

FANTASTIC UNIVERSE

MAY 1958

Vol. 9, No. 5

Needed—Space Intelligence 4
by *Lester del Rey*

Sit by the Fire 16
by *Myrle Benedict*

We'll Never Catch Them 23
by *Ivan T. Sanderson*

H. L. Herbert
Publisher

Field Report 33
by *Roger Dee*

Hans Stefan
Santesson
Editorial Director

Colon the Conqueror 36
by *John Boardman*

Face of Evil 44
by *Vincent S. Larkin*

Bait for the Tiger 62
by *Lee Chaytor*

Shapes in the Sky 109
by *Civilian Saucer Intelligence*

Virgil Finlay
Cover Design

Little Green Men 121
by *John Nicholson*

The Beautiful Things 125
by *Arthur Zirul*

FANTASTIC UNIVERSE, Vol. 9, No. 5. Published monthly by KING-SIZE PUBLICATIONS, INC., 320 Fifth Ave., N. Y. 1, N. Y. Subscription 12 issues \$3.75, single copies 35¢. Foreign postage extra. Reentered as second-class matter at the post office, New York, N. Y. The characters in this magazine are entirely fictitious and have no relation to any persons living or dead. Copyright, 1958, by KING-SIZE PUBLICATIONS, INC. All rights reserved. May, 1958.

Printed in U. S. A.

shapes in the sky

by . . . *Civilian
Saucer Intelligence*

A report on the November sightings and on how the Air Force then slew the Flying Saucer Dragons. . . .

IN THE first week of November, 1957, the front pages of American newspapers were aswarm with the doings of what a hundred facetious editors were unanimously inspired to call "whatniks"—nothing more or less than flying saucers, under a new and even more grotesque name.

On November 7, practically every paper in the country carried a story declaring that "Air Force Says No Evidence For Flying Saucers Ever Found."

In the second week of November, all the "whatniks" abruptly disappeared—if not from the skies, at least from the news columns.

And on the 16th, the press solemnly recorded that the U. S. Air Force had "refuted the flying saucer tales"—and that was that, until the next time.

Brief though it was, the UFO wave of Nov. 2-7, 1957, was probably as intense a visitation as this part of our planet has yet experienced. Brief though it is, the Air Force's official "explanation" of five of the reports on Nov. 15 is as revealing an illustration of the hollowness of the Air Force's sham UFO "investigation" as has ever been foisted on gullible citizens. Brief

Civilian Saucer Intelligence of New York, authors of the above discussion of the November sightings and on the Air Force analysis of the same, is a Metropolitan Area research group which holds occasional public meetings, publishes a newsletter, and has a considerable file of material on UFOlogy.

though this article must necessarily be, we can at least summarize what happened in those five cases—quote the *Air Force's* version of what happened—and show why the Air Force version is (to quote Dr. Donald Menzel somewhat out of context) “nothing but bubbles of hot air.”

Whether by coincidence or not, the outbreak of the November UFO epidemic came just one hour after the launching of Sputnik II on the other side of the globe—many hours before it was publicly announced by the Russians. At 10:50 p.m. CST, on the night of Nov. 2, the police station of Levelland, near Lubbock in northwestern Texas, received a phone call from a local farmhand and part-time barber, Pedro Saucado, who had been driving with his companion Joe Salaz about 4 miles northwest of Levelland when, as he told the police and the Lubbock *Avalanche* reporter the next day:

“We first saw a flash of light in the field to our right and we didn't think much about it . . . then it rose up out of the field and started toward us, picking up speed. When it got nearer, the lights of my truck went out and the motor died. I jumped out and hit the deck as the thing passed directly over the truck with a great sound and a rush of wind. It sounded like thunder, and my truck rocked from the blast. I felt a lot of heat. Then I got up and watched it go out of sight toward Levelland.” Saucado said the object was “torpedo-shaped—like a rocket,” and he

estimated it as 200 feet long. Afraid to return to Levelland for fear of encountering it again, the two men drove on to Whiteface, ten miles west of Levelland, where they phoned in their report to the police station. Although Saucado sounded “terrified,” the officer on duty did not at that time take the report seriously.

An hour later, the police telephone rang again. Jim Wheeler, driving about 4 miles *east* of Levelland, had seen a blazing, 200-foot egg-shaped object sitting on the road ahead of him; at the same time, his car lights went out and his motor died. The object rose and disappeared. A few minutes later came a call from Whitharral, 10 miles north-northeast of Levelland: José Alvarez declared that his lights and motor had gone dead as he drove near a bright, egg-shaped object on the road. At 12:15 a.m., Frank Williams of Kermit, Texas, reported a similar encounter in the same area.

