

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 Salvetat (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.*