

L o n d o n
U n i d e n t i f i e d
F l y i n g
O b j e c t
R e s e a r c h
O r g a n i s a t i o n
B U L L E T I N

Vol. IV. No. 2.
January/February/March,
1963. APRIL / MAY

LUFORO'S AIMS: Unbiased scientific investigation of reports of Unidentified Flying Objects and associated claims, collection of first-hand evidence of verifiable data; publicising information in bulletins and by other means; bringing about closer co-operation and understanding between UFO researchers.

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.N.P. Stephenson, 12, Dorset Road, Cheam, Sutton, Surrey.
Vice-Chairman: G.G. Doel, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., D.M.R.E.
Honorary Secretary: L. Beer, 61, Great Cumberland Place, London, W.1.
Honorary Treasurer: V.W. Smithson, 33, West Towers, Pinner, Middlesex.
Bulletin Editor: C.A. Stickland, 22 Roseberry St., London, S.E.16.

WITH COMPLIMENTS
YOUR MAGAZINE
REQUESTED IN
EXCHANGE ED.

EDITORIAL

Two items for your consideration :-

(1) Why not make a "UFO identikit"? For the benefit of those unaware of the nature of an identikit I should explain that it is a means by which the police may build up a picture of a wanted person from the descriptions given by one or more witnesses. It consists of transparent sheets of material on which are portrayed the great range of facial features that may be encountered, e.g. eyes wide apart, eyes close together, triangular chins, square chins, etc. etc. The sheets carrying the selected features are then superimposed to build up a composite picture of the face of the person concerned.

I see no reason why, as an aid to better UFO description, a similar method could not be used by us. It should, in fact, be easier to construct an identikit for our purposes since the range of variation encountered would not be so great as that in a human face.

(2) Is the term "UFO" an adequate designation in all circumstances? By using it we are saying the object in question is unidentified. Is this a reasonable approach to adopt? I would maintain that in at least a few cases we have sufficient evidence to state that the report refers to a machine of extra-terrestrial origin and that we should say so. By invariable use of the term "UFO" (admittedly applicable in the majority of cases) we are being unconsciously defensive. I believe the time has come when we should be prepared to make more positive assertions about certain sightings, and for this we need some other description, "ETM" for extra-terrestrial machine, perhaps. What are your views?

HELP RECEIVED

David Jones kindly told us about one of our undated cuttings mentioned in the last issue. We still need information about the other two, though. And I am still looking for a 5/8ths inch typewriter ribbon!

THE YEAR'S REPORTS

Commencing with this issue, we are going to try and give you a full list of observations of UFOs and related phenomena from the beginning of the year. Whether this is possible remains to be seen. But we will try! We will appreciate any notes of errors or omissions,

but for the latter we must know the date of occurrence, the place and the reference of the original report. These three items are absolutely essential.

The general schema is as follows:-

Date	Place
Nature of observation	
References and/or credit	
Comments (if any)	

-
1. 1/1 Over Swaffham Forest moving towards Kings Lynn 2 discs of light, off-white in colour, stationary at one time CUGIUFO
 2. 2/1 Over Western Rootstown, U.S.A.
object bigger than a star carrying 6-8 red lights, stationary
Beacon-Journal, Akron, Ohio (3/1/63) Credit- N.R. April '63
 3. 4/1 Small park in suburbs of Rome, Italy.
landing and take-off of object, seen by psychiatrist
Credit - Roberto Pinotti
 4. 7/1 over Bass Strait, Victoria-Tasmania, Australia.
slow-moving silver dot, seen from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.
Age, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia (7/1/63) Credit N.R. April '63
 5. 10/1 Montesano, Westport, Grayland area, Washington, U.S.A.
5 ascending objects having appearance of rockets
Twin Harbor Press, Westport, Washington (17/1/63) Credit N.R.
Might have been military rockets. April '63
 6. 14/1 small village near Brindisi, Italy.
landing and take-off of object with semi-transparent dome
Credit - Roberto Pinotti
 7. 15/1 Holbaek, Denmark.
Orange-red Saturn-shaped object bigger than moon
Ufo-Nyt (May '63)
 8. 15/1 Durban, South Africa.
two square formations of large golden lights, bigger than stars
F.S.R. (March-April '63)

9. 18/1 Jacobsaal, South Africa.
weird bright light, low on the horizon
pretoria News (19/1/63)
10. 21/1 Escombe, South Africa.
bright object like a star, moving south-east
Natal Mercury (22/1/63)
11. 24/1 Johannesburg, South Africa
brilliant red-brown stationary light with tail and halo
Daily Dispatch, East London (25/1)
12. 25/1 Mt. Pilchuck, near Granite Falls, Washington, U.S.A.
delta-shaped silvery-bluish light, moving and stationary
Credit - N.R. (April '63)
also seen on 13/2 - see No.18
13. 28/1 Seattle, Washington, U.S.A. seen about 10.30 p.m.
elliptical object, green and changing to other colours
Post Intelligencer, Seattle, Washington (29/1/63)
might have been a meteor
14. 28/1 Shilton, near Coventry. seen at 5.20 p.m.
yellow-orange cigar-shaped object with four portholes
Credit - F.S.R. (May-June '63)
15. 28/1 15 miles inland from Durban, South Africa
black cigar-shaped object, showers of light like sparks from
the tail seen about 11 p.m.
Credit - F.S.R. (May-June '63)

It is extremely interesting that all three reports on this day describe a cigar-shaped or elliptical object. Were they one and the same?

