

THE QUESTION OF REALITY

A contribution towards a comparative phenomenology of UFO-experiences

By *Luis Schönherr*

UFO research of recent years is marked by a growing tendency to accept the idea that UFO-reports may not only contain statements that refer to actual objective occurrences, but also that they describe subjective, hallucinatory experiences.

It remains to be seen whether this hypothesis—especially in extreme forms, which will strip the UFO-phenomenon of every objective aspect—proves to be fruitful.

The history of science shows that there has always been a peculiar psychological readiness to refer anything that defies explanation within the established knowledge and rigour of an exact science, to other, less exact, disciplines. It could well be that future historians of UFO-research will regard the above-mentioned trend as just another example of an attitude that has often turned out to be unjustified.¹

On the other hand, progress in UFO research could be retarded as much by attempting to apply technical solutions to a non-technical problem, as it could be by regarding as hallucinatory something that could be a valuable clue for understanding a technical reality.

In such a situation it seems advisable to avoid all extreme views, and to try instead to develop a set of criteria which will enable us one day to distinguish the hallucinatory elements from those descriptions which refer to physical facts, no matter how difficult the first steps in this direction may be.

Perception: real, imaginary and hallucinatory effects

In normal circumstances perception depends on at least one sensory channel. If we see something, the lens in the eye creates a picture of the object on the retina. From there the information is transmitted along the nerves to those perceptive centres in the brain that are assigned to the perception of visual stimuli.

Apparently such stimuli cannot only emerge from the sensory apparatus (eye, ear, nose, etc.), but also from within the brain, particularly from the various strata of the memory. To imagine a past event means, for example, that information stored in the memory is fed into the perceptive centre. Under normal circumstances these centres distinguish very well between signals from the memory (imagination) and signals from the sensory system (reality). But there are also cases in which data seem to creep quite unawares from other parts of the brain into the perceptive centres without any such distinction. Such incursions are apparently interpreted as data coming from the sensory channels; mistaken, in other words, for a real experience. This process is called an hallucination.²

Whether an experience should be regarded as

hallucinatory, or not, may at times be difficult to decide. In the absence of conclusive material evidence for its reality, two criteria are frequently applied:

- (i) possibility and probability of the alleged experience, and
- (ii) its phenomenology, i.e. its perception-patterns, the whole context in which it occurs, and background and history of the percipient.³

Criterion (i) is of little use if we are really confronted with something basically new. It is all too likely that its manifestations will necessarily appear absurd and unreal within our present framework of understanding.

The phenomenological approach (ii) does not depend on assumptions (often very questionable and subjective) about what is possible and what not. Basically it consists in looking for perception patterns which already might have been recognised, quite independently, in other fields, and preferably those whose nature—hallucination or reality—has already been demonstrated convincingly in another connection.

In most cases however one will have to rest content for the time being with the knowledge that there is some possible correlation, the true nature of the observations remaining an open question.

The much-discussed link between UFOs and parapsychology belongs to this category, because opinion is still divided as to what extent parapsychological phenomena should be regarded as real or hallucinatory.

Another possible approach would be to start with the assumption that the reported phenomenology is an undistorted description of a real event, and then to try to find contradictions. This, however, would eventually bring us back to criterion (i) which we have dismissed. I must add, therefore, that this method should not be used for testing the reality of a UFO, its behaviour, or its occupants, but only those parts of a report to which our conventional standards of what is possible may justifiably be applied. Admittedly the above approach has its dangers, for the exact borderline may be difficult to draw. I shall give an example of this later.

Phenomenological short-cut?

I am fully aware of the fact that the phenomenological approach is probably a convenient and easy short-cut approach to a solution of the UFO mystery. Although I feel that the non-specialist could perform an important task in ferreting out links between various fields, it should likewise be clear that indisputable correlations, and even laws, can only be established by the patient teamwork of specialists of virtually every field of science.

Everyone who tries the phenomenological approach

will soon find that one of the greatest obstacles is the wording of the reports. The same thing may be described by different observers in very different terms, and by using different comparisons, which in turn lead to different ideas about what has actually been seen. On the other hand the same comparison may create different associations in different investigators, and so on.

Look, for example, at translations. Were it not for place and name of the witness (and sometimes even these data are distorted beyond recognition!) it would at times be impossible to establish whether two translations in different languages refer to the same report at all.

