

by the compiler and available from him at P.O. Box 711, Hobe Sound, Florida 33455-0711, U.S.A.; price \$14.50 including postage abroad; 282 pages). It is totally amazing how many publications dealing with UFOs have been spawned since 1947, and most of them it seems lasted only for a few issues. Tom Lind gives as much information on each as he has been able to discover: location, publisher, address, editor, dates of first and last editions, frequency. An incredible multiplicity of titles has emerged, including some very strange ones: 'Galac Ticks from the Universal Clock', 'Lavender Sun Newsletter', 'Flying Manure Spreader News'. Both these catalogues will be of great value to anyone interested in or researching the history of ufology.

In *The Andreasson Affair, Phase Two* by Raymond Fowler (Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey; price \$10.95; 278 pages; illustrated; bibliography; index) Betty Andreasson undergoes more hypnotic regressions (see *The Andreasson Affair* reviewed in FSR Vol. 25, No. 6) and a series of events are reported which are as amazing as those disclosed in the first book. She revealed that her earliest experience was in 1944 at the age of seven, when she had a contact experience whilst playing in her garden. Aged thirteen she underwent a typical physical examination during an abduction and continued with a series of visits to inexplicable locations culminating in a meeting with the 'One', beyond a great glass door, a meeting with mystical religious overtones but about which she can say nothing. Her new husband Robert Luca also underwent several ses-

sions of hypnotic regression in order to delve into his hidden memory of 1967 when he had a UFO sighting and a time loss of three hours. It was his attempts to find an explanation for this experience that had caused him to originally meet and later marry Betty. Under hypnosis he too disclosed eventful contacts, first in 1944 aged five and later in 1967. As in the first book, the events revealed are involved, obscure, sometimes terrifying for the percipients, and contain a strong religious message. The Lucases, since their major experiences, been subjected to a continual stream of psychic occurrences, ranging from levitating, apporthing and disappearing objects to phantom prowlers in their house. They say also that they have repeatedly been harrassed by low-flying unmarked helicopters whose origin cannot be determined. The author concludes with first a review of reactions to and criticisms of the first book, secondly an exposition of biblical miracles seen in a ufological context, and finally a concise review of the messages conveyed to Betty and her husband by the entities during each of their experiences. If these events are accepted as a factual account of real experiences, then they suggest that the entity/percipient interaction is not a chance event but part of a continuing plan of surveillance and selection and that every CE3 may have a series of such encounters buried within the witness's unconscious memory. Alternatively, as the functions of the mind are so little understood, the critics of the hypnotic techniques used can still maintain that the reports are more likely to be based on unconscious fantasy rather than fact.

AN OPEN LETTER TO AN IMPATIENT UFOLOGIST

Dr. Pierre Guérin

Astronomer and Physicist, Maître de Recherche, CNRS (Senior Research Officer in the French National Council for Scientific Research)

(Translation from French)

Just as is happening in the U.S.A. and here, a vigorous effort is now being made in France to prove conclusively that all the remarkable events of the great UFO Waves of 25 and 30 years ago were either fraudulent or due to misinterpretation of normal phenomena. As the events in question become more distant in time and more of the eye-witnesses die off, this task will naturally become steadily more easy. In the meantime, however, we are indebted to Messrs R. Veillith and F. Lagarde and the Editorial Committee of *Lumières Dans La Nuit* for this important statement from an eminent French scientist, which appeared in No. 215/216 of their Journal (May-June 1982).

EDITOR

You know perfectly well that the things which, for want of a better term, we call "UFOs", do really exist, even if you have no bits and pieces of one to present as evidence to the Academy of Sciences. The whole of your "parallel" activity as a "Ufologist" has been spent by you in trying to prove that reality, against the allegations of the "rationalists", and you have succeeded

in proving it, whatever *they* may continue to claim. Their persistence in denying the facts astonishes you, indeed it even disgusts you. The truth is that you simply cannot understand their attitude — and I am very much afraid that they themselves have not fully analyzed the causes of it. But I think I understand the reasons for it, and I shall try to explain these reasons

to you. First of all, however, I would like to remind you of the kind of "proofs" that you have secured. This aspect is fundamental to our discussion.

