

British UFO Research Association



BUFORA BULLETIN

Papers by Jenny Randles, Quentin Fogarty, Nigel Watson,
John Paynter. Letters, Book Reviews.

B.U.F.O.R.A. ARCHIVES

No 005

THIS PUBLICATION IS
NOT TO LEAVE THE LIBRARY

Sept 82

PRESIDENT

Lord Kings Norton

VICE PRESIDENTS

The Rt.Hon.Earl of Clancarty
Leonard G. Cramp, AFAES, MSIA
Professor Bryan Winder, BSc.,
CEng., FIMechE.
G.F.N. Knewstubb, CEng.,MIERE.,FBIS

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN

Leslie Bayer, MBE.,FINST.,MSM

VICE CHAIRMAN

Arnold West

COUNCIL MEMBERS

L.E. Beer, FRAS
Robert S. Digby
Steven Gamble, FIMLS.,FRAS.,AFBIS
Mrs S. Anne Harcourt
Peter A. Hill, AMR.,FMS.,FSS
Miss Jenny Randles
John Shaw
John Spencer, ACA (TREASURER)
Miss Betty D. Wood (SECRETARY)

BUFORA EDINBURGH BRANCH

Fraser Gordon,
27 Buckstone Dell, Edinburgh,
Scotland EH10. 031 445 2705

MEMBER SOCIETIES include Britain's
oldest UFO group:- BFSB; 29
Rowlandston Gardens, Locklease,
Bristol BS7 9UH. 0270 698424.

Exchange journals should be sent
to the Editor at the address
listed opposite.

Secretary

Miss Betty Wood,
6 Cairn Avenue, London W5 5FX

Membership Secretary

Miss P. Kennedy, MBE.,
30 Vermont Road, London SE19 3SR

Treasurer

John Spencer, ACA.,
2 Malbury Court, Clarence Road,
London, N22

PUBLICATIONS

Editor

John Barrett
34b Marylebone High Street, W1

DIRECTOR OF PUBLICATIONS

Arnold West,
16 Southway, Burgess Hill,
Sussex (Tel:04446 6738)

Librarian

Robin Lindsay,
87 Station Road, Whittlesey,
Peterborough PE7 1UE
(Tel: 0733 203414)

RESEARCH AND INVESTIGATION

Director of Research

Peter A. Hill, AMR.,FMS.,FSS.,
47a Easter Bankton, Murieston,
Livingston, West Lothian,
Scotland EH54 9BD (Tel:0506 33720)

Director of Investigations

Miss Jenny Randles,
8 Whitethroat Walk, Birchwood,
Warrington, Cheshire WA3 6PQ
(Tel: 0925 824036)

ADVERTISEMENTS

Details of rates from Mr A. West.

THE BRITISH UFO RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

BUFORA LTD (by guarantee). Founded 1964. Registered Office:
2 Malbury Court, Clarence Road, London, N22. Registered in London
1234924. Incorporating the London UFO Research Association founded
1959, and the British UFO Association founded 1962.

AIMS 1. To encourage, promote and conduct unbiased scientific
research of unidentified flying objects (UFO) phenomena throughout
the United Kingdom. 2. To collect and disseminate evidence and data
relating to unidentified flying objects (UFOs). 3. To co-ordinate
UFO research throughout the United Kingdom and to co-operate with
others engaged in such research throughout the world.

MEMBERSHIP. Membership is open to all who support the aims of the
Association and whose application is approved by the Executive
Council. Application/information forms can be obtained from any
officer.

COMMENT

I would like to know what articles you, the reader, would like to see published in the Bulletin. Whilst present funds do not allow for the wide coverage we had in the Journal, scope still exists for developing new topics, encouraging new writers and drawing on the views and talents of the BUFORA membership to give the Bulletin its own individual personality.

Letters and features should be sent to me at the address given on page 2 of the Bulletin. Editorial space is limited so contributions must be as concise as possible. Features should not run to more than 2,500 words (four Bulletin pages) if the article is not to be split between consecutive issues.

The following simple editorial guidelines will, I hope, help you. Manuscripts should be typed, double-spacing, on one side of A4 paper. A short autobiographical note, setting out your interest in the UFO phenomenon would also be welcome, particularly from new contributors. If references are made to other source material this should be placed at the end of the article and list the name of the author(s) followed by initials, the title of the original article, publication, volume and issue number and year of publication.

Where permission is required for the publication of material either contained in the article, or the article itself, it is the writer's responsibility to acquire this from the original source.

The editor reserves the right to reject or to edit any material submitted.

Contributors should make it clear if they want their material returned to them, whether published or unpublished. Unfortunately it is not possible to retain published manuscripts/articles for more than two months after the Bulletin has appeared.

The Bulletin pages are yours, please do help to fill them. I shall look forward to hearing from you and so, I am sure, will your fellow members.

John Barrett.



CONFERENCE

BUFORA will hold its third National Conference at the Lorch Foundation Conference Centre, Lane End, near High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, during the Bank Holiday weekend Saturday August 27th-Monday, August 29th, 1983. The venue is approximately midway between London and Oxford and close to M40 Motorway.

Further details will, of course, be published in the Bulletin.
BUT MAKE A NOTE IN YOUR DIARY NOW.

DIARY DATES

Saturday, October 9th, 1982. "The UFO Investigator and the Witness." Afternoon seminar (1.00 pm - 5pm) at the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology. This should be an interesting opportunity to learn something about perception, witness interviewing and the implementation of the code of ethics. From past experience the practical exercises are usually the best part! This is part of an attempt by BUFORA to hold more events outside London. So do support this event. Advance booking is requested and the cost, for BUFORA members is £1.50.

Cheques and postal orders should be sent to Peter Warrington, 5 North Avenue, Burnage, Manchester M19 2WR, from whom further details are available.

Not all BUFORA members can attend London meetings to hear lectures or talk to fellow ufologists. There are, of course, UFO societies in the rest of the UK who welcome visitors and new members. Details of two are given below:

NUFOIS. Meetings at 443 Meadow Lane, Nottingham from 7.30pm-10.00pm every Tuesday evening. The group arranges meetings which include instruction in astronomy, aircraft identification, map-reading use of equipment etc. Meetings are also held to discuss sightings, ley lines and other matters of interest.

NUFOIS's Derbyshire group meets at 46 The Common, Quardon, near Derby. The local Secretary is Peter Ann at the address above. The Secretary of the Nottingham group is Les Hall at Meadow Lane.

