

FANTASTIC UNIVERSE

SCIENCE FICTION

JAN

35c

1950

THE ENLIGHTENED ONES

A New Novelet by
EDMUND COOPER

WARD OF THE ARGONAUT

AN UNPUBLISHED
GAVAGAN'S BAR STORY

By L. SPRAGUE DE CAMP
and FLETCHER PRATT

DAN GALOUYE
HARRY HARRISON

BERTRAM CHANDLER
ROBERT MOORE WILLIAMS



now
the
nonterrestrial

by . . . *Ivan T. Sanderson*

What should an intelligent being from outside our solar system look like and have any visited this planet?

THERE has been a great deal of talk throughout history and, it would seem, since early prehistoric times about the presence in our midst of intelligent beings that, for some reason, were considered not to be indigenous to this earth. Stone Age artists depicted monstrous-looking beings of humanoid type which they appear to have regarded as supernatural or at least unnatural and quite distinct from mere foreigners from other lands, on the one hand, and from gods on the other. Almost all if not entirely all religions affirm in their early formative periods the existence of beings both superior and in some respects — though mostly morally — inferior but nonetheless intelligent, which are alleged to be out of this world. Primitive monotheists such as the Semitic resisters of *Yahweh*, the Zoroastrians, the West African animists, and even the Australoid tribesmen, from the first, asserted that there were intermediaries between their miserable selves and the Almighty — superior beings but not themselves gods nor any more the "sons of God" than are men. The great teachers, from the prophets of Sumeria and Ancient Egypt to the

Ivan T. Sanderson, who has been interested in Ufology for many years, continues his challenging series of articles in which he explores possible explanations of the phenomena. He is the author of numerous books including the recent MONKEY KINGDOM and LIVING MAMMALS OF THE WORLD (Hanover House).

Gautama Buddha, Christ, and even Mohammed, affirmed the same. The Angels were the *Messengers* of God; plain straightforward folk like us, different only in that they had had longer to learn the ways of the Almighty—ways that can only result in greater intelligence, purity, and understanding.

Sweep away all the dross of ethics and morals and other irksome disciplines devised by and necessary for a life-form (such as ourselves) struggling up from unknowingness, through stupidity, to some enlightened understanding of things, and much of the alleged mystical pronouncements of the ancients don't look quite so puerile. Even the matter of devils becomes less lugubrious and if you will reread what is written about these characters you will note that, although they are credited with all manner of malevolence and almost a corner in evil, they appear as not really evil themselves, but just wicked and profoundly different. The Devil is a bogeyman to us but to the ancients he had a lighter side, and a darned efficient organization too, if we are to believe the early scribes.

These are very basic religious questions that do not further concern us except to demonstrate that throughout the ages there has been a persistent acceptance—rather than a mere belief—that there are in existence more enlightened and competent beings than our own kind and that they don't dwell here habitually, but come down here out of the sky,

and seem—as we say today—not to have been evolved here.

The gamut of these types is, however, rather extensive and is not confined to mere godlets, angels, devils, and humanoid messengers, but has always included also a considerable galaxy of *Little Folk* such as fairies, pixies, and similar entities called throughout the world by all manner of names such as *dwendies*, in Central America, and *chongolis* in inner China. (It would seem that the “—is” sound almost universally denotes smallness). These little ones have never been regarded as particularly decent or indecent, holy or evil, but to be either a nuisance or mysteriously magnanimous though always aloof, unpredictable, and altogether “not-of-us.” While human beings have sometimes readily given themselves to the devil and always stood in utter awe of the Angels, they seem never to have known quite what to do about the little folk. Basically, men have always seemed scared stiff of them and, failing to be able to please them either by good deeds or bad, have just put out little bowls of honey for them and hoped for the best.

Then again, there is another mysterious fact about history. If you dig back to the earliest records of any nation or tribal group you will invariably come up against the statement, in one form or another that “In the beginning there came to our country *men* who taught us . . . etc.” And the emphasis here is on the word *Men*. These were never al-

leged to be gods or even super-beings but plain, straightforward earthly men—though usually pale-skinned, with beards, having ships and clothes, and knowing about agriculture and building in stone. The statement itself is a contradiction in terms because if *people came*, there were people there already, and those who came must have come from somewhere else and been *there* already. Professor William James Perry of Liverpool University in his remarkable book *The Growth of Civilization*, (1924, Dutton, New York) has sought to show—and not, indeed, without great cogency—that all these people who *came* to other lands throughout the world were the descendants of those first people who discovered that plants gave rise to seeds which, when planted gave rise to more plants and thus discovered agriculture (probably on the banks of one of the great rivers flowing through the northern deserts, such as the Nile, that bring floods once a year) and thus founded settled civilization. His belief is that they spread slowly all over the earth, carrying with them this novel idea of *planting* food instead of collecting it, and the concomitant ideas of village life, stone buildings, astronomy, religion such as we know it, metallurgy, boating, and all the rest.