After this the county sheriff, Weir Clem, together with numerous highway patrol officers, took to the roads in search of the hedge-hopping egg. At 1:30, Clem, driving back toward Levelland from the north, briefly saw a streak of light cross the highway an estimated 300-400 yards south of them: “it lit up the whole pavement in front of us for about two seconds.”

Clem described it later as oval-shaped, and said it looked “like a brilliant red sunset.” Two highway patrolmen in a car a couple of miles

behind Clem also observed the flash of light.

At about the same time, Levelland Fire Marshal Ray Jones was also looking for the mystery object north of Levelland, when his car engine "almost died, then started up again." Immediately afterwards, he saw a "streak of light" which "appeared to be north of the flats."

At the same time as these officials were seeing this, the police station received a call from a Waco truck-driver, James D. Long, who reported that at 1:15 he had been driving on a farm road about 5 miles northwest of Levelland when he came upon a 200-foot-long "egg-shaped mass" that "glowed like a neon sign." His engine coughed and died, and his lights went out. As he got out and approached the object, which was less than a hundred yards away, it suddenly took off straight upwards. (The United Press story said that it departed with a roaring noise; the Associated Press quoted Clem as saying that Long fainted from fright; these details are not confirmed by local accounts.) After the object was gone, Long's engine started easily.

The next day two more witnesses reported to the police that they too had encountered the UFO. Texas Tech freshman Newell Wright, Jr., 19, was approaching Levelland from the east at 12:05 a.m. and was about 10 miles from town when he noticed his ammeter jump to "discharge" and back; then the motor quit, "as if it were out of gas," and the car rolled to a stop as the lights went out. He

got out and looked under the hood but could find nothing wrong. Turning around he saw, in the road ahead, an egg-shaped object with a flattened bottom—"like a loaf of bread"—and glowing "not as bright as neon." No portholes or propellers were visible. Frightened, Wright got back into his car and tried to start it, without success. After a few minutes, the "egg" rose almost straight up, veered slightly to the north, and disappeared from view "in a split instant." After it was gone, the car started normally. Wright reported his experience only at his parents' urging, and after interviewing him Sheriff Clem "vowed that young Wright's story was a factual account."

These were the principal reports on the Levelland "egg," as described in the Levelland *Sun-News*, 11/5 and 11/6, and the Lubbock *Avalanche*, 11/4. It seems that one may be unreliable: but others were trustworthy. "I definitely know there was something," Sheriff Clem told the *Sun-News*. "I know it from not having any controversy between those who saw it. Their stories fit to a T."

Let us see now how the Air Force "refuted" this "flying-saucer tale." Air Force Press Release No. 1108-57 of Nov. 15, 1957, opens with these paragraphs:

As a result of inquiries concerning Air Force evaluation of recent Unidentified Flying Object reports, the following general aspects of certain reports have been ascertained:

1. **LEVELLAND, Texas:** (Big

Light, seen by "dozens," stalled autos)

Investigation on the scene revealed that only three persons, rather than "dozens," could be located who saw the "big light." Preliminary reports have not revealed cause of "stalled" automobiles at this time, although rain and electrical storms at the time of the reported sightings, affecting wet electrical circuits, could be cause. Object visible only few seconds, not sustained visibility as had been implied.

EVALUATION: Weather phenomenon of electrical nature, generally classified as "Ball Lightning" or "St. Elmo's Fire," caused by stormy conditions in the area, including mist, rain, thunderstorm and lightning.

One wonders what were the feelings of the local Weather Bureau officials on reading this "evaluation"! It was specifically stated in the *Levelland Sun-News* of Nov. 5 that "Weathermen said they could not explain away the sightings. There were no thunderstorms in the area, and they scoffed at St. Elmo's light." Just for the record, it should also be pointed out that the anonymous author of the "evaluation" was evidently unaware that St. Elmo's Fire (brush electrical discharge) is never red in color; that it is always attached to ground objects, and cannot rise into the air; that is an entirely different phenomenon from ball lightning; that ball lightning itself is, like flying saucers, an inexplicable phenomenon whose very existence is denied by the majority of scientists;

that ball lightning is not neon-red, either; and that ball lightning is seldom, if ever, more than one foot in diameter! As for the suggested explanation for the mysterious stalling of engines, it would be an unacceptable one even if there had been torrential downpours (which there weren't), since all of the witnesses stated that their ignition functioned normally again as soon as the object had departed.

