The destination for this information, technically referred to as CIRVIS reports was not Project Blue Book, even when it was in existence, but instead, as might reasonably be expected, the headquarters of the military organization such as the Aerospace Defense Command then at Ent. Air Force Base, Colorado.

Blue Book was not on the distribution list. These reports are not distributed to the press either. Obviously, the same techniques used to monitor the skies for enemy attacks with missiles or aircraft are the most appropriate for monitoring flights of Unidentified Flying Objects over North America. In addition, the military systems are much more useful for obtaining technical data about the flight characteristics, electromagnetic signatures, and other technologically significant aspects of the unidentified flying objects than are eyewitness reports.

To repeat, from a government and military viewpoint the most significant aspect of visits to planet Earth by technologically sophisticated vehicles is the potential for military utilizations by Earth-based groups of that technology. Surely the first government to be able to duplicate the hyper maneuverable high-speed flights of flying saucers will use that capability for the delivery of nuclear and other weapons and for defense and attack purposes. In

the real world of the late 20th century, these potential information gains from the careful scientific investigation of flying saucers—in the air, crashed, or captured—greatly overshadow any philosophical, religious, or humanitarian concerns of the general public. One need only note that collectively the countries of planet Earth now spend about 750 billion dollars on military items each year, down from 1 trillion at the height of the cold war. Is it really any wonder that governments do not want to reveal whatever sophisticated scientific data they have about flying saucers?

While there have been frequent accusations in the past about a government cover-up of UFO related data obtained through military and intelligence channels, there is a growing body of documentation to support those charges. For example, Dr. Bruce Maccabee has obtained well over 1,000 pages of UFO related correspondence and sighting reports from FBI files, despite the fact that J. Edgar Hoover, the long time head of the FBI, often wrote that the FBI is not now nor has ever been collecting information about UFOs.

A Freedom of Information (FOI) suit against the CIA, begun by Ground Saucer Watch, but pushed to fruition by Citizens Against UFO Secrecy (CAUS), with most of the effort coming from Berkeley researcher Brad Sparks, has forced the release of over 900 pages of UFO-related items complete with deletions, and admission of the existence of at least 57 other UFO-related documents not released. None of the released documents were classified higher than SECRET though my visits to 15 archives have established that there are loads of TOP SECRET documents out there. Sparks has indicated that in just the first ¼ of the released documents there were references to over 200 other UFO-related documents not yet explicitly revealed, released, or acknowledged by the CIA. Future legal actions are expected to greatly swell the amount of available information from the CIA, NSA, and a variety of other intelligence agencies not generally accountable to the public or press.

Charles Buffer, for example, persisted (despite frequent denials of the existence of any such document by agencies which later evidence clearly showed had copies) in obtaining the release of the classified memo from an American military attaché in Iran describing a very fascinating multiple witness air and ground radar-confirmed military aircraft chase of a UFO. The distribution list for the memo included the CIA, the DIA, the White House, the Secretary of Defense, the Commander of Naval Operations, etc.

Since the NSA was listed as having produced 18 of the 57 other agency documents found by the CIA, an FOI request was made to them. It was turned down flat on the grounds of National Security. An appeal in Federal Court resulted in the NSA being forced to search its files for UFO information. They found 239 UFO documents including 79 other-agency ones of which 23 were, believe it or not, from the CIA. They released none. They were petitioned to show the 160 NSA UFO documents to the Judge, Gerhardt Gesell, so that he could determine whether they were properly invoking National Security. They refused to show him any of the 160 NSA UFO documents, but did provide him with a 21 page TOP SECRET+++ IN CAMERA Affidavit justifying the withholding. Our lawyer was not shown this document since it required a very special security clearance.

Judge Gesell ruled in favor of the NSA *not* releasing any of the documents saying (Nov. 18, 1980): “The in-camera affidavit presented factual considerations which aided the court in determining that the public interest in disclosure is far outweighed by the sensitive nature of the materials and the obvious effect on national security their release may well entail.” The Federal Court of Appeals agreed with the Gesell ruling after seeing the affidavit. The Supreme Court wouldn’t hear the case. The affidavit when received after a FOI request was itself 75% blacked out. For more than a decade I have challenged debunker P. J. Klass to provide any of the NSA withheld documents or a cleaner copy of the affidavit. No luck so far, but he still contends that there is no cover-up!

