

Volume 2 No. 12  
Summer 1970



**BUFORA**

***JOURNAL***

**BRITISH U.F.O. RESEARCH ASSOCIATION**

## MEMBER SOCIETIES

As at 1/4/1970

### **BRITISH FLYING SAUCER BUREAU :**

c/o D. R. Rudman, Esq., 54 Sylvan Way, Sea Mills, Bristol 9.

### **CAMBRIDGE U.F.O. STUDY SOCIETY :**

c/o J. Clark, Esq., 31 Perse Way, Cambridge, CB4 3SG.

### **CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY GROUP FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF U.F.Os. :**

c/o P. Rawcliffe, Esq., Pembroke College, Cambridge.

### **DIRECT INVESTIGATION GROUP ON AERIAL PHENOMENA :**

c/o Mrs. J. Nelstrop, 5 Ridgmont Road, Bramhall, Stockport, Cheshire.

### **D.M. COLLEGE U.F.O. RESEARCH CLUB :**

Fawley Court, Henley-on-Thames, Oxon.

### **GLOUCESTER U.F.O. INVESTIGATION GROUP :**

c/o A. Marshall, Esq., Superintendents Lodge, Coney Hill Cemetery, Glos.

### **IMPERIAL COLLEGE U.F.O. RESEARCH GROUP :**

c/o S. J. Roberts, Esq., Chemistry Dept., Imperial College, South Kensington, London S.W.7.

### **SCOTTISH U.F.O. RESEARCH SOCIETY :**

c/o Miss S. Walker, 69 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh EH3 6JG.

### **SOUTH LINCOLNSHIRE U.F.O. STUDY GROUP :**

c/o Mrs. P. Barnes, 43 Gladstone Street, Bourne, Lincs.

### **SURREY INVESTIGATION GROUP ON AERIAL PHENOMENA :**

c/o O. F. Fowler, Esq., 149 Mytchett Road, Mytchett, Camberley, Surrey.

### **NOTTINGHAM U.F.O. DETECTION SOCIETY :**

c/o J. Wisniewski, Esq., 72 Sneinton Dale, Sneiton, Nottingham.

### **SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY U.F.O. RESEARCH GROUP :**

c/o C. W. Osborne, Esq., Students Union, The University, Southampton.

## BRANCHES

### **HALIFAX BRANCH B.U.F.O.R.A. :**

c/o T. Whitaker, Esq., 253 Huddersfield Road, Halifax, Yorks.

### **NORTHERN IRELAND BRANCH B.U.F.O.R.A. :**

c/o T. Thomspson, Esq., 23 Mountainvale Road, Newtonabbey, Co. Antrim, N. Ireland.

# THE BRITISH UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Founded 1964

(Incorporating the London U.F.O. Research Organisation, founded 1959  
and the British U.F.O. Association, founded 1962).

---

## THE BUFORA JOURNAL AND BULLETIN

Volume 2    Number 12

Summer, 1970

---

### CONTENTS

|                                    |       |    |
|------------------------------------|-------|----|
| Editorial                          | ..... | 2  |
| Hoax & Hallucination: the Evidence | ..... | 3  |
| An Analysis of the 1967 UFO Wave   | ..... | 6  |
| Root Out These Stupid Hoaxers      | ..... | 8  |
| Notes & Quotes                     | ..... | 10 |
| Two BUFORA Conferences             | ..... | 11 |
| Annual General Meeting 1970        | ..... | 13 |
| The Changing World of Ufology      | ..... | 13 |
| Sceptical SIUFOP                   | ..... | 15 |
| Book Review                        | ..... | 16 |
| Member Societies                   | ..... | 17 |

## EDITORIAL

Scientists, with a few notable and honourable exceptions, have declined to involve themselves with the study of UFO manifestations. This has left the field wide open to the incursion of scientific cranks, whose specious pretensions confuse those who have bravely shouldered the burden of the research, in default of the experts whose task it ought to be.

The scientific crank is not necessarily a common ignoramus. Any person possessing a little common sense can see through the claims of the sort of confidence-tricksters who solicit cash contributions to finance trips to the Moon and planets, in flying saucers which they have constructed secretly in their backyards. The kind of crank I have in mind is a much more complicated individual.

He has a strong belief in his own pet theory. He often possesses considerable real knowledge of various branches of scientific research. What has led him astray is an *idée fixe*, perhaps arising out of some unrecognised psychological quirk in his makeup. In support of his cherished delusion he will twist and pervert fact in a way which the layman is often unable to discern.

The so-called Atlantologist is a case in point. He is convinced that Plato's story of a vast mid-Atlantic Continent, which sank in a cataclysm some 9,000 years B.C., is literally true. He assembles, as evidence for his belief, a conglomeration of similarities in the art, architecture and mythologies of the civilisations of the Old and New Worlds, which the non-expert, dazzled by the genuine erudition involved in the compilation of the catalogue, accepts readily as proof of the former existence of Atlantis. Under cover of this erudite smokescreen, our Atlantologist is able to command acceptance of sundry geological and biological 'proofs' of highly dubious vintage.

The plain fact is, of course, that if the cockle-shell ships of Columbus could cross the Atlantic—if, indeed, as we know to be the case, lone voyagers can cross it in rowboats—the giant galleys of the Ancient World could cross it with ease. Evidence is accumulating in recent years that they did in fact cross it. This, of course, accounts for the similarities between Old and New World civilisations simply and directly, without the need for postulating the former existence of a mid-Atlantic Continent.

Science has contributed to the confusion by its reluctance to admit intercourse between the Old and New Worlds in Antiquity, thus presenting a classic instance of scientific dogma hindering the recognition of scientific fact.


There seems now to be little doubt that any substratum of historical fact in Plato's Atlantis story, derives from the vast eruption of the volcanic island of Thera, (Santorini), in the Aegean, which dealt a death-blow to the Minoan civilisation of Crete, about the year 1450 B.C.

Low in the scale of crankery are the devotees of the pseudo-occult movements, whose belief in a theory is directly proportional to its vastness, vagueness and general improbability. With these enthusiasts, a million aeons are as a mere thousand years with the Lord! My observation is not intended as a reflection upon the true Arcane Tradition, which is not available to the general public in books and pamphlets.

