

UFO PHYSICS - PART 2 (a)

Jan Heering

AFTER further thought about the nature of non-reflecting light I have become somewhat less certain of the anomalous character of the light itself.

2. Emission of non-reflecting light – continued

As pointed out in part I it resembles normal light in all respects except that it is either not at all reflected, or reflected much less than normal light. There may be other differences, of course, but they are not obvious. (From some of the case histories one gets the impression that it looks different, but this is rather vague.)

An alternative explanation is that the UFO affects surrounding matter in such a way that this no longer reflects light. How this is managed I do not know, but in some non-reflecting light cases electromagnetic effects have been noted (201, 211*, 213). At Malataverne (203)* the witness was unable to move while the 'cask' was close to him. At Tarbes (209) two people experienced complex sensations while a light slipped over their car like a snail.

The influence causing these effects may also be responsible for the change in reflectivity of the surrounding matter, but the fact that in other cases no electromagnetic effects have been reported does not make this seem very likely.

In any event, in principle there is a method to decide which of the two possible explanations of non-reflecting light is the right one. If the second explanation is valid, objects close to the UFO not only will not reflect the light emitted by the UFO itself which, in this case, is assumed to be normal light, but will also fail to reflect the light from any other source. This means that they must become exceptionally dark.

I'll call this the 'dark zone

effect.' This would be especially striking during daytime independently of any light emission of the UFO and would manifest itself as a zone in which objects are colourless and dark, while the air in it looks normal. At night such a zone would be difficult to distinguish from the surrounding darkness, but, if the range of the field causing it is shorter than the effective range of the light emitted by the UFO, the zone would be much more conspicuous because the area beyond it would be illuminated normally.

On the other hand, if the light itself has a special character, (i.e., if it is true non-reflecting light), there would be no 'dark zone effect'. At Shuttlewood (215) a dark zone was observed around a UFO while within the zone everything except the UFO itself was invisible. The witness, who was at times quite close to the object, did not experience any paralyzing influence but felt his hair standing on end when it came within a few metres of him. Whether this was caused by fear or by an influence exerted by the object has not been put on record and more evidence is needed before a definitive choice can be made. On the other hand this case seems to indicate that the second explanation may be the right one and that contrary to my original idea the lack of reflection is not an inherent property of the light itself. On the other hand daytime sightings of the 'dark zone effect' seem extremely rare or even non-existent which would indicate that my original idea may be correct and the observation at Shuttlewood was something of a freak case.

3. Use of light for purposes of observation and communication

UFOs are profuse light emitters and changes in colour and/or

intensity of the light emitted by a UFO have frequently been reported to occur simultaneously with a change in either its speed or direction of travel. (301) is a nice example and has given rise to the theory, that the light is in some way related to the propulsion system. This possibility and its implications are discussed in 302, 303 & 304).

UFOs also seem to use light for purposes of observation and communication and probably as a direct consequence, they are interested in and react to light changes in their environment. In paragraph 1 the use of "solid light" beams for observational and other purposes has been discussed but this need not necessarily be visual observation, as one is almost automatically inclined to think. Certainly on reading case (305) one gets the distinct impression that the "solid light" beam emitted by the mini-UFO was being used as some kind of feeler since after twice touching the radio it crept towards the tape recorder and touched that as well.

Javier Bosque, the witness, compared the beam with the antenna of a snail. The precision with which the beam was directed at the two electronic devices in the room seems to indicate that possibly by sensing the weak, relatively low frequency electromagnetic radiation coming from them – both were switched on and operating – the UFO must have been aware of their existence and position.

It is difficult to say whether such feelerlike behaviour is standard when 'solid light' beams are used for observational purposes since sometimes the beam stops short of the supposed target without actually touching it.

Most light beams coming from UFOs behave in a more conventional way. They are used to scan

the environment, obviously as an aid to visual observation and in this they resemble our search lights. Often a UFO emits only a single beam, but multiple beams are not at all uncommon. See (306, 307) for a few examples. (306) is an extremely rare case in which a UFO emitting about twenty orange beams, turning night into day, terrified a farmer and his wife, who were milking their cows.

Searchlight-type cases are very common and the reader will have no difficulty in finding many more of them himself but observations of UFOs exchanging light signals are much rarer. I have not been able to find more than four examples (308, 309, 310, 327) which would seem to indicate that UFOs sometimes communicate by changing colours or directing flashes of light at each other. Such communication could be relatively simple, comparable to flag signals used aboard ships, or the flashes could, for instance, consist of a sequence of very short light pulses following each other too rapidly for the human eye to distinguish and making up an encoded message of arbitrary meaning and complexity. Case (327) gives evidence of very complex behaviour accompanied by many colour changes and is one of the most impressive observations on record anywhere, with a significance going far beyond the context of this paragraph. I urge the reader to study it closely.