As a footnote, I filed an FOI request with the CIA for its 23 UFO documents as discovered by the NSA, but not by itself. After 35 months they released 9 documents, all, believe it or not, Press abstracts of Eastern European newspaper articles about UFOs, which the Russians had the day they were published. Two years after I appealed concerning their own 14 UFO documents, they released tiny portions of 3 with some pages having all of 8 words that were not blacked out.

Security classification and the reasons for it are one of many relevant areas of ufology and technology treated in

grossly inadequate fashion by Dr. Edward U. Condon during his tenure as director of the University of Colorado half million dollar study of Unidentified Flying Objects. Condon's comments before, during, and after the program make a mockery of the methodology of science. It would be appropriate for a psychiatrist to try to determine why Condon was so biased and irrational in his approach to the problem and to his critics. The attitude revealed in the correspondence between Condon and Dr. Donald Menzel, author of three strange anti-UFO books, and learned Harvard astronomer (who I later determined was very heavily involved with the NSA, CIA and other intelligence activities), is one of egotistical unscientific arrogance coupled with disdain of those lesser lights holding contrary views. Condon, on several occasions, stated that the files of the University of Colorado study had not been preserved. And yet, they are now at the Library of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia treated as Condon's personal files and only accessible with permission from one of his children.

There have been a number of detailed criticisms of the Condon report. (See for example Refs. 7, 8, and 9.) In summary, one might say that it failed to come to grips with either a mountain of evidence available outside the confines of the study itself or that generated within it. Nobody participating in the study had an extensive knowledge of UFOs prior to the study. The final report is loaded with padding more appropriate for textbooks than a report about UFOs. The discussion of technology related to interstellar travel or exotic atmospheric propulsion system design is, to say the least, inept and incomplete as is the discussion of plasma physics. There isn't even one chapter devoted to the more than 30 sightings, both investigated by Condon's people and unexplainable by those people, including multiple witness radar visual sightings (Refs. 10 & 11). A committee set up by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, to review the whole question of UFOs, noted (Ref. 12) that one could come to the opposite conclusions from Condon, based on the data in the report, and that 30% of the 117 cases studied in detail could not be identified!

Both the press and scientific community were negligent in accepting Condon's conclusions and the accompanying Air Force press release at face value when even a cursory review of the report would have indicated both its inadequacy and that its best cases support the notion that some UFOs are extraterrestrial spacecraft.

Other volumes of data loaded with relevant evidence concerning the question of some UFOs being ET spacecraft include the report of the July, 1968, Congressional Hearings (Ref. 13) with testimony from 12 scientists; *The UFO Evidence* (Ref. 14) with information about 746 Unknowns culled from 4,500 sightings investigated by NICAP; J. Allen Hynek's book (Ref. 15) *The UFO Experience*, James McCampbell's *Ufology* (Ref. 16), etc.

As of May 1979, Ted Phillips' files in Sedalia, Missouri, contained information on over 1,470 landing cases covering more than 2,000 years and from 59 countries. By 1994, Ted had clocked over 4400 cases from 65 countries. Ted has personally visited about 600 trace case locations. More than 50% of these reports involved more than one witness. More than 80% of the observation lasted longer than 60 seconds. Alien beings were observed in more than 22% of these cases. Of those objects observed having a definite size and shape (as opposed to a bright glowing light mass obscuring the details of what was inside the glow) more than 80% involved a round disc shaped object between 10 and 35 feet in diameter. Small footprints were found in more than 40 of the cases and radioactivity detected in eight of the cases. The data in Ted's files is crying out for both investigation and publication. An early document (Ref. 17) does tabulate information on hundreds of these leading cases.

Also crying out for wider exposure are the data obtained by Dr. James Harder, Professor of Engineering at the University of California at Berkeley, on the more than 100 abduction cases involving more than 150 abductees that Dr. Harder has investigated. More than 80% of these cases have had no publicity even though many involved extensive regressive hypnosis and fascinating glimpses of the aliens and their activities.

Dr. Richard Haines has collected statistical information concerning more than 3,500 sightings of UFOs by pilots. Two-thirds of these cases involved commercial pilots. More than 90% of the sightings involved more than one witness and more than 85% lasted for longer than one minute. The data comes from more than 40 countries. Most of these sightings have had no publicity. Dr. Haines' files also cry out for further investigation and publication.