Therefore the following examination of some reports should be regarded as a very humble and preliminary contribution towards a comparative phenomenology of UFO reports, which I hope will some day come forth from improved methods of data-gathering as well as data-transmission, and the work of more competent and scientifically trained men.

Examples of comparative phenomenology of UFO reports

For identification of cases I shall give date, location, name of witness and source.

(1) Missing, transparent or indistinct extremities

Loosely speaking the entities seen in connection with UFOs seem to have difficulties with their extremities. Witnesses report that they could see no arms, or that they had the impression that they were held close to the body.⁴

In one case the witness noted quite definitely that the legs of the entities were transparent—he could see the grass through them. Others reported that the lower part of the body seemed “indistinct”, or hidden by high grass. Phenomenologically both statements could refer to the same category of phenomenon. Whether someone says the legs were transparent, or that the grass was visible through them, or whether another person says the legs were hidden by the grass, they amount basically to the same thing.⁵

This kind of thing has frequently been reported about the phenomena of the séance room. Materialisations of persons are seldom complete—often only the head appears, while legs and arms are either indistinct, or deformed, or partially missing. The same applies to the many reports of apparitions, for in general they appear to the observer to be best defined in the upper part of the body.

It is a fact that people usually have the most precise memory of the physiognomy, the head and the upper part of a person's body, while the colour of the shoes, for example, is often not only forgotten, but possibly not even perceived.

It seems not unreasonable to assume that the same mental process may play a role in the generation of hallucinatory experiences, whether they be séance-room materialisations or UFO-entities.

One could even argue that the internal mechanics and logic of the process of hallucinatory perception would demand that for images that cannot be experienced within the framework of an hallucination (because there may be no pertaining information in the memory-strata accessible in such a case),⁶ other images are

sometimes substituted in order to maintain logic and consistency of the experience.⁷

Seen from this angle, the missing-leg-pattern would possibly have to be suspected in other disguises, as for example in those sightings where UFO-entities have been reported wearing monk-like cowls or gowns,⁸ or have been seen within UFOs with their legs partially concealed by the object's structure.⁹

The latter would mean that not only the entities, but also the objects—or what the observer perceives of them—are hallucinatory experiences.

It has often been argued that the sort of experiences reported by witnesses of UFO-landings and of entities, cannot be hallucinations because such extensive and consistent hallucinations are only known to occur in pronounced pathological subjects—a category of percipients to which the majority of UFO witnesses definitely do not belong.

This argument, however, does not take into account the possibility that conditions may exist in the vicinity of a UFO, which stimulate hallucinatory experiences even in mentally sound and perfectly normal people, which are comparable in quality and degree to the pathological cases.¹⁰

In the field of UFOs, as well as in parapsychology, there are other things, however, that do not fit into the hallucination hypothesis, and to which I will return later.

(2) Hopping and jerking movement of entities

This feature has often been interpreted as an indication that the UFO-entities are either unaccustomed to our Earth's gravity, or that they are robots (for some reason clumsy and jerky movement seems to be a necessary part of the “robot-image”).¹¹

Unfortunately the wording of most reports lacks the necessary precision, and is such that it seems totally unjustified to build far-reaching conclusions upon them.

There is, however, one report in which a hopping gait is described with sufficient precision for one to establish an interesting correlation—although on the basis of pure statistics there are some who will regard it as “not very impressive”, or perhaps only as pure coincidence.¹²

On August 16, 1955, at Bradford, Yorkshire, lorry driver Suddard and his son perceived a peculiar black being, which, according to their description, hopped and jumped forwards, feet close together, in jerky movements.¹³

Now this sort of movement is identical with a procedure that has always been recommended to firemen and rescue crews, should they ever have to approach a broken and grounded high-tension cable. As ground resistance is high compared to that of the line, a potential gradient is being built up around the earthing point. Anyone walking in the direction of the earthing point could receive a deadly voltage without touching the cable itself, simply because in normal walking the two feet may bridge points of widely differing electric potential.¹⁴

To avoid this so-called “step-voltage”* it is usually recommended on training courses and in manuals to hop through such areas with legs and feet pressed

* The German technical term is *Schritt-Spannung*.

tightly together, or to approach the earthing point in a smooth, concentric spiral.¹⁵

A correlation to this spiral movement may possibly be found in those reports in which entities are described as "inspecting" their craft, or walking around it several times before re-entering.