BUFORA Lectures, 7.00pm, Kensington Central Library, Campden Hill Road entrance, London W8.

Saturday, September 4th, 1982:

There is More to UFOs Than Meets The Eye. Peter Warrington

Saturday, October 2nd, 1982

The Aveley Abduction - A New Look. Andy Collins

Saturday, November 6th, 1982

UFOs. A Scientific Enigma or a Modern Myth? Robert Morrell

"UFO/IFO: A PROCESS OF ELIMINATION"

When a UFO sighting eventually reaches the press media or a UFO group, there are two courses of action available. The information can either be taken at face value and an account of a UFO can then be published, or the information can be acted upon in a methodical manner by investigating the sighting in every aspect. This involves site surveys, witness interviews, photographing, measuring and obtaining accurate weather and aircraft movement reports. From this, the sighting can more often than not be explained and the 'UFO' therefore becomes an 'IFO'. IFOs make up some 90% of all sightings, and two westcountry groups have compiled a collection of case histories and articles which illustrate just how UFOs become IFOs with a thorough investigation. The articles are not by ufologists, but by people who are accepted as experts in their own fields of study and the topics covered include astronomy, meteorology, perception, aircraft and balloon identification and investigation procedures. There are five in-depth case histories - some explained, some not - and the solutions are not revealed until the end. It is essential reading for the serious ufologist, and the complete 44 page booklet is available direct from 'SCUFORI', 29 Lethbridge Road, Swindon, Wiltshire. SN1 4BY. The price is 80p plus 20p postage.

The BUFORA investigation system is undergoing a transformation. Consequently the publication of case summaries will be re-organised. We will not publish lengthy lists of information although investigators can rest assured that all case data is of value. Instead, Bulletin space will be given to summaries I will make of incoming interesting cases. These will include IFOs (potentially explained cases) These have been undervalued in the past, as Allen Hendry's excellent book* shows. We must not forget that IFOs form 90 per cent of our data. I believe it will prove instructive for investigators to see examples of misidentification. They can point the way toward spotting similar mistakes in future. The more important cases will, hopefully, be the subject of articles for JTAP, and FSR may well have space for some also. In addition I intend to provide some regular statistical breakdown of incoming data.

CASE 73-XX (IFO) UNKNOWN DATE 1973. LOW⁺ LEVEL C⁺
 Arklow Co. Wicklow, Eire.

A report forwarded by the British UFO Society (A BUFORA RI with BUFOS data substituted!) Stuart Campbell commented on it for me "...it is consistent with ball lightning (except for its occurrence under a clear sky)" Ball Lightning is certainly a phenomenon more common in our records than many give credit for. The witness (then 16) and five friends were walking by a church at 2200 when they heard a strange humming, looking up they saw a ball of white light hovering beside the spire. It was there for about five minutes and dropped two small "blobs" to the ground. It then increased in brilliance and the brightness grew louder and it vanished. The point of the spire would probably act as a form of lightning conductor.

CASE 79-268 (Insuff) November 9th, 1979. LOW LEVEL C
 Edinburgh, West Lothian

On a cool clear night a 33 year old postman was out with his dog in a park at 1930 GMT. He observed two unusual blue/silvery/white lights flashing on and off. They moved very slowly towards each other, passed each other and then retreated on their course. One moving SSE the other NNW. The witness watched for over an hour until they moved out of sight. The most interesting aspect of this case is its timing, only 14 hours before the classic landing with traces just to the west in Livingston.

Investigator: Stuart Campbell.

CASE 81-034 (IFO) June 15th, 1981. MED LEVEL C
 Hornchurch, Essex.



Frederick Simmonds, 37 years old, was travelling to work at 07.15 BST when he observed a parachute-like object. It drifted slowly west to east to be lost behind trees. Silver in colour

* The UFO Handbook.(Sphere. 1980. £5.95)
 + See notes at the end of this article.

it resolved into a dome structure of metallic sections, seemingly welded. (Figure 1). The bottom was shaped like a 50p piece. Investigation concludes that this was a meteorological "wind direction" finding device. Note witness description suggests this and is not exaggerated.

Figure 1

Sideview



Underside view

Investigator: Bob Easton.

CASE 81-038 (IFO) October 4th, 1981
Hastings, Sussex

CE1 Physiological LEVEL A

This is an excellent, detailed report on a fascinating case which the investigator very reluctantly accepts as an IFO. Mrs M. Antell reported the case to me having seen my address in a cutting from "The Unexplained" (sent to her by someone who saw her sighting in the local paper) UFOIN member Philip Taylor undertook a detailed follow-up and a copy report was obtained for BUFORA files. Philip has a Master of Science degree and works at the Royal Greenwich Observatory, Herstmonceux. He met Mrs Antell, 65 along with her 30 year old daughter-in-law Janette. At 20.55 BST Mrs Antell, whilst watching a film, felt "compelled" to go to the window (which faces SW). She was amazed to see a large, bright yellow object "...like two blobs of golden jelly - wobbling and pulsating." She called her son but he could see nothing, but Janette was so excited at the prospect she rushed over. For five or 10 minutes nothing was visible, but then it appeared, changing shape a number of times to various forms (including "cross shaped"). It was generating its own "camouflage" - a cloud emitted by the object. This was fluorescent and did not move like the other clouds in the stiff wind. Whenever an aircraft approached it "hid" behind its cloud. This occurred at least five times. She thought military jets were investigating it. Up to this point Janette had not seen as much detail as Mrs Antell. But, finally, she did so, as it went through a variety of shape changes, now a red disc on the horizon. They felt sad at its apparent departure and wished for its return. As if in answer to this it did - suddenly coming close and appearing as a brilliant golden colour! At about 22.00 BST it vanished over the horizon.

Mrs Antell called the police and two officers came to discuss the affair. They promised to submit a report and return if their superiors felt the case should be pursued. They did not come back. Next day both Mrs Antell and Janette claim to have suffered headaches over one eye. These recurred during the next three weeks.

Four days after the event, at midday, Mrs Antell felt tired and cold and suffered what she terms a "blackout" being conscious of nothing until 02.30 next day!

The doctor was called, Mrs Antell fearing a stroke, but she had no symptoms. She has not had similar blackouts before and the doctor could not explain it.

Both Mrs Antell and Janette relate these "effects" to the UFO. Indeed (having seen the current "Sunday Mirror" items about a regression hypnosis case in Todmorden Mrs Antell speculated about her "time lapse" and viewed it as UFO-related)

Mrs Antell bestows the sighting with semi-religious overtones, describes the UFO as "beautiful" and feels a lot easier about the world now that she knows "they" are here to help us. Janette shares most of these impressions and is certainly convinced she saw an alien spaceship.