In brief summary, there is a mountain of evidence dealing with the sightings and landings which cannot be explained by competent investigators and which indicate *some* UFOs are ET vehicles. The skeptics don't refute these data, they ignore them or misrepresent it.

Arguments Against UFOs

Anti-UFO arguments made by the very small, but very vocal, minority of skeptics can be divided into five basic classifications:

1. Poor evidence.
2. Aliens wouldn't behave that way.
3. The government can't keep secrets.
4. UFOs violate the laws of physics and the technology is impossible.
5. Only nuts believe in flying saucers.

A. Poor Evidence. The common thread running through these arguments as laid down by the skeptics is ignorance of the relevant data coupled with the assumption that absence of knowledge on the part of the skeptic concerning such information can be taken as evidence that there is no such knowledge. If it were around, he would know about it. He doesn't, so there must not be any.

Typical of the poor evidence arguments are statements that there are no sightings that can't be explained; that the only reasons sightings can't be explained is that there isn't enough data available; that there are no landings, no radar visual sightings; no sightings outside the United States; no sightings by pilots; no sightings by astronauts; no sightings by multiple witnesses; no sequential sightings; no sightings by scientists or astronomers; there are no abductions of "respectable people"; none of the camera pictures of the sky taken to monitor meteors show UFOs; all photographs are fakes; no motion pictures have been taken of UFOs. Every one of these statements is definitely false!

All purpose notions include the idea that Philip J. Klass objectively and honestly has explained all the good sightings; that Donald Menzel explained all the good sightings; if there had been good data J. Allen Hynek would have published it many years ago and would have spoken out against the Air Force and against Menzel's explanations rather than endorsing both; people only see UFOs who want to see them or already believe in them or have a deep seated psychological need to be saved or to be famous or get rich; reports of humanoid beings must by definition be in error because aliens can't possibly be humanoid. Press coverage produces UFO sightings; sightings are very uncommon. I have dealt in detail with each of these notions in previous publications. None can stand the glare of reality.

B. Aliens Wouldn't Behave That Way. These arguments are often made by people who may be well educated in some particular specialty such as astrophysics, but who cannot be said to have any special insight into Earthling motivation and behavior much less that of aliens. Astronomers are amongst the worst of such offenders. Their training, professional backgrounds, and professional activities provide no professional insight whatever into the behavior singly or collectively of Earthlings, much less humanoids. This in no way interferes with their willingness to make pronouncements such as if aliens were visiting Earth, they would wish to talk to the National Academy of Sciences (Menzel) or the local press club; they would land on the White House lawn; they would either keep hidden or make contact with our leaders; they wouldn't come here just to stop cars and play games (there is no evidence that that is why they come here); there is nothing special happening on Earth (even though we will shortly be going to the stars); they would have taken over years ago; they would not come here until they had picked up our TV signals sent out just a few years back; since sending radio telescope messages is so much cheaper than traveling, they would only send signals rather than coming here; they would try to reach us by radio and when they made contact

would transmit all their secrets slowly and by radio, and of course to the exobiologists and radio astronomers so concerned with finding extraterrestrial intelligence.

These notions betray a lack of any understanding of human behavior but do tell us a lot about the lack of imagination and egos of those who propose and espouse them. Refs. 18 and 19 deal with these ideas at length.

C. The Government Can't Keep Secrets. It is truly amazing how many statements are made concerning the government's supposed inability to keep secrets by people who know nothing about our security system, but are only aware of some few secrets which have been revealed. Typical examples might include the Gary Powers U-2 shot down over Russia proving that U.S. planes had indeed been violating Soviet airspace and the release of all kinds of information about Watergate and about a wide variety of domestic CIA activities. The thought is that if there were anything classified about UFOs, it would have been found by the Jack Andersons or Woodward-Bernsteins of the media. Some relatively prestigious NASA or other officials believe that if there was anything hidden about UFOs, they would have known about it. Of course, more careful consideration would indicate that most secrets that are brought into the open come intentionally from the Deep Throats of the political scene and that there is no way to judge how much is still hidden on the basis of what little leaks out.