In this case, by good luck, we happen to know something about the character of the "investigation" conducted by the Air Force. It consisted of one man, in civilian clothes, who "first showed up at the sheriff's office about 11:45 a.m." on November 5, made two automobile excursions during the day, and finally told Clem, "Well, I'm done" about seven hours after his arrival. (Considering how little time he put in on it, he did well to interview even *three* witnesses, if he did interview them.) "There was never any hint as to what he found or whether he was really a civilian or an Air Force officer"; but for once the Air Force's secrecy did not succeed in concealing the embarrassing truth, for "an out-of-state newsman said he recognized the mysterious investigator, and identified him as an Air Force sergeant." (*Levelland Sun-News*, 11/6 and 11/7.)

On the night of November 2-3, orange-luminous objects were seen not only near Levelland, but in many places in Western Texas and other parts of the Southwest. Two and a half hours after Sheriff Clem's expe-

rience, the first of a pair of similar incidents took place 250 miles west of Levelland, near the site of the world's first A-bomb explosion about 60 miles north-northwest of White Sands National Monument, New Mexico. At 3 a.m. (MST) on November 3, Cpl. Glenn H. Toy and Pfc. James Wilbanks were in the "Trinity site area" near the old abandoned A-bomb bunkers on a routine jeep patrol when they saw a "very bright object" high up in the sky. The object came down very slowly until it was about 50 yards above the old bunkers, two or three miles from the observers. "It stayed there motionless about three minutes, giving off a brilliant reddish-orange light," said Toy. He compared its brilliance to the sun, although the light "was contained within itself," and did not illuminate the ground. "Then it came to the ground fairly fast at about a 45-degree angle. The light went out quickly. It looked like a completely controlled landing." The soldiers described the object as egg-shaped, and estimated it to be 75 or 100 feet in diameter. Admitting later that they had been "pretty scared," the two men did not approach the site of the apparent landing, but immediately reported the incident to their commanding officer, Lt. Miles F. Penney. The sergeant of the guard returned to the area, but failed to find anything. However, "officials admitted that because of the lack of roads in the area, it was possible to have overlooked an object if one had been there." At this time neither of

the men had yet heard of the Texas reports of a few hours before.

At 8 p.m. that evening, two other MPs, Sp/3C Richard Oakes and Sp/3C Henry Barlow, were patrolling in a jeep in the same area when they encountered a similar, or the same, blazing "egg." They knew nothing, they said, of the Toy-Wilbanks observation of that morning. They first noticed the object, "200 or 300 feet long and very bright," hovering approximately 50 yards above the old bunkers, two or three miles to the east of them. Then it began to rise slowly, at a 45-degree angle; stopped; then continued to rise, blinking on and off as it got higher and higher. "It got so far up it looked like a big star," Oakes said. "Then all of a sudden the light went out." The soldiers filed a report with the provost marshal, who noticed the similarity to the Toy-Wilbanks report and brought it to their attention. (*El Paso Times*, 11/6; AP in *Albuquerque Journal*, 11/6.)

The most natural interpretation of these reports is that an orange-luminous, controlled object, similar in all respects to that seen at Levelland, was seen to land close to the A-bomb site at 3 a.m., and was seen to take off again from the same spot seventeen hours later. The only reasonable alternative is that the witnesses were in collusion to perpetrate a hoax. But the Air Force explainers did not care for the most natural interpretation; and apparently they did not concern themselves much with the reasonableness of

their alternative. Here is what they came up with in their Nov. 15 press release:

4. *WHITE SANDS, New Mexico*
(Two patrols report UFO's separate times)

Investigation revealed that originators had discussed phenomena among themselves, accounting for similar stories, first given to local newspapers, then reported to their command. Astro plots indicate Venus is at magnitude at the time, place and direction of the first patrol's observation and the moon, with scattered clouds was in general direction of the second patrol's observation.

EVALUATION: Astronomical.

The "originators" of this "evaluation" would have achieved a more convincing effect if they had stopped after the first sentence, with its clear implication that the reports were at least partially fictitious, and their "originators" publicity seekers. To be sure, the accuracy of this allegation is highly dubious. The charge that the reports were "first given to local newspapers, then reported to their command" would appear to be refuted by the newspaper accounts themselves: those we have seen state that the newspapers were first informed of the sighting by the witnesses' commanding officer, Lt. Penney.

Nevertheless, the Air Force explainers are on safer ground when they impugn the witnesses' integrity than when they attempt to venture into astronomy. Whoever wrote the second sentence has crammed a more

than usual number of crass boners into it. "Venus is at magnitude" is an entirely meaningless expression; and if the "astro plots" (star maps?) really indicated that Venus was visible during either sighting, they had better be junked. At the time of the first patrol's observation, 3 a.m., Venus is *never* visible! And at the time of the second patrol's observation, it had set at 7:30, half an hour before the object was seen. The Air Force evaluator was not only unaware of this, but ignored the fact that the second patrol (which he seems to have confused with the first) saw the object *rising* to the east of them—while Venus, when it was visible, had been *setting* in the west!

