

From the Director.

Since the last Research Bulletin, we have been able to add a few more statistics to the Report on the Research Section's activities (R.B. 2, 2, p1). The last three months have seen our volunteer investigators increase in number from 240 to 260. This has been matched by a continuing steady decrease in the numbers of interesting sighting reports reaching us. The 1967, '68, '69 totals at present read 230, 180 and 52 reports, but to counter this slightly depressing outlook, information now reaching us suggests that a minor wave of UFO reporting (mainly in the press) occurred during June and July. It does not necessarily follow that UFO activity as such has increased, because every Summer sees a seasonal rise in the reporting frequency, the exact cause of which may be sociological, journalistic or ufological, but of which the true explanation has yet to be accurately determined.

In the last 18 months since I became Director of Research, the section has received approximately 250 reports, but its Evaluating Officers have examined over 420 reports.... such was the backlog of work facing us in December 1967. Credit for the clearing of this backlog must go to Richard Farrow, our Investigations Coordinator, and our four other Evaluators; but really without Richard's coordinating influence, the Section team could never have cleared the volume of work.

The breakdown of our 1969 sightings into classifications reveals that, whilst there were only about 35 'lights-in-the-sky' type of reports, there were only 12 to 15 cases of more detailed objects seen (type B), and but three class A sightings of objects involved in landings or near landings. One of these occurred in Norfolk at the end of June and was investigated by one of our members, but he has yet to file his report with us and without his cooperation, or for that matter any investigator's cooperation we cannot hope to fulfill our purpose of being a national UFO research association. So please investigators lets have your reports.

The second case dates from 1964 and is still under investigation. A report and evaluation are expected soon. The third case is the Tyneham 'landing' of August 29th. It has been impossible to gain further information on this case and so we have to leave it filed as a probable hoax. I might add that there are some recently unearthed details of the case that tend to support this conclusion.

Stephen Smith

\* \* \* \* \*

Where Flying Saucers Really Come From ....

The above was the title of a five column-inch item in October 1st's Daily Mirror. It continued:

"A team of investigators have discovered where flying saucers come from - the vivid imagination of science fiction addicts. After a two-year probe they have decided there is 'absolutely no proof' that flying saucers exist. The team, from the Society for the Investigation of Unidentified Flying Objects Phenomena, found that all the people who claimed to have seen them had two things in common. 'They all had a large science fiction library and a vivid imagination', said Chairman David Simpson at his home in Bridle Close, Ewell, Surrey, yesterday.

"The Society also dismisses photographs as evidence. They are too easily faked. But the Society's probe is to continue - just in case".

Credit: Tony Pace and Roger Stanway

Perhaps Mr. Simpson should read the Condon report - there is an excellent case of an unfaked completely puzzling photograph in it, McMinnville, Oregon. Or perhaps they should investigate the following:

Express and Star, Wolverhampton, 18/8/69.

Ken Hughes is resigned to the fact that people will think he's mad. But he is convinced he saw a spaceship in Stourbridge last Friday. "I didn't believe in flying saucers or anything like that before," said 21-yr-old, Mr. Hughes, of Bowling Green Road, Stourbridge, "But I definitely saw it". "I don't care what people will say".

He saw the unidentified flying object at his place of work, Bateman's Wood Yard in Union Street. His story is supported, albeit rather reluctantly, by a workmate, Ralph Attwood (30), of High Street, Amblecote. It all happened on a quiet overcast morning. Ken was in Bateman's office when he saw the UFO come down on a high pile of wood about 50 yards away. It came down like a hovercraft, but there was no noise, or engine, or smoke, or anything. It hovered about six to nine inches above the pile of wood. Some doors slid open in it, but nothing came out. The doors had curved tops, but were quite small - about 5 ft. high. The machine was steely grey in colour, and egg-shaped. Ken estimates that it was about 6-7ft. high, 4-5ft. wide, and about 12 ft. long. It had a wide cushion round it.

