

Vol. 1 No. 3 WINTER 1964

# BUFORA



## JOURNAL

AND BULLETIN

Published by the  
BRITISH U.F.O. RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

# THE BUFORA JOURNAL AND BULLETIN

Volume 1 Number 3

1964 - 65

Published by the British Unidentified Flying Object Research Association

*President:* G. F. N. KNEWSTUB, A.M. Brit. I.R.E., A.Inst.E.

*Vice-President:* L. G. CRAMP, A.R.Ae.S., M.S.I.A.

*Chairman:* G. G. DOEL, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., D.M.R.E.

*Vice-Chairman:* Wing-Cdr. A. C. HARPER

*Honorary Secretary:* M. C. HOLT, Bramhall, Claremont Road, Claygate, Surrey.

*Editor:* C. A. STICKLAND, B.Sc., A.R.C.S., 22 Roseberry Street, London, S.E.16.

*Evaluation Officer:* J. CLEARY-BAKER, Ph.D.

*Records Officer:* Rev. R. K. HURGON, 106 South Hill Park, Hampstead, London, N.W.3.

*Publicity Officer:* L. BEER, Flat 15, Freshwater Court, 59a Crawford St., W.1.

**MEMBER SOCIETIES:** Anglo-Polish UFO Research Club, British Flying Saucer Bureau, Cambridge University Group for the Investigation of UFOs, Cheltenham Flying Saucer Group, Croydon UFO Research and Investigation Society, Direct Investigation Group on Aerial Phenomena, Isle of Wight UFO Investigation Society, Merseyside UFO Research Group, Oxford University UFOs Study Group, Scottish UFO Research Society, Tyneside UFO Society, Birmingham UFO Analysis Group.

**BRANCHES:** Halifax and Stratford-on-Avon.

**AIMS:**

1. To encourage and promote unbiased scientific investigation and research into Unidentified Flying Object phenomena.
2. To collect and disseminate evidence and data relating to Unidentified Flying Objects.
3. To co-ordinate UFO Research on a nation-wide scale and co-operate with persons and organisations engaged upon similar research in all parts of the world.

**MEMBERSHIP:** The annual subscription to BUFORA is one guinea (\$3). This entitles the member to receive four consecutive quarterly issues of the Journal and Bulletin. Enquiries and subscriptions should be sent to Mr. N. T. Oliver, 95 Taunton Road, S.E.12.

**ARTICLES, LETTERS** for publication (preferably typed double spacing), **BOOKS** for review and **EXCHANGE PUBLICATIONS** should be sent to the EDITOR, Charles. A. Stickland, 22 Roseberry Street, London, S.E.16.

## INFORMATION

The association relies very heavily on individual members for information concerning UFOs and related phenomena. You are earnestly requested to send reports and press cuttings immediately, direct to the Information Officers for the regions concerned:

*Cumberland, Durham, Northumberland, Westmorland, North Riding of Yorkshire:* William D. Muir, 104 Rowanberry Road, Longbenton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

*Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, East and West Ridings of Yorkshire:* John M. Stear, 2 High Park Crescent, Heaton, Bradford, 9, Yorkshire. Tel. Bradford 41842.

*Wirral Peninsula (Cheshire), Flintshire, Isle of Man, Lancashire:* Alan Rawlinson, 24 Saker Street, Liverpool, 4. Tel. ANF 6921.

*Anglesey, Caernarvonshire, Denbighshire, Merioneth, Cheshire (except the Wirral), Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Staffordshire:* Mr. G. Doodson, 81 Lumb Lane, Audenshaw, Manchester, Lancs.

*North-East half of Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Shropshire, Worcestershire, Wales south of and including Cardiganshire and Montgomeryshire:* Mr. A. R. Cole, "Elsmere" 7 Okua Road, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham, Glos.

*Warwickshire*: J. D. Llewellyn, 63 Masons Road, Stratford-on-Avon, Warwickshire.

*Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, Norfolk, Northamptonshire, Rutland, Suffolk*:  
Stephen Smith, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

*Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire*: T. A. Williamson, Brasenose College, Oxford.

*Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, S.W. half of Gloucestershire, Somerset, Wiltshire*: D. Rudman,  
43 Elton Road, Bristol, 7. Tel. Bristol 47035.

*Hampshire, Isle of Wight*: F. W. Smith, 4 Connaught Road, East Cowes, I.o.W.

*Surrey*: H. Roberts, 47 Brigstock Road, Thornton Heath, Surrey.

*Eire and Northern Ireland, Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent, London, Middlesex, Sussex*: Dr. G. G.  
Doel, 26 Heath Drive, Potters Bar, Middlesex. Tel. Potters Bar 54749.

*Scotland*: Mr. Roy Cuthbertson, 61 Colinton Mains Road, Edinburgh 13.

## CONTENTS

|                                                                                             |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Editorial                                                                                   | .. | .. | .. | .. | 3  |
| Some Considerations regarding Possible Contact<br>with Intelligent Extra-Terrestrial Beings | .. | .. | .. | .. | 4  |
| Epping Landing 1965                                                                         | .. | .. | .. | .. | 8  |
| The Longer Paper                                                                            | .. | .. | .. | .. | 9  |
| B.U.F.O.R.A. Library                                                                        | .. | .. | .. | .. | 9  |
| Feeling Lonely?                                                                             | .. | .. | .. | .. | 9  |
| B.U.F.O.R.A. meets Joel Rhenstrom (Finland)                                                 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 10 |
| Waveney Girvan                                                                              | .. | .. | .. | .. | 10 |
| Investigations and Research                                                                 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 10 |
| A Landing in New Jersey (cont.)                                                             | .. | .. | .. | .. | 11 |
| Foundations of Orthoteny                                                                    | .. | .. | .. | .. | 12 |
| U.F.O. Detectors                                                                            | .. | .. | .. | .. | 13 |
| Correspondence                                                                              | .. | .. | .. | .. | 14 |
| Estimates of Angular Size                                                                   | .. | .. | .. | .. | 16 |
| Home Reports                                                                                | .. | .. | .. | .. | 17 |
| Overseas Reports                                                                            | .. | .. | .. | .. | 18 |
| Reports (a reminder)                                                                        | .. | .. | .. | .. | 20 |
| A Personal Statement by the Editor                                                          | .. | .. | .. | .. | 20 |

## EDITORIAL — ROUND THE DIAL

I bought myself a transistor set recently ; in the first flush of interest, did some knob-twiddling, and heard a lot of odd noises. The thought struck me - how do I know that none of these strange sounds are produced by UFOs ? The short answer to that, of course, is that I don't. But surely there must be some experts amongst our members who do, or members who know some experts who do ? Will someone write an article themselves or get someone to write an article that can be given wider circulation ? These are the kinds of question I want them to answer :—

(1) I know that continental stations fade and come back over periods of time that vary. But what about those whose sound fluctuates rapidly and regularly - such as the one about 660 kilocycles about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times a second at the time of writing this ; about 680 kilocycles - also about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times a second ? Is this the result of slow jamming ? If so, don't tell me it is, and leave it at that. I want a complete run-down on jamming - what kind of frequencies are used, who jams what and when, so that I shall know when I am listening to something unusual and when I am not.