Mrs Antell also believes there is an official cover-up, partly because the police never came back, because the RAF at Manston denied that any of the planes were theirs and because Gordon Taylor (no relation) at Herstmonceux was approached for an "off-the-cuff" quickie response and told the press it could have been the moon.

In fact, despite the incredible nature of the sightings and aftermath this, according to Philip, seems to be the right answer!

The moon was crescent-shaped (one of the reported UFO shapes) It set at 22.02 - the exact time the UFO was last seen. There was complete cover of high thin cloud (through which the moon could shine distorted "...as if covered by cloud.") and variable low cloud to enhance the shape-changing. But the most damning factor is that the witness directed the investigator to a WSW bearing for the "UFO." The moon was at bearing 249° (i.e 31° south of W or WSW!)

Looking at it this way it MUST be the moon, although the witnesses strenuously reject this - and it does seem incredible - does it not?

This is the sort of case we should study in more depth to find out just how and why this kind of thing can occur.

Readers may recall a 1976 case at Bignall End, Staffordshire. Tony Pace showed that this (which even had entities mixed with it!) was the moon also.


Investigator: Philip Taylor

CASE 82-001 (UFO) January 9th, 1982.
Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire

LOW LEVEL A

At 19.30 GMT Mr and Mrs Merry were watching the lunar eclipse when two pinkish twinkling lights approached from the NW. They moved silently and at great speed (estimated 1.6 radians per second). One light moved on a linear trajectory, the other undulated. They were in view 5-6 seconds. 15 minutes later a second set of five lights in a cross-shaped array (Figure 2) passed W to E. They maintained a constant pattern and moved at a similar speed.

Figure 2.



The investigator poses the obvious question: Why no other witnesses? Hundreds of people must have been watching the spectacular lunar eclipse locally.

Only one thought strikes me - could it be birds reflecting street-lighting? I have come across reports such as this before. The colour of street-lighting in the Neath Hill area of Milton Keynes would not be pinkish white would it?

Investigator: Ken Phillips

+ NOTE The Codes I use follow my suggested modifications of Dr. J. Allen Hynek's system
(see UFO, A British Viewpoint (Hale, 1979) and UFO Study (Hale, 1981))

LOW Low Definition Reports (unsubstantiated shape or lights)
MED Medium Definition Reports (a clearly defined shape)
CEI Close Encounters of the First Kind
(CE2 second, i.e. permanent traces)
(CE3 entities)

These cases involve some kind of effect on witness or environment, described afterwards e.g. CE1 physiological (medical effects on a witness)

LEVELS are indications of the depth of investigation, as devised by myself and Bernard Delair (see same sources and FSR Vol.24 No.2)

A On site investigation
B Interview with witness
C Official report form filled out by witness
D Letter describing case from witness
E Entirely third-hand source (e.g. press cuttings)

One of the things which most convinces me of the reality of UFOs is the periodic occurrence of "crazy days" when several important UFO events happen simultaneously in different locations. Here the theory that the media generate a mass psychosis is very hard to accept. The incidents appear to be quite independent and if they happen out of the blue (literally) in the midst of a dearth of good UFO reports, then one must take notice and wonder why.

This was the situation on Saturday, April 17th, 1982. Details are still coming in, but two or three good cases exist - including a multi-witness event in Lancashire's Rossendale valley where a flashing cigar-shaped object was observed. The most important event happened in Surrey and has been well-investigated by Omar Fowler and Mike Prewett of SIGAP (Surrey Investigation Group into Aerial Phenomena) within five days of it being reported.

It concerns 31 year old Peter Mackie11 and his 27 year old fiancée whom we shall call Chris. The night was clear and cool and they were driving along A25 Guildford to Dorking road near the tiny hamlet of Wootton which borders the village of Westcott. Here they approached Coast Hill which descends into a hollow with lovely open views across the plains into Sussex.

Suddenly Chris saw two very bright lights over some trees ahead. Peter joked "They probably built a road across the top of the trees" As they came closer they presumed the lights must be those of an aircraft but after about three minutes of approach the lights remained stationary and they both began to have doubts about this theory.

As they travelled along the rises in the road the lights kept disappearing temporarily, but they always reappeared, dispelling any doubts that it was an illusion. As they came really close they could see the lights shining through the trees. It was only at this stage that they speculated about it being a UFO and Chris became very frightened.

As they went into the hollow they rounded a bend and confronted the object in full view. It was a massive dark shape pouring out light and illuminating the field above which it hovered. They guessed that it could not have been more than 100 ft off the ground, and, indeed, as they descended to the hollow's base they came more level with it. Peter was at this point repeating to himself "It's an aeroplane ... it's an aeroplane..." to reassure himself. He knew that it was not. Chris says her legs turned to jelly and she cried out. At their closest proximity, as they went almost underneath the object, Peter yelled "My God, it is a UFO!" In his terror he drove the car onto the kerb.

The object displayed two bright spotlights projected forward, with a red and green light on either side. It was these seeming "navigation lights" that made them assume it to be an aircraft. Along the side of the front of the curved, oval bulk was a row of fluorescent green "window" lights. Peter says "It was as though the light was shining from the inside out." He adds that the shape itself reminded him of "a zeppelin." He made out something on the side, a protruberance, which was dimly visible and was not like wings. The object remained quite silent as they drove past up the hill on the other side of the hollow.

The journey parallel with the object took about 30 seconds and as they got to the rise of the hill they could see, due to the change in angle, two orange "burners." "You could see right down inside them" said Peter "and they were glowing. You could actually see the depth of them. Chris added "I saw them as clear as day." They frightened her.

An interesting close encounter symptom as they drove by was the absence of other traffic. This puzzled Peter. As soon as the object disappeared there was traffic. This common feature of close encounters, almost as if time is suspended, I call the "OZ Factor" (after the famous wizard and his spells). I am giving a talk on it at a BUFORA lecture in December.


After reaching the top of the hill Peter reversed the car and drove back to the spot - there was no sign of the object. They looked out across the landscape and could see for miles - there was no sign of the object "it might as well have disappeared into thin air." Peter called Gatwick Airport and they tried to convince him that it was an aircraft en route to them, but he says it could not possibly have been. "I will swear on the Bible it was not." The couple returned home and sketched the object independently. It was evident that they had seen the same thing. We do not have any knowledge of a possible time-lapse since timings were not accurately recorded. But it was 23.15 immediately after the sighting, estimated as lasting about five minutes in total.

