

CROCODILE-SKINNED ENTITIES AT CALGARY

W. K. Allan

WE have been criticised for "sitting" on this single-witness case report, but I would like to emphasize that it was not our intention to withhold details from anybody. Our wish was only to keep from publication the sketch made by the witness, David Seewalt, and his description of the entities until a similar experience was reported reliably and independently from a different locale.

The details of the Pascagoula case reported by Messrs. Parker and Hickson seem to have satisfied Drs. Hynek and Harder; they seem also to meet this criterion. However, the David Seewalt sketch of the "android" is retained by us, together with the details (i.e. numbers) of fingers and toes, in the hope that either Parker or Hickson can provide a sketch, for comparison, with no possibility of previous collusion. Later correlations between such sketches would provide a strong element of the kind we have sought after for so long.

Elsewhere Dr. Leo Sprinkle has come across a girl who, under hypnotic regression, described how she was exposed to an "orange light" which seemed to erase the conscious memory; within two weeks of that, the experience of two Idaho Indians — described two years later in the last multipage format NICAP UFO Investigator — also seemed to check. One of the Indians was quoted as saying that the face of the reported entity had a rough look like "scars, deep scars," large "high" ears, a slit of a mouth with thin lips — or none at all; no nose could be seen in the roughness of the face. These cases, including that of David Seewalt, should certainly be considered as a group.

The incident

On November 17, 1967, David Seewalt left his chum's home at 5.45 p.m. and started on his short walk home, which would normally take three minutes. At 6.30 p.m. his older sister saw him dash in through the front door and, following him upstairs, she found him trying to hide under the bed. She stated that his eyes were glazed, and that he seemed to be in shock. She shook him and he said: "I've been chased by a flying saucer." One of his shoes was missing, and this she later found out in the road.

David's parents telephoned me, and on the Sunday (three days after the alleged experience): I went over and taped his description of what he believed had happened. His mother told us that David, who normally is a placid person, had been uneasy and nervous all weekend.

Investigation

On April 21, 1968, David had a nightmare — his

Our contributor, who has just retired after 39 years as a school teacher, lived and worked for many years at Calgary, Alberta, Canada. Well-known locally for a series of radio broadcasts on the topic of UFOs which he made on the local station, he became a focal point for people who wished to report UFO experiences without seeking newspaper publicity. Mr. Allan now lives in Kelowna, British Columbia.

EDITOR

first — and on being awakened by his younger brother, with whom he was struggling, he said: "Call Dad. I know what happened when I was chased by the UFO."

Mrs. Seewalt telephoned us about this development, and some time later we were lucky to obtain the services — gratis — of Dr. K. (name and address on file), a doctor of dental surgery who employs hypnosis in his practise. Dr. K. conducted six sessions of hypnotic regression for us, and requested that we did not record any of it other than one short, dramatic sequence.

I found the reactions to Dr. K.'s questions most convincing. For instance, when he asked David what they had been doing at his friend's house, he replied: "Weight lifting." Now Mrs. Seewalt had told me that David was always home on time, so, when Dr. K. said: "Now you boys know you were up to some mischief and devised this yarn to cover up your being late getting home," David replied with an angry and hostile denial.

When he had quietened down he was asked what had happened as he walked home across the field. He replied:

"Heard this high-pitched hum."

"Then what happened?"

"I looked up and saw this big thing."

"What happened next?"

At which question David's leg, which had been relaxed and crossed over the other leg, began to shake violently, as though the boy were frightened.

After a pause to allow him to calm down, the question was repeated, and was followed by another paroxysm of terror.

Dr. K. thereupon changed his approach:

"Now you are watching a T.V. show of your experience and it can't hurt you. Just relax and tell me what you see on the screen."

At that the story unfolds. He is taken up in an orange beam of light, put on a table and wheeled through a 'computer room' with a console with blinking lights, and undressed by aliens who had a 'rough brown skin like crocodiles.' They had no clothes, 'x' fingers, 'x' toes, and when he recalls how the fingers touched his body he begins deep breathing and trembling, and is obviously terrorised.