(2) When one hears a crackle one tends to say 'interference' and leaves it at that. The idea is that some storm somewhere has caused it. But how do we know ? Has anyone really made a detailed study to the extent that he could say 'That particular noise, consisting of a mixture of sounds ranging from frequency X to frequency Y, heard at 2 a.m. on a set in Lowestoft on the 8th May 1942 originated in the fourteenth stroke of lightning in a storm centred over Great Yarmouth' ? I think I am on reasonably safe ground in guessing that no-one has, but has anyone gone part of the way towards it and what conclusions did they reach ? The point I am trying to make is that because the average person has no detailed information on the subject of interference we may have been listening for years to unusual noises that were not caused by storms at all.

(3) Every 9 seconds a station about 520 kilocycles emits the Morse letters ML followed by a continuous note ; every 20 seconds a station about 700 kilocycles emits the letters FNR followed by a continuous note. The tone of the latter is lower pitched than that of the former station, and, on listening intently, appears to be generated by something rotating. What are these stations and why do they do this ?

(4) At the moment (2.5 a.m. Sunday morning) I am listening to a continuous note from a station at about 1200 kilocycles. What is the origin of this ? (I can hear no other station in its immediate vicinity). I've now found another one like it at about 630 kilocycles (2.20 a.m.) - it cut out just now - a low-pitched buzz was heard and then the sound cut in again - the same thing has happened again but the sound has not resumed this time - the low-pitched buzz has occurred again - and again (like someone putting a plug into a socket and pulling it out soon after) - and again (2.25 a.m.). Will someone please explain ? (I thought that the sound had disappeared completely but, on putting the set to my ear I can hear it faintly - normal fading?).

I think by now my purpose should be reasonably clear - I want to know what sounds one hears on the radio, other than the normal programmes, which have a natural explanation. So that, should I hear something unusual I shall know it is unusual and not assume, because of my ignorance, that its origin could be simply explained.

## NEWS OF MEMBER SOCIETIES AND BRANCHES

Societies and branches having any news of their activities, notices of meetings, etc. which they wish to see publicised in the journal should send the information to Alan Rawlinson, 24 Saker Street, Liverpool 4.

We are indebted to Mr. K. S. Bleach for introducing us to the following paper. The editor is always pleased to hear from members who can perform a similar service.

## SOME CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE POSSIBILITY OF CONTACT WITH INTELLIGENT EXTRA-TERRESTRIAL BEINGS

E. Conrad Miller and J. L. Smith

### *Summary*

The most likely probabilities, in the opinion of the authors, are considered as to how the first contact with advanced extra-terrestrial creatures may be effected, what preparations should be made and what may be deduced from the initial contact.

### *Resume of man's current position*

Prospect of contact with extra-terrestrial life poses the most profound questions of theology, philosophy, ethics and sociology that man has yet had to ask himself.

While man has been confined to his own bear garden he has been able to say 'I am the king of this castle' to other life forms : hence the phrase 'as dead as the dodo'. Man has in fact made little attempt to understand his fellow creatures ; his apparent domination may be due more to ecological principles than to any positive attempt on his part to control his environment.

Man's inhumanity to man is proverbial, one of the most grossly distorted theological concepts is that man was created in the image of God ; man has merely used this concept egocentrically as an excuse to wield power of life and death over his fellow men. He accepts the theory of evolution as licence to kill, maim and destroy. He accepts either the doctrine of redemption or the banner of communism as implying that the end justifies the means. He squanders a large part of the world's wealth on useless munitions and callously allows two-thirds of his fellows to starve.

But willynilly, come what may, this addle-headed, conceited jackanapes is headed for the stars. He would do well to put his own house in order so that he might at least leave his mother planet with a moral standard sufficiently high to condone his trespassing.

### *Appreciation of man's current thinking*

The Milky Way galaxy is one of scores of millions of galaxies each of which contains scores of millions of stars ; many of these stars are believed to have planetary systems. The sun is a comparatively young star and so, therefore, is our planetary system, and so therefore is man, (assuming that he evolved or was created here) : other stars and other planetary systems are older and must be expected to have produced some intelligent and advanced cultures. The question of likely abodes of intelligent extra-terrestrial life may be divided between intra-solar system and extra-solar system. Whether or not our neighbouring planets have intelligent life is open to question, we have as yet no direct evidence either way. The contention that the speed of light is a limiting factor to interstellar travel is now being seriously challenged (DINGLE, H., Bulletin of the Institute of Physics, Vol. 9, No. 12, December 1959, pp.314-316). Also if it is considered that intelligent extra-terrestrial life may exist then it must also be acknowledged that some may have achieved spaceflight.

If we assume a statistical correlation between the age of a group of stars and the technical competence of the intelligent life in that system and we further assume that systems nearer the rim of a galaxy are younger than those in or near the centre then because of the sun's position in the Milky Way galaxy we may certainly expect that of the number of planets in our galaxy having intelligent life seven out of eight will be far in advance of us.

### *The alien conception*

We have now conceded that alien intelligences may exist and may have advanced cultures not excluding interstellar travel. Since interplanetary travel precedes interstellar travel it may be assumed that other planets having life have been visited and a code of ethics governing contact has evolved. Because of the profound effect on a barbarian culture of spaceships arriving from the sky and also from observing the effects of mankind's previous intrusions into unknown territory, it is likely that the first ethic of space travel is to prohibit landing on an occupied planet until the occupants of that planet have themselves achieved spaceflight. So, assuming alien life, with space travel and a code of ethics then some method must be used to apply the ethical standards, possibly by presenting them to developing races spawning off into the interplanetary medium by using trained personnel specialised in contacts of this nature to act in an advisory capacity. The contravention of this ethic may be implied by an attempted manned landing on Mars or Venus, particularly if either of these have life forms. Therefore, of the three basic postulates, manned ship to alien planet, alien ship to Earth or alien ship to Earth ship, the last (the one most difficult for us to evaluate) is the one the authors consider most likely to be expected.

### *Action Stations*

The fuel available for man's first generation spacecraft precludes him from taking much action to avoid meteors or to inspect objects in space, this problem is intensified because of the mathematical difficulties involved by intermittent orbital changes. It is, therefore, assumed that contact will be effected by the hypothetical alien ship because it will have better detection instruments, greater range and manoeuvrability ; possibly having tracked us since take-off.

The various radiations, particles and objects that are open to detection by us are suggested in Table 1. Several motivations that might determine the attitude of the alien ship to us are suggested in Table 2.

TABLE 1. Things open to detection

|                               |                                                                                                |                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (1) Electromagnetic radiation | (a) gamma<br>(b) x<br>(c) U.V.<br>(d) Visible light<br>(e) Infra red<br>(f) Radar<br>(g) Radio | )<br>) Nuclear power,<br>) exhaust ion emission,<br>) exhaust light emission,<br>) beacons,<br>) detection equipment.<br>) |
| (2) Magnetism                 |                                                                                                |                                                                                                                            |
| (3) Gravity                   |                                                                                                | inertial drive                                                                                                             |
| (4) Particles                 | (a) Sub-atomic<br>(b) Atomic<br>(c) Molecular                                                  |                                                                                                                            |
| (5) Masses                    | (a) Meteors<br>(b) Probes<br>(c) Missiles<br>(d) Ships                                         |                                                                                                                            |

TABLE 2. Possible attitudes of alien ships

|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (1) Belligerent        | (a) I am scouting for territory in which to expand my race.<br>(b) I am looking for barbarians to act as cheap labour or to fight my battles.<br>(c) I wish to exploit you for prestige reasons.                                                |
| (2) Actively peaceful  | (a) You are likely to be a menace to us or to interplanetary relations.<br>(b) You will in future proceed under these regulations.<br>(c) You are running into danger.<br>(d) You will confine yourselves to this particular field of activity. |
| (3) Passively peaceful | (a) We have been waiting for you so that we can be friends.<br>(b) We have come to help you.                                                                                                                                                    |
| (4) Noncommittal       | (a) Hullo, Who are you, Where are you from ?<br>(b) We will ignore them.                                                                                                                                                                        |
| (5) Superficial        | (a) What a dear little primitive craft.                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| (6) Scientific         | (a) What type of life have we here.<br>(b) What are their cultural standards.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| (7) Quizzical          | (a) Are you going to be a nuisance to us ?<br>(b) May I come and visit you ?                                                                                                                                                                    |

Table 2 is, of course, not exhaustive but is merely an indication of the range of human attitudes when contacting others. Various combinations of these attitudes are to be expected.