At the pinnacle of the edifice of crankery are a few men of deep learning and unquestioned ability, whose theories, unacceptable *in toto*, nevertheless anticipate in certain particulars scientific findings unavailable when they wrote. The name of Dr. Immanuel Velikovsky springs to mind in this connection. There are, too, theories, like those of Wilhelm Reich, which rest under very strong suspicion of crankery but which have yet to undergo scientific examination and must, therefore, be treated as *sub judice* for the present.

The above has a vital bearing on UFO-research, in that all too many UFO meetings degenerate into veritable orgies of crankery, in which Atlantis is blithely equated with Egypt and Assyria as a veritable civilisation of yore, or in which the Hörbiger-Bellamy hypothesis of Earth's multiple moons is treated as on a level with Kepler's Laws of Planetary Motion. It cannot be stressed too strongly that UFO-researchers, in preparing papers or lectures for presentation to the public, should be at pains to inform themselves of the scientific status of theories they propose to expound. If we wish our findings to command the attention of scientists, we must train ourselves to think and behave like scientists. Let it be said, however, that we should do well to remain uncontaminated by the dogmatism and exclusiveness which have overtaken certain scientists and which are as deplorable as the credulity and easy faith of the minions of crankery.

We should do well, too, not to confuse Science proper with the insidious materialistic outlook which is too often associated with it and which is actually blocking scientific progress in certain directions, notably in the realm of research into psychical phenomena. In attempting to steer a course between scientific dogmatism and materialism on the one hand and pseudo-scientific crankery on the other, we have no easy task. If there is any golden rule to be followed here, it is probably that we should eschew private predilection at all times, in favour of fact and logic.



## HOAX AND HALLUCINATION : THE EVIDENCE

While a detailed theory of UFO hoaxing and hallucinating has yet to be developed (no doubt sceptics think it so much a foregone conclusion that the effort would be wasted) it is still possible to search the UFO data for signs that psychological mechanisms are at work.

The direct way of doing this would be to examine the personality characteristics of the witness. Here solid evidence is totally lacking; we don't even know, for example, whether UFO reporters are more or less extraverted than the population as a whole. The only data to draw on are the casual judgments of investigators; for example Hynek, who claims that witnesses tend to be of above-average intelligence and that hoaxers and psychotics can be fairly easily identified (3, 4). Hynek, along with Michel, Sprinkle, Schwarz and others (2) has stressed the need for extensive screening of witnesses, leading to an estimate of observer reliability, and Walker (in 1) has provided a hypothetical case-study showing how the use of physiological and psychological measures might lead to an explanation where less stringent interview techniques would have failed.

A few contactees have admitted fabrication of their stories (at least one following a failure to pass a lie-detector test) and in some other cases (e.g. Scoriton) the evidence points that way; but these are extreme examples and quite unlike the typical "landing" incident where an ordinary farmer or policeman, say, describes his experience without religious or mystical overtones. It's impossible ever to be certain that a given report is a fake in the absence of a confession or of physical evidence (e.g. the "disc" in a photo is shown to be suspended on wire), but with regard to hallucination, it is possible to be more definite: whereas there are hundreds of cases in which two or more persons have described the same "object," often from different locations and with objective backing, there are no cases on record in which an apparently reliable person claiming to have seen a wholly unconventional "craft" can be shown positively to have been the victim of hallucination.

Since there is no firm evidence about the individual witness, it is necessary to use statistical methods; are UFO reports distributed in time and space in ways predictable from the psychological theory?

It was the USAF that first presented evidence relating UFO report frequency and national publicity given to "flying saucers" in the U.S.A. In Project Blue Book Status Reports 8 (31.12.52) and 10 (27.2.53) were displayed two graphs plotting daily report frequency and major newspaper and magazine UFO articles (NICAP edn., 1968, pp. 143 and 183): on the basis of these studies it was concluded that "the direct relation between newspaper publicity and the number of reports submitted has been firmly established . . ." (Status Report 11, 31.5.53). Unfortunately, the "direct relation" seems to have been only in the eyes of the Blue Book personnel; not only do the figures fail to show any systematic connection between publicity and report frequency, but no tests of significance were used and the data were so badly graphed that it is impossible to carry out quantitative analysis using them. So this issue is still open, although most UFO groups possess the necessary raw material for its solution, including estimates of the signal/noise level which is probably more helpful (than the total report frequency) in this context.

It is well established that there is an inverse relationship between population density and number of reports per head of population (8). This law holds good both within (9) and between countries (10) and is most pronounced for the Type I events, even allowing for the UFOs occasionally found parked in Caracas side-streets. It is quite contrary to the prediction from the psychological theory.

It has been shown by Vallee (8) and Pearson (7) that UFO reports have tended over certain periods to correlate with the synodic period of Mars (the time between oppositions); this finding is quite reliable and does not fit in with the psychological interpretation. Vallee (8) also provides evidence that different UFO types have different yearly and diurnal distributions; this is another reliable finding (despite the odd remarks in 5) and is also hard to interpret—why should people fake or hallucinate different types of UFO at different times? Orthoteny is another problem, if Saunders' radically new method of statistical analysis supports it as he claims.

It is often suggested that UFOs are the products of national anxiety and fear, of the Bomb, say, or due to the tension and pressure of modern life. Sometimes the idea is phrased rather naively (e.g. 6) but writers such as Rhine and Sagan have

pointed to the panic during the Orson Welles "Invasion from Mars" and the wave of reports that followed the Sputnik launchings as indicating how country-wide worry can give rise to odd stories. Of course, nobody who panicked in 1938 actually claimed to have met a Martian, and the 1957 had begun long before Sputnik; we must also ask why UFO waves didn't occur during the Cuban missile crisis or during the years of the Depression, when, as Vallee notes, science fiction magazines and films were enjoying considerable popularity. There is no evidence, either, that national levels of anxiety or neuroticism correlate with frequencies of landings per head; however, political, geographical and cultural differences may render comparisons between countries suspect. In connection with the 1954 cases, Vallee also mentions a "moon illusion" effect which, he claims, indicates that the Type I objects were real. In the light of present knowledge about perception this does not seem fully justified, although it would be interesting to see the experiment repeated with more data.

Finally, there are all the well-known objections to a subjective interpretation—the presence of imprints, secondary effects, radar tracks, photos, multiple independent witnesses, and the correlations between unpublicised sightings. Taking these into account we can arrive at a conclusion that seems justified in the light of the available data: Hallucinations may be discounted as an important agent in the causation of UFO reports, and there remains a certain proportion of cases which can be "explained" only by postulating widespread and sophisticated hoaxing, drawing together prominent members of the public, the military, and the scientific communities in what amounts to worldwide conspiracy. Or, of course, they may really be alien objects.