It is all too easy to claim to examine, one by one (as our opponents have now triumphantly done) all the press reports that served as the source material here in France 28 years ago for Aimé Michel's book about "mysterious objects in the skies", and then to proceed to show, by re-questioning the alleged witnesses so many years afterwards (provided of course that they aren't already dead in the meantime), or by questioning their neighbours — who didn't like them anyway maybe and who hadn't believed them at the time — it's all too easy, I repeat, to argue, as our critics are now doing, that ALL those reports were mistakes relating to the Moon, or to meteorites, or — more rarely — to common or garden hoaxes, plus the fact that, to cap it all, the journalists had in any case generally distorted the stories in the process. In certain of the cases that have been analyzed in this fashion I am indeed in entire agreement with the conclusions arrived at by the opposition, even though I doubt very much whether they have had the sheer physical time REALLY to investigate every single one of the cases that they quote. Far too often, due to the mere force of circumstances, they have carried out these investigations of theirs *by . . . telephone!* But that's not the worst of it! In actual fact, the cases "knocked off" by them in this fashion only amount anyway to about 80% of the total number of cases listed in Aimé Michel's book, and not "the whole lot" as is claimed by those whom our opponents get to write the prefaces of their books.

Now it is *precisely* these cases that have been left out and that the other side don't talk about — it is *precisely* these that stand up so strongly against all attempts to "settle" them. *Every Ufologist has long been aware that the main percentage, 80%, (90% sometimes, depending on the source), is precisely the proportion of the reports that, AFTER DUE INVESTIGATION, do yield to other explanations, leaving us then with a vital residue.* But anyway, let us disregard this attempt to refute Ufology by a piece of blatant intellectual dishonesty — *dishonesty*, because it is done knowingly, in the attempt to make us believe that irreducible 20% (or 10% as the case may be) of the reports are reducible too.

The reason why these 20% (or 10%) of the cases are "irreducible" is NOT because (as the denying camp make out) the eyewitnesses reported too few details, but — on the contrary - *it is because of the very abundance and the very precision of their details!* When a claimed sighting has lasted for many seconds — sometimes for much more than a whole minute — giving the eyewitnesses time enough in which to pinch themselves and make sure that they aren't dreaming, and when the object (for that's what we must call it — *the object*) is seen, often in broad daylight, at a small or medium distance (established with

the aid of reference markers provided by the terrain) with an apparent diameter exceeding by several orders of magnitude the separative power of the eye, and when it reveals numerous precise structured details, as well as movements — then in such cases as these you can't invoke bad viewing conditions, or the effect of surprise — both of which factors are wont to render many human testimonies fragile in the extreme. Oh no! In such cases as these, I say, we have from the outset but three possibilities left to us, namely:—

1. The eyewitness or the eyewitnesses have made it up.
2. They are mentally sick individuals, prone to hallucinations.
3. They are people of sound mind who have genuinely seen what they report, and what they describe, if not with perfect accuracy, at least sufficiently exactly for any correlation with known objects or known phenomena to be ruled right out.

If we now turn to hoaxes, our opponents themselves admit that hoaxes are relatively rare. And let me add that every serious investigator who has conducted his enquiries *at the source* (and I admit that I myself have sometimes failed to live up to this rule) has, generally speaking, no difficulty whatever in showing up a hoax — often the authors are only too unable to refrain for long from boasting about it. And if it's a mythomaniac with whom you are dealing, the behaviour of the "witness" will not deceive the alert investigator.

As regards *hallucinations*, you are aware that we have contacted psychiatrists and have, on several occasions, passed on to them for consultation a witness whose prior consent has, of course, been obtained. Occasionally the diagnosis "mentally sick" has been positive (cranial traumatism), but, far more often the diagnosis has been negative, and in these latter cases the eyewitnesses could in no manner whatsoever have "hallucinated" what they had seen. *In any event, we have learned from the psychiatrists that, if hallucination there be, it cannot provoke visions presenting the precise features of the good UFO reports.* And indeed those who were seen by the doctors and were found to be suffering from cranial traumatisms had never described other than utterly "woolly" scenes. And, finally, we found that the alleged "waking dream", by eyewitnesses of sound mind but beset by anxiety over the dangers of war or pollution, *does not exist medically*, and is nothing but an *ad hoc* invention cooked up by certain opponents of Ufology who are hard put to it for an argument with which to bolster up their case.

