

and the implied relationship between cattle mutilations and UFOs in other cases.

The details of the related events will be concluded in the Second part of this report, which will also include the investigators' evaluations.

\* \* \* \* \*

# MAIL BAG

## Oue for the 1954 book

Dear Mr. Bowen, — Your *excellent* answer to Dr. Willy Smith in FSR Vol. 26, No. 6, gives me the opportunity to write you, vieux copain, and to give a brief account of a case in 1954 which I have never before mentioned.

The "witness" first wrote me a letter. In every other way he seemed believable — sober, cultured, anxious to keep his story secret — yet at first I did not believe him, rather in the fashion of Dr. Smith. Perhaps I should try to explain: what he told me so perplexed me that I couldn't rid my mind of it, especially when, during the long years, I investigated a CE3(4). He was, in fact, the first "contactee" I had encountered, and he was a strange contactee at that, for he himself could not believe his own story (though he was sure it took place) because of its absurdity.

Let me relate the details: one night that autumn, while driving in the country, he was stopped by something on the road. He stopped, got out of the car, saw — somewhat vaguely — what was then called a flying saucer (round, etc.) and, between him and the thing, a little being. He never gave me precise details for he considered that nothing in his adventure deserved investigation (because of its absurdity). The little being approached and addressed the witness, in a queer "artificial" or monotonous voice, repeating two sentences a number of times. Those two sentences were:—

"*La vérité est refusée aux constipés,*" and "*Ce que vous appelez cancer vient des dents.*"

Even in French the first sentence is more than ambiguous. "*Constipé*" means, of course, "Constipated," but it also means "stiff" or "ill at ease". In the second sense it can be understood somewhat humourously. But "*refusée*" *par qui?* does it mean that people with stiff characters are unlikely to find or grasp truth? (What truth?). One can imagine many other interpretations. As for the second sentence, there are also many other possible meanings, for example "*vient des dents*" ("comes from the teeth") can mean "through what you eat" (your diet), or "your manner of eating" and so on.

Remember that in the autumn of 1954

all such strange things were *new* — by that I mean CE3 and 4. An ordinary person in 1954 could not grasp the idea that another world, whatever that can be, was mounting a scenario, of "fantasmagory," as huge as that wave, merely in order to deliver such follies and platitudes.

Years later, while still reflecting on that, and other cases, I tried to renew contact with the witness. Alas he was dead. However a friend of his answered me (I think he is still alive) and so is the unique confident of the witness (apart from me). The friend told me that he asked the witness on his death bed what was the truth of the story. The dying man confirmed the whole story ... and died asking himself what the devil it could all mean.

Personally, I believe the story is "true". But *Quid est veritas?* as Pontius Pilate said. Voltaire remarked that "... he went out without waiting for an answer, so that human kind were left in ignorance of the truth."

Yours sincerely,

**Aimé Michel,**

Alpes de Haute Provence,  
France.

21 April, 1981

## Genesis: Miss Randles please note

Sir, — Any book published is going to receive both positive and negative reviews, and while all authors worth their salt should enjoy the former and keep quiet about the latter, no author should take lying down the sort of distortions purveyed by Jenny Randles in her review of my novel *Genesis* in the November issue of FSR. The following corrections are therefore to be noted:

It is suggested that the author never explains who his two leading characters are working for. In fact, in the very first chapter (page 16), it is made clear that they are working for a civilian organisation called the Aerial Phenomena Investigations Institute, based in Washington, D.C. The work of that institute, obviously based on NICAP, is discussed by both characters in the same chapter. I apologise for not discussing their income (another complaint by Jenny), but I can't imagine many readers being interested.

**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.**

It is also claimed that my two scientists, who do not work for the government, "stroll in and out of military bases with a freedom that is ridiculous to say the least." To say the least, my scientists pay calls to only two such establishments throughout the course of the novel: one to Winslow Air Base, Arizona, and the other to NASA. Regarding the former, Winslow is not a secret establishment and it would be perfectly easy for a journalist or scientist to obtain the sort of pass used by my character; regarding the latter, rather than have my characters "stroll in and out ... with a freedom that is ridiculous", I clearly show them being *refused* entry to NASA.

Jenny describes the younger of my two scientists as someone who "wallows in strong drink or drugs." In fact, that particular character, Stanford, has two major confrontations in the book — one with an alcoholic and one with a drug addict — but during neither scene does Stanford either "wallow" in drink or take drugs; and nowhere in the 612 pages of *Genesis* is it even remotely suggested that he has ever indulged in such delicious vices.

According to Jenny, the reader is "forced to assume" that young Stanford's admittedly violent methods of interrogation (on only two occasions, I might add) is "standard for both him and other associates of his." In fact, Stanford's only other associate is clearly shown to be a kind and gentle old man who treats everyone with unflinching decency. As for Stanford, contrary to the monster suggested by the unduly sensitive Ms Randles, he is drawn as an obviously intelligent, amiable but uncommitted young man whose two outbursts of violence in the latter half of the book are borne of increasing frustration, fear and desperation — a not abnormal reaction under the circumstances described in the novel.