#### References :

1. BAKER, R. M. L. Statement. *Hearings before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 2nd Session : Symposium on UFOs.* U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
2. BOWEN, C. (ed.). *UFO Percipients.* FSR Special 3, 1969.
3. HYNEK, J. A. The UFO gap. *Playboy* 14(12) 1967.
4. HYNEK, J. A. 21 years of UFO reports—1. *FSR* 16(1) 1970.
5. JULIAN, P. Statistical analysis. In Gillmor, D. S. (ed.). *Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects.* New York: Bantam, 1969.
6. MILLER, K. Midsummer nights' dreams. *The Listener*, 27 June 1968.
7. PEARSON, D. J. The computing project at Imperial College. *FSR* 14(6) 1968.
8. VALLEE, J. and VALLEE, J. F. *Challenge to Science.* London: Spearman, 1967.
9. VALLEE, J. Analysis of 8,260 UFO sightings. *FSR* 14(3) 1968.
10. VALLEE, J. A catalogue of 923 landing reports. *FSR* 15(4) 1969.

CARL GROVE  
April 1970

## AN ANALYSIS OF THE 1967 UFO WAVE

The author of this article has collected sightings relating to 1967 and analysed them according to geographical distribution. He proposed a sighting probability figure that could be used for detecting the incidence of reporting waves. Some alignments were detected and are discussed in relation to the Fortean 'London Triangle.'

A total of 179 UFO reports were obtained for England and Wales, mostly from the Flying Saucer Review (Vol. 13, No. 5 and No. 6, and Vol. 14, No. 2 and No. 3). It was felt that this would give a good country-wide source of information without undue bias to any one particular area. For this reason the UFO report by Stanway and Pace was not included as a source of information since although it provided an excellent survey of UFO activity in Staffordshire in 1967, its inclusion would have given undue weight to the Staffordshire area in any analysis.

An analysis of the sightings county by county gave a table of which the following is an extract of the top part:

|                |            |                |
|----------------|------------|----------------|
| (1) Lancashire | 24 reports | 13.4% (of 179) |
| (2) Yorkshire  | 13         | 7.3            |
| (3) Devon      | 11         | 6.2            |
| (4) Kent       | 11         | 6.2            |
| (5) Sussex     | 10         | 5.5            |

It would be expected that Lancashire and Yorkshire would return the highest number of sightings since they have the highest county populations (5.1 million and 4.7 million, 11% and 10% of the total England and Wales population respectively: Population Statistics 1961). Perhaps more significant is the fact that some counties with low populations (less than 1 million) provided more reports than would be expected. For example, Devon with a population of 800,000 returned 11 reports (6.2%), Berkshire, population 500,000 had 8 (4.5%), and Dorset, population 300,000 had 7 (3.9%).

If the sightings probability rate is taken as one sighting per million of population per year (giving 40 to 50 sightings per year from England and Wales) each county could be given a sighting probability figure. On this basis, Lancashire with a population of 5.1 million would be expected to return 5 reports per year. By dividing the actual number of reports in 1967 for each county by the population of the county, the actual sighting rates per million were obtained. By this method, Lancashire was found to have a rate of 4.7 per million instead of the expected one per million. However, taking into consideration the fact that 1967 was not a normal year, the Lancashire sighting rate cannot be regarded as exceptional.

When the 1967 sightings rates were calculated for Devon, Berkshire and Dorset the rates are 13.8, 16.0, and 23.3 per million respectively. Whether it was a general rule in 1967 that there was a higher sighting rate in the less densely populated counties could be shown by plotting the number of sightings per million population against population densities of each county.



A study of sightings in 1966 suggested that UFO reports could be aligned. It was decided to plot the 179 reports of 1967 to see what alignments, if any, were apparent. The location of each UFO report was first established as accurately as possible from an AA Road Map. This location was then transferred to an atlas map of England and Wales and marked onto an outline by tracing off. Sites with more than one sighting were double marked. When all the reports had been thus marked, several alignments became evident. Two of these alignments were confirmed independently. Three of them seem to confirm those suggested in the study of 1966 sightings (see Handbook of Leys and Orthotemies). These were:

- (1) Heysham (Lancs)—Birmingham—Stratford—Chipping Norton.
- (2) Boscastle—Taunton—Slough—Clacton.
- (3) St. Germans—Weymouth—Worthing—Dungeness.

Alignment (1) when continued passes through Berkshire west of Reading to the south coast east of the Isle of Wight.

Alignment (2) passes through Warminster, then on near Reading, passing just south of West Mersea Island to the east coast at Clacton.

Both of these alignments were confirmed by a colleague who had not seen the alignments which I had found, or the alignments of the 1966 sightings already published. It was agreed that alignment (3) was not as definite as the other two.

It may be interesting here to consider another intriguing fact. Charles Fort, who noted many strange phenomena in England, mostly during the last century, found that there often seemed to be a recurrence of phenomena at certain localities. These were linked by a triangle named by Fort as the London Triangle. The north of the triangle was marked by Worcester and Hereford, the west by Reading, and the East by Colchester. Many strange phenomena were noted in the Reading area, and Fort records that the severest earthquake in the 19th century was centred near Colchester on April 22nd, 1884, West Mersea being one of the places which suffered most.

Is it just a coincidence that an apparent alignment of UFO reports now seems to coincide with the base-line of the 'London Triangle'? The alignment passes both Reading and Mersea Island. Reading, and in fact the county of Berkshire, seemed to be quite an active area for UFO sightings, at least in 1967. If this is of interest, an idea explaining a possible link between UFO alignments and fault lines (with their associated seismic activity) was outlined in a letter which I wrote to the Flying Saucer Review (see Vol. 15, No. 1).

I am open to comment on any of the statistics or assumptions I have put forward here. Any further statistics will be willingly supplied if requested.

G. A. FALLA.

## ROOT OUT THESE STUPID HOAXERS

Displeasing incidents on the skywatching front are of concern to all genuine Ufologists. They contribute only bad feeling and nothing constructive to the study of inexplicable flying objects in our skies. A case in point arose from two remarkable sightings recorded by BUFORA at Cradle Hill, Warminster, during the organised sky watch of June 28-29th, 1969.