The idea that a grounded UFO creates a potential gradient around it is perhaps further supported by the luminous discharges displayed from the bottom of the craft on take-off, and (less frequently) in the touch-down phase. It could also be the reason why a ground contact is often avoided, the craft remaining hovering.¹⁶

One could object to this interpretation on the grounds that it should be easy to avoid this "step-voltage" by wearing insulating shoes. But what was observed by Mr. Suddard could have been an emergency situation, as a result of a defect in the being's space suit. However, it is also possible that the primary force in the case of UFOs is not electricity at all, but something quite different, that can neither be insulated nor shielded: gravity, or perhaps even that mysterious field beyond electricity, magnetism and gravitation, which Einstein in vain tried to formulate with his unified field theory.

Is it conceivable that gravity also induces electrical potential differences? If this were the case, then within a strong, but spatially restricted G-field with a steep gradient (as postulated by Cramp with his "point source"),¹⁷ a comparatively small conductor could bridge points of considerable difference in G-potential, thereby inducing strong and, should the conductor be a living being, even deadly currents. Such currents, by their very nature as secondary effects of the G-field, could not be avoided by any sort of shielding or insulation.

Could this be the explanation for those instances where beings have been seen with their arms held close to the body? This would be unnecessary if the effect depended on ground contact alone.

So far, I haven't found any parallel for this weird behaviour in the field of parapsychology or in known hallucinatory experiences.

Some observers report non-moving lips and eyes, missing lips and noses, boneless structure, or a very hard (scaly), body surface. There is something sinister about such observations, and inevitably they create the impression that we are being confronted here with kinds of dummies, robots or zombie-like creatures.¹⁸

In this connection here is another possible correlation. Sometimes entities are reported to have a stiff gait, and a peculiar manner of turning around.

This could point to a lack of co-ordination in the senso-motor system, and it may be noted that the same behaviour is often observed in hysterical or mentally deranged people.¹⁹ It is interesting, in this connection, that many observers have complained of the same effect after having been near a UFO, and there are also cases of a progressive deterioration of personality and character after a contact or close-up sighting.²⁰

Are we to deduce from this that the Ufonauts themselves may not always be sufficiently protected against the effects of the force fields of their own craft? Is mental and physical degeneration the price paid only by the pilots of those craft, or is it the curse of a whole race?

Although the correlations mentioned above do not

conclusively preclude the possibility of hallucinatory experiences, it will be granted that the reported patterns—absurd and incredible as they may seem to be—point towards an objective reality.²¹

Dr. Bernard Finch once suggested that the entities might be degenerate "angels". To this one can only add that the reported appearance and behaviour is what one would expect of both mentally and physically degenerate mutants. A rather gloomy outlook, if the entities should really be earth-men time-travellers coming back from what we call our future.²²

NOTES

¹ Not so long ago ball lightning was referred to by scientists as belonging to the realms of physiological optics (after-images, etc.) and even as hallucination, folklore or plain superstition. Only recently, and with considerable hesitation, have they begun to grant the phenomenon the status of an objective fact.

C. Maxwell Cade-Delphine Davis: *The Taming of the Thunderbolts*. Also the Condon Report, Section VI, Chapter 7, "Ball-lightning".

² Experts will probably consider this to be a very simplified presentation. It is, however, sufficient to show of what, basically, a hallucination consists. It is an error about the origin of a signal.

For distortions in video-sensory perception see: Durham-Watkins: "Visual Perception of UFOs", FSR, Vol. 13, No. 3, p. 27, and Vol. 13, No. 4, p. 24.

³ White mice and spiders as such are nothing impossible. But if a heavily drinking individual perceives them, while others fail to do so, it is pretty clear that this is an hallucination.

⁴ Schönherr: "Winged Beings", FSR, Vol. 10, No. 4, p. 20.

⁵ July 2, 1968, Sierra Chica, Argentina/Iriart. FSR, Vol. 14, No. 5, p. 26. August 22, 1955, Casa Blanca, California/Douglas. FSR, Vol. 13, No. 5, p. 16. July 3, 1955, Stockton, Georgia/Symmonds. Stringfield: *Saucer Post*, 3-0, p. 63. March, 1955, Loveland, Ohio/R.H., *ibid.*, p. 66. November 1966, Gaffney, S. Carolina/Huskey, FSR, Vol. 14, No. 2, p. 17.