In relation to our hypothesis there are three possible things that may be detected, a transmitted signal (probably either an identification sign or a message, the latter not necessarily for us): an emission from another spacecraft; a foreign body, most likely a meteor but possibly an artifact.

Transmission of information from ship back to Earth is already current practice and it is suggested that this should be implemented to the extent that all the ships detectors should be continually monitored by Earth. This information must be provided in order to assess what has happened in the event of a catastrophe or an anticipated or developing situation demanding unforeseen action by the crew. Data which will be available for evaluation are indicated in Table 3.

TABLE 3

| Data for evaluation        | Possible subsequent action to be evaluated |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1. Relative velocity       |                                            |
| 2. Acceleration            | 10. (a) probe                              |
| 3. Angular velocity        | (b) missile                                |
| 4. Angular acceleration    | (c) grapple                                |
| 5. Signal emission         | (d) signal                                 |
| 6. Shape                   | (e) message                                |
| 7. Size                    |                                            |
| 8. Features                |                                            |
| 9. Electro-magnetic field. |                                            |

A body effecting a change in orbit or one on a collision course should provoke immediate attention; locking-on devices being used to train all available means of observation on the body. An object on a collision course will require immediate evaluation and probably an evasion manoeuvre.

An alien ship may take up position ahead, alongside (at an indefinite distance) or astern, but it is considered that whilst the ship may take position ahead as an indication of superiority it is more likely that it will adopt a parallel orbit (a) to observe (operate short range detection devices), (b) to signal, or (c) to send a probe; it may even come close alongside and effect direct physical contact. In this last event the attitude of the Earth crew should be calm, friendly and in no way consciously provocative, they will be, after all, representatives of the human race and mankind's first ambassadors to an alien culture.

## *Communication*

Signals may be made from them to us or from us to them; we will have received and presumably understood their mode of communications if only from their recognition signal (it is considered that they will be transmitting a recognition signal (a) to identify themselves to other craft and (b) so that they may be located). It may take time to arrange to transmit a similar type of signal if, for example, a laser is being used, so we may expect to receive an intelligent message directed to us before we have transmitted to them. Alternatively they may have transmitted to us on a channel that we are using. In either event a message will be received by us. Since they have previously communicated with other interplanetary intelligencies some simple code may have been devised and consideration should be given to the form that this might take.

## *Contact*

It may be that although a super-intelligence can readily codify information capable of reduction by another super-intelligence of a different culture it is not possible to devise a simple system which an average Earthman can recognise, so physical contact might be the only means of achieving comprehensible communication. In this case other ethics must apply as suggested by one of the present authors in a letter published in the July 1962 issue of *Spaceflight* (Miller, E.C., *Spaceflight*, 1962, 4, 139).

## *The 'Bug-Eyed' Monster concept*

Whilst it may be that the alien ship is unmanned we should, nevertheless, consider the form of the creatures that may be on board. It is admitted that it is possible to conceive of such things as lucid luminous lugubrious legumes or even badinaging bandersnatches but it is contended that extra-terrestrial intelligencies may be humanoid. Three reasons for this are submitted (I) various authorities have studied this problem and have declared it as their considered opinion that something like the human form, possibly biped, height about six feet, a head at the top capable of turning, two eyes in the front of the head and so on, is quite likely to have evolved and to be a dominant form on other planets; (II) the theory that man arrived on Earth in spaceships is just as valid as creation or evolution and in this connection there is a probability that medical science may be able to adapt the human body to a not too dissimilar alien environment, e.g. alcohol in the blood for a cold planet, enlarged lungs for a low pressure planet, an increase in the oxyhaemoglobin carrying capacity for a planet with less oxygen, and (III) homo sapiens was a contemporary of Neanderthal man and the only link between them is the Greek myth that the gods came to Earth and had union with the inhabitants.

## *Conclusion*

It is possible that contact will be made in the relatively near future with extra-terrestrial intelligences and that this contact may occur as a ship to ship meeting in interplanetary space. The alien ship may or may not be manned but it will probably, in either event, be reporting back continuously and our ships (whether manned or not) should be doing the same. Earth's crews should be briefed to take no possible action that could be deemed hostile and to take defensive measures only in the last resort for self-preservation. Equipment should be developed for detection of objects in space at as great a distance as possible. Ships should carry exterior recognition beacons operating through a wide frequency and spaced so as to define the size of the ship. An effort should be made to determine whether it is possible to develop messages suitable for initial contact with an alien intelligence.



## AN EPPING 'LANDING', 1965

The Epping area has once again furnished news of a possible UFO landing and readers of the BUFORA Journal will remember the Epping sightings reported in the Summer issue last year. The following account was given to BUFORA member Mr. Paul Webb by a Mr. G. M., an engineer living in Hackney. Mr. M. remembered Mr. Webb's part in reporting the previous sightings in this area and following his unnerving experience of the evening of January 4th 1965 he sought the advice of Mr. Webb as he was not anxious to have publicity in the local press. The young lady with whom Mr. M. was driving at the time of the incident was most explicit on this point.

It appears that Mr. M. was travelling along the road towards Theydon Bois on the evening of January 4th with his lady friend and near Abridge he turned off the road onto a 'green' lined by trees. He parked the car just under the trees and got out to remove his raincoat. He noticed a bright spot of light flying across the sky towards him high up and concluded that it must be a 'shooting star' although moving more slowly than he expected a conventional shooting star to travel. Dismissing this phenomenon from his mind he entered the car. The time was then approximately 9.15 p.m. At about 9.45 p.m. he again got out of the car to resume his coat. Casually he glanced to the rear of the car and received a tremendous shock. Only fifteen yards away, also tucked in under the edge of the trees was an extremely bright object shaped 'like an igloo'. It was about the same length as the car but higher and of a uniform brilliant whiteness.

Mr. M. did not wait to make out further details but dived back into the car. He started the engine and with headlights blazing turned onto the green in a wide circle which would bring his lights to bear on the strange object. The lights swept across the place where a moment before he had seen the igloo-like structure but nothing was to be seen, the spot was empty.

As they motored homewards considerably shaken by the incident they saw a bright object flying away up beyond some houses towards the direction of Walthamstow.

Mr. M. and Mr. Webb returned to the site of the 'landing' but found nothing of note. The ground had been frozen rock hard and no definite markings were traced. The spot was again visited by Messrs. Webb, Stephenson and Doel, samples of earth were taken, also a tin lid. These yielded no evidence of radio-activity or of undue magnetism.