Professor Perry may have something here or he may have become over-enthusiastic, but that is really beside the point, which is that these people who *came* to other lands in

turn asserted universally they did not invent these useful processes themselves, but that *they* "got them from the gods." This may have been only a polite form of diplomacy or an easy way out of awkward questions, but then, tracing these Children of the Sun back to their original *mastaba* tombs, megalithic monuments, and other early evidences of what we call civilization, we run smack into a real problem. Where is the enormously long period of evolution needed to evolve the very things they seem to have possessed? It simply is not there in the archaeological record.

If the Children of the Sun were missionaries from the first center of established civilization, wherever that may have been, they would seem to have appeared first in those very river valleys mentioned above—the Nile, Tigris-Euphrates, and Indus; and possibly the Ganges, Brahmaputra, the Yangtse-Kiang, though the last three did not flood annually—bringing with them their full blown and highly advanced culture. As to where they came from we do not know though all sorts of suggestions have been made. For instance, the Dynastic Egyptians were once thought to have come from the Hadramaut in southern Arabia. The only practical suggestion, however, seems to be the one that is most frowned upon; namely, that they came from some lands that lay in the central Atlantic and that they were the last wave of peoples to leave those lands as they gradually

sank, starting in 25,000 B.C. when their fisherfolk quit and landed on the western fringes of Europe—the Cro-Magnons — and continuing in the form of the Magdalenians, the Azilians, and Capsians, and finally the Iberians. The idea is that the leaders or most civilized communities from the cultural center of those sinking lands left last, in ships, and fanned out all over the world. Those who believe in this theory used to assert that “civilization” was discovered and slowly developed in those lands, over an immense period of time, and “ending” about 8000 B.C. when the last land sank in a cataclysm, a tradition of which lingered in the writings of the Greek, Plato. However, the practitioners who reached other lands, always insisted that they got *their* knowledge from outsiders.

This is an irksome question that stampedes all scientists and thoroughly alarms the average person. Yet, it is by no means as bad as something much more concrete that has come up recently and which has been not only talked about but also most heartily endorsed by certain scientists, technicians, historians, government officials, and others of like standing and of altogether acceptable orthodox scientific training. The problem was succinctly summarized in a radio broadcast discussion in the Sunday series entitled *The Georgetown University Forum* that has been maintained over a radio station in Washington, D. C., by Georgetown University for many

years and which is most widely and universally respected for its high intellectual integrity and scientific accuracy. To summarize briefly, this is the pith of what was then said.*

Some years ago a Mr. Arlington H. Mallery, a retired engineer, became interested in some ancient maps discovered by a Turkish naval officer in Istanbul and presented to our Library of Congress. These maps were drawn at about the time of Columbus but were stated to have been copies of very much more ancient maps that were customarily used by mariners for centuries before that time, and which, in fact, stemmed from maps compiled by the Alexandrine Greeks and other eastern Mediterraneans in Roman times, again, in accord with even earlier maps stemming from Ancient Egypt and/or other still earlier civilizations. The maps had been considered interesting museum pieces but were neglected, stored, and forgotten. Mr. Mallery was led to them through his many years of research into ancient iron artifacts in America, other evidences of a Pre-Amerindian race in North America, and of the very great changes in our shore and coastlines since the retreat of the last Ice Advance (now known, from radio-carbon dating, to have occurred only about 10,000 years ago). He had heard that there were ancient maps

*Reprints of transcripts of this program are available from that station and make some of the most extraordinary reading of anything that has been published in this century. It is the standing of the participants in that discussion which lends the whole thing its startling aspects.

in existence that, though made in Europe or Asia, showed the American coastline.

When he rediscovered these—now called the Piri Reis Maps—he found that, while landmasses were depicted out in and beyond the great oceans that were shown as surrounding the main continent of Eurasia, they looked to be purely imaginary lands. Besides, even the “known” world centered around the Mediterranean, was all cockeyed; yet, when he examined the details, he found to his astonishment that by going slowly along any coast from some known point (like the township of Marseilles, that was on both these ancient and modern maps, and which has existed for centuries and not moved its position) every little promontory, inlet and island was there and *in the right order* but *out of position*. It was, Mr. Mallery tells me, just as if the original mapmakers had charted the whole coastline of the world accurately but then lacked any concept of latitude or longitude and so had no way of transferring their linear discoveries on to a two-dimensional surface. At first, in fact, he considered the possibility that the original draftsmen might have thought the earth to be flat; but, even adjusting for this idea, he still found the relative positions of all recognizable points to be altogether inaccurate and, in fact, perfectly whacky. Then he noticed something else—namely, that they were all *equally* whacky in certain particular mathematical respects. This could only

mean one thing and was a very great discovery, for it showed that these cartographers *did* use some kind of what is called a *grid* on which to plot their charted details. What was this grid?

To make a long story short, Mr. Mallery went to work with Mr. M. I. Walters, of the U. S. Hydrographic Office, and after much patient research, they found a grid that fitted the maps. They then *corrected* the maps from that grid to one of our own modern projections and something altogether amazing emerged.