Alert readers who also take FSR will have read a quite remarkable similiarity between this case and a UFO which hovered beside M53 motorway near Wallasey on the Wirral. Figures 1 and 2.



Figure 1. Westcott, Surrey, April 17th, 1982

Figure 2. Wirral, May 15th, 1980



What was seen on both these occasions? The only thought which comes to mind is a Harrier jump jet (although most of these were doing something rather more important during April, 1982!) Aircraft experts say that the afterburners noted in both cases are improbable under the circumstances. What about the total lack of sound and the inconsistent lighting and the object's sudden disappearance? This sounds like a classic close encounter unless any reader knows of any unconventional Harrier activity (Falkland crisis exercises?) being undertaken on the night of April 17th.

I did not of course know that April 17th was destined to produce several UFO stories. On that day I gave a Paper to ASSAP's Leicester conference on regression hypnosis. I got off the train at my home station Birchwood (Cheshire) as dusk fell (around 21.25)

saw a single, very large bright red light moving across my view from right (east) to left (west). I assumed it to be an aircraft but as it moved through a wide arc no other lights were visible. The light pulsed in a slow, rhythmic fashion and faded into the distance. It was totally silent. I imagined that it must just have been a quiet helicopter possibly going to Burtonwood USAF base (about five miles away). During the sighting I heard the muted hum of traffic on the distant M6 and M62 motorways, which were further away from me than this light clearly was. I do not regard my observation as significant, or even probable as that of a UFO. It no doubt was just a helicopter with unusual lighting. But when details came to me of other sightings (including that at Rossendale which was at the same time as mine) I thought I had better record it - just in case!

WHERE HAVE ALL THE UFOs GONE?

There is an appreciable dearth of sightings coming into BUFORA. It seems we are not alone in this. Other UK UFO organisations have noticed the effect since 1979. In an average year BUFORA handles around 300-400 cases, but the 1980 and 1981 totals are only 110 and 60 respectively. This year, if anything, is worse for the first six months of 1982 we have only five cases entering our files! Investigators are asked to make extra efforts to discover cases hiding out there somewhere. The Bulletin editor would like to hear from you if you have any theories as to why there is such a fall-off. I have two comments to make. The effect of the massive publicity in 1978-79 with "Star Wars" and "Close Encounters" has been super-saturating, and the result was to bore people about UFOs in the long term. Also, we have become better investigators and are weeding out more of the obvious LITS mis-identification without filing a report on them. The result - the current drought. If you disagree with me please say so.

Some RICS have asked me to point out that all cases should go from you to them initially and not me Jenny Randles. You should not undertake investigation without notifying your local controller otherwise he might duplicate your work. RIC names and addresses are given below:

<u>Scotland</u>	Stuart Campbell, 4 Dovecot Loan, Edinburgh, EH14 2LT.
<u>North</u>	Peter Campbell, 5 North Avenue, Burnage, Manchester M19 2WR.
<u>Midlands and mid-Wales</u>	Mark Brown, 155 Ashburton Road, Hugglescote, Coalville, Leicestershire.
<u>Central</u> (Home Counties)	Ken Phillips, 13 Falcon Avenue, Springfields, Milton Keynes MK6 3HG, Buckinghamshire.
<u>East</u>	Bob Easton, 29 Crown Road, Billericay, Essex.
<u>East Anglia</u>	Peter Johnson, 1 De Morley Garth, Sherringham, Norfolk NR26 8JG
<u>West and south Wales</u>	Ian Mrzyglod, 16 Marigold Walk, Ashton, Bristol BS3 2PD.
<u>South West</u>	Eric Morris, 17 Wilkinson Road, St.Budeaux, Plymouth PL5 1DF, Devon.
<u>London</u>	Roy Rowlands, 122 Winchester Avenue, Kingsbury, London NW9 9TD.
<u>South East</u>	Philip Taylor, 14a Gilda Crescent, Polegate, East Sussex BN26 6AN.
<u>Channel Isles</u>	Geoff Falla, Highcliffe Avenue, Beauvais, Ville Au Roi, St Peter Port, Guernsey, CI.

Debunking UFOs and those who report them, is a favourite past-time of many sceptics and government authorities. Gradually the sheer weight of scepticism bends and sometimes breaks the UFO witness, they scurry off cursing the encounter, and the debunkers chalk up another victory for science and rational thought.

Once in a while, however, there is a case that stands up to scientific scrutiny. Such an event occurred in the early morning of December 31st, 1978, off New Zealand's South Island when a television crew saw and filmed a number of bright airborne lights. The case was investigated by American optical physicist, Dr. Bruce Maccabee, a consultant for the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP). He referred his findings to 20 fellow scientists and experts in radar, optics and physics who agreed that the light sources defied logical explanation. The film was declared the first verified movie footage of a UFO.

As one of the passengers on that flight I too suffered at the hands of the debunkers.

I have been called many things since the encounter - hoaxer, liar, fool even the George Adamski of the 1980s. I admit to only one major failing - naivety.

When I told my incredible story it did not occur to me that people would disbelieve it. After all I had seen the things with my own eyes as had the others on board, including the pilot, a man with 24 years flying experience. More important the objects had been tracked on radar.

The scoffing increased when two days after the sightings I collapsed and was admitted to hospital. One critic even claimed the rather dubious honour of helping me into a hospital bed. Evidently he phoned the television channel on the day my tired and battered spirit cried "Enough" to inform management that our UFO was in fact Jupiter. In a later phone conversation the critic, Sydney amateur astronomer Rober Lanigan-O'Keefe, remarked on the apparent coincidence of my collapse and his phone call. He seemed most put out to learn that I was unaware he had contacted the channel and that my collapse was the end result of too much work and pressure and too little sleep.

In the following months Lanigan-O'Keefe became my most vocal critic through the columns of the "Sydney Morning Herald". Later he was joined by a group of New Zealand government scientists, although they were uncomfortable bed-fellows. Lanigan-O'Keefe remained firmly convinced that the sighting was that of Jupiter while New Zealand scientists from the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR) settled first for Venus and later for a Japanese squid fishing boat, as well as a host of other "most likely" theories.

* Mr Fogarty was the reporter with a three man Australian television film crew who encountered the UFOs in December, 1978 off the east coast of New Zealand.