Because the respective objects, large and starlike, hovered in the sky despite a fairly stiff south-east breeze, we concluded they were authentic UFOs. Many BUFORA members present certainly agreed with our opinion. When a torch was flashed at the second object, sailing steadily upward from a point near Cradle Hill copse, in the early hours of Sunday, June 29th, there appeared to be a flash in response, noted by many present.

Then began a chain of wretched rumours that the sightings were cunningly arranged hoaxes, carried out with the aid of lighted balloons inflated by helium. We asked the mud-slingers for the names of the culprits. They promised we should be supplied with the names, so when I lectured subsequently at Caxton Hall and Kensington Central Library, London, I temporarily conceded that there was a confusion over the authenticity of the apparant UFOs.

No evidence has reached me of a firm or categorical enough nature for me to change my opinion that these were genuine UFO sightings.

If hoaxers were responsible, how do they explain the fact that similar UFO sightings were registered at Warminster the following week. Proof? Let us hear first from Richard Heller of Ripon Grammar School, Yorks.

“ On Sunday, the 29th June, at 11.2 p.m., I saw my third UFO. I went to Cradle Hill and waited there for an hour, thinking I would be alone for the rest of the night. Then David Keepax from the Birmingham area turned up in his car and soon after Terry Smith from Bath arrived. I do not know who first saw the UFO at 11.2 p.m., I think it may have been Terry.

“ The object appeared just like those of Saturday night, bright whitish-orange in light and similar to Mars. I first noticed it approximately north-east from the gate at the top of Cradle Hill. It was about five to ten degrees elevation and traversed thirty to thirty-five degrees of the horizon.

“ It accelerated on two occasions, quite suddenly, its light intensity becoming noticeably greater on doing so. The UFO was moving horizontally and against the prevailing wind, which rules out any possibility of a balloon. When it reached a bearing roughly north of us, it faded out and disappeared completely.

“ We noticed particularly that there was no sound at any time during the sighting. Terry said that just before the UFO appeared he heard some birds which were obviously disturbed by something. This, perhaps, might be significant.”

Thus Richard Heller.

Now the relevant question is: Why should any UFO-rigging pranksters hang around Cradle Hill area on Sunday, long after BUFORA members had left?

On the following Tuesday, July 1st, 1969, ex-Grenadier Guards N.C.O. John Cotton, who is foreman in charge of motor transport at 27 Command Workshops of REME, Warminster, saw a large cylindrical object tearing across local sky reaches between the Minster Church of St. Denys and the Cradle Hill area.

It was late at night and he was returning along the Bath Road in his car. He was patently shocked and surprised at the aerial phenomena, not daring until that moment to credit the existence of UFOs.

John Bosley, a Warminster Police sergeant, was on duty in the town the same evening, when he saw a glowing circular object overhead, speeding across the sky towards Warminster Down, near Cradle Hill. It fitted no conventional pattern of aircraft or satellite, glowing red in fading sunshine and moving without noise. Sergeant Bosley is an ex-Commando paratrooper.

ARTHUR SHUTTLEWOOD.


### **Editorial comment :**

The above is slightly condensed from Arthur Shuttlewood's manuscript.

I was myself present on Cradle Hill on the night of June 28-29th, 1969 and saw the disputed objects. They MAY have been lighted balloons, but, while keeping an open mind on the subject, I feel that Arthur's comments are deserving of notice.

Outstanding UFO manifestations, like the celebrated 'Charlton crater' episode of 1963, often provoke spurious confessions of hoaxing from publicity hounds, weak-minded individuals and persons with private axes to grind.

UFO investigators, too, are apt to write off sensational UFO reports as faked without being in possession of adequate evidence of fraud. I have reason to suppose that the sighting and ground marks at Tyneham in Dorset, in August, 1969, fit into this category.



In Britain, as in the U.S.A., exponents of the 'radical' and 'conservative' approaches to the UFO enigma are often in conflict. The following observations by a scientist of international repute, Professor Ludwig von Bertalanffy, are relevant here:

" . . . . There is not a necessary opposition or enmity between the rational way of thinking, that finds its clearest expression in scientific, empirico-deductive thought, and intuitive experience culminating in what the mystics, in necessarily insufficient language, tried to express. Rather both have their place and may co-exist."

J.C-B.

## NOTES & QUOTES

**A Critic of the 'Journal'** With this issue the Second Volume of 'BUFORA JOURNAL' ends. I have edited 21 out of the 24 issues which comprise Volumes One and

Two and have contributed upwards of 50% of the material personally. Mr. Ron Toft, Editor of 'Pegasus,' finds the 'JOURNAL' leaves something to be desired in the matter of size and content. The size is limited by the amount of cash available for production. The content might be improved if qualified researchers would take time off from paddling their private canoes and respond to my appeals for contributions.

**That Byland Abbey UFO.** It appears that the silvery disc which excited "maximum terrorem" among the monks of Byland Abbey, in A.D. 1290, was not, in spite of the Condon Report, a modern schoolboy fake. The report appears, according to the late H. T. Wilkins, in the 'Chronicle' of William of Newburgh.

**'Earth's shifting crust.'** A 'Telegraph news item of 21st April, 1970, states that evidence is now available that the area which is now the Sahara was the Earth's South Polar region 450 million years ago. This finding appears to vindicate the work of Hapgood and Campbell, who, following Hugh Auchincloss Brown, formulated in 1959 a crustal slip theory involving terrestrial catastrophes at long intervals throughout the Earth's history. Interested readers may refer to an article of mine in the 'Journal' for Summer 1965, Vol. 1, No. 5, in which I dealt with the subject in some detail, under the title, 'UFOs and the Antarctic Icecap.'

**A note for UFO sceptics.** "The greatest of all causes of non-observation is pre-conceived opinion."—John Stuart Mill.

**Meteorites on Exhibition.** The Chairman and I recently visited the newly-opened 'Meteorite Pavilion' in the Natural History Museum, South Kensington. It is interesting to see fragments of some of the meteorites one has read about in 18th Century issues of 'The Gentleman's Magazine,' along with other fragments from modern arrivals like the Barwell Meteorite of 1965. There is an Exhibition of Moon photographs in the Geological Museum which also merits a visit.

