

# The Ufological Paradox: Why Interstellar Visitors Still Make Poor Explanations

*Joseph Wayne Smith and N. Stocks*



(BBC, 2022)

## 1. Introduction

For nearly eighty years, unidentified aerial phenomena (UAP) have captured public imagination and, at times, institutional concern. Waves of testimony, declassified reports, and recurring claims of exotic technology have kept the extraterrestrial hypothesis (ETH) alive. Yet a basic problem persists: the behavior attributed to these objects looks nothing like what we should expect from a civilization capable of crossing interstellar space. In this essay, we develop what we call the “ufological paradox”—the deep mismatch between the technological sophistication required for interstellar travel and the oddly clumsy, inconsistent actions described in UAP reports. We argue that this paradox significantly weakens the ETH as an explanatory framework.

## 2. A Mystery That Refuses to Go Away

The modern UFO narrative begins in 1947, with Kenneth Arnold’s sighting and the Roswell incident. Since then, the phenomenon has endured far longer than most cultural fads (Peebles, 1994; Denzler, 2001). Government interest has periodically

reignited the debate—most notably through the Pentagon’s AATIP program, Navy-released infrared footage, and recent rounds of congressional testimony (Blumenthal and Kean, 2017; Cooper et al., 2019).

Yet despite decades of claims, leaks, and speculation, we remain in a peculiar holding pattern. No physical artefact has survived peer review. No unequivocal contact has occurred. No propulsion principle has been demonstrated outside anecdote. There is an odd tension between the extraordinary nature of the claims and the decidedly ordinary evidence.

### 3. The Ufological Paradox

The ufological paradox is straightforward:

**P1.** If UAP are physical craft from an extraterrestrial civilization, that civilization has mastered technologies vastly beyond our own.

**P2.** A civilization with such capabilities could observe Earth using methods that avoid detection entirely—remote sensing, miniature probes, passive monitoring, or observation from the edges of the solar system.

**P3.** Yet the historical record is full of close encounters, apparent “dogfights,” mysterious crashes, radar chases, and ambiguous physical traces. (Hynek, 1972; Vallee, 1991; Kean, 2010)

**Conclusion:** The behavior described in P3 does not cohere with the capabilities implied by P1 and P2.

This is not simply a problem of weak evidence; it is a conceptual contradiction. The ETH requires us to imagine a civilization capable of travelling between the stars but unable to avoid running into trees, aircraft, or the desert floor of New Mexico.

### 4. Common Counterarguments—and Their Problems

#### A. “*The Anthropological Analogy*”

A popular defence holds that aliens might be studying us as wildlife biologists study animals (Jung, 1959; Sagan and Page, 1996).

But modern field biology uses remote sensors, satellite tracking, and DNA sampling—methods designed to avoid disturbing the animals being studied. A civilization thousands of years more advanced than ours should be even more discreet.

And crucially, biologists do not repeatedly crash jeeps while conducting fieldwork. The level of technical failure attributed to extraterrestrials is implausibly high.

### *B. "The Prime Directive"*

Some suggest that aliens follow a non-interference policy (Tough, 1998). But this explanation immediately contradicts itself. A strict non-interference rule is incompatible with alleged abductions (Hopkins, 1981; Mack, 2007), military encounters, or any scenario involving crashed craft. The "directive" is invoked to explain both the absence and presence of evidence, often selectively.

### *C. The Nuclear Monitoring Hypothesis*

Researchers have noted clusters of UAP reports around nuclear sites (Hastings, 2017). This is often interpreted as surveillance.

Yet nuclear facilities also have the best instrumentation, strict reporting protocols, and heightened security—making them natural hubs for false positives and unusual detections. And again, a spacefaring civilization could monitor radiation from millions of kilometers away. Dramatic fly-overs seem unnecessary at best.

## **5. Other Possible Explanations**

If the ETH struggles conceptually, what alternatives remain?

### *A. Unusual Natural Phenomena*

Atmospheric physics still contains poorly understood plasma and electromagnetic effects (Teodorani, 2004). The Hessdalen lights show that recurring anomalous displays can occur without invoking extraterrestrials (Strand, 1984).

These explanations fit sensor anomalies but struggle with reports of intelligent control.

### *B. Cultural and Psychological Dynamics*

UFOs may function as modern myths—stories shaped by Cold War anxieties, media cycles, and cognitive biases (Bartholomew and Howard, 1998; Jung, 1959; Bullard, 1989). Digital platforms amplify ambiguous stimuli into shared cultural narratives.

This model explains the persistence of belief without dismissing witness sincerity.

### *C. Terrestrial Black Projects*

Another possibility is that classified aerospace programs have used UFO narratives as cover (Jacobsen, 2012). The U-2 and SR-71 famously produced waves of sightings during their development. While this explanation requires secrecy, it remains grounded in known physics and institutional practice.

## **6. The Asymmetry of Evidence**

Carl Sagan's maxim—extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence—remains a useful guide (Sagan, 1980). After nearly eight decades, we still lack:

- any verified artifact
- any unambiguous high-resolution imagery
- sensor data released in full technical detail
- physical traces inconsistent with terrestrial technology

Instead, the record consists largely of testimony, blurry videos, redacted documents, and interpretive leaps. A few cases (e.g., Nimitz 2004) remain intriguing, but “unexplained” is not equivalent to “extraterrestrial.”