Illiterate "evaluations" like these are a disgrace to the organization that issues them, and to the press that publicizes them under such headlines as "Air Force Refutes Flying Saucer Tales." In this case the Associated Press did its bit to make confusion even worse confounded: its story on the Air Force press release spoke of the observations as having been made by "*planes* patrolling near White Sands."

Seventeen hours after the second of these bomb-site observations, there was another remarkable occurrence 100 miles to the south-south-east. At 1:10 p.m., on Nov. 4, 46-year-old James Stokes, a veteran of 24 years in the Navy, now a high-altitude missile engineer at Holloman Air Force Base, was driving south from Alamogordo to El Paso

on Highway 54. Eight miles beyond the desert town of Orogrande, his car radio began to fade, then died; at the same time, his motor quit. As the car rolled to a stop, Stokes noticed that half a dozen cars ahead of him, evidently similarly afflicted, were likewise pulling off to the side of the highway. People were getting out of the other cars and pointing to the northeast. Looking in that direction, Stokes saw an egg-shaped object, "mother-of-pearl" in color, rapidly approaching in a shallow dive. Making an abrupt right turn toward Orogrande, the object "made a pass" at the highway to the north of them, then disappeared quickly in the north. Two or three minutes later, the "egg" reappeared from the same direction, crossed the highway an estimated two miles north of them, then swerved to the northwest again and went off toward the San Andres mountains. After this the automobiles could be started normally, though Stokes found his battery "steaming." "Judging from the distance the object covered and the extremely short time it took to cover it, I'd judge that it must have been traveling at a rate of Mach 2" (nearly 2,000 mph), Stokes said, adding that "the object appeared to be 1,500-3,000 feet in altitude. I based this guess on the heights of the cloud formations overhead, which the object flew into now and then. It must have been about 300 to 500 feet long, and something like 100-200 feet in thickness. We were able to view it for two or three minutes at

most." He saw no windows nor any other markings. There was no sound whatever, and it left no vapor trail.

"As it passed, I could feel a kind of heat wave, like radiation from a giant sun lamp," Stokes said, and he found afterwards that he had received a slight burn, similar to a sunburn. (This detail was confirmed by veteran UFO investigator Coral Lorenzen, the director of Aerial Phenomena Research Organization at Alamogordo, who is personally acquainted with Stokes and interviewed him later that evening. On the following day, though, Mrs. Lorenzen noted that the reddening had disappeared.)

Stokes said that one of the other witnesses was a Mr. Duncan of Las Cruces, who had photographed the UFO with a 35-mm. camera, and that another was Allan D. Baker, from White Sands Proving Ground. However, neither of these two supporting witnesses had been located as of this writing.

(Sources for the above: Alamogordo *Daily News*, 11/5; *APRO Bulletin*, Nov., 1957; Terry Clarke in *Writer's Digest*, Dec., 1957; AP and UP wire-service stories.)

The Air Force's explanation for this incident was a brusque one.

2. *ALAMOGORDO (sic), New Mexico (10 stalled autos, radio fade-out, "heat" light and "sunburn")*.

Investigation of originator's report revealed no "sunburn" effect from "heat" light; originator admitted

radio fade-out previously in same area; none of witnesses originator cited in other automobiles could be found after extensive search.

EVALUATION: Hoax presumably suggested by the Levelland, Texas "reports."

An accusation of hoax is difficult to refute, unless direct confirmatory evidence can be produced; it can't be said *positively* that this "evaluation" is as worthless as the others, though we are strongly inclined to believe that it is. As to the absence of visible sunburn at the time the Air Force "investigated the originator's report," we have Coral Lorenzen's testimony that something resembling a sunburn *was*, indeed, visible on Stokes on the night of the 4th. As to the alleged previous radio fade-outs, the point would be relevant only to an attempted explanation of the story as a *mistake*; it has nothing to do with an explanation of the story as a fabrication. The non-appearance of confirming witnesses may be admitted; and while the Air Force investigator's search for them was most likely *not* "extensive," that of the local newspapers probably *was*. But on this point Mrs. Lorenzen has an interesting suggestion to make: as one familiar with the Alamogordo region, she points out that it is very likely that all of the drivers on that road at that time were, like Stokes, Air Force employees, aware of their employer's attitude toward UFO observations.

Perhaps the most significant bit of evidence is the fact that Stokes—ac-

cused of perpetrating an embarrassing hoax—at last reports still retained his job at Holloman! His reputation there seems to have been a good one: on the 4th, "Holloman spokesmen said the background and experience of Mr. Stokes rendered him competent in the observation of flying objects, and said the Air Force was accepting Stokes's report as bona fide" (*Alamogordo News*, 11/5.)