**Humanoids reported from British Columbia.** A report is to hand from the Cowichan Valley, British Columbia, of two human-like beings seen inside a hovering UFO on New Year's Day 1970. A number of persons saw the UFO, although only one was in a position to testify as to its occupants. This would seem to be one more nail in the coffin of the exponents of the 'bug-eyed monster' school of thought on extra-terrestrial life-forms. It seems to me axiomatic that life elsewhere will have evolved in similar conditions to those of our planet and therefore, *ex hypothesi*, in similar forms.

# BRITISH UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

## CONSTITUTION

---

|           |   |                  |
|-----------|---|------------------|
| Article 1 | — | Title            |
| „ 2       | — | Aims             |
| „ 3       | — | Administration   |
| „ 4       | — | Membership       |
| „ 5       | — | Member-Societies |
| „ 6       | — | Council          |
| „ 7       | — | Branches         |
| „ 8       | — | Meetings         |
| „ 9       | — | Journal          |
| „ 10      | — | Subscriptions    |
| „ 11      | — | Expenses         |
| „ 12      | — | Finances         |
| „ 13      | — | Amendments       |
| „ 14      | — | Dissolution      |

### 1. TITLE

The Society shall be called: "British Unidentified Flying Object Research Association," (short title: "B.U.F.O.R.A."), hereinafter referred to in these presents as: "The Association."

### 2. AIMS

The Aims of the Association shall be:—

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 U.F.O. Research on a nation-wide scale and co-operate with persons and organisations engaged upon similar Research in all parts of the world.

### 3. ADMINISTRATION

- (a) The members shall elect, at the Annual General Meeting, the President, Vice-Presidents to the number of three and National Executive Committee of the Association.
- (b) The administration of the Association shall be vested in the National Executive Committee, (hereinafter referred-to in these presents as: "The Committee"), which shall consist of: Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Honorary Secretary, Honorary Treasurer and not more than eight other members in good standing, members ex officio.
- (c) The Committee shall meet on not less than four occasions in a year and Committee Members shall receive written notice of such meetings, from the Honorary Secretary, not less than seven days in advance.
- (d) At a Committee Meeting, five members shall constitute a quorum and the Honorary Secretary shall prepare minutes of the proceedings at such Meeting.
- (e) The Committee may appoint and dismiss other officers as may be considered necessary in the interest of the Association, and shall notify the members of such appointment and dismissals through the "Journal."
- (f) The Committee may co-opt up to three additional members and may appoint sub-committees for various purposes, reserving the right to terminate such co-option and dissolve such sub-committee at discretion.
- (g) The Committee shall exercise its authority in all other ways it may deem necessary, subject to the over-riding provisions of the Constitution of the Association.
- (h) The Committee reserves the right to repudiate statements made in its or the Association's name, without authority, by any member or official.

**4. MEMBERSHIP :**

- (a) Any person who:—
  - 1. Completes a membership application-form.
  - 2. Is approved by the Committee.
  - 3. Pays an Annual Subscription or Life Membership Fee as laid down elsewhere in these presents: shall be deemed a member of the Association in good standing.
- (b) In the case of an applicant for membership under the age of 16 years, the Committee shall further require the written consent to the application of a parent or guardian of the applicant.
- (c) Members may express personal views of any kind on Unidentified Flying Objects but no such expressions shall be held to reflect the official opinions of the Association.
- (d) The Committee may suspend or expel any member whose activities are deemed to be prejudicial to the interests of the Association.
- (e) The Committee may confer Honorary Membership of the Association upon designated Members of foreign or other UFO-research Societies, which shall be done upon a reciprocal basis and with the object of promoting co-operation between such Societies and the Association.
- (f) The Membership may, at a General Meeting and on the recommendation of the Committee, confer Honorary Membership or Honorary Life-Membership of the Association upon any person whose services to UFO-research are deemed to be deserving of such recognition.

**5. MEMBER-SOCIETIES**

- (a) Any Organisation of U.F.O. researchers pursuing aims similar to those of the Association may apply to become affiliated with it.
- (b) Such affiliation shall be subject to the approval of the Committee.
- (c) Member-Societies shall be entitled to administer their internal affairs without interference from the Association.
- (d) Each Member Society shall pay to the Association such annual subscription as shall be recommended by the Committee and approved by the Membership at an Annual General Meeting.
- (e) Member-Societies shall be entitled to the use of such facilities as the Association may, from time to time, be in a position to offer to its members.
- (f) Member-Societies shall contribute U.F.O. reports and information to the Association and may draw for information upon the records of the Association.
- (g) A Member-Society may be expelled from the Association for activities prejudicial to the Association's interest, which decision shall be taken by the Committee.
- (h) Membership of a Society affiliated with the Association shall not confer membership of the Association upon any person who has not complied with the provisions of Article 4(a) above.

**6. COUNCIL :**

The Committee may, at discretion and with a view to co-ordinating UFO Research in pursuance of its Third Aim, convene an Advisory Council consisting of representatives of the Association, the Member-Societies and outside UFO study organisations.

**7. BRANCHES :**

- (a) The Committee may authorise the formation of a Branch or Section and may appoint a member in good standing to act in the capacity of Secretary of such Branch or Section.
- (b) The Committee shall exercise a general jurisdiction over the activities of Branches and Sections and may at any time assume direct control over them, or dissolve them, if such action should be deemed necessary in the interests of the Association.

**8. MEETINGS :**

- (a) The Annual General Meeting shall be convened in London by the Committee, in the Autumn of each year.
- (b) An Ordinary General Meeting may be convened by the Committee at discretion.
- (c) An Extraordinary General Meeting shall be convened within a reasonable period by the Honorary Secretary following a written demand addressed to the Chairman or Vice-Chairman and signed by eight members.
- (d) Preliminary written notification of the Annual General Meeting must be given not less than ten weeks in advance of the date on which the meeting is to be convened and such preliminary notification shall require members to submit to the Honorary Secretary in writing, not less than eight weeks before the date of the meeting, nominations for officers and Committee members and resolutions to be proposed and debated at the meeting together with the names of the proposers and seconders of such resolutions.

- (e) Final notification shall be sent to all members not less than two weeks before the Annual General Meeting, by the Honorary Secretary, and shall contain names of persons nominated and resolutions submitted in accordance with the provisions of Clause (d) above.
- (f) At a General Meeting, twenty members shall constitute a quorum.
- (g) Minutes shall be kept of the proceedings at all General Meetings.
- (h) Nominations for the Committee may be accepted from the floor at an Annual General Meeting if, in the opinion of the Meeting, such nominations are essential to enable the Association to be administered in an efficient manner.

