

events apparently repeated. This time fear was replaced by guilt — guilt because they had “betrayed a trust” by informing the police of the original incident. After the incident, the young woman who had left the car during the first incident, developed a severe speech impediment, and “lost” certain basic skills such as writing. Her friend suffered no adverse effects other than fright. Apparently as at now the “victim” has recovered from most of the post-UFO-event ailments. Apparently police patrols had observed strange lights during the same night, and one patrol had come upon a massive procession of snails crossing the road and heading towards the area of the bizarre event. Could the snails have had something to do with the viscous material?<sup>17</sup> This incident bears some remarkable similarity to the Umvuma to Beit Bridge UFO escort case in Rhodesia of May, 1974.<sup>18</sup>

Whatever the nature of the Nemingha phenomenon, further elucidation depends on receiving further information from the two witnesses, and from the woman who experienced it all. Had some of the white substance been recovered and subjected to analysis the case may have set quite a precedent for formulating theories about the nature of the unknown aerial phenomenon.

#### References

1. Newspapers; also see “What is the truth about these

- mysterious sightings?” by Tony Barker, *Sunday Mail*, October, 1965.
2. *Maryborough Advertiser*, “AUFOR”, No.10, Dec. 1969 & “AFSR” (Victorian edition) No.5, July, 1966.
3. AFSR (VUFORS) No.8, & *Flying Saucer Review* (UK) — FSR — Vol.14, No.2.
4. *Pix-People*, September 7, 1972.
5. UFOIC Newsletter, No.37, Sept./Oct. 1972 & *Melbourne Sun* April 15, 1972.
6. *Australasian Post*, August 24, 1972, & Investigation by B. Stapleton & Garry Little (Investigation notes compiled by K. Basterfield). See also FSR Vol.18, No.6.
7. *Pix-People*, October 12, 1972.
8. TUFOIC. See also FSR Vol.21, No.5.
9. *Northern Daily Leader*, 8.4.76.
10. Ibid. (9)
11. Australian UFO Trace case catalogue compiled by B. Chalker, consisting of 63 UFO related trace cases to date.
12. *Northern Daily Leader*, 29.6.76.
13. *The World of Flying Saucers*, Menzel & Boyd (1963), page 194.
14. FSR Vol.18, No.6, “Landing on the Leusderheide” by G.S. Wiersema.
15. FSR *Case Histories*, No.10, June, 1972, “The Strange Force that moved a car,” GICOFF (Sweden) report.
16. FSR *Case Histories*, No. 4, April, 1971, “Strange Norwegian Encounter near Helleland” by Anders Liljegren.
17. Personal investigation (B. Chalker).
18. FSR Vol.21, No.1, “Car teleported by UFOs in Rhodesia” by Charles Bowen & Vol.21, No.2, “Escorted by UFOs from Umvuma to Beit Bridge” by Carl van Vlieden.

## MAIL BAG

### On J.M. Bigorne's "Forced Feeding by UFO Entities"

Dear Sir,—The events of the encounter described in FSR Vol.21, No.6 can, I feel, best be explained as a testing of the reaction of a chance human witness to a sudden and unexpected confrontation with the unknown and an *apparently* senseless action by unknown beings.

In terms of human logic, visitors from an advanced alien civilization would not approach a person alone on the road. Furthermore, they would not stop him, hand him something to eat, and then depart after he had consumed it. Human logic says that any such visitors would openly approach world leaders and land perhaps before the U.N.

However, in view of the all too frequent human reaction of fear — with its resultant violence — when confronted by that which is of the realm of the unknown, such an operation could only be termed foolhardy. Before contact of an involved nature could be initiated, some method

would have to be devised whereby this fear/violence reaction could be overcome. Chance encounters with isolated individuals the world over would be an excellent means of doing this.

In these encounters, each of the witnesses would be approached and his reactions (perhaps also thoughts) noted at all times. Some of those who reacted with fear would be allowed to simply depart, as in this case. This would demonstrate the lack of hostile intent on the part of the unknown beings, for no attempt is made to prevent the witness from departing. In other instances, even though fired upon, there is no retaliatory action taken which proves fatal to the human being(s) involved — at most a paralysis beam is used on a temporary basis. In still other instances, these visitors approach the witnesses and engage in such things as physical examinations. Beyond that there are those instances in which they engage in some *seemingly* nonsensical actions such as the “piece of chocolate” given to this witness.

**Correspondence is invited from our readers, but they are asked to keep their letters short. Unless letters give the sender's full name and address (not necessarily for publication) they cannot be considered. The Editor would like to remind correspondents that it is not always possible to acknowledge every letter personally, so he takes this opportunity of thanking all who write to him.**

In all such encounters, regardless of the particular events which transpire, each side obtains a bit more knowledge regarding the other. The more each knows about the other, the better the chances of a successful open confrontation at some future date. It would be expected that curiosity would ultimately replace fear. Thus, those instances in which a human being were approached and he sought only to greet the unknown, having replaced fear with a desire to learn from the experience, would indicate a measure of success in the *programme*.