16. 29/1 San Diego, California, U.S.A.
rumbling sounds heard intermittently all day
Union, San Diego, California, (30/1/63)
seismologist reported no earthquakes, Navy reported no firing
17. 3/2 Totland Bay, Isle of Wight.
two inverted-saucer-shaped objects glistening in sunlight
IOWUFOIS
18. 13/2 As for No.12 above.

19. 15/2 near Moe, 80 miles south-east of Melbourne, Australia.
thick grey disc, about 25 feet wide, transparent band round
circumference, number of scoop-like protrusions, made pulsating,
whooshing sound as it revolved about 75-100 feet overhead.
Auckland Star (16/2/63)
This is in same general area as No.4. above.
20. 20/2 Arnes, Norway.
yellow-red, fierce, pulsating light
Ufo-Nyt (May '63)
21. 22/2 Tinglev, Denmark.
red inverted-saucer-like object, flames emitted when turning
Ufo-Nyt (May '63)
22. 27/2 Rome, Italy
formation of five objects
Credit - Roberto Pinotti
23. 2/3 Yeovil
Two white lights, moving and stationary
Western Gazette (8/3/63)
24. 6/3 Bolton
dark silvery blue disc, hovering
Bolton Evening News (8/3/63)
25. 6/3 over Wimbledon common
gleaming silver circular object
Wimbledon Boro' News (15/3/63)
26. 8/3 over Wallsend
grey-blue object like two discs joined together by a tube
Evening Chronicle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne (21/3/63)
27. 10/3 Detroit expressway, U.S.A.
cigar-shaped object
Credit - Weekly Research Magazine's Look-See Vol.8, No.5.
28. 20/3 off Rathlin Island, Northern Ireland
two red flares seen by coastguards
News Letter, Belfast (21/3/63)
29. 22/3 Copenhagen, Denmark.
three orange-coloured spindle-shaped objects with fierce light,
rectangular orange-coloured object.
Ufo-Nyt (May '63)

- 30, 3/4 Fiji Islands
 huge object glowing with green-white light, with long fiery orange tail
 Birmingham Post (4/4/63), London Evening News (30/4/63)
 Credit - C.D. Sutcliffe.
31. 7/4 Copenhagen, Denmark,
 Circular object (or two close together), colour changing from glass-like to yellow-white to red, moving and stationary.
 Ufo-Nyt (May '63)
32. 28/4 Heap Bridge, Heywood, Lancashire.
 brilliantly-lit object hovering and landing, engine noise like rocket taking off
 Heywood Advertiser (3/5/63) Credit - S. Whitehead.

Abbreviations:-

CUGIUFO Cambridge University Group for the Investigation of UFOs.
 F.S.R. Flying Saucer Review
 IOWUFOIS Isle of Wight UFO investigation Society
 N.R. NICAP Reporter

AN EXPLANATION

Some members appear to have been confused by the calls for subscription to L.U.F.O.R.O. or B.U.F.O.A. In fact you have three possible choices.

(a) Continuing your membership of L.U.F.O.R.O. To do this you send your yearly subscription of 10/- to the treasurer, Mr. V.W. Smithson, 33 West Towers, Pinner, Middlesex. This entitles you to receive the LUFORO Bulletin, notices of meetings, etc. and to make use of LUFORO facilities.

(b) Becoming an individual member of B.U.F.O.A. For this, you send an annual subscription of £1.1. 0. to the appropriate regional representative. This entitles you to receive the B.U.F.O.A. Quarterly Magazine.

(c) Joining B.U.F.O.A. while continuing as a member of L.U.F.O.R.O. To do this you pay a subscription of £1. 1. 0. You are then entitled

to receive the LUFORO Bulletin, notices of meetings, etc. to make use of LUFORO facilities and to receive the BUFOA magazine.

Naturally we hope you will continue to belong to LUFORO and therefore your appropriate choice would be either (a) or (c)

CORRESPONDENCE

The letter following from W. Jolliffe is the best of those received on the questions posed in the last issue and therefore wins the 5/- prize. Do you agree with the writer?

First, let me briefly examine the well-known theory that UFOs are space-craft, or more precisely, the way this theory is arrived at.

The evidence from UFO sightings does not enable us to place UFOs in any known category of objects, which leads to the deduction that they are non-terrestrial. Furthermore, UFOs invariably have the appearance of machines and sometimes behave as if intelligently controlled. Hence the conclusion that they are space-craft from outside the earth.