Interrogation of local householders yielded one corroborative witness, a lady who was returning with her small son from school at about 5.30 p.m. that evening. They had seen a strange light high up like a large star. This had moved around aimlessly and hovered: a statement which was borne out by the boy who said 'Mummy, I told you it was a flying saucer.' (Out of the mouths of babes, etc!) Ten days after this sighting Mr. Webb himself saw a similar high star-like light which behaved in a most unstar-like manner, again moving erratically at times beneath the cloud cover over towards Walthamstow. Attempts to get near in a car failed as the object then moved off to another point and he soon gave up the unequal chase.

At no time did anyone hear any noise from the objects and no smell was evident at the site of the 'landing'. The trees were not disturbed.

There is some similarity in the description given by Mr. M. of the object he saw with that seen by Miss Pauline Abbott only a mile or so away at Ivychimneys on Friday, December 27th, 1963. This she described as a bright object about the size of a car, shaped rather like a pie, which glowed in the twilight. This object took off rapidly when she called out.

Mr. Webb is of the opinion that Mr. M. is not hoaxing and a tape recording of his voice, though indistinct, sounds as though he is telling the truth. The circumstances of the sightings would suggest that he was not expecting to be confronted with such a startling apparition so very close to him; his mind could hardly have been dwelling on UFOs. The Epping area would seem to be somewhat favoured by our mysterious visitors. BUFORA did hold a skywatch there last year without success. However it seems we should try again in this area and again and again.

G. G. Doel      March 2nd 1965

### *Our Research Officer takes up the story :*

I visited witness's parents on 16th January 1965. They think that their son must be telling the truth. They saw him when he returned home in the evening immediately after the event and they say he was very excited. Since then he has been taking a serious interest in the subject and talks a lot about it. When he goes in for something, he goes in for it seriously, they said. Previously they had not discussed the subject, but later his mother remembered that a year ago he was very interested in the landing at Ivychimneys reported in the local press, and then tried to get in touch with 'the man at Mill Garage', (Mr. Paul Webb).

The witness's fiancée who was with him in the car at the time apparently saw nothing, a point about which the mother is very surprised. The mother, who was very agitated about the observation, feels there must be some simple explanation, as she finds the idea of extra-terrestrial spaceships terrifying.

G. N. P. Stephenson

A more recent observation which may have a bearing on the above incident was made on 1st March. It was made at about 7.05 p.m. by Mrs. A. Murray at Woodbine Close, Waltham Abbey, which is on the edge of Epping Forest. Mrs. Murray's husband drew her attention to an object giving out a white glow in the sky, like that of a large star. In Mrs. Murray's own words :- 'Had this object been stationary it would have passed as a bright star. But as it was moving very erratically and seemingly in some set course it was impossible for it to be a shooting star. The alterations in its course were sudden (i.e. at right angles) and not in keeping with any aircraft to my knowledge. At all times it gave off a steady whitish glow like that of the many stars to be seen that night, but, unlike them, it did not flicker or twinkle. It moved with a sort of jerk (like the flight of a fly when it suddenly changes course in flight) and gave the impression of triangular movement whilst continuing on the one main course. Had there been any flicker or lack of continuity in the glow transmitted, one would have thought there were two or three lights appearing in quick succession'. The object was under observation for about 10 - 12 minutes, and was finally hidden from view by a haze before reaching the horizon in the north-east.

### **THE LONGER PAPER**

If there are any potential contributors who may have written a paper, but have been deterred by the obvious limitations on space in the journal from submitting it, please think again. We are considering issuing occasional papers, which would overcome such limitations, and would appreciate any contributions which you may have to offer.

### **B.U.F.O.R.A. LIBRARY**

In order to complete our files of the 'Flying Saucer Review' we would be pleased to hear from any members willing to donate, exchange or sell :- Vol. 1, Nos. 2, 3, & 6; Vol. 2, Nos. 5 & 6; Vol. 5, No. 4; Vol. 6, Nos. 4, 5, & 6; Vol. 8, Nos. 2, 3, & 5; Vol. 9, all needed. Thank you!

### **FEELING LONELY ?**

It has been pointed out by a number of members that they would welcome the opportunity of discussing UFO matters with other members living near them. We cannot supply members' addresses without their permission, and accordingly are overcoming the difficulty by the agreement of Mr. V. W. Smithson, 33 West Towers, Pinner, Middlesex, to put members in touch with one another. If you write to Mr. Smithson he will inform you of any other members near you who have also written to him. As it may be some time before he builds up a list of interested members, please do not expect an immediate reply.

## B.U.F.O.R.A. MEETS Mr. JOEL RHENSTROM FROM FINLAND

On January 29th, at Mrs. Lloyd's home, Mr. Creighton, Mrs. Lloyd, Mr. Oliver and myself had pleasure in meeting Mr. Joel Rhenstrom (whose address is Oitti, Finland). Mr. Rhenstrom is Information Secretary of INTERPLANETISTITRIY, which has about 50 members and is the only Finnish U.F.O. society. He was visiting London to study our dry-cleaning methods as he has his own business in Finland.

We learnt that "Lentava Lautanen" is Finnish for "Flying Saucer". Mr. Rhenstrom has published a few American saucer books in Finnish (bearing the cost out of his own pocket) and very kindly donated a book to our Library entitled "Olen Ollut Lentavalla Lautasella", which translates as "Inside the Spaceships" (by Adamski).

Swedish is the Finns 'second' language and Mr. Rhenstrom remarked that on about January 20th this year, a Swedish evening paper published details of the Russian cave painting of a "Martian spaceman". It would seem that the Russians are preparing for the day when they can announce the reality of flying saucers. Our guest has tried to interest the air defence authorities in flying saucers, without apparent success. However, Mr. Creighton remarked that these authorities the world over are keenly interested in UFOs and probably know more than they let it be known.

We were told of a contactee story about a gardener, Mr. Valkeinen, who was fishing at a lonely lake in Finland in 1952, when an Adamski type saucer landed by the lakeside. The man was irresistibly drawn towards the UFO, which he entered, and met three short mongolian featured, yellow skinned men with large heads and short spindly legs. He conversed with them (telepathically?) in Finnish and was taken for a ride round the world, stopping at Lake Titicaca in Southern Peru. He apparently gained considerable knowledge of the world's history from his hosts, which he would have been unlikely to know about otherwise.

Our conversation covered trolls and other gnome-like creatures, and it was agreed that some of these creatures might well be UFO entities. Mr. Creighton has made a special point of meeting people claiming to have seen "little people" and feels that these often tie up with contactee reports.

B.U.F.O.R.A. wishes Mr. Rhenstrom and Interplanetistitriy every success with their activities. Last year we welcomed Miss Lou Zinnstag of Basle, Switzerland, and Mr. Rex Stanford of the U.S.A., and will be pleased to meet other overseas UFO researchers visiting London.

Lionel Beer - Publicity Officer.

The address of INTERPLANETISTITRIY is : Postilokero 101, Helsinki.

## WAVENEY GIRVAN

Most members will have heard by now of the death of Waveney Girvan. He, more than anyone else, helped to bring the topic of flying saucers before the public at large. When working for Carroll & Nicholson he was responsible for the commissioning of Gerald Heard to write "The Riddle of the Flying Saucers", the first book on the subject to be published in this country. Later, while editor-in-chief at Werner Laurie, he was responsible for the publication of "Flying Saucers Have Landed", by Leslie and Adamski. In addition, he found time to edit the Flying Saucer Review, to sponsor and to write various newspaper articles, and to write a book himself - "Flying Saucers and Commonsense", published by Frederick Muller. This last, a balanced and shrewd analysis of various attitudes to the subject, will probably remain as his most enduring contribution to the literature.