And so, by a process of elimination, we have come to the point where it is necessary to accept the thesis of *the thing seen correctly and described correctly.* And, incidentally, we possess an indirect proof of the reality of such accounts. This stems from sightings of meteor-

ites, or of space-craft re-entering the Earth's atmosphere. Many witnesses say, in such cases, that they saw a "UFO", and that this "UFO" was spitting out fire through its tubes and had portholes. What they say was "fire" is in fact a very good description by them of the tail of ionized gas behind the meteor, and when they say "portholes" what they are describing no less precisely are the various parts of the craft as seen in succession the one after the other. All of which permits of precise identification, and only serves to enhance the quality of the witness's statement.

All of this so far, as you see, pertains to the domain of *testimonial evidence*, and not to the domain of what is called "scientific" proof. But, incidentally, is there actually such a thing as scientific proof? Does it exist? After giving careful thought to this point, I think I doubt it — at least I doubt it at least insofar as "crude" observed and reported facts are concerned. The proof of a crude fact, in the absence of any explanatory model, cannot be other than merely testimonial. When the pieces of evidence are sufficiently numerous and are mutually concordant — their independence incidentally being guaranteed (and this was always the case in respect of UFO reports before the media got into the act and debased the material) — one can indeed arrive at a degree of conviction which, while it is not scientific proof, and never could be scientific proof, nevertheless still carries weight. We see this every day in the course of scientific work, where everything has its start in this way, and where the explanatory models only come later — at any rate in theory.

Why then is it — and it is this that makes you so wild — why is it that there are two sets of weights and two systems of measurement? What I am saying is this: why are UFOs rejected by the scientific community as a whole whereas, for example, meteorites were accepted when testimonial proof of them was supplied to the French Academy of Sciences by Biot? Don't tell me that the proof for meteorites wasn't only testimonial, but was also "material" — fragments of stones that had dropped from the sky having been gathered up *in situ* by Biot and taken by him to Paris. What I am saying is that the fragments of meteorites were *likewise* only "testimonial" — based on somebody else's statements (just as the marks left on the ground by UFOs are), for it was necessary to accept the word of the peasants who had seen those stones falling, and also to accept the word of Biot that these examples produced by him *really were* some of those stones!

Oh no! the true reason why the meteorites were accepted at that particular moment in time derives from the fact that chemistry and crystallography were sufficiently developed at that date to be able to furnish, lock stock and barrel, the whole experimental and conceptual framework that was necessary for the analysis and the comprehension of the meteorites. A century or so earlier, it had not been so, and the meteor-

ites were rejected, despite the fact that the testimonial proofs that stones had fallen from the sky were already just as much available as they would be later.

The epistemologists inform us *how Science should be*; the historians of Science tell us *how it is*. Every new phenomenon (which it is legitimate to doubt in the beginning, from scientific prudence) is, generally speaking, given consideration ONLY IF IT FITS INTO AN ALREADY EXISTING CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK. In Biot's day, meteorites could be fitted into such a framework, but could not have done so earlier. In our days, the UFOs cannot (yet) fit into our Science. So, despite all the evidential proofs, they are rejected.

You aren't going to change anything . . .

This rejection is in the first place *psychological*. For as long as Science has existed, all those phenomena, at first unexplained, which religious and/or simply popular belief attributed to a non-human intelligent intervention often labelled "divine" or "diabolical" (such as lightning, disasters, etc.) have gradually turned out to be explicable on the basis of natural laws, without intervention by spirit, or by a spirit. With the result that scientists have got into the habit of considering that any new phenomenon seeming *prima facie* to derive from some non-human intervention external to the Earth is either a case of poor observation or reducible to a non-intelligent natural phenomenon that the eyewitness has failed to recognise properly. Any attitude opposed to this is regarded as intellectual regression.

And then too we have the arguments from Physics. Our present-day knowledge of the topological structure of the Universe is confined to spaces x, y, z , etc., and we cannot imagine that, in order to go from one star to another star, there is any way by which one could travel other than along one continuous trajectory. This Space is the arena for the interplay of the relativistic limitations of speed and energy, which render impossible journeys aboard very small craft like the UFOs, in a reasonable span of time, and with a sufficiency of "fuel." The single, unique landing of one immense space-craft arriving here from the depths of Interstellar Space once in a few thousand years would not upset the physicist. What does upset him is this vast coming and going of small craft that appear, into the bargain, to defy all the laws of inertia in our own atmosphere. This in fact is one of the real reasons for the rejection of the UFOs by the "rationalists." But we Ufologists have long been of the opinion that maybe the topological structure of the Universe is more complex than we nowadays admit it to be, and that there might exist spatio-temporal "short-cuts" that would permit journeys from one star to another, without involving any violation of the relativistic limitations in a classic four-dimensional Space. Mathematical models (so-called "twin universes") already exist today, but we have absolutely no knowledge of whether, over