⁶ It is tempting to compare the human memory with that of a computer, where data are stored in memory devices with a different degree of accessibility (tape-, disc-, core-storage).

Although there are snags in this comparison, little doubt remains that a similar "memory-hierarchy" exists also in the human brain.

⁷ An example of how the human mind is capable of "arranging" ideas and images, quite unconsciously, so as to make them appear as a logical and consistent whole, are those dreams which, although they are often elaborate and complex stories, are terminated quite logically by the sounding of the alarm clock. Experiments have demonstrated that the onset of the dream coincides with the alarm—i.e. the dream story is built up in a manner that is perfectly consistent with the sounding of the alarm or, as is often the case, represents the logical end of the dream experience. (Even today many occultists readily take such things as "proof" precognition!)

⁸ October 10, 1954, Pournoy-la-Cétive/Hirsch, Michel: *Flying Saucers and the Straight Line Mystery*, p. 154. September 19, 1963, Saskatoon, Canada/Whitehead, FSR: *Beyond Condon*, p. 55. November 13, 1967, Winterfold Forest, Surrey/Freeman, FSR Vol. 14, No. 1, p. 15. May 22, 1953, Brush Creek, California/Black, *The Humanoids*, p. 146.

⁹ October 20, 1954, Parravacino d'Erba/Rugina, *The Humanoids*, p. 51. May, 1957, Milford, Pennsylvania/Stichler, FSR, Vol. 15, No. 5, p. 14.

¹⁰ On the influence of magnetic and electrical fields on mental processes see: B. E. Finch: "Beware the Saucers", FSR, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 4, "Saucers and Speech", FSR, Vol. 12, No. 2, p. 13.

Visual stimuli by rapidly fluctuating light sources (stroboscopic lights) can also induce drowsiness and hallucinations (see Grey Walter: *The Living Brain*). One could surmise that the various lights and "rays" displayed by the UFOs, and by the Ufonauts themselves, work on this principle.

According to reports from the Soviet Union in 1964 and 1965 it seems that Russian astronauts experienced hallucinations as a result of weightlessness in orbit. This may be of interest in view of the hypothesis that UFOs are gravity-powered. Would a rapidly alternating gravitational field perhaps induce similar effects as do strobo-lights?

¹¹ It is not plausible that a being who is already struggling against the Earth's gravity should choose a form of locomotion that demonstrably demands more effort than ordinary walking.

¹² One gets the impression that many researchers tacitly assume that the most frequently displayed features of UFOs must therefore be the most important and most "significant" ones for an understanding of the phenomenon. On this implicit premise, exceptions are brushed aside, and decisions are made as to what is noise and what is signal, which contact claims are true and which are not, and so on. Yet a little reflection should be sufficient to show that this could be a very serious mistake.

If the UFOs are instruments of a hypothetical intelligent observer, the chances are that by their very interaction with our system, they cannot always avoid leaving traces, or showing patterns, so furnishing us involuntarily with information about their own technology and aims. As I have demonstrated recently (see: "Observations of a Sceptical Believer", FSR, Vol. 16, No. 3, p. 16), the chances are also that this intelligence would try to invalidate this significant information by playing into our hands non-significant data, thereby obliterating the truly significant patterns. From experience in other fields (take radio-jamming procedures, cryptography or what you will) one must expect that the amount of noise will be some orders of magnitude above the level of the signal.

I feel, therefore, that some of the truly significant information may well be buried in the statistical exceptions, and its extraction could possibly demand more refined techniques of statistical correlation and filtering, the prerequisite again being an extensive scientific phenomenology.

¹³ A. Constance: *The Inexplicable Sky*, p. 243.

¹⁴ Cade-Davis: *The Taming of the Thunderbolts*, pp. 69, 83. The authors of this book mention the age-old experience that in the case of a lightning strike, animals are more likely to be killed than human beings. One reason for this is certainly that a lightning strike temporarily creates a potential gradient on the ground—just as does a broken high-tension cable—and that quadrupeds like cows and horses stand a good chance of receiving a higher voltage, because thanks to their body structure their feet will always bridge greater potential differences than does a human being. Another point is that while humans wear shoes, animals make a better contact with the ground. The above-mentioned circumstances also explain why, in herds, lightning often kills several animals at once, although investigations must lead to the conclusion that only one, or perhaps even none, of the animals has been directly hit.