These ancient maps—the originals from which they had been copied dated at the latest 3000 B.C.—showed the *entire world* in great detail and absolute accuracy and included not only the coastlines of the Americas but also that of the entire Antarctic, and, in addition, displayed a plethora of mountain ranges in the middle of all the great land-masses that most accurately depicted not only those we know but numbers of others in certain unexplored regions of northern North America and in Antarctica that we did not know—the latter in places that are now covered with a continuous, smooth dome of ice estimated to be almost two miles thick! Only in some limited areas did the coastlines *not* coincide with modern maps but it was this very fact that most startled Mr. Mallery, for some of these were spots covered by his previous researches into changing coastlines, and in each case the old maps coincided with his findings. In other

words, they showed where the coastlines should have been seven to ten thousand years ago according to his findings from quite other sources. Then Mr. Walters made another most remarkable and chance discovery.

Going over certain U. S. Army maps—or rather surveys—that had just been completed in northern Canada and its great arctic islands and which had not been published, since these lands had never before been mapped, he found to his amazement that whole mountain ranges had come to light that had until then (1952) been quite unknown to the modern world, but all of which were on these ancient Piri Reis maps and *in the right places* and of the right shape, size, and orientation. Greatly mystified, he and Mr. Malley then went to the Reverend Daniel Linehan, S. J., Director of Weston Observatory of Boston College, Chief Seismologist to the U. S. Navy IGY explorations in Antarctica, and showed him all the mountain ranges and the coastlines in that continent, shown on the ancient maps. Almost unbelievably, Father Linehan states on the broadcast named above that one and all of these physical features that have subsequently been investigated by scientific depth-soundings made through the ice by Task Force 43, have proved to exist just as shown on the Piri Reis maps.

Now this poses a question indeed. Who was boating all around the American continents and Antarctica

before the ice-cap formed on the latter, and who penetrated the inner recesses of northern Canada and its great islands at that time?

You can't beg the question and say that the maps were made only at the time of Columbus because, first, the Americas, let alone Antarctica, were unknown at that time and, second, if they had been known they would already have been covered with ice so that said mountains and coastlines would not have been available for charting. As the learned but admittedly mystified gentlemen on that program confessed, the thing defies comprehension unless (1) there were expert surveyors and cartographers with very precise instruments who knew that the world was a globe drifting in space, before 3000 B.C. and (2) these personages (or beings) had not only most seaworthy ships *but also flying devices of some sort*, for, it was their express belief that those inland mountain ranges could not have been mapped so accurately by even the best equipped teams travelling over the surface of the earth.

Here is a pretty one! This is not a science-fiction story, believe me; nor is it a report on some theory developed by some hard-working individual with a mission, either erudite and sound, or uneducated and mystic. It is a sober report by top-notch Government-paid technical scientists of the highest probity, and made public withal on a respected radio broadcast in our national capital. There is no question of trickery or fakery

here. The maps are genuine; there for all to see; and have been in the safekeeping of our Congress for years. These findings cannot be denied. They have got to be explained, and there is only one possible explanation—namely, shortly after the retreat of the last Ice Advance, or shift in the whole earth's crust, which moved, among other things, that part of the land we call the Great Lakes area out from under the North Pole, there were intelligent creatures on this planet who had some kind of airplanes, most advanced surveying instruments, and a knowledge of tridimensional geography that beats ours. Who were these beings, where did they come from, and where did they go?

The whole business, of course, conflicts in every way with all the findings of anthropology, archaeology, and history. Despite the four ice-advances during the immediately past few hundred thousand years, a fairly continuous and orderly evolution of both human beings and their artifacts leading to civilization has been unearthed all over the world. True, there are some nasty ones like another discovery of Dr. Mallery's (which has now been seconded by both the Smithsonian Institute and the U. S. Bureau of Standards who ran the tests) namely, that some people seven thousand years ago were also making steels in the form of alloys that require 9000° C. for their manufacture. And, who had furnaces of that nature, then? There are also these

myths and traditions mentioned at the outset, first, of superior beings; then of messengers looking like us; then, of those bearded gentry who "came to our country in the first times"; and finally, of these other superior beings from whom they in turn got their knowledge of sunworship, building in stone, seamanship, etc. And all the time, there are the little pixies and fairies bobbing in and out of history apparently participating neither in our own earthly progress nor the affairs of these superior types. What are we to make of all this?

I have thought long and profoundly on this tangled skein, and I have tried to talk to all manner of people who should know about the matter but I find that people either just don't want to talk about it at all or, while expressing stunned amazement if not outright doubt, simply do not care to interpret any mystery in their own field through evidence in another field. Thus, the anthropologist will not as yet accept or even go into the evidence of the metallurgists or hydrographers, while the archaeologist won't even accept some of the findings of the anthropologist. Therefore, I cannot record *any* balanced theories and can only offer a series of my own in the form of simple equations.