## INVESTIGATIONS AND RESEARCH

If you are interested in helping with any aspect of our investigations and research, and have not already indicated this on your membership form and received a letter from me, I shall be very grateful if you will let me know.

G. N. P. Stephenson, Research Officer,  
12, Dorset Road, Cheam, Sutton, Surrey.

## A LANDING IN NEW JERSEY ? (continued)

Further information is to hand concerning the incident at Glassboro, New Jersey described in the last issue and comes from an admirably detailed report in the "U.F.O. Investigator", published by NICAP.

According to Ward Campbell, a NICAP member who visited the spot, the place where the marks were found is a small clearing in a heavily wooded oak forest on the property of one, Frank Sergi. The dimensions of the clearing are about 20 feet wide by 35-40 feet long. The ground surface is composed of moss, oak leaves, white sand and small bushes from a few inches to about a foot in height.

The central hole was conical, about 30 inches across and  $19\frac{1}{2}$  inches deep. The diameter of the bottom was about 10 inches. The sides were smooth, hard-surfaced and scorched black. Gravel was piled up 3-4 inches high round the rim and extended about 11 inches from it in a perfectly symmetrical fashion. This gravel had eleven definite impressions in it about 4 inches in diameter and  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch deep, about equally spaced. (The shape is not described.) Embedded in the upheaval were globs of a peculiar chemical substance, as well as particles of a metallic substance (the latter being also embedded in the sides and bottom of the hole). The chemical substance varied from a snow white to a purplish black-green mass interspersed with orange and red traces, as well as minute particles of metal.

The three imprints found surrounding the central crater were all the same size and depth - about 9 inches square and 7-8 inches deep. They appeared to have been formed by extreme pressure or weight, rather than by digging, the sides being compressed into a hard packed mass. Each imprint was inclined at a slight angle from the vertical toward the central hole, as though formed by supports for a large central object.

To the north of the markings was a partially uprooted 12-14 foot sassafras tree with three broken limbs. The breaks and abrasion marks were fresh, about  $4-4\frac{1}{2}$  feet above the ground. The leaves bordering the nearby marking were discoloured and wilted, although there was no evidence of direct flame or charring on them. The leaves on the limbs facing away from the marking were fresh and green. The ground beneath the broken limbs was severely scorched.

The ground around the crater for a radius of 2 -  $2\frac{1}{2}$  feet had no scorch marks. But from a point to the north, in an arc of 180 degrees to the south and outward to the imprints the area was severely scorched and blackened. A faint aroma resembling hydrogen sulphide lingered in the immediate area.

Later a Mr. Alphonse Zulli, a former U.S. Forestry Technician and tree expert with 30 years experience visited the scene with Paul Gawanus, another tree expert.

Mr. Zulli's opinion was that to bend the tree would have required heavy machinery or the combined weight of more than ten men. Some 'singed' leaves, obtained by a tree climber from a 40-foot oak, were seared to the last degree of being destroyed. If it were a hoax he thought it would have had to have been done by a magnesium flame thrower in very skiful hands. Other tree limbs broken at various levels, mostly out of reach from the ground, indicated a rough circle of 30 foot diameter.

A pine seedling two foot tall was also found on the site, uprooted and blown free of every trace of soil, but with the roots intact. The only way they could suggest this could have been done was by air pressure.

The two men finally concluded, as tree experts, that a hoax was patently impossible to produce the damage they investigated on the trees.

The reader will have noticed that there are slight discrepancies between the account above and that in our previous issue. This is probably due to the fact that Mr. Campbell arrived on the scene before Mr. Gaskill. By the time Mr. Gaskill arrived the site had no doubt been rather disturbed. One item of information that would be of interest occurs in neither account - namely, how far were the smaller impressions from the central hole - can anyone tell us?

It appears that this incident has points of resemblance to the Charlton case - the discovery of markings in an out-of-the-way area with vague evidence of lights being seen nearby in the adjacent time-period. However, the American investigators seem to have been rather more fortunate than we were, inasmuch as more physical evidence was available. As is usual, a hoax has been suggested, but, from the evidence presented, it seems even less likely than in the Charlton case.

### FOUNDATIONS OF ORTHOTENY by Peter M. Seeviour

In most books on paradoxes in mathematics there will be a chapter on statistics, which will show some of the traps in simple problems. In Orthoteny the traps have become more complex. Though doubtless alive to this danger articles so far show that theoreticians have taken short cuts, and so obtain various answers with little indication as to their accuracy. How can these be used with any confidence!

Suppose that a number of saucer sightings, seen over a certain period of time, are marked on a map of France, the positions of all of them being known with a certain amount of accuracy. Do they tend to lie along narrow strips of land? These narrow strips of constant width are called corridors, and were introduced to represent 'fat' straight lines, like those drawn with a pencil. The mathematician's infinitely thin straight line would be too abstract to deal with using our blunt tools. We can't know to the very inch where each UFO was. We are now faced with a purely statistical problem. Though we mustn't lose sight of the objective all arguments about geography of the land and variations in population can be left until an explanation of the results is required.

Consider all corridors of a certain fixed width which lie in France, or touch some part of it. There is an infinity of them. But if two of the corridors, have within them exactly the same points where UFOs were sighted, and no more, I will regard them, for the moment, as the same. A mathematician would say they are **equivalent**. Moreover if one corridor has within it **all** the sighting points which are in another corridor, **plus** at least one more sighting point, the former corridor I call **better** than the latter. A corridor might have sightings at A and B within it. But if another corridor had sightings at A, B and C within it, this would be a better corridor.

With each line joining two sightings we can associate two corridors, one each side of the join and having it as a bounding line. The two corridors run along each side of the join. For every other corridor not formed in this way there is either an equivalent corridor or a better one, in the senses above, which is. Some corridors will not have any better than them. They are the **best** corridors. Every best corridor is equivalent to one of the corridors formed in the way described above. So we can pick from the corridors, formed in this way, a set of corridors, no two equivalent, which represent all the best corridors. It is called a complete set of best corridors. It is such a set we need to examine. Any best corridor in this set can be replaced by an equivalent corridor and the result will still be a complete set of best corridors.

The properties are difficult to examine by theory alone. Following Jacques Vallee's course in France it seems easier to do a large number of experiments. Each one consists of generating a number of random points, equal to the number of sightings, over the map of France, and noting the properties of the resulting complete set of best corridors formed by the method of the last paragraph. After a large number of these experiments we can conclude what is to be expected in a single case, and how often any particular property should occur. Then it can be seen how typical of a set of random points the saucer sightings are.

Each corridor has an infinity of equivalent corridors. One of these can be selected so that in some way it is superior to the rest, and there are several ways of doing this. The lines which run down the middle of each corridor chosen in one of these ways form a complete set of orthotenic lines. The way used as a method for selection is a matter of taste. The sightings can be said to lie roughly along these lines.

The final answer is not out. The number of experiments required is vast, and the theory is complex. Preliminary results seem to indicate the improbable occurrence of 6 or 7 point 'lines' whilst 3 and 4 point 'lines' come up roughly as expected. Either a UFO is due to an objective or to a subjective cause. Could it be subjective if a tendency to follow lines was shown? If most UFOs were observed in towns, and towns showed a tendency to follow lines, UFOs could have a subjective cause and show the same tendency. Otherwise it seems difficult to explain them as subjective. The indications also imply that, rather than a weak influence over all sightings leading to a slight increase in 3 and 4 point lines, there is a stronger influence over a few leading to the 6 and 7 point lines. Whether this influence, if shown to exist, is an alien race would still be a matter of conjecture.