That such an *alien study programme* might well exist is evident in the world wide reports of UFOs and their entities which form a definite pattern. There is a logical progression from nocturnal lights, to brightly lit objects that fly by, to craft that hover nearby and reveal certain structural details, to craft which land, to beings seen peering through windows, to beings seen emerging from these craft, to beings seen engaged in such actions as specimen gathering, and, finally, to close encounters with human wit-

nesses. Each step brings the two groups closer together and thereby provides that much more data on which to work. The latter steps serve to demonstrate peaceful intent and scientific study to beings unknown; all progresses in a manner which shows definite purpose and which results in no serious injury to the witnesses. Every opportunity is present to harm the individual involved, and, yet, nothing of the sort takes place.

The witness in the case being considered was "very frightened" when he first became aware of the presence of "the two ufonauts." In fact, he was "panic-stricken." Thus, the first course of action would be to do everything possible to reduce or eliminate the overpowering emotion of fear. Reason would have to be in control if positive results were to be expected from the incident. An attempt to convey both the need for controlling reason and the needlessness of fear can be seen in

the fact that at no time was the witness roughly handled; all the two beings did was grasp the handlebars of his moped and gesture "indicating to him that he should eat something."

That the reactions of a human being to a chance encounter with the unknown were being tested is supported by the fact that the entities exchanged glances as if communicating. Had the fear of the witness been noted? Was the "piece of chocolate" a further testing to see how he would respond to an *apparently* senseless action on their part? An action, however, which though seeming pointless did, in fact, serve a very definite purpose — that of showing the witness that hostility played no part in the event. He was offered the "substance"; it was at no time forced upon him. To quote the article, the witness himself insisted that: "the two beings patiently waited until he had quite finished eating the substance before

they let him go. In fact, as soon as he had eaten the substance, they moved away from his moped and so permitted him to depart, which he did so with the utmost speed, terrified, without waiting for anything else to happen."

When everything indicated that fear, rather than reason, was in control, it became quite evident that little, if anything, of a positive nature could be expected to result from prolonging the encounter. Thus, it was immediately terminated and each side went its separate way.

By itself, then, the "piece of chocolate" makes no sense. But, when viewed as a segment of the hypothesized *alien study programme*, it takes on an entirely new light; it fits the pattern designed to eventually culminate in open contact.

Beatrice M. Zimmer  
Fairfax, Virginia, U.S.A.  
June 29, 1976.

# World round-up

*of news and comment  
about recent sightings*

## United States of America A creature from Wisconsin

This item is taken from the *National Star* of May 11, 1976. This newspaper is a tabloid which is distributed nationally in the States in drug stores and grocery stores, and the account tells of an incident which took place on November 10, 1975:

"The visitors that arrived unexpectedly on the doorstep of Peter Eilbes' house were out of this world. They had mouths the size of dimes and when they moved they drifted like astronauts 10 or 11 feet with each step.

"Now Peter, 64, a retired construction foreman, of Wauwatosa, Wisc., is convinced that his uninvited guests were from outer space. And his wife Anne, 59, who was first to see them when she answered their ring at the doorbell, agrees.

"She told *The Star*: "The first thing I saw was a hat one of them was wearing. It had a narrow brim which made it look like a flying saucer. I opened the inside door and stuck my arm out to lock the screen door. Twice I said 'yes?' and when I got no reply, I told Pete that whoever it was could not talk."

"Pete continued: 'I could see about four others flocking around, though the rest of the street was deserted. We were surrounded by these critters. Their legs seemed to be moving, but they weren't touching the grass.

"The one at the door had a

mouth that was extremely small, about the size of a dime. It looked as if he could only sip liquids through a straw, and his chin was fixed.

"It would be impossible for anyone to move the way these critters were moving. They drifted a couple of feet off the ground and moved 10 or 11 feet with each step — the way the astronauts walked on the moon, only more controlled."

"Mrs. Eilbes said that the creatures left after about five minutes.

"When the Eilbes reported the incident, they felt that the police thought they were nuts.

"I got the feeling the officer thought I'd been drinking," said Pete.

"A spokesman for the police department at Wauwatosa, said:

"We investigated the incident but nothing was substantiated."

Credit: Richard W. Heiden of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Mr. Heiden comments (June 15, 1976):

After Ted Bloecher sent me this article, I called the witnesses again; the reporter had spoken with them only briefly, and took pictures. Peter made two drawings for them, but I feel sure that the drawing with the article was made by a *Star* artist (Peter did not have the article on hand when I called, so he did not know for sure). In the drawing he made for me, he would not draw the eyes, as he did not remember them. Also, there is only one step



Sketch of one of the "spacemen" based on a drawing by *Star* artist

there (even if there were two, as incorrectly shown in the picture, the witnesses would only have seen the top one from the doorway where they were). I interviewed the witnesses for about three hours in their home, and also talked with them by phone a couple of times. They seem sincere and I am inclined to believe them, but I have made no reference check with neighbours, pastor, etc. (I am saying this only to avoid sticking my neck out with a definite conclusion at this time.)