Incidentally, the AP story on the Air Force's explanations gave the impression that it had turned out to be an "exaggeration" of some genuine but commonplace occurrence. Perhaps the AP felt it would be more prudent not to publish such a strong accusation.

Fifteen hours after Stokes saw and felt his UFO, something was seen, or felt, by a radar set. At 5:10 a.m. (CST) on Nov. 5, the radarscope of the Coast Guard cutter *Sebago*, 200 miles south of the mouth of the Mississippi in the Gulf of Mexico, began recording "blips" from an unknown object. According to the *New Orleans Times-Picayune* of Nov. 6 and a radio interview the same day with station WBZ in Boston, the "target" was first spotted about 14 miles west-northwest of the ship, moving in a southerly direction. By 5:13 it had approached within two miles of the vessel; then it turned and was moving north, parallel to the ship, when "contact was lost" (possibly from the object's rising out of the radar beam) at 5:14. Two minutes later, it or another similar object was picked up again slightly

west of due south at 22 miles. This blip receded from the vessel at 1,000 mph, and at 5:18 contact was again lost when it was at a distance of 55 miles. At 5:20, the object showed up again, now stationary only seven miles northeast of the cutter, and the crewman went out on the bridge to look for it. Within a minute, four of them (Ensign Wayne Shockley, the officer of the deck; Lt. Donald Shaffer; 1C quartermaster Kenneth Smith, and radioman Thomas Kirk) did indeed see a luminous object, moving fast on a horizontal trajectory from south to north—but to the west of them, not the northeast. Kirk, the first to spot it, shouted "Look at that star—it's moving!" The object, "similar in appearance to the planet Venus," disappeared into a cloudbank after being viewed for three seconds. At 5:31 radar contact was resumed, the target now being 175 miles north-northwest of the cutter; six minutes later it disappeared from the scope for the last time.

According to Ensign Shockley, "the radar contacts were sound and definite." On at least one occasion, the object abruptly stopped and reversed its direction. Lt. Shaffer, the *Sebago's* navigator, said the object's top speed, estimated from the radar returns, was 3,300 miles an hour. Cmdr. C. H. Waring, the ship's captain, confirmed that it had traveled at 1,000 mph at the least: "In about two minutes it went 33 miles straight away from the ship," as he told New Orleans Coast Guard officials later. (And these are probably nautical

miles, which means a speed of 1,150 land miles per hour.)

Readers of our articles on radar-observed UFOs (*Fantastic Universe*, February and March) will recognize how typical is this case, with its objects traveling erratically at speeds varying from zero to super-jet velocities, intermittently disappearing from the radarscope, and apparently showing curiosity about man-made vehicles. ("The course of the object up the side of the ship made people feel they were being observed," remarked Cmdr. Waring, as quoted in the *Times-Picayune*.) But here is what the Air Force said:

3. COAST GUARD CUTTER—

Gulf of Mexico (Object seen 3 seconds and radar contact)

Investigation based on data furnished by U. S. Coast Guard, indicated sighting four objects, three being radar and one visual, rather than one as has been widely reported. Radar returns on each of three contacts showed contact in almost direct opposite direction from preceding target, indicating spurious returns (false targets). However, a time-distance plot of two contacts indicated one target had approximate speed of 250 MPH and another a speed of 660 MPH, suggesting a propeller- and jet-type aircraft respectively. The one visual sighting for three seconds, described as bright, like a planet, moving at high speed, horizontally, also indicated high speed aircraft. The area of the sightings is the scene of many flights and operations by the Air Force and

Navy, too numerous to check out based on these reports.

EVALUATION: Aircraft, and possible spurious radar returns.

One would like to have seen the faces of Cmdr. Waring and his crewmen when they read this. As if they had never seen an airplane before! The observed 1,000-mph speed (actually 1,150 mph if they were nautical miles, but the Air Force investigator probably didn't know about nautical miles) has been arbitrarily reduced by one-third to make it a possible speed for a jet plane, and the completely un-planetlike hovering and violent maneuvers have been ignored—or shuffled off with a vague noise about "spurious returns," which will seem to mean something only to those who don't know anything about radar. (If it means that the blips were produced, or distorted, by some sort of atmospheric effects, it is nonsense: see our March article.) Just as in the other "evaluations," we see here a vacillation between *two* different, and indeed incompatible, interpretations of the data, neither of which has any real merit—except, of course, the merit of being a *non-UFO* interpretation.