Later, at a Sony videotaped session at the Psychology Department of the University of Calgary, David described the examining table and the bright lights like those of an "operating room." When asked how he knew, he described in great detail his appendicitis operation when he was in Grade IV. He even detailed the incision under general anaesthesia. One of the orderlies who had wheeled David into the operating theatre on that occasion was old, and under Dr. M.'s questioning, David conceded that he had wrinkled skin on the back of his hand. Dr. M. cast a knowing glance, which suggested that this admission had resolved the whole affair.

In this I can in no way concur, for it does not take into account the events I witnessed in the preliminary sessions with Dr. K. Nor does it take into account David's imitation of the aliens' voices, which checked with the description "...similar to the noise made by a kazoo" (page 60, line 3 of *The Humanoids*, in its original FSR Special Issue No. 1 version — October-November 1966). The Lorenzens' *UFOs over the Americas* did not appear in Calgary until later with its descriptions of rough-skinned

beings on p.127, lines 15 and 16, and p.180, lines 8 and 9.

Since I cannot disprove Dr. M.'s theory that the whole affair is a mental miasma arising from too many TV saucer shows and science fiction books in combination with the subconscious memory of his appendectomy, we let the matter rest in the hope that something else may turn up that will help to resolve the matter.

* * * * *

Editor's comment: I trust Bill Allan will soon find himself free to release further details to fill the obvious gaps in this report. In addition to the temporarily-withheld data about the appearance of the entities, the sketch, and the number of fingers and toes, there is no mention of David's age at the time of the incident. Also we would like to know more, if possible, about the 'craft,' whether or not it landed and, if it did, then *how* it landed, and so on. The existence of so many gaps in this report has been one of the main reasons for our delaying publication.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN

Fernand Lagarde

This item was the signed editorial leader of the French journal *Lumières dans la Nuit* No. 139 of November 1974. Translation by Gordon Creighton

A VISIT to us by Monsieur Gayral, our devoted investigator at Muret, who brought me plaster casts (impressive) of two of the 223 holes left by a 'machine' that flew over a field at Salvétat (Haute-Garonne) has pointed up one aspect of the situation which we generally do not take into consideration, simply because the *facts* remain unknown — and for a very good reason.

We are wont to ridicule credulous witnesses or flying saucer fanatics for whom it is self-evident that the UFOs come from Sirius, or from Venus, or who make fantastic mistakes over sundry objects. The harm that is done (in all good faith) by these folk is immense. Such is the lot of all inexplicable phenomena.

But what people don't know about are the sightings of weird phenomena for which the witnesses find a completely natural explanation that satisfies them, after which they no longer feel any further need to speak of the matter except perhaps to remark, in the course of a conversation, that they too once saw something, but that they are not so foolish as not to know the difference between black and white or to take the moon for green cheese.

Here are two examples to illustrate this sort of supposedly explicable sightings. One night one of these witnesses sees two luminous balls moving towards each other in the sky. The balls join up, remain together for a moment, and then separate, each going its way. The witness has his explanation: oh yes, it was two aeroplanes in flight,

which have just carried out a refuelling operation. The witness is satisfied. What he saw is normal and natural.

Another witness explains: "Yes, I've already seen lights in the sky, but it was nothing. For example, one evening I saw a satellite pass over, and join up with a star. It remained inside the star for a moment, and then continued on its way again."

For this witness too the event was a quite natural one, and he has only spoken of it because we had insisted that he do so. But for him the matter is solved and disposed of: why, it was simply a satellite meeting a star and remaining in it for a while before departing again on its way. And what is there more normal than that!

Naturally happenings of these kinds will never be known, but they show that many witnesses do not overburden themselves with questions, or that they easily manage to find a reassuring explanation for something that was anything but reassuring.

These happenings show therefore that there are naive folk on both sides of the fence: in the camps of those who see saucers everywhere and those who do not wish to believe in saucers. Credulity and incredulity are attributes which are distributed in equal proportion. I thought it a good idea to emphasise this. The one side balances the other. But it is only the first category (that of the credulous) that comes to light. *It is the only one of the two that is known.*