Jenny suggests that one of the characters dies of a heart attack because of a beating received by Stanford. This is simply not true. The character in question is actually murdered by someone else.

Jenny claims that Stanford "resorts to rape to elicit the truth from one unfortunate." This, also, is untrue. The

## IMPORTANT NOTICE FOR OVERSEAS SUBSCRIBERS

£:\$ Rate of exchange: We are unable to keep pace with the rapidly fluctuating rate of exchange, and are unable to afford constant changes in our stationery. So, in order that overseas subscribers (particularly American readers) will not be charged over the odds, we urge them to remit either by International Money Order, or by Banker's Draft on a London Bank, in £ Sterling (remembering that our current subscription rate is £6.00 per annum).

girl is obviously willing and Stanford uses no force; it's a mutual seduction by two people who hardly know what they're doing.

Finally, Jenny seems particularly offended that I should recommend FSR as "mandatory reading" but with a "selective eye." To that I can only reply that no higher praise than "mandatory reading" can be applied to any publication; and that judging by your own admirably democratic and therefore argumentative letter columns, a "selective eye" is frequently utilised by your most faithful readers.

Any reviewer is entitled to dislike a book; no reviewer should be allowed to distort the contents of that book.

Otherwise, I thank you for the review — and I shall, of course, continue to read FSR.

Yours in hopes of democratic treatment,  
**W. A. Harbinson,**  
44 Rosebery Road,  
Muswell Hill,  
London N10 2LJ  
March 31, 1981

PS: The novel doesn't conjure up a nightmarish picture of Ufology; it conjures up a nightmarish picture of the possible abuse of current technology: the Ufologists are not accused; the scientists are . . . So!

**What do the "top brass" believe?**

Sir, — A really splendid feature by

Desmond Leslie on Mountbatten.

The answer is surely obvious. Mountbatten accepted UFOs as does the Defence Ministry, but when the subject became too near home he dared not voice his personal opinion, and instead he chickened out. So far as I know no top brass has as yet had the courage to say what he believes.

Yet, in your same issue in Part 2 of the 'Imjärvi Skiers', we come across the following statement: 'The humanoids are highly educated and their development is 5,000 to 7,000 years ahead of ours. . . ! In this context I suggest your readers take a close look at *The Janos People*, by Frank Johnson, and not write off this remarkable book as pure fantasy, as some have already done.

Yours faithfully,  
**Neville Armstrong**  
Neville Spearman Ltd,  
The Priory Gate,  
Friars Street,  
Sudbury, Suffolk.  
5 March, 1981

### Another mini-UFO?

Dear Sir, — I would like to report a possible UFO sighting that I made on 2nd May, 1981. I was flying in a glider approximately 1 or 2 miles south west of Lasham airfield in Hampshire, my height was 2,500 feet above ground level, or 3,100 feet above sea level. At about 3.15 p.m., BST, a silver coloured object approached me from the north.

When I first saw it, the object was slightly below me and looked like a car hub cap. When it had passed me I thought it was probably a balloon, but as this did not tie up with my first impression of a hub cap, I decided to follow it and make sure it was a balloon.

As I approached the object it started to turn to my right and I turned with it. It was now about the same height as my glider, and viewed side on looked about the same shape and size as a Rugby ball. Having done one turn in a clockwise direction, the object then moved to the south and was soon lost to view because of its colour and size.

The wind direction was north east, as far as I know, so the object could have been a balloon, the unusual thing being that it turned round me when I followed it.

Would you please let me know if you have had any sightings of similar sized objects, or can suggest what it might have been?

Yours faithfully,  
**R. Whittaker,**  
8 Hamilton Road,  
Church Crookham,  
Aldershot, Hants.  
GU13 OAS.  
7 May, 1981

*[Omar Fowler reported a mini-disc observed near Blackbushe airfield by a flying instructor and his pupil — an army officer — in 1979 (see FSR Vol. 26, No. 1, 1980) — EDITOR/]*

## THE WESSEX RESEARCH GROUP NETWORK

THIS is a co-ordinating network and focus for groups and individuals concerned with new areas of research and experience. They are particularly interested in spiritual, cultural, artistic, historical, ecological and scientific fields. They also have periodic UFO lectures, and regard the UFO phenomenon as one which deserves serious, objective investigation. A recent programme included a feature on FSR, acknowledging its high standards.

They meet in suitable places throughout historic Wessex, holding lectures by prominent speakers, and other events, designed to bring together divergent groups.

Branches are being formed in many parts of Wessex. Will anyone interested please contact the Co-ordinator, **Nigel Blair, Beech Cottage, 79 Acreman St., Sherborne, Dorset DT9 3PH (Tel: Sherborne 2353)**. If you would like to subscribe to their regular mailing list for a year, and be sent their programmes automatically, please send £1.00 (minimum charge) to the above address (cheques to "Wessex Research Group"), and advise them of your relevant interests, or of any activities in which you are involved.