**9. JOURNAL :**

- (a) The Association shall issue quarterly, "The B.U.F.O.R.A. Journal."
- (b) All members of the Association shall receive a copy of the "Journal" as one of the rights of membership.
- (c) Articles appearing in the "Journal" shall not be held to express the official views of the Association, unless such is expressly stated in the title of a given article.
- (d) The policy of the "Journal" shall be determined by the Committee in consultation with the Editor and the contents by the Editor in the light of such policy.

**10. SUBSCRIPTIONS :**

- (a) Each Member shall pay to the Association such annual subscription or Life Membership fee as shall be recommended by the Committee and approved by the Membership at an Annual General Meeting.
- (b) Subscriptions shall become due on the 1st day of September, and the first subscription of new Members shall be paid in full or in part as determined pro rata by the quarter of the Association's financial year in which it is paid.
- (c) A member who fails to renew his or her subscription within a period of three months after it shall have been due for renewal, shall be deemed to have lapsed from membership and shall no longer enjoy any of the rights or privileges accorded to its members by the Association.
- (d) Each Member shall be sent a written reminder that his or her membership will lapse if the subscription has not been paid by November 30th in any year.
- (e) Subscriptions paid late shall be back-dated to the date on which the member concerned should have effected the renewal of the subscription.
- (f) The Honorary Treasurer may, after consultation with the Chairman, reduce the annual subscription of a member who has applied for such reduction on grounds of financial stringency or for other good reason.
- (g) A member shall not be entitled to a refund of his or her annual subscription or Life Membership fee, or any part thereof, in the event of such member resigning from membership of the Association before the period covered by the annual subscription has elapsed.
- (h) A member expelled from the Association by the Committee shall be entitled to a refund of his or her subscription, or Life Membership fee, in full.

**11. EXPENSES :**

- (a) Members may be reimbursed for legitimate expenses incurred in the work of the Association.
- (b) Reimbursement cannot be guaranteed unless prior authorisation is obtained from the Committee.
- (c) The Honorary Treasurer, with the consent of the Chairman or Vice-Chairman, may reimburse members summarily, at discretion, when the sum involved does not exceed Ten Pounds, but must refer larger demands to the Committee for sanction.

**12. FINANCES :**

- (a) The Honorary Treasurer shall keep a detailed and orderly account of all monies received and expenditure incurred by the Association and shall present a statement of accounts for the year ending 31st August to the Committee, not later than 30th September, of each year.
- (b) The Annual General Meeting, or in emergency, the Committee, shall appoint two persons, not members of the Committee or co-opted thereto, to audit the accounts of the Association each year.
- (c) The audited statement of accounts shall be submitted to the members for approval, at the Annual General Meeting of the Association.
- (d) The Bankers of the Association shall be chosen by the Committee and the Banking Account shall be in the name of: "B.U.F.O.R.A."
- (e) All cheques drawn on the Banking Account shall be signed by two of the three following elected officers: Chairman, Honorary Secretary, Honorary Treasurer.

13. **AMENDMENTS :**

The Constitution of the Association may be amended by a special resolution, submitted in accordance with Clause 8(d), approved by two thirds of the members present at an Annual General Meeting or by two thirds of the membership upon a postal ballot.

14. **DISSOLUTION :**

- (a) The dissolution of the Association may be approved by the votes of a two-thirds majority of its members, upon a postal Ballot, following the recommendation of the Committee.
- (b) In the event of such dissolution, no member may claim a refund, in whole or part, of his or her annual subscription or Life Membership fee.
- (c) Outstanding liabilities to traders and suppliers and members' legitimate claims to reimbursement of expenses, shall be met, in that order of priority, out of funds available at the time of dissolution.
- (d) Residual funds and properties may be devoted to aims previously sponsored by the Association, or to such other purpose as may be determined by H.M. Commissioners of Customs & Excise.



**Meeting with a fellow  
researcher.**

I recently had the pleasure of meeting W. Raymond Drake, well-known author of several books on the historical aspects of UFOs. I found him a friendly and sympathetic personality, a fine lecturer and possessed of a memory which can only be described as phenomenal. His approach to the many problems presented by the considerations of ancient UFO reports is less conservative than mine. Nevertheless, his ideas are stimulating and always deserving of consideration.

J.C-B.

---

**TWO BUFORA CONFERENCES**

**BUFORA Northern Regional Conference, held at Wakefield,  
6 September 1969.**

The 1969 Northern Conference was organised by the Halifax Branch of BUFORA, and held at the pleasant and modern Cezar's Wakefield Hotel. Visitors were greeted by a small display of UFO items, which included blown-up UFO photographs from the New Year Show, Charles Elrick's earthbound UFO model complete with flashing lights, Peter Johnson's magnetic detector, and a model of the New Year Show diorama.

The proceedings, chaired by Malcolm Bull, opened at 2 p.m., and the first item was a lecture by C. Maxwell Cade, A.INST.P., F.R.A.S., A.F.R.A.E.S., C.ENG., F.I.E.E., F.I.E.R.E., 'avant-garde scientist and intellectual octopus,' author of *Other worlds than ours* and co-author with his wife of *The taming of the thunderbolts*. A lot of ufological ground was covered in an erudite and stimulating lecture, which moved quickly through space travel and the Astronomer-Royal's comment thirteen years ago that it was 'utter bilge' to arguments for a plurality of worlds, descriptions of the types of entity which could exist on other planets, methods of communication and, finally, the links between ufology and parapsychology. After a short break for an excellent sit-down tea, and after Lionel Beer had announced the untimely and tragic death several days before of Australian scientist and ufologist Dr. Miran Lindtner, five speakers talked briefly on various aspects of UFO research. Anthony Durham, B.A., spoke, using terrestrial logic, on UFO occupants and the likelihood of their catching our diseases or us theirs. Stephen Smith, M.A., BUFORA Research Director, spoke on the problems of investigation, and emphasised that all our information is secondhand, and that we only investigate UFO *reports*, not UFOs.

It is significant that an aspect of UFO research which is generally being accorded more attention, witness perception, also turned out to be the outstanding topic of this conference. Colin Ingleton, Industrial Psychologist on the staff of the Management Centre at the University of Bradford, tried to answer the question 'How can psychology (the scientific study of human behaviour) throw light on UFO phenomena?' He pointed out that man's perception is usually faulty to some degree and can be influenced by a wide variety of needs and motivations. An important conclusion was that more attention needs to be paid to the UFO witness, and the investigator should try to decide how much error there might be in the witness's perception. Dr. E. P. Cadogan, Hospital Consultant Psychiatrist, spoke further on perception.