and beyond their unquestionable internal logic, they apply to reality and possess any physical meaning. Models such as these would make it possible to cancel out the inertial impossibilities. Thus, a UFO performing a right-angled turn at very high speed would in reality be possessed of no movement in Space x , y , or z , etc. It would be occupying a series of successive instantaneous positions, in between which it would be making use of the "short-cuts" envisaged by us above. This incidentally would fit very well with certain sightings in which a craft has vanished as it were "on the spot", and reappeared immediately afterwards in the near vicinity. *But of course all this is still Science-Fiction, and will be, until the day when our most orthodox, most rational Physics makes a break-through in our present-day notions of Time and Space. And we don't know whether that will ever come, nor when.*

So far as I myself am concerned, I am now too old, and, above all, my training as an experimental scientist means that there are too many gaps in my theoretical knowledge for me to think of undertaking any research myself along these lines. But I do know that there are investigators (not necessarily people who are interested in UFOs) who are thinking of it.

In any case, until the day comes when our Science is sufficiently advanced to be able to find a place for UFOs, it is totally useless to try to get the scientific community to take UFO reports seriously — not even those for which the evidence is best established. And our Science is a long, long way from that day . . .

This is why I, for my part, have abandoned any hope, in the prevailing situation, of being able to promote any sort of interest in Ufology within the scientific community. The promotion of such an interest could only come about as a result of a new "revolution" or a number of new "revolutions" in Physics, but not by any premature psychological "forcing."

Introductory comment or preface by the Editor of Lumières dans la Nuit.

Everyone will be aware of the stand taken in favour of the physical reality of the UFOs by the astrophysicist Dr. Pierre Guérin, whose views run counter to the whole prevailing current of the majority of the scientific world (and not merely of their hard, "rationalist" fraction.) In his capacity as an "official" scientist, Pierre Guérin knows, better than anyone does, the sort of attacks to which you are exposed when you reveal a "Ufological" standpoint in that working milieu. Dr. Guérin explained to us most emphatically that, in publishing this "Open Letter," his purpose has in no way been to abdicate from or to distance himself in the slightest degree from his previous standpoint or to "toe the line again" by any sort of "capitulation", nor has he any wish to discourage the numerous amateur investigators who are keenly interested in the study of the UFO Phenomenon. All that he has wished to do,

he tells us, is to draw the *present* contours of the official recognition of Ufology by the scientific world, while at the same time "leaving the door open" for a later and more progressed recognition if and when Science — and particularly Physics — ever becomes sufficiently advanced to find a place into which it can fit the phenomenon naturally within the framework of its concepts. According to Dr. Guérin, that moment has not yet come, and this fact means a vast limitation on the hopes that some people had harboured, both in the USA (Condon Committee) and in France (G.E.P.A.N.), that official organisations would be created whose task it would be to throw light upon the problem. The pressures brought to bear upon such organisations (pressures designed to prevent them from lending credence to the idea of extraterrestrial visitations) arise essentially from the weight of the scientific establishment in the universities from whom they derive and by whom they are controlled rather than from the (undeniable) desire of certain Governmental Services to conceal from the public the existence of the UFOs — partly in order to avoid panic, and partly also with an eye to any possible technological spill-offs of a secret and military nature. Scientists are as a general rule highly allergic to any sort of imposed secrecy, and they would not have failed to denounce this policy of silence long ago had they themselves not already been fully convinced, for the most part, that there was nothing to hide from the public for the simple reason that, in their view, *UFOs don't exist*. Such is the actual situation.

The reader will notice, incidentally, that in this "Open Letter" Pierre Guérin presents implicitly, as fully evident (without discussing it) the physical, structured nature, and the extraterrestrial nature, of the UFOs as "craft" of non-human origin. For, in his opinion, such events as the close sightings of UFOs (by naked eye and simultaneously by radar) by pilots of military aircraft, the case where a helicopter was "sucked up" by a UFO, the truncated shafts of light emitted by UFOs — not to mention the recent cases of cattle mutilation — all this, he says, has nothing in common with the classic types of paranormal phenomena which have long been catalogued by parapsychologists and are of entirely human origin.