While the "great debunking" was in full swing I decided to drop out of the public eye for while leaving the case in charge of Dr. Maccabee. He soon discovered that he had a scientific time-bomb on his hands. The film was a clincher for as he said, it took him only four micro-seconds to realise that he was not looking at Venus, Jupiter, birds or moonlight. After several weeks' intensive study, he decided that on a scale of 1 to 10 the probability that we had seen and filmed a UFO was about 11!

Maccabee did not rush into print with his initial findings and thoughts about the case for, as he told me in a letter, "the stakes are high in this game." He travelled to Australia and New Zealand to interview all the witnesses, and he studied the entire UFO footage. He then referred his findings to a scientific panel which included Professor J. Allen Hynek, Director of the Center for UFO Studies (CUFOS).

With the backing of fellow scientists, Maccabee decided to go public. A press conference was held in New York on March 26th, 1979 and although there was a good turnout of some 40 members of the press corps the event did not exactly set the world alight. President Carter had picked that day for an Israeli/Arab peace party and two days later came the Three Mile Island nuclear plant scare.

I arrived back in Melbourne to find that the conference had created hardly a ripple. The silence from the scientific community, and the critics especially, was deafening.

It was a trying period in other ways. No matter where I went I was the "UFO reporter." People, mostly genuine, sought me out and wanted to know what had "really happened." Others, more cynical, did their best to tie me up in a vague scientific equation and yet others suggested, behind my back, that the channel had arranged the whole thing in order to boost its flagging ratings. Then, of course, there were the true believers, mostly extra-terrestrial adherents who regarded me with awe and glazed eyes since I had almost touched the stuff of their dreams.

My interest in UFOs began to change. I was no longer concerned whether they were space or time travellers, psychic phenomena, God and his angelic hosts or Satan and his demonic hordes. Rather, I had become fascinated by the lengths that some people were prepared to go to in order to argue away the facts. Lanigan-O'Keefe was a prime example as were New Zealand government scientists. Both believed their "explanations" were correct, but both had completely different theories which they clung to with limpet-like tenacity. They had not offered any challenge to Maccabee's findings, or none that I could find. Why? It seemed like a good idea to stir things up a little. A year later I contacted those who had set themselves up publicly as experts on the UFO phenomenon, and the December 31st sightings in particular, and said that I was preparing a magazine article and would be interested in their comments on the case. I registered the letters and gave the so-called experts two months to answer.

I did not contact DSIR scientists for they had already made their feelings plainly evident. On January 25th, 1979,

the Royal New Zealand Air Force (RNZAF) dismissed the December 31st events and a group of sightings 10 days earlier, as "natural but unusual atmospheric phenomena." The report was released by the air force but the scientific side of the investigation was carried out by the DSIR. When I sought further clarification an official government spokesman said that I could safely assume the object we had filmed was Venus. That, according to the spokesman was the final official comment. However, 11 months later, Bill Ireland of DSIR's Physics and Engineering Laboratory, released a detailed report entitled "Unfamiliar Observations Of Lights In The Night Sky." Surprisingly, this time the boffins had discarded Venus in favour of a "brightly lit squid boat." I can only assume this change came about with the discovery that Venus did not rise until after we had finished filming! Incidentally, Dr. Maccabee has released a scientific response to Ireland's claims which blows his hypothetical fishing boat right out of the water. I have also publicly challenged Ireland's findings in letters to New Zealand newspapers and magazines - they elicited no response. I can only assume that he and his scientific colleagues are unable to answer my charge that they have been involved in an official government cover-up.

Sir Martin Ryle, The Astronomer Royal: On January 3rd, 1979, was quoted as saying the film could have been a hoax and that he could have produced one like it within a week. Sir Martin was the first to reply to my letter and it was quite obvious that he had neither read, nor heard about Maccabee's finding. He wrote:

"When I was asked to comment on the UFO sightings on December 31, 1978, the main emphasis was placed on reports that it had been observed with a radar (I cannot now recall where); there are clearly various possibilities for misinterpreted visual observations. Since the radar was probably an Air Traffic Control system, it would have no facilities for height-finding, and since it apparently had not measured the speed of the object (which would have been easy) it is not possible to determine whether it was moving (a) very fast (b) at aircraft speeds (c) at bird flying speeds or (c) at wind speed. My enquirer also had no knowledge of the operating frequency of the radar. In view of the date of the event it seemed possible that some practical joker had dropped, from a light aircraft, a corner reflector + parachute, and of course possibly a light."

COMMENTS: A number of objects were picked up on radar that morning and some of them were seen to move; many others were apparently stationary and this backs up the visual observations of those on the aircraft. One target that did not move was observed on two separate occasions by the radar duty operator at Wellington airport, Geoff Causer. That target travelled about 38km at speeds ranging from 30-60 knots. Sir Martin refers to the date of the event (the early morning of New Year's Eve) as appropriate for a practical joke. Maybe they do things differently in Britain but to my knowledge the traditional day for practical jokers has always been April 1st. Let me assure Sir Martin, that it was no joke. In fact everyone on board the aircraft that morning has had little to laugh and joke about since. We have been too busy trying to counter destructive and ill-informed comments of so-called experts.

Philip Klass, a confirmed American sceptic and the author of "UFOs Explained" was, on January 4th, 1979, reported as saying it was possible the film had been doctored. Klass prefaced his remarks by confirming that he had seen Maccabee's copy of the New Zealand film on two separate occasions.

"And let me add," he continued, "that after 13 years of investigating famous UFO cases in the US, I am not surprised that you and your associates, possibly (Klass's emphasis) excluding Captain Startup, could get caught up in the excitement of the moment and honestly believe that you were photographing 'EFOs' (Extraordinary Flying Objects)"

He then went on at length to suggest that the radar returns were spurious targets, called 'angels' and referred to Ireland's report which suggested that conditions in New Zealand at the time of the sightings were conducive to such anomalous propagation. Klass also mentions inaction on Geoff Causer's part to alert Startup to a potential mid-air collision, and the apparent lack of concern by Causer and Startup about the whole situation. He suggests that Causer was:

"derelict in his responsibilities and that Captain Startup has suicidal tendencies and has lost all desire to live."

Another possible explanation, he suggests:

"is that the operator and Startup were playing games for your benefit, never dreaming that the incident would mushroom into an internationally famous incident. I am unable to think of any other alternatives."

Klass implies that the light filmed on the climb out of Christchurch was a ship, or ships, and another light as Blenheim airport's rotary aircraft beacon. However, because of his unfamiliarity with the locale, he says he could not possibly even suggest an explanation for each and every light we filmed although

"perhaps some were bright celestial bodies."