My father, who was a keen mountaineer, often related how a severe thunderstorm once took him and his comrades by surprise on the peak of a high mountain.

They sought shelter in a wet cave lower down, and they sat down. Several lightning strikes hit quite near and on each occasion they experienced painful electric shocks in their legs and their abdomens. By dint of their very convulsions they quickly discovered that they could avoid shocks by lifting their feet and balancing on their backsides alone. It must have been a very frightening experience, and later I learned that they had solemnly promised a pilgrimage in case they should survive, although my father would never admit to this.

During salvage work after an air raid I myself experienced a similar, but rather weak effect, near a broken overhead street car conductor.

¹⁵ As I was told by an expert, the hopping procedure is recommended but is seldom practised.

¹⁶ B. E. Finch: "Can they See Us?", FSR, Vol. 14, No. 2, p. 31.

¹⁷ Cramp: *Piece for a Jig-Saw*, Part 2.

¹⁸ December, 1968, Wairakei, New Zealand/Perego, FSR, Vol. 15, No. 4, p. 29. In this case the witness himself likened the behaviour of the entity to that of a zombie. Also: J. A. Keel: "The Glendale Contact Claim", FSR: *Beyond Condon*, p. 64, Note No. 5. December 10, 1954, Trans-Andean Highway, Venezuela/Flores, *The Humanoids*, p. 95. August 28, 1963, Belo Horizonte, Brazil/Gualberto, FSR: *UFO Percipients*, p. 28.

¹⁹ It seems that the manner in which these entities sometimes laugh produces a very unpleasant effect on most witnesses. They describe it often in terms like funny, peculiar, hysterical or insane (see Keel: "The Little Man of Gaffney", FSR, Vol. 14, No. 2, p. 17, Note No. 4). Perhaps the kind of question to which they react in this manner is also not without interest?

²⁰ Keel: "Medical Aspects of Non-Events", *Anomaly*, No. 2.

²¹ One could assume that either Suddard or his son had a hidden memory of the hopping pattern, and that the whole thing was a telepathic hallucination. But according to certain parapsychologists there is some indication that in case of a telepathic rapport, it is not the complete image in all its details that is being transmitted, but only a sort of "abstract" to which the percipient adds individual details from his memory. This would mean that if indeed the ideas "hopping men" or "spacecraft" are being transmitted to different percipients, each would perceive only his own idea of it.

If this is true, and Suddard and his son really saw exactly the same, this would preclude the possibility of an hallucination. Personally I feel that the very cases in which UFOs have been seen by different observers from different angles and distances within the landscape speak very much in favour of a reality. (It is as interesting as it is amusing to observe how science as a whole rejects the possibility of telepathy while some scientists in such cases cling desperately to concepts that amount to practically the same thing in order to avoid admitting something "worse".)

²² I have proposed time-travel as a possible interpretation of the UFO-mystery as early as 1963. (See: "UFOs and the Fourth Dimension", FSR, Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 10.) This suggestion probably created amusement at that time, but it seems that in the meantime some others have begun to play with the idea, as one may gather from confused hints appearing now and then in different publications on the subject. I would not at present go so far as to drop the extraterrestrial hypothesis, but if certain alleged incidents really are true then the time travel hypothesis is more consistent with the facts than is ETH. It may be possible, however, that a synthesis between both views will be necessary. But this is another matter.

A NEW FSR CATALOGUE

The effects of UFOs on animals, birds, and smaller creatures Part 8

WE now come to an even busier year report-wise. So busy that it must of necessity be spread over two parts of our Catalogue. Prepared by Gordon Creighton, the final section of this list will probably reach the 200th case!

THE CATALOGUE—(viii) January - August 1967

121. Point Pleasant, West Virginia, U.S.A. (10.30 p.m., January 10, 1967).

Hearing his beagle dogs barking furiously, Mr. Wallie Barnett went outside to investigate. He saw an object, of the size of a Volkswagen car and with brightly lit windows, which was floating about close to the ground around his chicken-coop. The object came to within sixty feet of him.

John Keel: *From My Ohio Valley Notebook*, FSR, May/June 1967, pp. 3-4.