The very fact that there has only been one Daniel Ellsberg releasing classified government documents (outdated political ones at that) should indicate that the barriers to release of classified data are high indeed. The penalties are very tough—like death and life imprisonment, forfeit of all benefits and pensions now or ever due, 10,000 dollar fines, etc. All people with access to classified material have to sign statements indicating that they will never, ever reveal that data. All people with high level clearances are well aware that the main limit to the release of classified data is the need-to-know system which prevents access in the first place to people who don't have to a need-to-know in their jobs for that data, regardless of what level their security clearances are. Those who have a need-to-know and have the data don't talk. Senator (and former Air Force General) Barry Goldwater has admitted that he asked Curt Lemay to see the UFO file and was both turned down and told never to ask again.

The Watergate revelations, of course, had absolutely nothing to do with release of classified information, access to classified material, or anything else related to national security. The penalties involved related to civil violation not associated with military or government security.

There have also been silly statements to the effect that there is no possible reason for government cover-up except fear of panic (which totally neglects the military significance of the flying saucers being able to violate anybody's air space and the potential benefit to anybody that is able to duplicate their flight characteristics). Some academic scientists have even suggested that because they are receiving federal grants for their work, they would know of anything and everything going on under security. Equally foolish statements have been made by journalists who say that since they know what is happening, they would have known about anything classified about UFOs.

A much more detailed critique of these attitudes is given in Ref. 20. The long and short of it is clearly that UFOs represent vital intelligence data, a kind of Cosmic Watergate to all governments and intelligence agencies.

D. UFOs violate the laws of physics and the technology is impossible. Some of these criticisms (usually from academic physicists and astronomers who know almost nothing in a practical sense about space or atmospheric propulsion system operation or design) include the following foolish statements: It would take too long or too much energy to get here from other star systems; once here, no craft could avoid making sonic booms; no craft with beings on board could make right angle turns; no craft could move thousands of miles per hour without burning up almost instantly; no craft could move backwards and then forwards without turning around; no craft could literally fly circles around a rocket or high performance aircraft. No real three-dimensional craft could seem to suddenly disappear from view or from a radarscope, etc. All of these false conclusions are based upon wrong assumptions as to how such peculiar objectives could be achieved and are about as useful as pointing out that it is impossible to travel comfortably from San Francisco, California, to Sidney, Australia—on a bicycle. They do demonstrate that one can prove almost anything is impossible if one makes enough inappropriate assumptions.

One characteristic that all these arguments seem to share is they carefully avoid coming to grips with the technological data indicating that while certain objectives are unachievable using one technique, they might well be achievable using another. Fast, cheap, small, pocket size, battery operated computers may be unfeasible with miniature versions of the 1950 gear-wheel-cog devices, but are quite feasible using newly developed micro-integrated circuits. Star trips involving primitive brute force chemical rockets or acceleration limited to one G or the same craft performing both atmospheric and deep space missions may well not be practical, but the use of magneto-aerodynamic atmospheric propulsion systems (as Earth Excursion Modules) and nuclear systems for deep space travel shed an entirely different light on the plausibility of all of the technical aspects of flying saucers. In addition, any study of technological development over the last 100 years reveals several important facts:

1. Technical progress almost always comes from first improving the old systems as much as possible until some inherent limit is reached, and then entirely changing the method used to accomplish the end objective. Progress comes from doing things differently in an unpredictable way. Lasers are not just better light bulbs. Nuclear Fusion rockets on which I worked in the early 1960s are not just better chemical rockets.
2. Each generation of academics, in particular, seems to think all science has already been discovered and with it all engineering and there is no other approach than the one they have suggested. They also confuse the issues by not learning from past proclamations about the impossibility of a whole host of objectives which have since been achieved. It is tempting to note the old notion that those who can, do. Those who can't, teach.
3. Almost all the real technological developments have come from practical engineers rather than the noisy negativists of academia. One only has to think of Dr. Campbell, a noted Canadian astronomer, who calculated in the early 1940s (Ref. 21) that the initial launch weight of a chemical rocket capable of getting a man to the moon and back would have to be one million, million tons. Of course, he made such "clever" assumptions such as that it would be limited to one G acceleration; that the whole rocket would be a single stage vehicle launched directed from the surface of the Earth, loaded on the moon, launched from the moon and decelerated chemically (rather than aerodynamically) near the Earth upon its return. He made a whole host of other inappropriate assumptions and turned out to be off in his calculations by a factor of 300 million since we got three astronauts to the moon and back with a chemical rocket whose initial launch weight was only 3,000 tons!