He ended by offering me the chance to sign an agreement with him in which he promised to pay \$10,000 for proof of extra-terrestrial life.

COMMENTS Maccabee states that during the sightings the duty radar technician at Wellington checked for anomalous propagation but found no evidence of the super-refraction referred to by Ireland. Klass, like so many critics of the sightings, then attempts to belittle the significance of the case by attacking the integrity of some of the principal participants - Causer and Startup. This is part of the not so subtle art of debunking. No amount of mud-slinging however will alter the fact that Startup is a well-respected pilot with 24 years flying experience and Causer a highly-trained government radar operator. As for Klass's offer, I make one point. At no time have I claimed that what we saw and filmed was extra-terrestrial and, to my knowledge, neither has anyone else associated with the case.

THIS ARTICLE WILL BE CONCLUDED IN THE
NEXT ISSUE OF THE BULLETIN.

In the last edition of this Bulletin we discussed some of the elements which might be responsible for causing UFO waves. In human society there are always some psychological tensions present, but they become apparent in many different ways for different reasons. So tensions that may create a UFO wave in one instance might create a different kind of panic in other instances. This kind of mechanism is illustrated by Peter Rogerson in his article "Interpretation Of UFO Type Data In Terms of Contemporary Panics" in MJFOB Volume 6 No.2. As Peter wrote: "One of the most terrifying things that people can be confronted with is the random, disturbing event. Faced with one or many such events, there is a general tendency among people to try to fit them into a convenient pattern. Any pattern, however irritational and capricious is better than no pattern at all. Therefore there is a great impetus to see 'meanings' behind world events, to hold, for example, that disturbing social change is generated by malevolent conspiracies, or to see portents and archetypes in random lights in the sky." But this kind of hypothesis does not explain why there are invariant factors involved in different UFO waves and the panic created by anomalous aerial activities. Carl Grove has pointed out that there might have been "different social stimuli at work in the US in 1897 and in the UK in 1909 and 1913, (but) the appearance of the phenomena was much the same (except for the lesser number of Type 1 events in Great Britain) And similar sightings were made in New Zealand and elsewhere, where different social environments would obtain." We could explain this by claiming that the stimuli for these waves were not that radically different, and worries and fears of people in these countries were so similar as to provoke the same reactions. It can be seen that all the countries involved were scientifically and technologically advances, and were worried about the threat of war. However, this impression might be due to the fact that their means of written communication were more efficient, and records of other waves for different reasons might have occurred but were not recorded. Even if we ignore the bias of our material, we still have to explain such invariant factors as the appearance of "rapid acceleration, right-angle turns, zig-zag descents, extremely bright lights, etc." We could also add the puzzling appearance of Men In Black who turn up during UFO waves, vehicle stoppage incidents, and a multitude of other factors which seem to crop up time and again in sighting reports and waves before and after 1947. The "social panic" hypothesis can blind us to the actual constituents of reported happenings, and their significance can easily be overlooked. One of the fascinating aspects of historical research is that we can try to determine if these "invariant" factors" can be substantiated or whether we are giving emphasis to data which is not representative. We can also explore the (hypothetical) stimuli for these observations, the outcome of such studies can have an important bearing on contemporary incidents and our understanding of them.

To change the subject of discussion to a less intricate area of study we might like to consider the short novel "The Variable Man" by Philip K. Dick (Sphere, London 1969, 2nd edition 1977, originally published 1953) Thomas Cole,

the hero of the story, has the ability to fly all manner of mechanical contraptions and makes a living as a freelance knife sharpener and repairman. In the spring of 1913 he is going about his normal business in Nebraska, USA when he is suddenly assaulted by a tornado: "All at once it was there, completely around him. Nothing but grayness. He and the cart and horses seemed to be in a calm spot in the centre of the tornado. They were moving in a great silence, gray mist everywhere" (page 20). In reality this tornado is a time bubble device which deposits Cole into the future, October 6th, 2128, to be precise. Eventually he aids the people in the future in the creation of a faster-than-light space propulsion system, thus opening up the Universe to our inspection and eliminating the necessity to continue fighting the Proxima Centauran empire which had traditionally inhibited Terran expansion by conventional spacecraft. A fairly dull story, but the choice of Spring, 1913 as a date for Cole's disappearance is relatively interesting. I wonder if the author had any particular reason for picking that season, year, location, etc. The use of a tornado-type device has its antecedents in other science-fiction type stories and we might look at them in a future Bulletin.

Send communications to: Nigel Watson, Westfield Cottage, Crowle, Bank Road, Althorpe, South Humberside, DN17 3HZ.







"Ignore it, it's only more temperature inversion."

Before I launch into verbose conjectures about a very tricky subject I would like to say that I am only a layman - by no stretch of the imagination could I be called an expert!

I have been looking at the differing racial types on this planet for some time now and I have come to the conclusion that there are only four basic specimens. They are quite simply the white, red, black and yellow species with all others (including Asian and Australoid) being hybrid. According to C. Sigaud they are classified as being Bronchopulmonary, Gastrointestinal, Muscular-articular and Cerebro-spinal. If we look at the accompanying illustrations you can see how I have related Sigaud's classification to my own.

Classification of Racial Stock

			
BRONCHO-PULMONARY	GASTRO-INTESTINAL	MUSCULAR ARTICULAR	CEREBRO-SPINAL
RED	YELLOW	BLACK	WHITE
ATLANTIS	SUMERIA	NUBIA	HYPERBOREA

This cannot be taken too precisely because, due to hybridisation over the centuries and weaknesses and failures of individuals, it can only serve as a general illustration of my ideas. I am not a scientist, my imagination is my greatest asset, so I use it to point to possible new directions of thought so that research of the "unknown" is kept alive.

The Atlantean descendants found their natural home in the Andes, South America, as they had the respiratory adaption to cope with the rarified atmosphere at those altitudes. The Sumerians have long been indigenous to the Far East, although when we look at their physical structure, we find that they are adapted to the extreme conditions of the Artic - as evidenced by the Eskimos. It is interesting to note that it is generally

accepted that the Eskimo migrated to his present location, although there is no explanation for how his Eastern cousins have developed the physical attributes associated with heat retention. Both the men and women have a subcutaneous layer of fat, are small in stature and have that "roll" above the eyelid that is so effective against sun glare. It is also interesting to note that southern China is on the same parallel as central Africa which is the home of the Negro.