It has been suggested that better results would be obtained if the map was regarded as on the surface of the Earth, that is a sphere, as it really is, rather than on a flat plane. This leads to global orthoteny. The same techniques used here could be applied equally well. The calculations would be more difficult.

In any problem one must go as far as one can without approximating, and I have tried to do this here. It does not go far towards a theoretical solution perhaps, but it lays the foundation on which such a solution must surely be built, and leads to a practical method of a simpler nature than

Jacques Vallee's (see FSR July-August 1964).

## UFO DETECTORS

As we have already stated, we welcome any information on detectors of any kind. We have heard of at least two members who intend building the apparatus referred to in the last issue and will be interested to hear of any results they or others obtain. Concerning the query posed in the article Arnold West writes '..... The radiation from a horizontal ionised gas stream would be similar to that from a vertically positioned column, but the plane of polarisation of radiation would be changed. If, however, the radiation from the ionised gas is of random polarisation, no difference would exist..... Considering the height or speed of UFOs and the time an ionised trail persists the possibility of accurately fixing the position of a UFO, unless hovering, is small, but enough indication of the quadrant to observe should be given.'

Harry Bunting of DIGAP has sent us details of the 'Aitchison' and 'Cartwright' UFO detectors and we would welcome information concerning their usefulness, reliability, stability, etc.

## ADVERTISEMENT

INFORMATION, suggestions requested on UFO detectors, communication equipment, and contact. Tor Bay Astro-Research Club, 127, Maidenway Road, Paignton, Devon.

## CORRESPONDENCE

*Orthoteny*

In your last editorial (part 3), you explain how straight-line trajectories within the limits of France can be expected, as "an object travelling at 10,000 m.p.h. will cover a distance of 500 miles in three minutes, not a large time-period in which to initiate and execute changes of course." However, as Michel points out on page 80 of "Flying saucers and the Straight-line Mystery", an orthotenic alignment does not correspond at all to a trajectory, nor do the sightings along a line occur in chronological order, nor within a few minutes.

The UFOs that were reported at different points along an orthotenic line (on one of the days under study in the Autumn of 1954) were usually quite different in appearance and behaviour, and travelling in different directions, while many were seen to hover or even land. It is of fundamental importance that all students of orthoteny appreciate this fact.

4th December, 1964

Nigel Stephenson (Research Officer)

(Nigel Stephenson is perfectly correct in quoting Michel as stating "the alignment does not correspond at all to a trajectory". But Michel is not entirely consistent in this. For instance, why does he think it necessary to state, on p. 216 "The reported directions of movement almost always correspond with an orthotenic line passing through that point."? Elsewhere in his book he links the path of objects with orthotenic lines, e.g. pps. 115, 168, 182. His main concern, as in the passage quoted by Mr. Stephenson, seems to be to emphasise that each object reported appears to have been seen at only one point on the corresponding orthotenic line. This does not exclude the possibility that the object was travelling along the line in question and the additional comments by Michel referred to above tend to support this. - Editor)

*Magnetic Fields and Cars*

Mr. Alan Watts is to be congratulated on putting into practice the theory that loss of power experienced by a car in the vicinity of some UFOs is due to magnetic interference with the ignition system of the vehicle. The change in engine note when the current of 8 amps a.c. passed through the solenoid around the car's coil is not easy to explain. Saturation of the core of the coil sufficient to interfere with its step-up action would probably cause loss of spark and immediate mis-firing rather than change in engine tone.

The frequency of the sparking and therefore of the field fluctuation of the coil depends on the engine revolutions and these alter constantly as the car is driven. It is difficult to imagine that an external field could be varied to coincide with these ever changing frequencies or could 'take over' the function of the spark coil. However in the realms of advanced electronic technology it is perhaps wise not to speculate on what cannot eventually be achieved.

Mr. Watts refers to the fact that I dismissed magnetism as the cause of repulsion of Mr. Wildman's car (LUFORO BULLETIN May-June 1962) when no remanent magnetism was found in metal objects in the vicinity of the sighting. This I did on the following grounds :

a. An a.c. field of the intensity required would not have just repulsed the steel parts of the car but would have set up a vibration in step with the alternation of the a.c. field. This would have been enough to either heat up the car at high frequencies or shake it violently at low frequencies.

b. A d.c. field which might well repulse the car would certainly have left remanent magnetism in the iron railings, etc. along the road. If, as some suggest, the saucer 'rides the lines of the earth's magnetic field' the d.c. field required to provide sufficient repulsion to lift the craft would be fantastic.

I still think that Mr. Wildman's car was held back by a repulsion force achieved by the use of an 'anti-gravitational field'.

February 6th 1965

G. Doel.

I would like to make some comments on Mr. Watts' experiment on the ignition system of his Cortina. In general his ideas and practical methods are sound, but his theory is shaky.

An ignition coil on a car consists of an iron core, on which the coils are wound, enclosed in an aluminium cylinder and mounted near the engine. In this situation the field produced by a test coil placed over the ignition coil cylinder might not give the expected flux density in the iron core because of leakage flux through the surrounding metal.

I am left in some confusion by Mr. Watts' formula :

$$H = 43 \times 1 \text{ gauss}$$

What is his magnetising field? If H stands for its **strength**, as is conventional, then the units are oersted, but if it stands for its **density** then the units are gauss but the conventional symbol is 'B'. Luckily, however, the two quantities B and H are numerically equal in the c.g.s. system and so unfortunately the units oersted and gauss become confused and interchanged. I presume that this happened in the formula and H should be in oersted. This leads us to the first test with the d.c. field.

With 6.5 amperes in the coil the field strength on the coil axis would be 280 oersted, but iron saturates at about 50 versted. This means that no spark could be produced by the ignition coil, unless all the flux or by far the greater part of it passed away from the core through the main body metal of the car. Presumably all the flux leaked away as the car engine did not falter under test except with the a.c. field.

With this field there is the additional transformer effect between test coil and ignition coil to be taken into account. If the induced voltage were in phase with the engine firing spark then one or maybe two cylinders depending on engine speed would miss continuously. This would cause a loss of power and subsequent slowing of the engine. The slowing of the engine would put the timing out of phase with the induced voltage and the cylinders would all fire again and the engine would run on at reduced speed. There would, however, be occasional missings if the engine speed tended to rise again, as it would do under light-load conditions. Mr Watts heard no unevenness in engine note, so the engine speed remained constantly lowered by this interaction.

The lack of effect of the d.c. field could be explained also if the current in the formula was in absolute amperes (abamps) and not in amperes. Has the common error of leaving out the conversion factor of ten been perpetrated? This could have been checked had Mr. Watts given his coil dimensions. If the error exists, then the field strength in the d.c. test would be 28 oersted and, if there is no leakage of flux, the iron would not be saturated and no effect would be observed. The a.c. peak field, however, would saturate the ignition coil and the car would stall.

The contact breaker frequency is solely dependent of engine speed which in turn is dependent on the load and the throttle setting. A car travelling along at constant speed, running into the alternating magnetic field of a saucer would first mis-fire on one or more cylinders and then the engine would lose power and stall; c.f. Levelland and other cases, but this does not explain the case of the car that continued to run when a saucer travelled along directly overhead. Perhaps the direction of the magnetic field had something to do with this.