## **7. Broader Philosophical Lessons**

### *A. Inference to the Best Explanation*

The ETH is often presented as the most straightforward explanation. But inference to the best explanation requires simplicity, coherence, and predictive value (Lipton, 2004). The ETH adds unnecessary entities and has produced few successful predictions.

### *B. Belief, Desire, and Meaning*

UFO beliefs often meet psychological needs—cosmic significance, distrust of authority, or a longing for mystery (Kunda, 1990). Recognizing this does not invalidate witnesses' experiences; it simply acknowledges the human context in which beliefs form.

### *C. Institutional Secrecy*

Government opacity creates fertile ground for speculation (Zollman, 2010). This dynamic complicates public understanding and underscores broader concerns about transparency.

## **8. Conclusion**

The ufological paradox—requiring us to believe in interstellar travellers who behave like erratic hobbyists—continues to weaken the extraterrestrial hypothesis. This does not mean every UAP can be neatly explained; some cases deserve genuine scientific investigation. But the leap to alien visitation remains logically and evidentially unsupported.

If extraordinary evidence ever emerges, it will speak for itself. Until then, the more responsible position is cautious curiosity rather than cosmic speculation. The truth may indeed be “out there,” but it is unlikely to look like the stories we’ve been telling since 1947.

## REFERENCES

(Bartholomew and Howard, 1998). Bartholomew, R.E. and Howard, G.S. *UFOs and Alien Contact: Two Centuries of Mystery*. Amherst MA: Prometheus Books.

(BBC, 2022). Newsround Staff. "Is a UAP a UFO? NASA's New Team Investigating the Unknown. *BBC/CBBC*. 27 October. Available online at URL = <https://www.bbc.co.uk/newsround/63401781>>.

(Blumenthal and Kean, 2017). Blumenthal, R. and Kean, L. "Glowing Auras and "Black Money": The Pentagon's Mysterious U.F.O. Program." 16 December. *The New York Times*. Available online at URL = <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/16/us/politics/pentagon-program-ufo-harry-reid.html>>.

(Bullard, 1989). Bullard, T.E. "UFO Abduction Reports: The Supernatural Kidnap Narrative Returns in Technological Guise." *Journal of American Folklore* 102, 404: 147-170.

(Cooper et al., 2019). Cooper, H. "'Wow, What is That?' Navy Pilots Report Unexplained Flying Objects." *The New York Times*. 26 May. Available online at URL = <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/26/us/politics/ufo-sightings-navy-pilots.html>>.

(Coulthart, 2023). Coulthart, R. *In Plain Sight: An Investigation into UFOs and Impossible Science*. New York: HarperCollins.

(Dean, 1998). Dean, J. *Aliens in America: Conspiracy Cultures from Outerspace to Cyberspace*. Ithaca NY: Cornell Univ. Press.

(Denzler, 2001). Denzler, B. *The Lure of the Edge: Scientific Passions, Religious Beliefs, and the Pursuit of UFOs*. Berkeley CA: Univ. of California Press.

(Hastings, 2017). Hastings, R. *UFOs and Nukes: Extraordinary Encounters at Nuclear Weapons Sites*. USA: CreateSpace.

(Hopkins, 1981). Hopkins, B. *Missing Time: A Documented Study of UFO Abductions*: New York: Richard Marek Publishers.

(Hynek, 1972). Hynek, J.A. *The UFO Experience: A Scientific Inquiry*. Chicago IL: Henry Regnery.

(Jacobsen, 2012). Jacobsen, A. *Area 51: An Uncensored History of America's Top Secret Military Base*. Boston MA: Little, Brown and Company.

(Jung, 1959). Jung, C.G. *Flying Saucers: A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Skies*. Princeton NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

(Kean, 2010). Kean, L. *UFOs: Generals, Pilots, and Government Officials Go on the Record*. Danvers MA: Crown Archetype.

(Kunda, 1990). Kunda, Z. "The Case for Motivated Reasoning." *Psychological Bulletin* 108, 3: 480-498.

(Lipton, 2004). Lipton, P. *Inference to the Best Explanation*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., London: Routledge.

(Mack, 2007). Mack, J.E. *Abduction: Human Encounters with Aliens*. New York: Scribner's.

(Peebles, 1994). Peebles, C. *Watch the Skies! A Chronicle of the Flying Saucer Myth*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Books.

(Sagan, 1980). Sagan, C. "Carl Sagan on the Tonight Show with Johnny Carson." 27 August.

(Sagan and Page, 1996). Sagan, C. and Page, T. (eds.) *UFO's—A Scientific Debate*. Ithaca NY: Cornell Univ. Press.

(Strand, 1984). Strand, E. P. *Project Hessdalen 1984—Final Technical Report*. Østfold College. Available online at URL = <https://old.hessdalen.org/reports/hpreport84.shtml>.

(Teodorani, 2004). Teodorani, M. "A Long-Term Scientific Survey of the Hessdalen Phenomenon." *Journal of Scientific Exploration* 18, 2: 217-251.

(Tough, 1998). Tough, A. "Small Smart Interstellar Probes." *Journal of the British Interplanetary Society* 51: 167-174.

(Vallee, 1991). Vallee, J. *Revelations: Alien Contact and Human Deception*. San Antonio TX: Anomalist Books.

(Zollman, 2010). Zollman, K.J. "The Epistemic Benefit of Transient Diversity." *Erkenntnis* 72, 1: 17-35.