There seems to be (and to have been for some time) only one intelligent life-form on this earth—*i.e.* Man, as we call him. We may find that Hominoids (that is man-like creatures) have been around a

lot longer than we recently supposed—*vide*, the very man-like ape known as *Oreopithecus*, many bones of which have come from coal mines of the Miocene Age in Italy, in coal laid down 10 million years ago. Moreover, despite many things doubtless still to be discovered about our ancestry, we do seem to have *evolved here* and from a common ancestor with the living apes and both of us from monkey-like forebears stemming from Lemurs, and so on. The point is, there is every evidence that there has been a continuous line of ascent from the "animal" to the "intelligent," and in culture from the collecting, to the hunting, to the agricultural, to the industrial. There are funny things like this sudden appearance of the Aurignacian culture, but then sunken islands could explain this. Everything else appears to be fairly orderly and progressive. But then come along items like these damned maps, and those even more profoundly damned steel and pewter artifacts taken out of solid oolitic limestone and which could only have been sealed in there for seventy *million* years. There are, in fact, lots of things that don't fit into the orderly and "logical" time scale. The vast ruins of Ponape Island in the Pacific, and the holes bored by *marine* animals in the walls of Tiahuanaco (see Harold T. Wilkins, *Mysteries of Ancient South America*) now two miles high in Peru, don't fit at all. Phoenician cities in the Amazon Basin with inscriptions in two scripts

giving the names and dates (887-856 B.C.) of kings of Tyre and Sidon in Palestine don't figure (see L. Schwennhagen, *Antiga Historia do Brazil*, 1928); nor do over thirty thousand clay figurines including representations of one- and two-horned rhinoceroses, and of elephants, found in Guanajuato in Mexico; nor circular stone forts with steel implements in the northern Rockies; nor, above all, the circular forts of Scotland and Ireland with their granite ramparts partly melted to glass, *on their* upper edges, mark you, which is something that we cannot do except with atomic heats! Then, add to these the ancient myths and traditions of superior beings who taught our rude ancestors all these things, and of great civilizations that either died away or *went away*, and one begins to wonder. All these equations have an "x" in them and the more I have pondered this, the more I have begun to wonder whether there may not be, in truth, but a single missing factor that may replace this unknown.

It is my frank thought that there is, and that this is simply "*outside influence*."

Supposing that evolution has proceeded in an orderly manner on this planet just as the record of the rocks and our spades have shown—*vis-a-vis* our species and other earthly animals and plants, that is—there is still no reason why it should preclude other orderly evolutions elsewhere. Surely the Almighty did not confine such a process to but one

planet going around one common-place sun. Why, Nature by herself will apparently kick-off "life" on a hydrocarbon basis anywhere that there is enough water between certain temperatures, and given some time. Supposing also that not just one but sundry life forms finally attained to intelligence (whatever that may be) and got to space travel; natural curiosity alone might eventually bring them around to our watery planet. Don't forget that water is the most remarkable substance in the universe and really rather rare, so that hydrocarbon-based life-forms would naturally tend to single out water-planets first. Not just one but dozens, hundreds, thousands, hundreds of thousands, or millions of different life-forms may, in the infinity of past time, have come by here. They may have come and then gone again; they may have stayed and minded their own business, or they may have interfered; they may even have settled and colonized. If the "x" in all these conundrums that modern science is unearthing in increasing numbers, is just this factor, then we have to do a spot of reappraisal of many things. Let us start with the modern reports of "visitations" from without this earth.

These fall into four main categories: (1) Unknowns in machines—*vide*, "flying saucers" and certain other Ufos, and such entities in "space-suits" as the so-called "Flatwoods Monster" from Sutton, West Virginia (1951), (2) Disembodied entities of all kinds ranging from

Poltergeists and some Ghosts to all manner of mystical entities. (3) Human or humanoid messengers or "gods" in the animistic sense, such as the Martian, Venusians, and all the other "beautiful people" of the Contacters, *plus* Angels, and the majority of "devils"—at least those that don't immediately dissolve in puffs of sulphurous vapour—, and these *Messengers* of the ancients. And, (4) the Little People, ranging from the for-some-reason so-called "Little Green Men" (though one and all have been reported to be aluminum-colored, though sometimes wearing green clothes) to the traditional pixies, gnomes, fairies, elves, dwendies, chumbies, and what have you. There are also types that do not seem to fall into any one of these categories but their numbers are so few in comparison to the overwhelming historical galaxy of these four that they may be excluded and disregarded for now. Let us, then, analyze these four main types.

There is little to be said at this juncture about the first lot. Until we get one, we might as well confine our activities to recording sightings and trying to analyze the physical features and actions of their machines. Only in the very rare cases where the "pilot" has been observed outside one, should we pause to consider. I investigated one of these cases—the famed Flatwoods business—myself and very thoroughly. It is a story in itself that I would like to tell one day in this magazine, and it has some fascinating aspects

that have not so far been published. The two important ones are that the machine (a pear-shaped object that glowed but which was not hot) *landed*, and something very like a modern deep-sea diving device came out of it and floated in the air like a balloon; but, more important, both this and the main machine completely *dissolved* or vaporized in a matter of forty-five minutes. This may explain many things about at least some of those Ufos that are constructions. They could come from places that are of a very different temperature to the surface of this earth or from ones that have different atmospheres so that the metals or plastics of which they are made, rapidly vaporize in our combination of oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and so on. Be it noted that there were six machines flying in formation over Flatwoods when they hit an updraft of air coming from the industrial area of West Virginia and which that day was filled with impurities such as carbon monoxide and still further polluted with smog from vast forest fires further south. Many Ufos may simply not be able to land, any more than we will be able to do for a very long time under the miles deep sea of methane that is believed to cover Jupiter.