Finally what of the strength of the field at the saucer? How strong would it have to be to stall a car? As we have seen it requires 50 oersted **at the core** to cause stalling. The experiment shows that perhaps 500 is required to leave enough after leakage flux has been taken into account. From outside the bonnet of the car the field strength would have to go up by another factor of the order of ten. This leaves us with 5000 oersted 20ft. from the saucer's skin. If the field is produced by a dipole then the field near the saucer is given by an inverse **cube** law, and at 1ft. from the dipole would be 40 million oersted.



It is of interest to note that according to the magazine 'Discovery', a magnetic "skin" one millimetre thick and of strength 100 million oersted, would effectively shield the occupants of a spaceship from all harmful radiation. Could the saucers be using this technique as their form of protection from cosmic radiation? Is the magnetic field really anything to do with propulsion?

14th December 1964

Stephen Smith

(Chairman of the Cambridge Group, CUGIUFO)

Dr. Doel's account of the incident in the Epping region in June/July 1958, suggested strongly that a lightning strike was responsible for it. The soil of the Epping area is predominantly London clay but there are isolated pockets of Pliocene gravel containing flint and white quartz, which are siliceous in composition. If the incident happened at the site of such a pocket, or if the bolt struck and fused some foreign object of high silica-content, in or on the ground, the results of Mr. Elliott's chemical analysis would be explained without recourse to any other supposition than the one I advanced.

25th November, 1964.

J. Cleary-Baker, Ph.D.

(In all fairness to Dr. Cleary-Baker, it should be explained that at the time of his evaluation of the Epping incident, he was unaware of the existence of Mr. Elliott's analysis. - Editor)

## ESTIMATION OF ANGULAR SIZE

by Peter Haythornthwaite (CUGIUFO)

Most UFO Sighting Questionnaires ask the witness to give the angular size of the UFO by comparing it with a common object held at arm's length. While at first sight this would appear a simple and direct method of obtaining the required information, there is evidence that some witnesses fail to understand the question, and give instead what they imagine may be the actual size of the object.

For example, early in 1964 CUGIUFO investigated the sighting of four objects, whose times of appearance, directions of travel and descriptions ('like a bright star') point beyond reasonable doubt to the satellites Echo I and Echo II. Yet, the object at arm's length with which they were compared by the witnesses were cricket-ball (twice), golf-ball, and, most remarkable, football. Such discrepancies will normally come to light only where factors other than size unmistakably indicate a given explanation. Where this is not the case, the size estimate may often be accepted at face value, and give rise to some confusion.

One answer to this might be to ask an additional question about size, such as the dimensions of the UFO compared with the diameter of the moon. Of course, where the witness is interviewed personally, he can be asked to compare the object with 'that chimney' or 'that TV-aerial', and this is probably the most reliable method.

Even where people are familiar with the concept of angular size, and with the 'arm's length' method of measuring it, there appears to be a tendency to exaggerate (ignoring entirely additional effects due to memory.) In some experiments by CUGIUFO, members were asked to judge the size of objects without actually holding anything at arm's length for comparison. About 75% over-estimated; the modal 'exaggeration factor' was 1.5, and some members overestimated by a factor of as much as seven.

Evidently, estimates of angular size should be treated with considerable caution. It would seem wise to use two or even three different methods of obtaining this information from the witness, and future questionnaires should perhaps be modified accordingly.

## HOME REPORTS

*Emneth, Norfolk*

19-10-64 - Mr. G. Morton Sooley, a 38-year-old smallholder was cycling home from Marshland St. James after visiting friends when he saw red, yellow and green lights going across the sky. They were round and evenly spaced apart. A batch of 6 to 8 lights came across, he saw nothing low and then felt something warm near his stomach. He put his hand to the place and to his fright felt his bare skin. There had been no fire, flames or smoke, but he noticed a smell like sulphur. The incident happened about 9.40 p.m. and after he got home he reported it to the local police about 10.30 p.m.

His clothes were sent to CUGIUFO whose initial examination revealed the following :

Raincoat : A rectangular burn hole, 2 inches x 4-12 inches, Major axis  $60^\circ$  to vertical, sloping down from wearer's right to left. Top button burnt on one corner.

Pullover : Rectangular hole, 6 inches x 2 inches, axis vertical, centered over wearer's solar plexus.

Tie : Synthetic fibre, nylon (?), melted in lower right hand corner of wide end.

Jacket : Rectangular hole, 4 inches x 2 inches, axis as in raincoat, situated at base of lapels.

Burn passed through two layers of raincoat, one layer jacket, ditto pullover, clipped the tie and according to Mr. Sooley, went through shirt and vest as well. That is six layers of clothing.

(This report, together with the associated evidence, seems consistent with Mr. Sooley being hit by a small meteorite or fragment of same. A fall occurred near Archie, Missouri, U.S.A. on August 10, 1932 during which a Mr. G. W. Weseman felt a number of small particles strike his shirt and hat and heard them falling like small hail.)

*Oxford, Oxfordshire*

30-10-64 - At 10.30 p.m., Mr. Martin Elsworth was standing outside his back door looking E. when he noticed a luminous white elliptical shape, apparent diameter three times that of a penny at arms length, elevation about 10 degrees. The object was at first white in colour, after five minutes it dimmed and appeared to be accompanied by a violet haze. Previously stationary, the object then began to sway backwards and forwards. At the same time, the centre of the disc appeared to glow in a succession of colours. Next the object was approached by two smaller, similar objects from the S.W., and after remaining motionless for a few moments, all three objects disappeared in the E.

During the sighting a compass needle swivelled violently while the objects moved, but remained steady when they were motionless. Mr. Elsworth added that six people in his area reported interference on T.V. at about the time of the sighting. (Report received from OUFOSG)

*Oulton, Suffolk and Gorleston, Norfolk (between)*

9-11-64 - At 6.30 p.m. Mr. Olaf Davey, together with his wife, saw a yellow oval object trailing a "3ft" tapered green tail, very bright in colour. A smaller, bright white object was travelling along with and above it. The elevation of the object was  $45^\circ$  and it came in from over the sea on a straight course from the SE. Seen for 8 to 10 seconds, it disappeared, leaving the small object travelling along the same course. The night was clear, the sky was bright with stars, the very slight wind was easterly. (CUGIUFO)

*Salford, Lancashire*

11-12-64 - On Friday evening at 5 p.m., Margaret Nock, a 16-year-old student laboratory technician, was walking down the drive from Hope Hospital, Salford, with a friend, when her friend called her attention to an object in the sky. It was roughly bullet-shaped and dull silver in colour. It appeared to be self-luminous and to be floating downwards slowly, without power. After about five seconds it disappeared behind some houses. The night was cool and clear and there were only a few stars out. The object was approximately north-east from the girls.

*Epping, Essex*

4 - 1-65 - Report elsewhere in the journal.

*Olton, Warwickshire*

13 - 1 - 65 - As a Mr. Samson of Olton was observing the night sky on the night of January 13th (8.12 p.m.) he saw a long tube-like object, which was moving from West to south-east above the clouds. The clouds were moving very fast from north to south, it being a very windy night. The tube was moving along at a much slower speed than the clouds. It was tilted at an angle of about 45 degrees. The sides and ends of the object were very straight and very clear-cut. It was in view for nearly five minutes and disappeared when heavy cloud formations obscured it.