Nuclear rockets would be far more sophisticated and harder to develop. But the potential is enormous. An appropriately designed fusion rocket, for example, would be able to kick particles out the back end having 10 million times as much energy per particle as they can get in a chemical rocket and would use isotopes readily available near all stars.

Paper after paper has been published by the exobiologists and radio astronomers proving it is impossible to get to the stars if one makes a host of absurd assumptions. They can't even get straight some basic facts such as that at one G acceleration it takes only a year to get close to the speed of light and that our trips take so long because we coast most of the trip. I have had guesses from professors of physics that it would take 10, 100, or 1,000 years at one G to get close to the speed of light. They don't seem to know that the amount of acceleration one can stand depends on the direction in which the accelerating force acts on the person's body and the duration of that acceleration and is not just some absolute number. For example, a trained pilot can stand an acceleration of 14 Gs (over 300 miles per hour, per second) for two minutes without damage if properly restrained and if the acceleration is from back to front. At the end of that time he would be going 36,000 miles per hour.

They don't understand that the faster one gets to orbit or away from Earth, the less propellant it takes. For each minute near Earth, gravity in effect pulls the rocket back at over 1,200 miles per hour. Accelerating at five Gs for five minutes thus produces a much higher final net velocity or uses much less propellant than accelerating at one G for 25

minutes, even though they may seem to produce the same final results.

I rarely have found skeptics familiar with the fact that there has been successful operation of jet engines on nuclear power; successful operation of nuclear ramjet engines; successful operation of nuclear power plants in space; and successful ground operation of nuclear rocket reactor propulsion systems at power levels of more than four billion watts in a package less than seven feet in diameter. All of these programs involved hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands of professional people and all were classified. Few involved major contributions from academia and essentially none included much effort by astronomers... the professionals most likely to give phoney technological arguments against UFO reality.

The simple fact of the matter is that it is completely unnecessary for us to be able to duplicate or even guess how flying saucers operate in our atmosphere or how they get here to establish that they do come here and do operate in our atmosphere. The sun was fusing for almost five billion years before Earthlings knew anything about fusion. One need not understand anything about digestion to enjoy a good meal or obtain nourishment from it. Because one Earthling is unable to duplicate the performance or activities of an alien does not mean that the performance or activity is impossible. It does mean that the individual cannot as yet achieve that particular objective at that time, and that is all it means. Most technological objections are reviewed in Ref. 22.

E. Only Nuts Believe In or See Flying Saucers. When all other phony arguments fail, the skeptics dig out the typical propagandist tricks including character assassination, guilt by association, positive and negative name calling, etc. So often do statements that only nuts, kooks, quacks, religious fanatics and assorted weirdoes believe in or see UFOs get made, that most people have come to accept this mythology even though it is contradicted by all opinion polls taken to date and supported by none. Consistently, Gallup Polls have shown in 1966, 1973, 1978, and 1987 that believers out number non-believers by at least 50% and that the greater the education the more likely to accept both that there is other intelligent life in the universe and that flying saucers are real. The results of the last five polls are summarized in Table 3.

Numerous other polls have established the same facts. A 1971 poll of engineers and scientists involved in research and development activities (Ref. 23) was included in toto in my first MUFON paper (Ref. 24). It has been repeated and the final results were published in July 1979 in *Industrial Research Magazine*. The 1971 results showed that 64% or those expressing an opinion said that UFOs probably or definitely exist and half of those expressing an opinion as to the origin of UFOs said, "outer space." In terms of seeing a UFO, the Gallup Poll indicated 9% have seen one and the IR poll that 8% definitely had observed one, with another 14% saying that perhaps they had observed one.

Once again, the data contradict the views of the skeptics:

Table 3. (From Gallup)

"In your opinion, are UFOs something real or just people's imagination?" (Based on those who have heard or read about UFOs)

Year	1966	1973	1978	1987	1991
% Real	46	54	57	49	49
% Real*	61	64	68	60	60
% Imaginary	29	30	27	30	32
% Not sure	25	16	16	21	19
Ratio of real to imaginary	1.59	1.8	2.11	1.63	1.53

*Percentage of those expressing an opinion—leaves out "not sure."