Plausible though the theory seems, a closer scrutiny shows that it is by no means an unbiased review of the evidence. At the outset, before the evidence is even considered, a pre-conceived notion is present, of which we may be unconscious, which influences all our subsequent thinking. From it the space-ship theory proceeds logically and inevitably. This notion does not seem to be based on the evidence at all. It is the assumption that UFOs are physical objects.

UFO evidence is mainly of a visual kind, although from time to time noises are reported and, more rarely, smells too. But as far as I can ascertain, in all the years that UFOs have been a subject of study there has not emerged any satisfactory evidence pointing to UFOs having a physical basis. As I am open to correction on this point, this may be the weak link in my argument.

Now, this absence of physical evidence can be, and has been, accounted for while still retaining the space-craft hypothesis. But all that need be said, without going into actual examples, is that any explanation of this sort amounts to a refusal to face up to the clear implications of the evidence. If the evidence lacks proofs of a physical nature, it is not very logical to insist nevertheless that UFOs are physical (i.e. space-craft) and then, armed with this theory, proceed to explain in one way or another this gaping hole in the evidence.

It hardly needs me to point out that the best way to be on safe grounds with UFOs is to base all thinking and theorizing (and research for that matter) strictly on the evidence we have. Apart from other advantages, this method has the merit of reducing the number of hypotheses we need to consider seriously to an absolute minimum; that is to one.

To my mind, as the available evidence stands, the one assumption we can make regarding the nature of UFOs (and we need only do this in a provisional way) is that they are not objects, that is to say non-physical. This may not be particularly illuminating perhaps, nor very congenial, but so long as it squares up to the data, what else matters?

And now, to satisfy my own doubtless peculiar notions of logic I shall have to slightly reward the two questions appearing on page two of the Bulletin, after which I think they will practically answer themselves.

1. Given a report from an observer, what kind of information would help to convince you that this was a report of a physical object?

Answer: any evidence of a concrete physical kind.

2. Given the same report, what kind of information would cause you to doubt that this was a report of a physical object?

Answer: the absence of evidence of a concrete physical kind.

66, Malthouse Road,
Southgate, Crawley, Sussex.

W.J.Jolliffe.

A New Approach?

The U.S. "Project Bluebook" and the U.F.O. investigative agencies of other countries have evaluated thousands of U.F.O. reports, employing resources and techniques out of reach of unofficial researchers. Nothing has come of all this activity beyond the presumption - often denied for the benefit of the general public - that UFOs are alien spacecraft, the product of a technology far in advance of our own.

Collecting and evaluating U.F.O. sightings will NOT solve the basic problems involved. What is needed is some new approach which may unlock the door to the U.F.O. Mystery. After a decade of investigation, the writer, for one, will try anything which appears

even remotely likely to throw some light on the enigma.

Can any readers of the "Bulletin" suggest ways and means of ending the present deadlock in U.F.O. Research?

3, Devenish Road,
Weeke, Winchester, Hants.

J.Clary-Baker, Ph.D.

(Although I am not wholly in agreement with this correspondent, I do share his view that we need new ideas. A 5/- prize will be awarded for a good letter on the above subject. Ed.)

PAST EVENTS

We apologise to those who arrived at the "Feathers" on 23rd March only to be told the research meeting was cancelled. This was, in fact, untrue. A person unknown to us telephoned to cancel the booking. Why, we do not know, it was obviously someone rather childish. The next research meeting will be held about July 20th. Further particulars may be obtained nearer the date from Eric Smith, 319, London Road, Reading, Berks.

Those who visited the Polish Hearth on 30th March heard an extremely interesting lecture by Antoni Szachnowski. We hope to tell you more in a future issue of the bulletin. Meanwhile Mr. Szachnowski would like to know of any reports of dumb-bell and triangular-shaped objects. If you write to the editor the information will be passed on.

FUTURE EVENTS

"THE HIDDEN FACTOR IN UFO PHOTOGRAPHS" a talk by Basil Nubel
7 p.m. June 1st at Kensington Central Library, Phillimore Walk,
(near Kensington High Street).

Buses: 9, 27, 28, 31, 46, 49, 52, 73, 270.

Green Line: 701, 702, 704, 705, 714, 716, 716A.

Underground: Kensington High Street.

Beginning on June 8th, and continuing on June 15th, 22nd and 29th, we intend to make a thorough investigation of the Adamski story. The meetings, commencing at 4 p.m. will be held at 106, South Hill Park, Hampstead. Technical, medical, photographic and psychological aspects will be discussed. You are

invited to bring along any evidence you may have that will throw light on this story.

LUFORO members are also invited to a rally of the STAR Fellowship on Saturday, 8th June at 11 a.m. at Chiddingstone, Kent. Among the subjects for discussion are orthoteny, hypnotism and past lives. Overnight campers are welcomed. Further particulars may be obtained from Tony Wedd, Tye Cross, Chiddingstone, Edenbridge, Kent.