This "primary" UFO phenomenon, says Guérin, derives unquestionably from a technology. The mistake of those investigators who reduce the whole of Ufology to manifestations of the paranormal is that they always neglect this aspect of the matter, and only take into consideration the seemingly "paranormal" side of many CEIII cases whereas, in Guérin's view, the "psychic" element in the affair is brought about by a psychic interference directly induced by the UFO itself upon the close-encounter witnesses, and is dependent upon the particular culture and the particular preoccupations of the latter. (We exclude of course simple cases of hoax, whether or not mounted with a

view to monetary gain . . .)

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

As usual, Dr. Guérin's very individual style of writing is difficult to translate, and I have taken a few liberties and translated rather loosely in a few places in order to bring out better the sense of his argument.

The *Editorial Note*, by the Editor of *Lumières dans La Nuit*, appeared in the French original in a different position, namely as a preface or introduction to Dr. Guérin's *Open Letter*. I have however thought that there might perhaps be less confusion for FSR readers if I put it last.

As for Dr. Pierre Guérin, a few words about this eminent scientist (*one of France's top astronomers*) will not be out of place. He became known some years ago for his work on the Rings of Saturn, and he seems to have accepted the reality of the UFOs at an early date. He was at first known to FSR readers under the pseudonym of Jules Lemaître. This was the signature which he used on an article in FSR Vol. 5, No. 6 (Nov./Dec. 1959). The title of the article was *Angels or Monsters?: An unbiased Enquiry into the Contact Reports*. He concluded that on the whole the reports of unpleasant creatures seemed so far to be the more convincing, but suggested that two widely different factions might well be involved.

A few years later, Dr. Guérin was writing to the Editor of FSR to the effect that already the "intellectual battle" seemed to have been won, that many of the rising generation of scientists in France appeared to be disposed to accept the existence of the UFOs, and that henceforth we might publish his articles under his real name — and this we have done since then.

When, in the early months of 1974, the French Radio Channel *France-Inter* broadcast a long series of about 40 interviews and discussions on UFOs with scientists, ufologists, including myself, and UFO percipients from a number of countries, Dr. Pierre Guérin figured prominently among those interviewed, and so did the French Minister of Defence, Monsieur Robert Galley, who told millions of listeners in France and throughout Western Europe that the French Government took the subject of UFOs seriously and had had a department looking into the UFO reports since 1954. Shortly after this, Mr. Hugh Burnett made a long documentary (over one hour) for BBC Television on UFOs. Charles Bowen and I were both interviewed (separately) for this film, and we both spoke at length on and laid emphasis upon the French Minister's revelations — the first ever made by a serving Government Minister. *When the BBC documentary on UFOs was finally shown, every word that Charles Bowen and I had said about the French Minister had been cut out.* The Minister's revelations had received wide coverage in the newspapers of Western Europe, and indeed throughout the world, but seemingly no

reference to them has yet been permitted anywhere in the British media, and in recent debates in the House of Lords a number of lies were told, it being variously maintained on several occasions either that (a) no such French radio programme had been broadcast or that (b) no such statement had been made by the French Minister. The radio series had led to the appearance of a very successful French book, *La Nouvelle Vague des Soucoupes Volantes*, by the producer of the programme, Jean-Claude Bourret, and in due course I translated this as *The Crack in the Universe: What you have not been told about Flying Saucers* (Neville Spearman, 1975).

This book was also the subject of a denial in the House of Lords, where it was first maintained that no such book had appeared, and then that I did not understand French properly and had not given an accurate translation of Monsieur Galley's statement about UFOs.

Two of the chapters of this book were devoted to the views of Dr. Pierre Guérin. In one chapter, entitled *My Philosophy in the Matter of the UFOs*, his attitude seemed already noticeably more sceptical as to the possibility that our contemporary scientists would agree to accept the evidence for the existence of UFOs. The substance of his comment was basically as follows: "*Scientists will only accept the evidence IF THEY WANT TO. If you give them one good piece of evidence they will simply reject it and demand twenty more. It is they themselves who make the rules as to what constitutes evidence.*"

Dr. Jacques Vallée had said much the same thing some years ago in one of his books, when he commented that too many scientists were reacting to the UFO Phenomenon *with their emotions and not with their heads.*

One may suspect that, in the years since the French radio programme in 1974, Dr. Guérin, who holds a high scientific post under his Government, will have had plenty to put up with. If we bear in mind what happened in the USA to Dr. James McDonald and Dr. M. K. Jessup, to mention only two, then we can feel nothing but admiration for the way in which he has stood his ground.