The matter of Disembodied Entities (No. 2, above) frankly alarms me. I personally am very pragmatic, being trained as a biologist. I don't like things I can't measure, put in a bottle, or skin and stuff for museum

exhibit. I have not investigated any ghosts (though I have seen some pretty inexplicable things that didn't seem to have respectable *bodies* and which I like to think were all imagination, or due to a sluggish liver or bad liquor) and I have read a lot about them, but I don't propose to investigate any. This is not to deny that they can exist or that there is a vast body of reports and some evidence to substantiate their existence. Still, I cannot see what they can add to history or reality at this point, unless they are prepared to come down to earth, as it were, and give us some concrete facts with equally physical proof of the matters with which we are here concerned, in the form of, say, some more maps, a key to deciphering some writings that tell us where they grew the food to support the labor that built Ponape which is now bang-smack in the middle of a vast ocean, or something else really useful of that nature. But ghosts, spirits, and other disembodied entities have throughout the ages steadfastly refused to do anything like this. They just go on haunting and usually moaning. Perhaps, if they do exist, even without a physical existence, they are just too dumb or uneducated to know anything or even to speak. In fact, I'm not at all sure they may not be mere projections and I don't think they can add anything to our discussion.

The third type of "visitor" is quite another matter. Let us take the modern ones (post Kenneth Arnold, 1947) first. These—the

"splendours" of Adamski, Menger, Betherun, *et alia*,—are not by any means uniquely a post-Arnold development. They go back to most ancient times. They all have one thing in common, namely, they *preach* rather than *teach*, and they have an extraordinary ability to appear always to be completely contemporary with the cultures to which they preach. This is very suspect but, it must be admitted, not a complete illogicality. We are starting to tamper with the bodily forms of animals (*vide*, experiments on pollywogs to get extra legs, *etc.*) and primitive tribesmen centuries ago imitated the cries of animals well enough to fool the creatures themselves. A scientist has just broken the most improbable script (see *Scientific American*, July, 1958) used by the extinct Easter Islanders, and it would be no problem to "break" the code of our language, learn it, and use it in contacting us.

If the "Angels" of the ancients were but superior beings made (and perhaps by their own surgeons) in *our* rather than God's image they might well have impressed mere men, even if they did not provide any concrete evidence of any great scientific mysteries. They might also, in time, have acquired wings on their shoulders that were really on the aerial machines they used to land on dreary deserts. Both they and their modern counterparts are certainly more interested in preaching ideas than in teaching practical science but who are we to say that the

end product of knowledge may not be nothing more than ideas, and anybody who has perfected space travel must be pretty intelligent and advanced. Yet, there is a vast impracticality about these modern human-type visitors which is not compatible with that advanced intelligence—at least to our present way of thinking. Why do they persist in picking out almost the least important people to contact and ones who, however worthy, upright and reliable previously, are most likely to be disbelieved thereafter, and thus able to do least in "furthering the cause." Perhaps there is a plan in all this, and "prophets" ultimately *do* achieve more change in the long run than princes and emperors or even scientists. It is a humbling thought and I'm quite prepared to accept it, but still, I would indeed wish that these "modern angels" would drop the communist party line, write down some of their ideas, give us a few formulae (for the edification of our primitive minds), and present some evidence both of their existence and of the value and validity of their doctrines.

So then we come to devils. These I personally dig; they are so much more down to earth and practical. They *do* things (however unpleasant) rather than *preaching* pleasantries. They are warm and nasty instead of cold and aloof, and they appear to have a lot of reptilian qualities like tails, scales, and funny feet, horns, lots of teeth, and so forth. They can be attacked and

beaten up if they make nasty stinks. But just where do they fit in, and can there be any logical explanation of the concept? I have heard one that seems to cover all others and it goes as follows:

Intelligent life does not have to be evolved just as it has on this earth. It could have arisen on a rather hotter planet and in a form that looks to us like (but is not, of course, genetically related to) the reptilian on this planet. These could have scales or wear scaly space-suits and have tails with a terminal spike (like our lions), horns or other head-protuberances, and what we call cloven-hoofs like our antelopes and pigs and so forth. They could even lay eggs. They might carry trident-like weapons and be naturally a bit rough and even flesh-eaters. After all, most of us are! Most important of all, they may be rather a nuisance in our part of this galaxy or in the universe generally, and apt to muscle in on other peoples' territories (planets) and even to put up armed resistance when reprimanded by godly and benign entities who regard said planets to be a sort of cosmic farm for their own special deliction. In fact, they might be rather "sporting" types, who favor a bit of fire and brimstone (nuclear and chemical) occasionally to get something done, and who don't mind a few lesser entities (ourselves) getting singed, any more than we suffer sleepless nights over the rodents killed when we fire grasslands for crop improvement.