Summary

Essentially all of these objections are complaints from people who have not studied the relevant data concerning flying saucer sightings, landings, and observations, technology, security, behavior. They have all been discussed in my earlier papers. The objections almost always boil down to professionals putting down that which they are not up on, rather than rational logical objections based on detailed investigations of the evidence. There have, after all, been by 1994 11 Ph.D. theses dealing with UFOs. Easily 20 volumes of papers concerning UFOs by scientists; at least half a dozen collections of sighting reports which eliminate all the objections about evidence.

The problem with acceptance of some flying saucers as extraterrestrial visitors is not that the data isn't available, but that the few loud objectors are unwilling to examine it. They would rather deal with their theoretically interesting objections than with the real world of data. They prefer to laugh rather than admit ignorance; to erect straw men for easy demolition rather than look at the relevant information. Lest the reader think my own ego is showing through, let me readily acknowledge my belief that I have spent far more time and effort than any of the fast and easy skeptics, trying to dig out the relevant information because I earned my living lecturing on the subject "Flying Saucers ARE Real" from May 1970 to 1982. I have had to answer tens of thousands of questions after lecturing to audiences at more than 600 colleges in 50 states, nine provinces, Germany, England, Italy, and Finland as well as appearing on hundreds, of radio and TV talk shows.

Prior to becoming the only space scientist in North America *known* (who knows who is working under security?) to be devoting full time to UFOs (1970–1982), I spent 14 years working as a nuclear physicist on classified government sponsored research and development programs involving nuclear airplanes, nuclear rockets, and nuclear power plants for space applications. Almost all the relevant data was classified and did not appear in the conventional "scientific" journals. It was a good way to find out about advanced technology and about security and about how the intelligence community operates, since I even spent two years working as a project engineer on a classified intelligence study effort under the aegis of the very same organization (Foreign Technology Division of the Air Force), which sponsored Project Blue Book.

There is no doubt in my mind, after 37 years of study and investigation that the evidence is overwhelming that planet Earth is being visited by intelligently controlled vehicles whose origin is extraterrestrial. There are no acceptable arguments against flying saucer reality, only people who either haven't studied the relevant data or have a strong will not to believe that Earth is at the bottom of the heap sociologically and technologically in our local galactic neighborhood.

I would like to conclude by urging all with an interest in the future of this planet to study the relevant evidence about flying saucers and technology. Stop being apologist ufologists! Stop being closet ufologists! Tell it like is. Is there any better hope for our own maturation than a recognition that we all on this planet are Earthlings? There is no better way of seeing our community than from the viewpoint of our alien visitors who undoubtedly think of us as a primitive society whose major activity is tribal warfare. It takes courage to recognize our own limitations rather than to hide behind the old nationalistic egotistic self-serving mottos of the past. The year 2000 is approaching. Will we blow the lid off the Cosmic Watergate? Will we bury the old mythology? The choice is ours.

(SPECIAL NOTE: The whole question of the recovery of two crashed flying saucers and alien bodies in New Mexico in July, 1947, which I have been investigating since 1978 and is discussed in detail in *Crash at Corona* by Don Berliner and myself (1992) and Marlowe and Co. (1994), is covered in depth in other publications.)

References

1. "UFOs: An Analysis Of Project Blue Book Special Report 14;" Davidson. Dr. Leon, 5th Edition, Revised 1976. USAF data on 3201 sightings, categorizations, quality evaluations, maps, charts, tables, statistics, etc. New edition with introduction by Dr. Bruce Maccabee. From Center for UFO Studies, 2457 W. Peterson Ave.,

