

PERCIPIENT-DEPENDENT COMPONENT IN THE FALCON LAKE INCIDENT?

Luis Schoenherr

IN a detailed 50-page paper¹ I have tried to show that there are cases in the UFO literature which display phenomenal details strangely related to the percipient's memory, and to his psychic and physical situation. I have coined for them the term "percipient-dependent components" abbreviated "PDCs". While the phenomenal characteristics of some PDCs are certainly reminiscent of hallucinations, I have also discussed the possibility that PDCs could manifest themselves as objectively perceptible physical elements, which may be identified by certain inconsistencies appearing from time to time in UFO scenarios.

With regard to this latter point, a detail in the UFO experience of Steve Michalak, also known as the Falcon Lake Incident,² could be significant. The witness stated that a hot blast emanating from a grid-like vent on the side of the UFO burned his shirt and inflicted a burn, patterned in the form of the exhaust-grid, on his abdomen. Now the photos showing the burn-patterns on the skin are indeed very impressive, but it is hardly possible that the burns could have been produced in the manner described. The physical behaviour of a blast of air, vapour, or any other gaseous substance, is quite different from, say, that of water emerging from a shower. While the latter retains, for a considerable distance, the structure determined by the tiny openings in the spray head, a gas jet would expand immediately after leaving the vent. Unfortunately none of the versions available to me states the exact distance between the witness and the exhaust, but even if he was — as may be inferred — only an arm's-length from the grid, it is more than unlikely that such a sharply outlined pattern could have been produced. This is the more unlikely as the witness wore a shirt plus an undershirt.

The Falcon Lake incident was also investigated by the Condon team. In the Condon Report this investigation is described under the title: **Case 22, North Central, Spring 1967, Investigator: Craig.**³ Apparently no attention was given to the inconsistency mentioned above, and the report does not mention that there was a patterned burn on the witness's body. It states, however, that there was such a burn on the witness' undershirt, matching, according to his assertion, the pattern of the UFO's exhaust openings from which the burning vapours had spurted. Although the Condon Report includes in the photographic section some 60 plates, there is neither a photograph of the burnt

undershirt, nor of the most extraordinary burn on the abdomen. Both photographs can be found, however, fairly well reproduced, in a recent Canadian publication.⁴ Unfortunately I could not obtain the witness' own, original account⁵ which seems to be out-of-print. One gets the impression that the investigator didn't pursue the matter of the burn subsequently, perhaps because he suspected that the burn had been self-inflicted. I too think that there could be some truth in this hypothesis, but not in a sense that would be discriminating against the witness.

Let's suppose that the witness had, deeply buried in his memory, an emotionally "filled" image of this grid-pattern. During the UFO experience, this image was triggered, and he produced a corresponding hallucination and, together with it, a psychosomatic effect, i.e. a stigma. It could also be that the grid was a real part of the UFO scenario, and that it triggered, by affinity, the corresponding memory image in the witness which led to the stigma. We may even say that it was the intention of the unconscious to construct a logically consistent scenario, but that this attempt failed because of the witness's imperfect knowledge of hydrodynamics. (At least it doesn't seem that the laws of hydrodynamics are part of the contents of Jung's collective unconscious.)

It is my opinion that inconsistencies of this sort can help us to learn more about the true process, the *modus operandi*, of the UFO experience. They deserve the increased attention of every investigator, and should not be brushed aside as merely random and, in the final analysis, insignificant distortions.

References

1. Luis Schoenherr: "Percipient-Dependent Components in UFO Experiences," in: *UFO Phenomena*, Vol. 4, 1980, Editecs Publishing House, P.O. Box 190, I-40100 Bologna, Italy.
2. Chris Rutkowski: "The Falcon Lake Incident — Part 1," in: *Flying Saucer Review*, Vol. 27, No. 1, p. 14.
3. Edward U. Condon (Project Director): *Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects*, 1969, Bantam Book 553-04747-195, New York.
4. Yurko Bondarchuk: *UFO Sightings, Landings and Abductions*, p. 37, 1979, Methuen Publications, Toronto, Canada.
5. Stephen Michalak: *My Encounter with the UFO*, Winnipeg, Osnova Publications, 1967.

UFO PHOTOGRAPHS TAKEN AT RICHMOND B.C.

Dorothy Wilkinson

WHILE browsing through some of my friend Owee-nee Beaton's collection of back issues of the *Flying Saucer Review*, I came across an article published by the *Wiener Montaq* on March 7, 1960. It was called "The Leibnitz Spider." This object was spotted and photographed by a correspondent of the same paper, the *Wiener Montaq*; his name is Edgar Schedelbauer, a native of Strass, near Leibnitz.

I have also managed to photograph a similar object, in fact I have six photographs taken in sequence, two years ago on 28 March 1980. I was only aware of this recently when I saw the picture of the Leibnitz Spider in the *Flying Saucer Review* of July-August 1960, Vol. 6 No. 4, pages 16, 17 and 18.

Accompanying this article are six prints taken from a film strip which I shot at my home in Richmond, British Columbia, Canada.

It happened on the 28 March 1980, at about 9.20 p.m. The weather was good except for a few cloud patches here and there. I was just putting my dinner dishes away, when a light was beamed into the kitchen at me (this is how they usually contact me). I opened the kitchen door, peeked out, and saw the object sitting up there in the sky.

I ran back into the guest room, picked up my three movie cameras, which I always keep loaded as I never know when they will decide to come, ran back to the kitchen, and out to the sundeck which is just off the kitchen.

The sundeck is on the north side of the house. I had to turn around and face north-west, and look up at a 45° angle to film the object. It looked like a three-quarter moon. The camera I used for the six shots was the Sankyo Seiki XL ES 44 with a F1.2 electronic lens. This movie camera is capable of taking single shots as well, which enables me to save on films, because I have been spending too much on them. The camera also has a telescopic lens, which I used as well. Had I rolled my camera I would have had many more shots of the object. I managed to get some shots with my other cameras though, but the angles of the shots are different as the object was turning around very slowly.

The reason for using the three movie cameras was

Photograph 1 (Right). Opening shot. Detail from proof, copyright No. 221A. Richmond B.C., Canada, 28 March, 1980, 9.20 p.m. Taken on Super 8 movie camera with still shot facility.

CANADIAN CONTACTEE'S REMARKABLE PICTURES

During the last decade we have become accustomed to the extraordinary photographic feats of people like "thoughtographer" Ted Serios, and UFO photographer Stella Lansing whose pictures were revealed to the world by Dr. Berthold E. Schwarz through the pages of *Flying Saucer Review*.

Here now is another unusual photographer, already well-known in Canada, who can only be described as a contactee, but a contactee with a difference. Not for her, it seems, the world of close encounters, of "philosophical" messages and trips to Venus. She merely claims that she receives forewarning of the presence of a sky object, and that she films that object until she has sufficient pictures.

Apart from Dr. Hynek, we gather that Dr. Richard Haines and Dr. Bruce Maccabee are very interested in the films. We have used the maiden name of our witness, as has been the case in other publications.

EDITOR