Like other types they may have been coming here from time to time but with more practical than lofty intentions and either had to be driven off (see the Book of Revelations) or to have just left voluntarily and in disgust due to the cold or the tastelessness of the food, like a modern epicure quitting modern English cooking. You may smile or be horrified at this whole concept but there is nothing illogical in it nor is there anything sacrilegious; and if you don't believe me, please reread your Bible.

I place the devils along with the angels because they appear to be traditionally also of about our size and not always *too* unlike us in form (apart from tails and some lesser frills) and outlook. They don't seem to have bothered to mimic us or even to learn our complex languages, but they do seem to think and act more like us than do the angels—alas—and, above all, they are *interested*. The last remaining category (No. 4, above) of beings apparently are for the most part not so, but for some very strange reason, they seem always to have been distinctly interested in our animals. This is most bizarre.

Coming then to these Little Folk, we meet a most peculiar state of affairs. Rather than go over the vast field of record or alleged records of these creatures, we may start by summing up certain aspects of the problem. There is a composite "little man" that is surprisingly unvaried. First, he (or it) is only slightly man-

shaped, being between two-and-a-half and three-and-a-half feet tall, having a large head, a barrel-like torso with prominent ribs, short, spindly legs ending in stubby feet or some kind of suckers, very long, dangling, slender arms, jointed like ours and ending in paw-like hands with only *four* digits, all bearing large, curved claws. They are almost always said to be hairless, to have enormous staring eyes that reflect yellow light rays, no apparent nose, a wide slit for a mouth, and huge ears shaped like those of an elephant, but put on upside down with the long points at the back and sticking upwards. They are reported as a dull but apparently metallic gray and to wear a wide variety of clothing, from leafy-capes in Central America, to little green jackets with brass buttons in France and Canada. They are often associated with alleged large aerial objects seen to "land" in the vicinity (*vide*, Hopkinsville) and seem just to pop up, and always at night, as if from nowhere and often on roads or near human habitations.

In character they are indeed said to be gnome-like and they have invariably given human beings an advanced case of the "willies." In fact, very few of those who allege they have encountered such creatures, ever want to talk about them again. This is the exact opposite of the "contacters" who never stop talking about their alleged contacts—(see *Meet the Extraterrestrial* by Isabel Davis in FU for November, 1957).

Moreover, they have only very seldom if ever been alleged to speak anything comprehensible or even to make noises. They are sometimes slightly aggressive but always very ready to defend themselves and they are curious in a queer kind of off-hand way. The "fairy-wand," scintillating like a star at the end of a short metallic rod, has recently cropped up in these stories too, and so also have gnome-like hoods, burned circles in grass meadows, and lots of other traditional items, all of which makes one wonder. There is a most interesting story out of Canada (see the *Steep Rock Echo*, for September, 1950) that a couple with their son on a fishing trip saw a lense-shaped machine floating on the surface of a lake and taking water aboard through hoses manipulated by just such little creatures wearing bright green suits, and when they realized they were being observed, they whipped in the hoses, closed a hatch, and took off with a whoosh but abandoned one little character who slipped into the water and sank. The craft left a fine golden metallic film on the water that spread out over the lake.

There is much further information offered on the behavior of these little people. They are often said to fly or rather to be able to "sail" up off the ground to considerable heights such as on to tree branches or roof tops, or horizontally through the air, and to be impervious to projectiles, from stones to rifle bullets, hurled at them, just bouncing

backwards from the impacts with metallic *boings* like that made by empty buckets. Trolls had the same abilities we are told, and fairies usually flitted about like great dragonflies. Some seem to be able to walk up perpendicular faces, while others appear to crawl rather than to walk. Odd as these descriptions may sound to rational people there is, if we are perfectly honest with ourselves and remain logical about the matter, an extraordinary ring of authenticity about them and the people who have made the modern reports are of an altogether higher probity and much greater known integrity than the contacters of heavenly blondes. Numbered among their ranks are quite a high proportion of police officers and as many women as men, which latter is not the case with the contacters.

So what can we make of all this? Are we to suppose that our earth has been visited not only throughout historical times but throughout geological eons by all manner of different intelligent beings? Unless all the historical and modern stories are simply untrue, for one or more reasons, this must be the case. The obvious ripost to which is, why haven't we got a single one yet? To this there are many answers, the most obvious of which is that we probably *have* but have either deliberately thrown it away in one manner or another as being too horrid or unfitting to show, or because we have not recognized it for what it really is. History, news re-

ports, and scientific literature are shot through with anachronisms and the unexplained. There are lots of items in museums that are mislabelled. Yet nobody that I know of has a fairy's skull, a devil's hoof, or a little platinum man's skin, any more than we have a Venusian book, or a Martian photograph. Yet we do seem to have some very strange maps, some very ancient nails, and some colossal monuments.