## OVERSEAS REPORTS

15.10 S., 108.00 W.

16 - 6-64 - From log book of M.V. Ionic :- Port Chalmers towards Balboa, 16th June, 1964, in 15.10 S. 108.00 W., an object was observed close to the zenith which resembled a flashing white channel buoy, except that it faded in and faded out every minute-and-a-half. It was of medium magnitude at its brightest, a little dimmer than Arcturus and was observed over a period of about five minutes between 0420-0430 G.M.T. Observable for about 40 seconds, eclipsed 90 seconds approximately over the said period, flashing every second. Object did not appear to be moving at all. Evaluation :-

This sighting was made in the South Pacific Ocean, about midway between the South American mainland and the islands of the Tuamotu Archipelago. The location is remote from any land mass, large or small.

Astronomical explanations seem to be "out". It is hard to believe that experienced seamen would fail to recognise a fairly prominent star or planet when they saw it and even harder to imagine that any kind of local meteorological conditions would result in a star or planet seeming to behave as this light did.

Satellites and aircraft would not remain in the zenith for five minutes. A helicopter might hover, certainly, but hardly at an altitude at which the noise of its engine would be inaudible to the watchers below. The remote location would seem to discount the possibility of a lighted balloon.

It is possible that lights from another vessel in the vicinity might have been reflected from a ceiling of haze or low cloud. One imagines, however, that this possibility must have been present in the minds of the officers of the IONIC, who would have been aware, via radio, radar, etc., of the proximity of other ships and would no doubt have taken steps to check it with these.

The alternating appearances and eclipses of the light, at more-or-less constant and predictable intervals, suggests that an intelligent agency was behind it. More specifically, that an unknown aerial craft was aloft and that the light represented a signal of some kind, flashed by its occupants for an unknown purpose.

So far as I can judge from the information available, this cannot have been any type of conventional aircraft.

2nd January, 1965

Report in  
Category "A"

Conclusion :-

**UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT**

J. Cleary-Baker, Ph.D.

Evaluation Officer

The Evaluation Committee concurs with these findings.

24.42 N., 120.10 E.

16-8-64 - From log book of S.S. FUNING :- 16th August, 1964, between 1750 and 1753 G.M.T., in 24.42 N., 120.10 E. A cluster of lights with tails similar to comets were observed on the eastern horizon at an altitude of approximately 10 degrees over Taiwan. The group passed quickly over the southern sky, south transit altitude estimated at about 20 degrees and then faded out on the western horizon at an altitude of approximately 15 degrees. They moved very much faster than any satellite and on first observing the group it appeared to be a formation of planes with landing lights on. Through binoculars, the stronger light appeared to have a greenish light at its head, fading to yellowish-white at the tail. In all, there were about five lights with tails, one of which was the largest, with two or three smaller ones on either side of it. One smaller one was a little separate from the rest, visibility at the time was 25 miles and the sky was cloudless.

Evaluation :- At the time of the observation, the S.S. FUNING was in the Formosa Strait, between Taiwan and the Chinese mainland. The cluster of lights was moving towards the coast of China from Taiwan.

There is a large civil airport at Taipei but there are no flights between Taiwan and China at the present time. If aircraft were involved they were probably military planes. There are powerful U.S. formations in Taiwan, bolstering up the Nationalist resistance to the Chinese People's Republic across the water. In fact, a virtual state of war exists in the area.

This fact has some bearing on the problem of the lights. The Formosa strait is only about 100 miles wide in this part and the good visibility suggests that the lights were not far from the mainland, (in terms of modern airplane speeds), when last observed from the S.S. FUNING. They were certainly very near Taiwan when first noted.

The coast of Taiwan facing the mainland is very heavily fortified and it seems unlikely that a Communist aircraft would fly over it with lights showing. It is even more unlikely that a Nationalist or U.S. plane would approach the mainland with its lights on, since it would inevitably encounter concentrated A.A. fire from batteries in the Amoy area.

If the lights were not from aircraft I am frankly unable to conjecture what they might have been. (In terms of "conventional" sources of aerial illumination). Many such reports are on file and in particular I recall a formation of globular lights with smoky appendages, (the "tails like comets" of the S.S. FUNING observation?) seen in the East China Sea off Shanghai at 10 p.m. on 24th February, 1893, by officers of H.M.S. LEANDER and H.M.S. CAROLINE.

It is perhaps relevant to recall that, over the last twelve to fifteen years, the area from the East Indies to the Sea of Japan has been a prolific source of unidentified flying object reports. Psychologists may argue that the cause of this is to be sought in the political and social tensions currently afflicting the Far East. I do not believe that this is the whole story, however.  
2nd January, 1965

Conclusion :-

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT(S)

J. Cleary-Baker, Ph.D.

Evaluation Officer

Report in

Category "A"

The Evaluation Committee concurs with these findings.

### *Gisborne, New Zealand*

9-11-64 - A Morere farmer, Mr. T. Foss said that on the night of Monday, November 9th, 1964, his 15-year-old son John had called his attention to a bright white light travelling from west to east across Gisborne. It had gone by the time he had obtained his 16x75 binoculars, but then he saw another object travelling directly towards them from the north. He described it as shaped like a round disc with fanned sides and straight at the back. There were a series of blue glows on the side which seemed to rotate, and a straight series of bright jets at the back.

Credit : Spaceview (New Zealand Scientific Space Research Bi-monthly Journal) No. 41  
Gisborne Herald, 10/11.

*Mangere, New Zealand*

24-11-64 - 7.25 p.m., a Mr. V. Wright, his wife and 15-year-old daughter were having tea, when they saw through the window a light in the northern sky. Of a blue-white colour, it was moving very slowly in a northerly direction while steadily gaining height. Through an old telescope it looked like an inverted teardrop for a time and then appeared like a small cluster of stars with light circles radiating from them. During the whole time Mr. Wright and daughter watched it, she saw what appeared to be a tail with lights travelling along behind it. The light was in view for 1-2 hours, until it gradually faded from sight.

Credit : Spaceview, No. 41.

## REPORTS

Members are reminded that all reports should be sent direct to the Information Officer for the region concerned. A list of these officers is given in the front of the journal. If this is done, it will save unnecessary correspondence and help to avoid duplication of effort.

### *A PERSONAL STATEMENT BY THE EDITOR*

At the last committee meeting, I was invited by four of the members present, to resign as editor, the reason given being the delays in appearance of the Journal. There is much I could say on this subject but will confine myself to explaining that the delay in appearance of this issue is due partly to organisational reasons and partly to illness in my immediate family. In order to preserve harmony in the committee I am resigning - Dr. Cleary-Baker will be Acting Editor for at least the next issue, and material for it should be sent to him at 3, Devenish Road, Weeke, Winchester, Hants.

Before I take leave of you I would like to briefly outline the principles I have been following in preparing these issues, apart from the aims of the Association. They are :

(a) No padding - space has not been filled with material, however interesting, which has no connection with the subject.

(b) No article has been refused on the grounds of its being too technical - if we are sincere in our aims we have a duty to publish scientific material that may not find a ready home in other magazines of the more popular kind.

(c) Attacks on officialdom have not formed a substantial part of the journal. I do not believe that an organisation professing to support scientific investigation and research is justified in spending energy in looking for burglars under the bed or skeletons in cupboards. If we should reach a conclusion different from that given by an official spokesman we should not immediately assume that he is trying to deceive us. He may have made a genuine mistake or, not being an expert himself, he may have been given bad advice. In other words, he should be given the benefit of the doubt. In any case, if our own investigations have been sound, why should we be particularly worried about opinions that differ from our own ?

These are the principles I have tried to follow. Not without success, I believe - with but one exception all letters I have received concerning the magazine have contained unqualified praise. And it is by these principles that I shall judge my successors.

Charles A. Stickland.