Actually, although the radar returns are thoroughly typical of UFOs, the visual "confirmation" is quite possibly *spurious*. One could hardly expect the Air Force "investigators" to think of this—but the fact is that "Muttник," the second Russian satellite, was due to the west of that area at just about that time, was

traveling in a south-southwest to north-northeast direction, and would have presented exactly the appearance described. Tulane University astronomer J. F. Thomson thought of this immediately when told of the *Sebago's* observation, and in our opinion his suggestion was a valid one. Of course, Thomson could not account for the radar observations, since he added that "I do not believe in the UFO. I have no faith in it." (*Times-Picayune*). Cmdr. L. W. Tibbits, chief of the Eighth Coast Guard District's electronics section, valiantly attempted to attribute *the radar observations, too*, to Muttnik (with the assistance of "patches of ionized air," etc.), and thereby succeeded in producing an "explanation" even more preposterous than the Air Force's.

The fifth and last case mentioned by the Air Force in its Nov. 15 press release was the story told in Kearney, Nebraska, by grain buyer Reinhold Schmidt on the afternoon of November 5. Schmidt said that he had encountered a silvery blimp-shaped craft, which stalled his car's engine, on the ground near Kearney. A middle-aged crewman emerged and temporarily paralyzed him with a ray, but then relented and invited him inside the ship, saying, "We'll have to be here a little while; you might as well come inside." The crew, which was engaged in some sort of electrical repairs, consisted of four men and two women, to all appearances ordinary terrestrial specimens; among themselves they spoke "high

German," and the one who spoke English did not speak it very well. Schmidt received neither technical information nor uplifting messages from the taciturn crewmen during his half-hour in the translucent craft, which finally rose silently and vertically with the aid of two large propellers, and disappeared into the sky.

This story, and its sequels, appeared in nearly every newspaper in the country. Schmidt went to the police, who put him in jail, and grilled him without allowing him much sleep. On the 6th it was revealed that Schmidt had a record (in 1938) as an embezzler; and on the 7th, he was examined by psychiatrists, and committed to the State Hospital "for an indefinite period." This was a case after the Air Force's own heart.

5. *KEARNEY, Nebraska: (space ship incident)*

Investigation revealed that local officials consider originator wholly unreliable.

EVALUATION: Hoax.

Although the affair is perhaps not quite so "open-and-shut" as it might appear (the newspapers did not mention the fact that Schmidt had been released from the hospital), there seems to be little doubt that the Air Force has succeeded in including one correct "evaluation" among its five. The Schmidt story is doubtless to be put in the class of fictitious "contact" claims (see Isabel Davis's article in *F. U.*, November), though it lacks the messianic flavor usually associated with such claims.

Now, aside from these five re-

ports, there were scores of others—at least a hundred sightings, in less than a week!—by witnesses of acceptable veracity. The Air Force's sample represents only about 5% of the UFO reports of that period. What about the other 95%? (Some of these will be discussed in detail in next month's column.)

Of course, after seeing the Air Force's performance against the five cases it *did* elect to do battle with (obviously because they were the most widely publicized ones), we can have no doubt that it could have slain—to its *own* satisfaction—a hundred other flying-saucer dragons with equal ease. "Explanations" come easy, if one is sufficiently careless with the facts. In the first five years of its existence (1947-1952), the Air Force's Project Blue Book found that 26.94% of 1,593 sighting reports analyzed were classifiable as "Unknowns." (Ruppelt, p. 277.) But the "Fact Sheet" No. 1083-57 released on November 5 (which was publicized so widely on Nov. 7) declared that of the 250 reports received in the first half of 1957, only 1.9% (which figures out, incidentally, to four and three-quarters reports) had to go into the UFO category. "Reporting, investigation, analysis, and evaluation procedures have improved considerably," smugly explained the "Fact Sheet." Unfortunately for the Air Force's reputation, ten days after this boast it committed the indiscretion of exposing to public view a few specific examples of these "improved" procedures.

From these November examples and many others, we can see that the picture of their Project Blue Book so assiduously drawn by the Air Force public-relations officers—thorough investigation, technical personnel, evaluation by experts, “improved methods of analysis”—and thus conclusions invested with a high degree of infallibility—is not quite correct. The officers who put out these statements are entitled to think what they please about UFOs, but they are *not* entitled to make public misrepresentations. They are *not* entitled to claim that the Air Force is doing a proper job of scientific in-

quiry, when it is not doing anything of the kind—and refusing to give any of its material to a competent civilian agency that *would* do the job. Least of all are they entitled to treat civilian questions as a mere nuisance, civilian skepticism as a wound to their sensibilities, and civilian criticism as a form of blasphemy.

As one UFOlogist commented: “I’m perfectly convinced that the saucers come from space. But there is one thing that would make me doubt it: if the Air Force boys began to support the theory.”