Many people tend to think of UFOs as sophisticated extra-terrestrial hardware. But (327) shows unmistakably that, for some UFOs at least, this is about the same as believing that a dog is a sophisticated steam engine.

Optical communication cases form a subclass of the highly interesting category of observations where several UFOs are seen co-operating on some task. A thorough, comparative study of such observations has, as far as I know, not been made, although it undoubtedly is a promising line of investigation.

(311) is a prototype case while (312) is another intriguing example. Here the least interesting

aspect — although the one concerning us here — is that the bright light emitted by the main object went out when the witnesses shone their spotlight at it. There are many other cases illustrating responses to this kind of "signalling". The UFO in one or more of the following ways:

— directs a powerful beam of light at the signal source, as if to take a good look at it (313, 314, 315, 325).

— It echoes the signals, as if in acknowledgement, by alternately switching its light or one of its lights on and off (310, 318, 319, 320, 321, 325).

— It extinguishes its light (312), changes colour (310), flares up brilliantly (316) or exhibits the 'zoom effect', i.e. it increases in size as if moving very fast in a straight line towards the observer (317) (see part III, 6). Generally it returns to its original state within a few tens of seconds.

— It starts moving, either towards the signal source or away from it (322, 323, 325, 326). If often returns to its original position after the signalling has stopped.

Finally, I want to draw attention to two curious cases. On May 18, 1974 a wine farmer at Alzonne (France) was confronted by a single globe exhibiting light phenomena as if to attract his attention (328) and five days later, on May 23, 1974, a woman in Los Angeles made a somewhat similar observation from her balcony (329). My earlier remarks in connection with (327) clearly apply here as well. All three cases (327, 328, 329) belong to the category of "structured lights" which will be discussed later. (to be continued.)

* These references will be found in Part 1, published in FSR Vol.22, No.5 of 1976.

* * * * *

References

(References 11–19 and 122–127 relate to Part 1 published in FSR Vol.22, No.5).

11. Richard H. Hall (Ed.), *The UFO Evidence*, NICAP, 1964.
12. Ted Phillips, "Physical Traces Associated with UFO Sightings," CUFOS, 1975.

13. J. Allen Hynek, *The UFO Experience*, Ballantine, New York, 1974.
14. Jacques Vallée, *Anatomy of a Phenomenon: UFOs in Space*, Ballantine, New York, 1974.
15. Jacques and Janine Vallée, *Challenge to Science: The UFO Enigma*, Ballantine, New York, 1974.
16. Jennie Zeidman, *The Lumberton Report*, CUFOS, 1976.
17. Robert Emenecker, *UFOs Past, Present and Future*, Ballantine, New York, 1974.
18. Raymond E. Fowler, *UFOs: Interplanetary Visitors*, Exposition Press, Jericho, N.Y., 1974.
19. Symposium on Unidentified Flying Objects, Hearings before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, July 29, 1968. Available from National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia, 22161, publication no. PB179541.

Additional 'solid light' cases (see part 1):

122. Ernst Berger, "The 'snails' are still around (II)", FSR, Vol.22, 2. A number of interesting observations are reported in (120, 122), among them a couple of 'solid light' cases.
123. "Huble au nord de Valparaiso", in (5), pp. 83–85. Also in LDLN, No. 111. Three humanoids leave their craft by means of a solid looking light beam.
124. At Trancas (102) two UFOs connected by a "solid light" beam were seen. Compare this with the sighting near Saintes in (7), p. 193.
125. Jacques Lob and Robert Gigi, O.V.N.I., *Dimension Autre*, Dargaud, Neuilly-sur-Seine, 1975. A large part of this fascinating comic book (last volume of a series of three) is devoted to the "solid light" phenomenon.
126. J.-A. Bouchet, e.a., "Observation près du sol a Pleuville", LDLN, No. 157. Possible "solid light" case.
127. Ramond Jordon, "1975 UFO wave in Arizona", observation by the Beardsly family at Sedona on May 15, 1975, *The APRO Bulletin*, Vol. 24, No. 10, p. 6.

Additional cases of non-reflecting light (Section 2):

213. J.-M. Bavay, e.a., "Un facteur surpris par un M.O.C.", LDLN, No. 123.
214. Jean Knauf, "Thiaucourt-Regneville", LDLN, No. 157.
215. Ananda Sirisena, "The light at Shuttlewood", FSR, Vol. 20, No.5. See especially the postscript on p. 28.