Meanwhile, our readers will have seen the important Editorial by Monsieur F. Lagarde which appeared in the same issue of *Lumières Dans La Nuit* as this Open Letter (LDLN No. 215/216, May-June 1982) and which I have already translated (see FSR Vol. 28, No. 1, *A Warning to All*.) Evidently the two documents belong together and should be studied together, along with Dr. Jean Gille's *Bankruptcy of the French UFO Research Body, G.E.P.A.N.*, which we publish on another page of this issue.

In conclusion, one can feel that there is indeed a very great deal of truth in Dr. Guérin's thesis that

scientists cannot bring themselves to accept the evidence for the UFOs simply because it does not fit in yet with their Science and with their current concepts of the nature of the Universe. There may likewise be a very great deal of truth in the view that governments are anxious to suppress discussion of the UFO Problem because (1) they fear public panic and (2) because some of them may be hoping to secure enormous military advantages by a clandestine study of UFO propulsion methods.

All of this may indeed be entirely true. But there could be more to it yet. As Dr. Jacques Vallée and John Keel and others of us have long ago perceived, what we see in the UFO Phenomenon is probably evidence for the operation of some sort of control-system. (Charles Fort: "I guess we're property!") And the objects of that control-system seem to be — us.

The orders for the suppression of the truth may consequently very likely emanate from a level above that of the terrestrial governments. The existence of telepathy or thought-transmission between humans is an unquestionable fact, and we already have plenty of evidence that telepathic control of humans by other entities is also poss-

ible. Nobody should therefore ever have to imagine that a government or an authority or an agency that acts at the behest of such telepathic controllers should necessarily ever be aware that it is itself under control and that it is merely carrying out somebody else's instructions.

Once one says this sort of thing, the whole question of human freewill and human responsibility is of course instantly put into question, and our situation becomes one of acute discomfort. But, if one contemplates the terrible course of human history on this planet, maybe such a theory may be felt to go far to explain why we are what we are, and why we are in the predicament in which we find ourselves today?

An old Burmese tradition says however that, throughout our earthly lives, we have a Good Angel sitting on one shoulder and whispering into one ear, and a Bad Angel sitting on the other shoulder and whispering into the other ear. Maybe then we do have free-will after all? *Maybe it all depends on which Angel we choose to heed?*

Enough has been said, for these are matters which it is extremely dangerous to discuss.

See Stop Press (inside rear cover)

A WAVE OF SMALL HUMANOIDS IN MALAYSIA IN 1970

Ahmad Jamaludin

In FSR Vol. 16, No. 6 (Nov./Dec. 1970) under the title: *Very Little Men! We gave a strange World Round-Up report from Malaysia about six schoolboys at Bukit Mertajam who claimed to have encountered a tiny craft and its tiny occupants. Such reports are to be found in the "folklore" of all people throughout all recorded history, and those who understand such matters will have no difficulty in perceiving what we are talking about. We now have pleasure in publishing a report from Malaysia which deals with the events of 1970 in more detail.*

IN 1970 a weird epidemic spread across the Peninsula of Malaysia. Those affected were strangely enough mostly schoolchildren in the age group of 8-14 years. We were unaware of this wave of encounters with the UFO occupants until nearly 10 years later, when, while investigating CE3 cases in this country, we found that nearly half of all the cases fall in this incredible year. Since it is now too late to locate all the principal witnesses, we shall therefore present only the newspaper reports that appeared at the time. The actual number of CE3 cases during this wave is still unknown. The events listed below are those that we have been able to collect so far.

1. Bukit Mertajam, State of Penang

On the evening of 19 August 1970, six schoolboys reported that they had seen a soup-plate sized UFO, blue in colour, landed in the bushes beside their school. Five little men only 3 inches tall alighted from

the object. One of them was dressed in a yellow suit, and the other four wore blue uniforms. They installed an aerial on a tree branch and sent out signals, which frightened the boys who then ran away.

SOURCE: *The Straits Times*, 21 Aug., 1970; FSR 16:6 p29.

2. Bukit Mertajam, State of Penang

A 10-year-old schoolboy, K. Wigneswaran, sighted 25 landed UFOs in the bushes just outside the school compound. From each object emerged a 3-inch tall entity. Just as he was closing in for a better look, the school bell rang and he returned to class. The encounter took place in broad daylight on August 19.

SOURCE: *The Straits Times*, 22 Aug., 1970.

3. Bukit Mertajam, State of Penang

The same witness as in case #2 went to the spot