MORE ABOUT OUR EXPLORER SATELLITE

The Explorer satellite, a cylinder eighty inches long with a tapered nose and a rocket nozzle at its rear, is gathering and transmitting to earth a variety of scientific data. Its speed is 19,400 miles per hour, a velocity greater than the Russian sputniks. The Jupiter-C rocket which threw the satellite 1,700 miles into space was developed by Dr. Wernher von Braun and his associates at the Army’s Ballistic Missile Agency at Huntsville, Alabama. The cosmic ray recording equipment in the satellite was developed in the laboratories of the University of Iowa, while the instruments for measuring micro-meteorite impact on the satellite were developed by a geophysics unit of the Air Force Research Centre; the satellite itself was assembled at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory of the California Institute of Technology under the direction of G.H. Ludwig of the University of Iowa.

The cylinder weighs a total of 30.8 pounds, of which 18.13 represents the satellite package. The weight of the instruments fitted into the satellite is 11 pounds, these including external temperature gauges; a package of instruments to measure the rain of cosmic rays from outer space and to gauge the density of micro-meteorites striking the satellite; and two transmitters for relaying information back to the ground. The higher-powered transmitter (with two pounds of batteries), radiating sixty milliwatts on a frequency of 108.03 megacycles (the approved IGY frequency) was only expected to last a few weeks; the other, radiating 10 to 20 milliwatts on a frequency of 108 megacycles, was expected to keep operating for perhaps three months.

little green men

by . . . John Nicholson

Here is a different kind of extraterrestrial, much less glamorous than the men and women reported by contactees.

THERE is a tendency, in UFO-minded circles, to ignore the fact that *two* distinct types of contacts with extraterrestrials have been reported—contacts with tall, golden-haired and wise “Teachers,” and contacts with little green men, sometimes extremely aggressive, described as anywheres from two and a half to four feet in height.

Admittedly, some of these reports may have been inspired by movies like *INVASION OF THE SAUCER MEN*, recently seen in the neighborhood theaters, where the little men were satisfactorily gruesome (as extraterrestrials always are in Grade C movies), cluck-clucking away as they scared the life out of youngsters whose necking they were interrupting. The little men obviously did not believe in romance.

There is an understandable tendency to dismiss many of these stories as hoaxes, inspired by Frank Scully’s famous report in 1949 of crashed discs and three-foot occupants, but this is a dangerously easy way to dismiss the possibility that some of these UFOs which are rude enough to keep popping up all over the place *are* machines piloted, for one or another practical reason, by unusually

Our cover shows an American Eagle attacking a little green man, emerging from a saucer that has crashed in the mountains. Here is a discussion of the often overlooked appearances of these little green men in saucer sightings, and of the reactions of the men and the women who have seen them.

small humanoids. We can, of course, as the editor of this magazine pointed out in a recent speech, shut our eyes and insist that the things don't really exist, but when we open our eyes, once more, the blasted things have refused to cooperate and are still there! In other words, while many sightings and contacts are perhaps hoaxes or hallucinations, there is a mounting and impressive body of evidence which cannot be ignored, evidence which leads the objective observer to believe that to dismiss the field as the latest of the mirages exciting a credulous public is not only unjustified—but also dangerous.

We have no way of knowing whether an American Eagle has found itself attacking one of these little men, as shown on the cover of this issue, but an astonishing number of people, here and abroad, testify jointly to the undoubted *existence* of these little men.

Let's take the "Steep Rock Episode," the description of which was first published in *Steep Rock Echo* for September-October, 1950. About dusk, on July 2, 1950, a couple who had been fishing in Steep Rock Lake, Ontario, saw a flying saucer land on the water. Ten occupants of this UFO, each apparently about three and a half feet tall, came out and walked on top of the saucer, their movements like automata rather than living beings (so the report has it), apparently taking on water through a hose.

Take the Marble Creek sightings

in California. On May 20th, and again on June 20th, 1953, two miners, John Q. Black and John Van Allen, reported seeing a strange silver object composed of two large discs of metal twelve feet wide and about seven thick, which landed on a sand bar at the junction of the Jordan and Marble Creeks in Butte County, California. The two men were a hundred feet away and watched as a "being," who looked like a broad-shouldered man about four feet tall, descended by a rope ladder. The "being" filled what looked like a bucket with water and handed it to something (or somebody) inside the UFO which took off as soon as they were aware of the two men's presence. Black later reported that he had found two campfires near the sand bar "around which were five-inch footprints. The failure of the UFO to return on July 20th caused Black to be branded as a hoaxer, but researchers have accepted the report as genuine.