The Negro is said to have developed his characteristics as a result of living in that climate, so why aren't the Chinese the same colour as the Negro? Another interesting observation is the Negro's superior strength, the musculature of his body having the sole function of motivating this biological vehicle against the pull of gravity. Since the gravitational pull on this planet is world-wide, it is odd that one race should be generally stronger than others. The Mongoloid actually has a very light, bird-like skeletal structure - quite contradictory to that of the Negro. Many people attribute this strength to the fact that the Negro was so recently enslaved, but they forget past times when the Nubian empire was at its strongest, buying European slaves from the Romans by the cartload! Almost every nation on this planet has been enslaved at one time or another. And all this does suggest to me that the four basic species originated on four different planets. It is certainly true that the only way to experience differing gravitational pull is to go on another planet. I do accept Darwin's theory on the origin of the species, but I do not believe that everything took place on Earth.

I feel that if we did evolve from the ape to our present state, there would be no such thing as an ape in this world today. Every organism has an inherent potential to evolve despite itself and, when Man came down from the trees, his cousins of similar latent ability would be, by now, as advanced as the tribesman of Borneo. Only by the introduction of an "artificial" civilisation could the ape have been left so far behind. Having established this as a viable consideration we now have to ask "Where did we come from?" My theory is quite simple. We came from our own galaxy - Mars, Uranus, Venus, and Jupiter. I am well aware that these planets are uninhabitable for Man at this physical level, but it is conceivable that they came from another dimension. I feel that these "dead" planets are inhabited on an "astral level."

I shall go into an exhaustive account of this phenomena explaining how every physical body has an astral double at a later date. But I am certain many people are familiar with the experience of "falling" just prior to waking from a dream state or witnessing their own operation in hospital.

When we glance through history, it does seem as though civilisation was hit by a thunderbolt. There does not seem to be any evidence to suggest that any nation developed naturally. One minute we are wearing animal skins and brandishing clubs, the next we are wearing paper underwear and operating pocket calculators. It does rather appear to me that a galactic traveller arrived on the doorstep selling instant technology. Another point is if we come from so recent a common origin - as Darwin suggests - why are our cultures so vastly different?

Language is another consideration, in my amateur studies I

have found no element that suggests the varying languages come from a common origin. It is only since the advent of travel that we discover the influence of one culture on another. In certain cultures, of course, even this miniscule deviation is quite impossible. I cannot see how English can have any effect on the Chinese language. It is also true, according to my observation, that art and culture are so diverse planet-wise.

I think we did originate from the ape in some far galaxy, then breeding stock was introduced to four different planets. These four pioneer groups developed their own culture in alien isolation from their neighbours and, when they had evolved sufficiently, came to Earth under their own steam (or was it nuclear fission?). I think this goes a long way towards explaining racial hatred - we are alien to one another in every sense of the word.

Readers' views on Mr Paynter's article would be of interest.

MUCH ADO

LBC (London Broadcasting Company) on the evening of Tuesday, July 13th, 1982 broadcast a phone-in on UFOs. Dan Damon was the presenter and those taking part were Lord Clancarty, Gordon Creighton of "Flying Saucer Review" Ian Ridpath, science journalist and, via hook-up with USA, Jim Oberg, Flight Controller from NASA, Houston, Texas.

I cannot believe that any listener was in the least impressed by the standards of the arguments put forward or the few examples quoted. Names, Adamski, Hynek, Leslie were bandied about, cover-ups were heatedly discussed, and statements (pro and anti UFO) were quoted from Lord Hill Norton and the French Ministry of Defence in order to back up respective points of view.

Lord Clancarty was much impressed by the force field article published in the last BUFORA Bulletin, Mr Creighton found the article's premise utter nonsense. Ian Ridpath maintained that there was no cover-up since books were written about UFOs, films made and they were all sitting around the studio discussing the subject to a large slice of south-east England. It was, he said, "the worst cover-up ever."

Governments were interested in UFO reports said someone else, since they often revealed military/space operations by countries such as Russia, and this often accounted for "flaps."

Jim Oberg, the "friendly sceptic", who later described one of the other speakers as "a mental dwarf" quoted the case of the June 14th, 1980 sighting over Moscow which had now proved conclusively to be a satellite launch from a secret base north of Moscow.

Dan Damon said he would be impressed by contactee evidence, but unfortunately Mr Oberg had not met one.

Mr Ridpath condemned the second-hand reports of the other UFO writers (pace Adamski and Leslie). He did not want to know what others thought at second or third hand, only to have answers to investigations. There was, after 35 years, still no positive UFO evidence, plausible though the phenomena was it did not stand up scientifically.

Three callers phoned in, John from Southgate and two Peters, one from Stevenage, one from Chigwell. They, alas, added nothing of interest to what was a very muddled and entirely inconclusive debate.

JB

Letters to the Editor

The Paper on "Facts About Force Field Craft" by Romeo Ferraro (BB May, 1982, Volume 4) seems to have caused more than its fair share of controversy.

From Manfred Cassirer, London, NW6 comes the following "Congratulations to Romeo Ferraro on his remarkable take-off (facts(?)) about Force Field Craft. Defunct though it may have been for the last quarter of a century, the "Terrestrial Theory" with its brave talk of dematerializing warships and their crews (the evidence apparently simultaneously materializing) is still good for a laugh!"

18 year old Lorna Miles of Wrexham, Clwyd, was "sad and distressed" after reading the Paper.

"....how does he (Mr Ferraro) know that the flying saucers Kenneth Arnold saw near Mount Rainier were man-made? How does he know that there is a secret factory producing force field craft in that area?"

"What makes him think that it was a man-made UFO that killed Captain Mantell and destroyed his plane? Why should they (the USAF) want to kill one of their own men?"

"If it was a man-made craft which kidnapped Barney and Betty Hill - why?"

"How does Mr Ferraro know that both Russia and America are planning to build a military base on Mars? If it is a secret - how comes he knows?"

Attempts to locate the author in order to answer these and other comments have so far failed. Perhaps he has taken-off in a force field craft.

The editor, however, makes no apology for the letters generated. It is important that all UFO theories (however outrageous) are discussed and commented upon.



From Ms C.E. Binns, Heidelberg,
West Germany and Wolston, Coventry

The Heidelberg Sighting

I wish to give a belated report of the UFO which I saw on Friday, November 14th, 1980 at 1431 in Heidelberg and

which was reported in BB, May, 1982.


I was walking across a car park in Neuenheimerfeld with my friend when we noticed a bright white light hovering over the Sportcentre ahead of us. It then slowly flew over our heads and proceeded in the direction of Kirchheim. It was a really huge machine - bigger than any aircraft I have seen or heard about. It had two huge "headlights" at the front which illuminated much of the sky in front of it. On the left hand side it had a red light and a blue light on the right hand side. As it passed over us I could see two yellowy-white lights at the end of it which seemed to be shining out from two cylinders.