References: Section 3:

301. "Objet avec satellite compaignon", in (5), pp. 30-32. Case of repeated extreme acceleration and simultaneous light flash, but also noteworthy because of a strange kind of interference between the light of the UFO and the light of a street lamp. And see also paragraph 7.
302. See (11), Ch. XII, C(1), "Study of colour changes related to motion."
303. Ch. 3 of (1).
304. James M. McCampbell, "Horses under the hood", in Proc. of the AIAA Symposium on hypotheses concerning the origin of UFOs, AIAA, Los Angeles, 1975 (available from CUFOS or UFORI).
305. See (103).
306. J.-M. Bigorne, "Limont-Fontaine", LDLN, No. 134.
307. Observation at Lot-et-Garonne.

- See: Gordon Creighton, "UFOs with multiple beams of light", FSR, Vol.18, No.3. Originally published in Phenomenes Spatiaux, No.30. See also "L'ovni qui aimant les tracteurs" in (9), pp. 37-40.
308. 1953 Bismarck, North Dakota, sighting, in (17), pp. 52-53.
309. Case 466, in (10).
310. Larry Speigel, "UFO flap reported in New Hampshire", Skylook, No. 82.
311. See (105).
312. Case NL-9, in (13), pp. 49-50.
313. See (104).
314. See (114).
315. Case RV-6, in (13), pp. 94-95.
316. "Observations a Franois (Doubs)", in (5), pp. 32-43. Also in LDLN, No.99.
317. J.-M. Bigorne, "Observations a Maubeuge", LDLN, No. 138.
318. Observation at San Bernardino, in (11), p. 41.
319. "Object emits three discs", The

- APRO Bulletin, Vol.25, No.2.
320. See (16), pp. 14-17.
321. Case 67-44A, in (18), pp. 152-153.
322. Observation from train, in (11), p. 9.
323. Observation at Origny, in (7), pp. 38-39.
324. Adolf Schneider, Ernst Berger, e.a., "UFOs invade the Bavarian Alps", FSR, Vol.21, Nos. 1 & 2. Also: "UFO reacts to signal flares", Skylook, No. 87.
325. Tapani Kuningas, "The 'super-human' light balls", FSR, Vol.20, No. 4.
326. Observation at Medellin, Spain. FSR, Vol.20, No.3, pp. 6-7. Skylook, No. 82, pp. 14-15.
327. J. Tyrode, "L'approche d'un mystere", LDLN, No. 127.
328. T. Revel, "Enquête à Alzonne (Aude)", LDLN, No. 140.
329. Ann Druffel, "Close-in lighted globe reported", Skylook, No. 86.

[To be completed as soon as possible in part 2(b)]

HUMANOID IN LONDON EC2?

Barry M. King

Investigations for UFOIN and *Flying Saucer Review* by Barry King, Andy Collins & Graham Phillips of a report which originated from the *Daily Express* "bureau".

THIS report from January 1977 concerns two youngsters who are genuinely puzzled by the events. It is in itself interesting that an identified object was seen on two separate occasions in the same location, and that, coupled with the second sighting, was a report of a small humanoid. It is not known whether this figure was directly connected with the aerial object.

REPORT ONE

One wintry evening in January 1977 Richard Luxford and his friend Tony De Rosa were returning home from a trip to the large estate at the Barbican in London. Richard was on his bike, Tony had his skateboard. After a while Richard hitched Tony's skateboard to the back of his bike and towed him along, a straightforward and innocent enough thing for a couple of East-Enders to do.

The time was between 6.00 and 7.00p.m. but neither of them had a watch, and neither cared very much.

Richard was the first to see the object and alerted Tony to its presence. At this point they were standing about half way along Willow Street, a typical street of the eastern part of the city of London, with old buildings, mostly flats, on either side, which were in the process of being demolished. The two lads found themselves alone in the small dark road.

They stood as if transfixed, looking up at the object, trying to decide what they were watching. It was a smallish object, just above the rooftops to their left. It seemed like a balloon with a string attached, but when they had taken in more detail they knew it wasn't much like a balloon at all. Spherical, it was a red-orange in colour, and it had a thin column of grey-black smoke, like string, issuing vertically from its top surface. Wavering slightly this 'string' or 'smoke' reached up quite a long way, and remained constant in length and width. They could not see where it terminated as it blended in with the sky.

For some reason the boys did not think the object, whatever it was, was solid. They could perceive a shimmering or scintillation of its surface, but it was not terribly bright, maybe no more so than the moon. A crackling noise was discernible but this was very slight. The UFO couldn't have been very high, for it was casting light on nearby rooftops, albeit faintly.

The witnesses had stood there, watching and trying to work out what it was, for about 20 seconds when it moved away. They are now unsure how it disappeared from view. Richard ran to the end of Willow street to catch another glimpse of it, but it had gone. Tony thinks it may have dipped and gone out of view, but cannot say for certain. It was estimated that the object measured at arm's length appeared about two inches long; they said that when