Some years earlier, on August 19, 1949, two Death Valley, California, prospectors had reported seeing a disc crash-land and two little men jump out. The men chased the beings but lost them in the dunes; when they got back, the disc had disappeared.

In August, 1952, James Allen, of West Lumberton, North Carolina, said that an eight-foot saucer grazed his chimney and landed in his yard. A small man, described as about "thirty inches tall," came out of the saucer but when Allen asked whether

he was hurt he climbed back in and took off.

Morris K. Jessup, in *THE EXPANDING CASE FOR THE UFO*, mentions the 1950 report of a flying saucer wreck near Mexico City, the dead pilot described as twenty-three inches high. Several saucers are said to have been inspected by (anonymous) scientists, thirty-four corpses, measuring between thirty-six and forty inches in height, being found in three of these crashed UFO. All the bodies are described as "well formed," as were the dead men, less than four feet tall, according to British sources describing a similar wreck, described in Dorothy Kilgallen's famous 1955 report.

Way back in May of 1909, in the Caerphilly Mountains, in Wales, a man named Lithbridge saw a large "tube-shaped" object sitting on the grass beside the road. In it were two men wearing "heavy fur overcoats." When they saw Mr. Lithbridge, they spoke excitedly in a foreign language, and sailed away. Newspapermen visiting the place found trampled grass and a scattering of debris.

Little helmeted figures without apparent arms are reported in several French sightings in 1954. On September 26th, a Madame Leboeuf, in Chabeuil, saw one such man. She thought at first that it was some new type of scare-crow, for it looked as if it was wrapped in a cellophane bag. Suddenly "it" began to approach her and she fled in fright, hiding behind a hedge, with her head

in her hands. A moment later she saw an object rise swiftly, neighbors finding a ten-foot circular impression in the ground in her garden where the object had apparently rested. The cornstalks had been flattened, and several branches of trees had been broken overhead.

The helmeted little men who embrace the startled people whom they meet have somewhat more aggressive counterparts, however. In the Cincinnati area there are the occasionally seen "strange little men about three feet tall," and in Hopkinsville there were the three-foot-tall green men, with hands like claws, understandably annoyed when the frightened Kentucky farmer shot at them.

In Venezuela, in November of 1954, there were a series of incidents involving aggressive beings, furry or hairy, three to four feet tall, with long arms and claw-like hands, enlarged heads with a pair of enormous eyes, and wearing what appeared to be something similar to a loin cloth. These beings would attack anyone stumbling upon them, the victims being hospitalized with lacerations and suffering from shock. In one case a meat delivery truck on their way to a sausage factory, found the way blocked by a luminous sphere, ten feet in diameter, hovering a few feet above the street. As the two men in the truck jumped out they found a man the size of a dwarf coming at them, a dwarf strong enough to knock one of them a distance of fifteen feet. Two other little men joined in the fray. Gonzales,

one of the truckmen, pulled a knife on the approaching glowing-eyed dwarf. To his surprise, the blade slid off as if he was striking metal. Minutes later the sphere shot off, the little men inside.

By way of contrast there is the little green man who approached the home of a man in Everittstown, New Jersey, only the other month. A luminous egg-shaped object, nine to twelve feet long, was hovering a few feet off the ground, in front of the barn, while the little man approached the house.

The little man is described as two and a half to three feet high, dressed in a green suit with shiny buttons, with a green hat like a tam and gloves with a shiny object at the tip of each glove. He had a putty-colored face, a nose and a chin, and large protuberant frog-like eyes. In a voice that seemed "sharp and scary" to the frightened man facing him, he apparently said, "We are peaceful people. We don't want no trouble. We just want your dog." (There is an interesting pattern, there, of the frequent interest of these little men in dogs.) The reply was a frightened and angry, "Get the hell out of here!", and "get" they did. . . .

Here, then, is a different and far less publicized aspect of the contact picture. In the above, and many other incidents, strange little men, varying from the grotesque to the "pretty," have had brief and generally abrupt contacts with our citizenry. These are no glamorous, soulful, golden-haired people, preaching the rather curious contactee gospel reported by some. These are strange and often "alien" beings, apparently frightening in their very difference, rejected ("Get the hell out of here!") and perhaps even described exaggeratedly by witnesses whose instinctive revulsion affected their reactions.

Who *are* these little men?

We still don't know, but it seems obvious that these little men—these "little green men"—do exist. . . .

The above is based on material appearing in CSI Newsletter No. 10, December 15, 1957; C.R.I.F.O. Orbit, Sept. 2, 1955, and Oct. 7, 1955; "Saucer Landings and Little Men," an address in 1956 by Ted Bloecher, Research Director, Civilian Saucer Intelligence; and "The Expanding Case for the UFO," by M. K. Jessup (1957, Citadel Press).