Could it be that one or other of these types (though I would like to exclude the disembodied,—*i. e.* No. 2, above) came here, did a grand survey, taught a few Stone Age humans to hold a pen and read a compass, built them a few stone forts, and then took off on the next leg of their surveying trip around this part of the Milky Way? Could it be that, meantime, some scaly characters came along for a spot of hunting; that light-bodied, little chaps with stick-like flashlights also arrived from time to time for a summer's camping or mushroom-picking in verdant landscapes; and that industrious little gnomes in uniform sometimes bring their ships down to take water aboard and occasionally scare Kentucky farm families, road patrol officers, and stoic truck drivers while searching for faucets or wells? If all these and other visitors do come our way no wonder they have also scared the proverbial if not the actual pants off savage tribesmen even in medieval Scotland, august Roman senators, Indian hermits, Tibetan Lamas, and

Japanese admirals, as they are reported to have done.

Nor is it any less likely that each race, nation, tribe, and culture should interpret these apparitions differently and according to their own lights and to the best of their current knowledge of the world around them. This is a most important fact to remember. A little, platinum-colored, four-fingered gnome in a green uniform with elephantine ears would be described quite differently by an Ancient Egyptian and a modern Kentucky farmer, but those two might agree more than either would with a Roman legionnaire or a New Jersey patrol officer. There is the cultural and technical factor as well as the historical factor, and then, of course, above all there is the religious. Here superstition plays a very large part and what your *eyes* might tell you was nothing but a large lizard with two horns, walking on its hind legs, and carrying a mine-detector, you might well interpret as the head devil himself seen in a vision only, and due solely to your own recent most execrable behavior. Under extreme stress soldiers have tramped across a field strewn with the corpses of their comrades, in broad daylight, and positively denied later that there was a single person killed in their unit. If a sight is too far beyond our ken, we can blank it out altogether.

Given, then, the possibility that some of these visitors are for real and that they can only come from other astronomical bodies or at least

from off our earth, are they, as described, possible? Put another way, where are the BEMs and the things with tentacles? In fact, why so bloody human in shape? And this brings us to the crux of this discussion and to the central core of Ufology.

That there is all manner of inanimate cosmic junk drifting around in or dashing through our part of space, is not denied even by astronomers or meteorologists. That there could be "life-forms" feeding on pure energies and indigenous to our upper atmosphere or to space itself is, in fact, fairly probable. That there could be life on the planets of other suns or even on other astronomical bodies cannot be denied; it is almost certain. That some of these could have reached a degree of intelligence and physical dexterity necessary to build machines that could navigate space also cannot be denied, and that some of these may have reached our earth is quite possible. If we go that far, we have to ask the two questions, why have we not contacted them or seen them, and secondly, what could they look like? Let us assume that the first question is answered and that we have throughout the ages contacted or been contacted by them. What of the purely logical possibilities for their appearance and behavior?

Some time ago, the writers Sprague de Camp and Willy Ley sat down for a long time to chumble over this question, and they came up with an answer that the latter author

has published and which has been reprinted in leading American popular periodicals and newspapers. To sum these up, they believe that intelligent life should probably, if not *must* be formed basically of a hydrocarbon body; that this body must have been developed in a gaseous (*i. e.* an air) medium rather than under water or in a solid or a vacuum because, they think, metallurgy is essential to progress and this could not be undertaken in these media. With this I do not wholly agree, nor do I believe that metallurgy is the sole key to mechanical progress — sponges manufacture glass, shells porcelain, some sea-animals collect copper, and so forth, and you could have plastic and ceramic spacecraft. However, these thinkers go on to point out that a nervous system is needed by a higher life form as a communication and control system and that this must have a central control-box or brain. The best place for this would seem to be in its middle, but is often at one end or on top of the thing. Then, the most efficient number of walking limbs is two, and most manipulations can be done with another pair of appendages: it is best to keep the two pairs separate to perform the two separate operations of moving and fiddling, like our feet and hands. Let me point out that while the wheel or a "tread" is a better way of getting about than one pair or two pairs of limbs, and that several pairs of hands would be much better than one, the law of

diminishing returns sets in mechanically in this respect and that Nature usually takes the easiest course rather than the most efficient one when all things are taken into consideration. Already we are getting very like a human-being.

However, I would like to add a few points. The idea of a "skin" which can be replaced from inside when worn off on the outside is an exceedingly good one and almost essential to a mobile creature. Then again, a certain number of sense organs are needed. Sight is probably the most important. We could do with an electronic receptor of some kind like some insects, and our sense of touch is not so hot but, taking all physical processes into account we are not too badly equipped. Things from elsewhere might be similarly better, or more poorly equipped or have a different set of receptors. We actually have *twenty-four*, not just five recognized senses (*vide*: our senses of Balance, Thirst, Electrical flux, Radiant heat, Hunger, *etc.*) and dozens more are known among other animals—or, rather, the sense-organs are known, though in many cases what they are for or what they "do" we do not yet know. Don't forget that a quarter of a century ago we hadn't even heard of radar but some fish have been using underwater radar for 200 million years. Little People don't need noses nor even a smelling apparatus any more than we need an electromagnetic detection device.