122. Old River, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, U.S.A. (January 12-13, 1967).

A man who was in a boat on this river took three very good Polaroid photographs of a UFO. On the morning of the 13th, he was struck by the quite unusually large number of dead fish floating on the water. Shortly after this, he again saw the UFO—or a similar object—and was again able to photograph it. On this occasion his attention was first drawn to it by alarmed birds: "What sounded like a million crows, all chattering like crazy," in a clump of trees across the river and just beneath the UFO.

APRO Bulletin, March/April 1967.

123. Malta, Montana, U.S.A. (9.00 p.m., one evening in January 1967).

Farmer Wilfred Tremblay and his wife and family were alerted by the barking of their dog, and saw a large rectangular object with red and amber lights moving rapidly in the distance and then landing in a field.

APRO Bulletin, January/February 1967.

124. Hilliards, Ohio, U.S.A. (evening of February 5, 1967).

A young man heard a strange noise, and also heard a dog barking furiously. He then witnessed the landing, in a field, of a large egg-shaped object, from which some entities emerged. These placed spheres around the craft. Then a man came across the field and appeared to be in conversation with them. The watching witness stepped on a twig and the entities, alerted by this, caught sight of the witness, chased him, seized him by the neck, and inflicted on him a wound resembling a burn. They tried to get him into the UFO, but finally dropped him and took off in their machine.

NICAP, *UFO Investigator*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (May/June 1967).

125. Red Hill, New Hampshire, U.S.A. (midnight, March 3, 1967).

Driving in their car towards Sandwich, with their dog, Charles Fellows and his wife saw a dark "clam-shaped" UFO which emitted a sound like the sound of a motor and "gave off a ping-type electrical charge." Said Mrs. Fellows, in a report to NICAP: "The air had an electrical sparking in it, and our dog began to be very disturbed, and his hair stood up like a bush."

NICAP, *UFO Investigator*, Vol. III, No. 12 (March/April 1967).

126. Bartlett, Illinois, U.S.A. (early morning of March 7, 1967).

Mrs. Lucille Drzonek of Bartlett was driving with relatives and with her dog, a beagle, in the car. The party saw a disc-shaped object descend in a wooded area, emitting a red glare, and "the beagle stood against the window of the car with all his hair raised in fright." Turning back so as to observe better, the party then experienced a brilliant white glare from something which "zoomed up out of the woods and shone straight into the rear window of the car." By this time the group of women were terrified. The UFO pursued them as far as their home.

APRO Bulletin, March/April 1967.

127. Lebanon, Ohio, U.S.A. (night of March 18, 1967).

Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Smith and their two daughters, residents of a rural area less than 25 miles from Project Blue Book's base at Wright-Patterson Air Field, saw a round, brilliantly lit object circling above their house for 45 minutes. Mrs. Smith said it gave out a high-pitched whine that hurt her ears and sent their poodle scurrying under a bed.

APRO Bulletin, March/April 1967).

128. New Haven, West Virginia, U.S.A. (evening of April 17, 1967).

A small boy who had hitched his pony to a wagon was slightly injured when a UFO with two huge searchlights on the underside flew overhead and terrified the pony, which wrecked the wagon and smashed the boy's glasses. The boy's father at first refused to believe his statement that he had seen a UFO, until he found the pony, which "was lying on its back, with its feet straight up."

NICAP, *UFO Investigator*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (May/June 1967), p. 6.

129. New Haven, West Virginia, U.S.A. (same evening, April 17, 1967).

Mrs. Lewis Capehart, employed at the Summers Pharmacy, reported that, as the same strange craft flew overhead, her two German shepherd dogs howled and barked, and one of them broke the chain with which it was tied up.

NICAP, *UFO Investigator*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (May/June 1967), p. 6.

130. Toronto, Ontario, Canada (8.30 p.m., April 26, 1967).

Miss Mary Ellen Roberts saw a "flashing red light in the sky," over the St. Catherine's area, and noticed a neighbour's dog "sitting very quietly . . . looking up into the sky." The light changed from red to green, the UFO came lower, and a beam of light shot down from the UFO and completely engulfed the dog in its bright glow, Miss Roberts herself being caught only by the edge of it.

NICAP, *UFO Investigator*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (May/June 1967).

131. Sermérieu, France (on or about May 28, 1967).

Just after a UFO had been seen in the close vicinity, four cows were found dead. The fields where these animals lay had a number of mysterious burnt areas, and there was a strange odour, "like benzine", near these areas.

FSR, September/October 1968, p. 36. From *Lumières Dans LaNuit*, March/April 1968.