Chicago, IL 60659

2. "Other Worlds," Carl Sagan, Bantam Books, 1975, 31.95.
3. "UFO Star Bases Discovered" by Stanton T. Friedman and B. Ann Slate in SAGA, July 1973, Vol. 46, No. 4, p. 37.
4. "The Zeta Reticuli Incident" by Terence Dickinson. 32-page, full color reprint of the original December 1974, *Astronomy* magazine article, all subsequently published comments by Carl Sagan, Marjorie Fish, etc. This covers most of the very important work done by Marjorie Fish on the Betty Hill star map and lists all sun-like stars in our local galactic neighborhood. 10,000 copies were sold by *Astronomy*. Now only \$5.00.postpaid
5. "Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects." Edited by Daniel J. Gilmore, 1969, E.P. Dutton Hard Cover (\$12.95), Bantam paperback, 1969, 96spages. \$1.95...out of print. (The Condon Report)
6. Department of the Air Force Staff Summary Sheet, October 20, 1969; Subject: Unidentified Flying Objects. Signed by Brig. Sen. Carroll H. Bolender, 3 pages, 16 attachments.
7. "The Condon Report and UFOs" by J. Allen Hynek in *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist*, April 1969, p. 39.
8. "A Very Creditable Effort?" paper presented by James E. McDonald at Sacramento Section of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, May 28, 1969.
9. Review by James E. McDonald in *Icarus* 11:3, November 1969, pp. 443-447.
10. "UFO Encounter 1 (July 17, 1957)" by James E. McDonald in *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, July 1971, pp. 66-70, Vol. 9, No. 7
11. "UFO Encounter 2," August 13-14, 1956 by Gordon David Thayer in *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, September 1971, pp. 60-64, Vol. 9, No. 9.
12. "UFO. An Appraisal of the Problem," AIAA UFO Subcommittee in *Astronautics and Aeronautics*, Vol. 8, No. 11, November 1970, p. 49.
13. "Symposium on UFOs," Congressional Hearings, July 29, 1968, 247 pages. Testimony by 12 scientists including Hynek, Harder, McDonald, Sprinkle, Baker, Sagan, Salisbury, Friedman, Menzel, etc. McDonald's paper has info on 41 separate sightings. Excellent. Order from NTIS, 5285 Port Royal Rd., Springfield, VA 22151. Item No. PB 179541. For McDonald's full size 70page paper, only \$10.00 from UFORI
14. "The UFO Evidence," Richard Hall and NICAP, 1964. 184 pages packed with data on 740 unidentifiable sightings and separate chapters on sightings by commercial and military pilots, law enforcement officers, scientists, etc. Out of print.New Edition probably available in 1995.
15. "The UFO Experience: A Scientific Inquiry" by Dr. J. Allen Hynek, 309 pages, H. Regnery, 1972 and paperback (Ballantine)
16. "Ufology: New Insights From Science And Common Sense" by Engineering Physicist James McCampbell. 153 pages, 1974.
17. "PhysicalTraces Associated with UFO Sightings" by Ted Phillips, 1975. Data on 831 UFO landings in 39 countries. 160 pages. From CUFOS, Out of print. Computer Printout \$10.00.
18. "Ufology and The Search For ET Intelligent Life," Stanton T. Friedman, 25,000 words, 73 Refs., June 1973. Reviews and demolishes the faulty arguments of the exobiologists and radioastronomers such as Carl Sagan, Bernard Oliver, etc. UFORI \$4.00
19. "Science Fiction, Science, and UFOs," Stanton T. Friedman. MUFON Symposium, July 16, 1977. Scottsdale, AZ. Proceedings pp. 137-166; 60 references; available from UFORI \$4. as one of "Four Scientific Papers Reviews false claims of Isaac Asimov, Ben Bova, Arthur C. Clarke etc.
20. "A Scientific Approach to Flying Saucer Behavior" by Stanton T. Friedman In *Thesis Antithesis, Proceedings of A Symposium Of A Symposium*, sponsored by AIAA and World Future Society, Los Angeles, September 1975. pp. 22-36, 146 pages. Out of print — also one of the 4 papers see item 19.
21. "Rocket Flight to the Moon" by J.W. Campbell in *Philosophical Magazine*, Ser 7, Vol. 31, No. 204, January 1941.
22. "Flying Saucers and Physics," Stanton T. Friedman, 20,000 words, 69 Refs., first edition, June 1974. Gives details

Stanton T. Friedman

on why UFOs don't violate the laws of physics by coming from other stars or in atmospheric flight; has 1973 Gallup Poll, etc., UFORI \$4.00

23. "UFOs Probably Exist" in *Industrial Research*, Vol. 13, No. 3, p. 75, April 1971, see 1979 poll results in July 1979, p. 139.

24. "UFOs: Myth And Mystery," Friedman, Stanton T., 15,000 words, 60 Rets., June 1971. General Overview. UFORI \$3.00