It was flying really low (unfortunately I could not guess at the height) and made no noise whatsoever. It had we would have heard it because it is pretty deserted around that area with hardly any traffic at night.

We wrote down what we saw immediately afterwards. The next day we went to the American Air Traffic Control just outside Heidelberg and told them about what we had seen. They said that their radar was not strong enough to reach that district but checked to see if anything had been reported - nothing had. They suggested it might have been a helicopter. But, had that been the case, we would certainly have heard some noise since it was such a huge craft. Then they said it could have been a weather balloon reflecting the lights from the city. But it had a

distinctive form and so did the lights, also, we were out of the city when we saw it and there are not many lights around the area at night.

This is what we saw from beneath the machine



The following extract from a letter received by the editor is, believe it or not, totally genuine. It comes from an ex member of the Association.

"I think the government has the situation (regarding UFOs) under control and that BUFORA is a part of the international cover-up.

"I must also say that any claims that I may have made in the past or may make in the future of contact with Extraterrestrials, or of being one are totally false."

CORRESPONDENCE ON ALL PAPERS AND ARTICLES IS WELCOMED ALTHOUGH THE EDITOR RESERVES THE RIGHT TO SHORTEN THOSE WHICH ARE OVERLONG.

AWARD FOR ARTHUR C CLARKE

Arthur C. Clarke, the science fiction writer and scientific research worker, has won the Marconi International Fellowship Award for 1982. It was presented by HRH Prince Claus of the Netherlands on June 11th, 1982 in the Ridderzaal, The Hague.

Mr Clarke, 65, was awarded the prize in particular for his ideas in the field of satellite communication. As long ago as 1945, he described the possibility of using geostationary satellites for intercontinental communication and also gave an important boost to the use of space platforms for earth observation and for carrying out interplanetary space flights.

He is currently Chancellor of the University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.

Book reviews

THE UFO VERDICT. Examining The Evidence. Robert Sheaffer. 242pp
Prometheus Books. NY 1981 (Unpriced)

Robert Sheaffer is to UFOs what Cyril Smith is to hang-gliding - and his book, well-argued though it is, is likely to infuriate ufologists. His position on the subject is unequivocal - UFOs do not exist and that is an end to the matter.

He cites a number of the classic cases as examples of hallucination (or fraud) on the part of the observer(s) and even the long-since and (I thought) appraised and accepted Trent photographs taken at McMinnville, Oregon in 1950 are claimed in the book to be yet more wire and cardboard trickery.

Mr Sheaffer makes a plea for a scientific look at the phenomena, and accuses UFO societies of lacking just that approach. Nowhere, he says, in the whole history of ufology is there one convincing item of proof of the existence of UFOs, not one single small artefact, not one authentic photograph. There is only the testimony of not always reliable witnesses, and vague, unidentified specks of light on film.

It would be easy enough to shrug off his arguments simply as those of the confirmed sceptic to whom proof, like Edith Cavell's patriotism is not (nearly) enough.

The book, however, is an important one and deserves more than outright dismissal. It should, in fact, be read by all those interested in the subject and who are anti-Sheaffer, not simply to understand the opposition's viewpoint but, perhaps, to rethink many of their own firmly held views on the matter.

JB.

ARE WE BEING WATCHED? Janet and
Colin Bord. Angus & Robertson. £3.95.

This is an interesting departure for the Bords in more ways than one. Their books - amongst them "Mysterious Britain" and "Alien Animals" - have included numerous photographs. Colin is a professional photographer and Janet no mean exponent of the art. UFOs, however, do not lend themselves to pages of professionally taken pictures! The other main difference is that "Are We Being Watched?" is entirely devoted to reports from children, and, indeed, its very readable content is ideal for children to cut their teeth on.

The purist might perhaps balk at the sub-title 'True UFO Sightings By Children Around The World' but personally I would consider it justified. In my own experience children are more prone than adults to believe they will not be taken seriously.

Neatly and concisely covering practically the whole ufological range in less than 100 pages, and including quite a number of drawings and artists' impressions, the book is recommended for adults as well as children. I know of no other source where reports from the under-16s have been so well collated.

NO.

wanted

ADVERTISEMENT

BUFORA Publications

Title	list price	Members and trade
UFO Investigation	£4	£3
Congress 1979	£2	£1.50
Vehicle Interference	£4	£3

Postage and packing for UFO Investigation is 50p for Congress 1979 and for Vehicle Interference 50p

BUFORA Periodicals

BUFORA Journal
Journal of Transient Aerial Phenomena (J-TAP)

BUFORA Bulletin

Details on the availability of the publications mentioned above are available from:

Arnold West,
16 Southway, Burgess Hill,
Sussex, RH15 9ST, England

TERMS

Cash with order.

Trade official order please.

Members please quote membership number.

Researcher seeks data/correspondence from researchers concerning unknown "underground sounds" either directly, indirectly or not connected with UFOs. Such sounds are ostensibly not earthquake related.

Details to: Greg Lang, 301 Armistead, Rickland, WA 99352, USA.

Brian (or Barry) Woodgate. Would anyone having the address of this 1965 member of the Fleet Street UFO Club please inform Eric Herr, 6250 Stanley Avenue, San Diego, California 92115, USA.

Mr Herr would also like to know where he can obtain a detailed description of the mice killed during the 1965 Warminster Sightings. (Page 26 "The Warminster Mystery.")

EDITORIAL NOTE. UFO researcher J.E. Herr is offering \$50 for a copy of a published description of mice killed or injured as the alleged result of their proximity to a UFO. Mice have long been used for laboratory experiments and it might be possible to correlate past results, for example the effects of micro-wave radiation.

STOP PRESS. Investigation is underway into a sighting by the pilot and first officer and two passengers, on board a Dan Air Boeing 737 at 12.00 BST on June 21st, 1982. The aircraft, travelling between Gatwick and Corfu, was passing over southern Italy at 23,000ft. The object was described as a dark "doughnut" with a flat base. The first officer says he saw a window in it.

More to come.

The British UFO Research Association does not hold or express corporate views on UFO phenomena. Contributions reflect only the views of the editor or the authors. Copy for publication must be sent directly to the editor and not to any other officer. Original material is copyright to both contributor and BUFORA. Where contributions involve other copyright holders, they should be so marked.