The Rev. Dr. Norman Cockburn, M.A., rounded off the proceedings by exhorting all ufologists to seek the truth, take UFOs in their stride, and to be good Earthmen. The conference, which had an audience of around 70, closed at 7 p.m., and a private dinner party held afterwards in this modern hotel, provided a stimulating medium for further exchange of information and ideas. It was apparent that the occasion was a great success, and all credit must go to Doreen and Trevor Whitaker and their colleagues for an excellent piece of organisation.

JANET GREGORY.

### **BUFORA Western Regional Conference, held at Bristol, 16 May 1970.**


This Conference was organised by the British Flying Saucer Bureau and held at Shirehampton Public Hall, near Bristol. It was well attended and began under happy auspices in that the wet weather of the previous days was succeeded by warmer and sunnier conditions.

The theme of the Conference was that of possible UFO manifestations in the past. The first item was a painstaking review, by Captain Edgar Plunkett, of Old and New Testament passages which might conceivably be read in a UFO context. My personal feeling is that the value of such references is slight.

An interesting account of modern scientific techniques of dating artifacts from historical sites, was followed by various short talks. The proceedings terminated with a question-and-answer session in which members of the B.F.S.B., together with Captain Mackay, Lionel Beer and the writer, dealt with points raised by the audience.

Sincere thanks are due to Mr. Graham Knewstub and his colleagues in the British Flying Saucer Bureau, for the time and labour which were expended on preparations for this Conference. An exhibition of UFO photographs and research equipment, prepared by Captain Mackay, attracted much favourable comment among those attending the function.

J.C-B.



The British UFO Research Association does not hold or express corporate views on UFO phenomena. The Editor and his contributors are solely responsible for views advanced over their names in this 'Journal.'

Articles and items for inclusion in the 'Journal' must be sent direct to the Editor and not to other BUFORA officers. Requests for permission to reproduce material from the 'Journal' should also be addressed to the Editor.

## ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING 1970

In accordance with the provision of Article 8(d) of the Constitution of the BUFORA, preliminary notification is given herewith that the Annual General Meeting of the Association will be held on Saturday, October 3rd, 1970, at 6 p.m., at the Kensington Central Library.

Nominations for the offices of President, Vice-Presidents, Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Hon. Secretary and Hon. Treasurer, also for the eight remaining seats on the National Executive Committee, should reach the Hon. Secretary in writing not later than Saturday, August 8th, 1970. Resolutions to be debated at the A.G.M. should reach the Hon. Secretary by that date.

Only members of the Association in good standing, i.e., in possession of a valid membership card, are entitled to be present and vote at the A.G.M.

-----o-----

### THE CHANGING WORLD OF UFOLOGY.

In the last few years the attitude of the general public to the subject of UFOs seems to have undergone a silent yet radical change. In this article the Author discusses the importance of this change, the reasons behind it and the possible implications this might have for organised Ufology in this Country.

It is impossible to put dates to changes in public attitudes; attitudes alter gradually over a period. However, would it not be fair to say that 1947—1957 was the period of almost total disbelief, when people interested in the subject of UFOs really were classed as cranks and the few students of the subject were very much on the defensive. Could the period 1957—1967 be classified as the decade when Flying Saucers took the place of Mother-in-Laws in music hall jokes and when UFO Researchers started to come out of their shells. Towards the end of this period one could discuss the subject reasonably seriously and it was the Government and Authority in general that were on the defensive.

What then for 1967—1977? Only three years have passed but nevertheless one can perhaps detect in that time a change in the attitude of the man-in-the-street. The reasons for this are, no doubt, legion but a few spring immediately to mind:—

- (i) More and more reliable sighting reports have been made to Ufologists and their investigations have progressed from the rather amateurish questionnaire to a deeper, more scientific approach when the investigator looks further than 'what was the weather like.'
- (ii) BUFORA and its affiliated regional Societies have, by their responsible attitude, been able to impress the news media in particular. Consequently programmes like Panorama have devoted time to a fair appraisal of the subject and Pressmen have become more objective in their reporting.

- (iii) The efforts of those in authority to publicly ignore, or at best to attempt to belittle the idea that UFOs exist, has, in the opinion of many, badly misfired. The result being that the arguments of UFO researchers appear more credible than the so-called explanations of Government Agencies. (This particular factor may be more important than one might first think, perhaps it is food for thought for a psychologist).
- (iv) Many scientists, as well as other experts, especially at our Universities and Colleges (there are UFO Research Groups at about a dozen of these establishments) are now giving serious thought to the subject and this encourages others to consider the possibility that we are not alone in the Universe.
- (v) BUFORA has, over the years, done excellent work in the field of public education with exhibitions (Olympia), Conferences (Oxford, Cambridge, Bristol, Birmingham, London and Wakefield) and lectures throughout the Country.

The result of the above, as suggested earlier in this article, has been an impressive change in the attitude of people to UFOs. One now finds that a vast number of the general public can accept the idea of UFOs—they don't even talk about Flying Saucers any more!—without too much difficulty. Indeed in discussions one often hears the non-Ufologist say “. . . . of course UFOs exist, we can't be the only intelligent life in the whole of creation, can we, so what are all the UFO researchers worrying, fussing and getting excited about.” This reaction is quite common and we Ufologists are not certain whether to rejoice at the public's 'conversion' or to despair at the continuing frustrating attitude of authority.

In these days when the views of those in Government seem to be so often at a variance with public opinion (Common Market, Hanging, Decimalisation, etc.), the Ufologist can afford to give himself a small pat on the back. He has succeeded in convincing a large section of the population that there is life on other celestial bodies, that some of this life is further advanced than life on this planet and that people from other worlds are visiting our Earth just as we are now taking the first hesitant steps in the exploration of our Solar System.

With this shift in public reaction to the subject of UFOs the approach, aim and philosophy of UFO Societies must undergo revision. It is no longer necessary, or desirable, to be an 'evangelical' movement (the word is used in its loosest sense), preaching the truth about UFOs. Lecturers now frequently find that they have no need to offer the conventional proof of the existence of UFOs to their audiences as they already accept the fact that they exist. People are now more interested in how E.T.Vs (Extra Terrestrial Vehicles) come here, what their purpose might be and how their presence might affect us.