It is probable that a mobile crea-

ture, or any other what we call animate thing for that matter, is better off with some method of replacing the material of which it is composed than to be a closed unit like a crystal that can only grow on the outside. This means some form of feeding and presumably elimination or disposal unit or units, and some kind of piping system to get the material to the points required. Already we have the master plan for an animal and, despite our sagging stomachs and flat feet, Man is a very efficient model of a mobile animal. There is every reason to suggest that evolution may have taken a very similar course elsewhere and at other times, and come out somewhere quite near the same point.

The Non-terrestrial should therefore have a high percentage chance of coming out not too unlike us. However, there is very little likelihood of his coming out *exactly* like us—and like the current North American so-called white man in particular—unless, for some extraordinary and to us esoteric reason, he deliberately transformed his body artificially (by surgical methods) to match ours and aped us in every other way. There could be reasons for doing this but so far they have not become apparent. On the other hand, Non-terrestrials could have been shaping *us* all along to match *their* appearance, by genetic manipulation and such little pastimes as warfare. Charles Fort suggested we might be property!

In fact, the bodily forms, as de-

scribed, of gnomes, pixies and little gray men seem much more likely. Being smaller and apparently lighter, they probably come from much more massive planets but as they seem to be able to get along without masks at our normal temperatures, their home planets would likely be not too dissimilar to ours. Of course, some may be metallic, or ceramic, or plastic (like us; for we are only a combination of plastics built around a mineral frame) and have built-in apparatus to cope with our atmosphere and climate generally. Also, be it well noted, they may move at quite different speeds; so fast perhaps that, when in full motion, they cannot be seen at all. Or, they may have "eyes" devised to "see" on a quite different band of the electromagnetic spectrum so that they are in total darkness here, or in too bright light. They may smell through their feet, hear through their paws, and breathe through their "ears": we have animals indigenous to this earth that do all these odd things. Who is to say what they do not do?

Let us therefore not be too smug about all this and above all don't pull the old argument that you have never seen any such being. How many New Yorkers have seen an owl in their city, yet there are plenty living there; how many country folk have seen a beaver; how many game-wardens or professional hunters have ever seen a Bongo in Africa, yet they range right across that vast continent? I have never seen a

wild mink in years of animal hunting and watching, but I do happen to have seen two Fisher Marten within seventy miles of New York, and they are supposed to have been extinct thereabouts for years—and I *did* see them too, because they or some of their relatives were subsequently trapped there.

There has been a notion throughout history that non-terrestrial beings visit us and are constantly among

us. The idea is outrageous to the average person because it appears to contradict all we know for ourselves or have been taught by generations of our thinking ancestors. Yet *some* things were around before the last ice-shift, mapping the Antarctic from the air, and *somebody* built the sunken city on Ponape. Who were they and where did they come from? More important, perhaps, is where did they go?

SINCE THE ABOVE WAS WRITTEN, and during a long discussion with Captain Mallery and Charles Hapgood (author of "Earth's Shifting Crust," Pantheon Books, 1958), I obtained, for the first time from anybody, an at least possible answer to a question that has always irked me. This is, if there were once long ago people or creatures with a highly advanced technology on this earth, why have we never found a single one of their artifacts, *nor* anything precision-tooled? Apart from any aesthetic values archaeological specimens may have, one and all are exceedingly crude and imprecise from a mechanical point of view.

Captain Mallery made the following points: (1) that if these advanced people who, for instance, drew the originals from which the Piri Reis maps were copied, were *visitors*, they were probably few in numbers and would not leave any of their valued instruments lying about or give them away to local primitives, (2) that the possibility of finding any they *did* leave would be extremely remote, even if they have not rotted away, like steels and irons do rather rapidly, (3) that if we have found any, we have most probably regarded them as examples of our own modern inventions, and simply thrown them away, or marked them "late colonial" but, (4) most important of all, these people, though very advanced, may not have developed through an *industrial* phase implying mass-produced and precision-made artifacts. In other words, while having space craft and complex power units, superb lenses and all manner of other devices, all may have been made individually and never on a mass basis like our tools and household implements, (5) even if they were so made on the home planet, they would not have been so here, where such industries were not needed and the local labor available—*i. e.*, our stoneage ancestors—would have been almost incapable of even tending the manufacturing machines.

These observations are highly significant when considering Sir David Brewster's modern-looking flat-headed *steel* nails said to have been taken out of a solid block of limestone laid down in the Cretaceous period, some 70,000,000 years ago. How many other contemporary-looking items have been found so situated and thrown away because, to our way of thinking, they just could *not* be where they were found? How many items that are *beyond* our own present technological standard have been thrown away because they did not seem to make any sense?