Persons like Cramp and Winder and others appear to have recognised this change in public attitude some time ago and now other Ufologists must follow their example. We must put our time, energy and resources towards research into the 'whys and wherefores' of E.T.Vs, as no clear thinking person who has studied the subject should any longer doubt that other intelligent life does exist within the Universe.

M. C. HOLT, B.A.

## SCEPTICAL SIUFOP

It is highly probable that intelligent life, possibly more sophisticated than our own, exists in some part of the Universe. It is also possible that this intelligence is trying to establish contact with other living beings such as ourselves.

Many Ufologists would have us believe that they have succeeded and their spacecraft, in the form of 'flying saucers,' have penetrated the Earth's atmosphere. The evidence for this mainly takes the form of lights in the sky. Unidentified Flying Objects obviously **DO** exist, as any light or object seen in the sky is a UFO to someone who does not know what it is. The interpretation of these lights however, is the point at which some Ufologists frequently leave logic and opt for exciting mysticisms.

The Society for the Investigation of UFO Phenomena (SIUFOP), upon receipt of a sighting report, looks for common human errors of observation. Sighting reports often add the witnesses occupation or letters after their name as if to imply that their powers of observation are above question. This is not always the case. Typically a witness might estimate the speed of a UFO without being able to estimate its height. This is completely impossible, no matter how experienced the witness might be. At low levels of illumination the human eye can only see in black and white, any colouring being purely in the imagination. Also, angular sizes of small lights seen in the sky are generally over estimated by an order of magnitude. Although a lot of cases do contain information that would have been impossible to ascertain, the witnesses should not be branded 'liars,' but merely human.

Common human errors of observation account for the mystery surrounding many cases and those that are left are *nearly* all descriptions of natural or man-made phenomena. I have personally witnessed Ufologists misidentifying satellites, aeroplanes, meteors and even stars, turning them into 'flying saucers following an erratic course.' However, we are still left with a few (very few) sighting reports that defy explanation along with a few 'contact' claims.

An investigation of the witness is then undertaken where possible. If this reveals that he (or she) is very imaginative, or relates what he wanted to see (e.g. Master-Ship) instead of what he actually saw, or relates inconsistent and contradictory stories, then the report is dismissed.

In SIUFOP's opinion, the almost insignificantly small number of reports left does not constitute proof that 'flying saucers' exist; defining proof as 'scientifically verifiable evidence' and a 'flying saucer' as 'an unidentified terrestrial or extra-terrestrial vehicle.'

Many Ufologists have called SIUFOP 'narrow-minded,' 'biased' and assert that we 'set out to prove that flying saucers do not exist.' This was not our aim; it is impossible to prove that flying saucers do not exist! Our members are always willing to consider new reports and theories, so if anyone can show us that our opinions are wrong, we would be pleased to hear from them.

D. I. SIMPSON.

(Chairman, SIUFOP).

## BOOK REVIEW

---

### "A REFERENCE BOOK OF U.F.O. SOUNDS"

BY DAN BUTCHER

Published by S.I.G.A.P., 14, Buckhurst Road, Frimley Green, Camberley, Surrey.

PRICE: 3/-.

---

The author of this booklet has been at pains to compile an exhaustive account of every kind of sound which has ever been described as associated with UFOs. He has done an excellent job and I regard this little treatise as a classic of its kind and likely to prove invaluable to the researcher. The old belief that UFOs are invariably silent when in motion has suffered many blows in recent years. Perusal of Mr. Butcher's opus should kill it once for all.

Some of the references are perhaps of questionable value and it might have been better if occasional excursions into the realm of the occult had been avoided. That, however, is a minor defect and need not reflect on the overall value of the work.

Ultra and infrasound receive attention in a UFO connection and such fascinating topics as voices and singing heard to proceed from UFOs are not neglected.

I heartily recommend this book to all students of UFOs.

J.C-B.

**OFFICERS (honorary) :**

President: G. W. CREIGHTON, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.B.I.S.

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

Dr. G. G. DOEL, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., D.M.R.E.

R. H. B. WINDER, B.Sc., C. Eng., A.M.I. Mech.E.

**B.U.F.O.R.A. Executive Committee :**

Chairman: Captain I. MACKAY

Vice-Chairman: L. E. BEER

Honorary Secretary: Miss B. WOOD

Honorary Treasurer: A. WEST

Asst. Secretary: Miss P. KENNEDY

Membership Secretary: Mrs. A. HARCOURT

Financial Adviser: N. OLIVER

Journal Editor: J. CLEARY-BAKER, Ph.D.

Director of Research: S. L. SMITH, B.A.

Field Officer: E. A. HATVANY

Committee Members: O. F. FOWLER

B. SIMMONDS

Miss C. HENNING

Miss J. GREGORY

—————o—————

**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 is 30/-, \$5 U.S.A. and Canada. Membership is open to all persons supporting the aims of the Association and whose application is approved by the Executive Committee. Application/Information Forms are obtainable from Miss C. Henning, 99 Mayday Gardens, Blackheath, London, S.E.3., or any other Officer.

**JOURNAL :** Published Quarterly and available to Members only, or by exchange. Publications should be sent direct to the Editor. Tel. 0962/2691.

**ADVERTISEMENTS :** Personal Column: 4d. a word. Display Rates: whole page £8 . 0 . 0d; Half page £4 . 0 . 0d; Quarter page £2 . 5 . 0d

Please send ad. copy and related correspondence to the Vice-Chairman:  
L. E. Beer, 15 Freshwater Court, Crawford Street, London, W1H 1HS.

**CORRESPONDENCE :** General—Honorary Secretary, Miss B. Wood, 6, Cairn Avenue, Ealing, London, W.5.

**SUBSCRIPTIONS :** Mrs. A. Harcourt, 170 Faversham Road, Kennington, Ashford, Kent.

**EDITORIAL :** Dr. J. Cleary-Baker, 3 Devenish Road, Weeke, Nr. Winchester, Hants.

**LIBRARIAN :** Capt. I. Mackay, 5 Pitt Street, London, W.8.

**UFO REPORT/PRESS CUTTINGS :** Omar Fowler, 149 Mytchett Road, Camberley, Surrey.

**RESEARCH :** S. L. Smith, B.A., 'Hill House,' Melton Road, Edwalton, Nottingham, NG12 4BU. UFO REPORT/PRESS CUTTINGS.