The machine took off and when it was about 20 ft. up, it just disappeared. "I was really just horrified", he added. Workmate Ralph came over to the window. "I just saw the doors shut and that was it", he said.

Credit: Surrey Investigation Group  
on Aerial Phenomena.

\* \* \* \* \*

Members' Subscriptions for Sept. 1969 to Sept. 1970.

Members are reminded that subscriptions for the period Sept. 1969 to Sept. 1970 fell due on September 1st, last. Please would all those members who have not already done so, send in their subscription to the Hon. Membership Secretary, Mrs. A. Harcourt, 170 Faversham Road, Kennington, Ashford, Kent, as soon as possible. The subscription due, as determined by the Annual General Meeting held on October 4th, is 30/- for individual membership and for Society affiliation.

\* \* \* \* \*

"UFOs? Yes! .... Where the Condon Committee Went Wrong

Saunders and Harkins, Signet Books, New York, December 1968.

"UFOs? Yes!" was published before the Condon Report appeared, but did not arrive in this country until after the Report. Thus unfortunately I was unable to read it as "a pre-requisite for assessment of the Condon Report", as Dr. James McDonald would wish it. Nevertheless "UFOs? Yes!" has not changed my view of the Condon Report. The predetermined and prejudiced leadership given to the Project was in part to blame for its failure to achieve a worthwhile concluding report. This view has already been adequately dealt with in detail by Carl Grove (R.B. 2,2, pp 3/4). The balance of fault for failure lies with the Project staff who were unfortunately overcome by the problems of inter-disciplinary research, particularly between the experimentalists and the analysts with their differing approaches to the same phenomenon.

Saunders also discusses the pitfalls of attempting to prove the ETI hypothesis - the true nature of which is totally unknown to us, and the best ways of electing the details of a sighting from a witness, in which he proposes our own method, that is to first get the witness to 'tell it as it was' without interruption, and then afterwards ask questions starting with the circumstantial verifiable evidence and ending with the finer details of the case.

The Mariana (Great Falls, Idaho) case is very fully and carefully discussed; as also is the Snippy case, which is an unnecessary and largely irrelevant digression and forms the only really bad inclusion in the book.

Saunders' final chapters are perhaps the most interesting for UFO research. He claims to have shown that "the odds are overwhelmingly in favour of the reality of orthoteny" as a property of particular sets of UFO reports. He does not claim any significance for his conclusion related to any hypothesised alien activity. Nevertheless I feel that there is no real significance of value in his limited conclusion. Chapter 23 details Saunders' reasoning as to why the Project failed and includes some penetrating remarks on the characters involved in the UFO plot. No ufologist will be quite the same after reading this chapter.

Lastly Saunders gives us some pointers to the future and how we should remove the difficulties facing UFO Research. He demands a trend towards respectability for the UFO problem and an increased amount of public money to be spent on its solution, whilst avoiding another Colorado Fiasco. I hope that he gets what he is asking for.

Stephen Smith.

\* \* \* \* \*

Navigation, Landing, and Additional Lights

Carried by Modern Aircraft

Introduction

All aircraft throughout the world whether military, civilian airline or privately owned must comply with aeronautical laws and carry basic laid down navigation lights, thus enabling them to be observed from the ground and by other aircraft that may be travelling on the same or a close flight path.

To list every type of navigation light and other lights carried by every aircraft throughout the world would take volumes, so I shall limit my discussion to a description of the lights and patterns they make as applied to the three major groups of aircraft in use. These are helicopters, military fixed wing aircraft and civilian aircraft.

Basic Navigation Lights

To comply with the law all aircraft must carry at least three navigation lights and one landing light, and they must all be placed in the correct positions on the aircraft. These are: one red light on the port side wing tip, one green light on the starboard side wing tip (both of which must only be visible from the front of the aircraft), one white light at the tail end of the plane in the dead centre, and the landing light is also white and placed under the port wing, though this varies with some aircraft.

Helicopters.

Like fixed wing aircraft, helicopters carry the same three basic navigation lights, but along with these all military and government helicopters carry one and sometimes two anti-collision lights. Anti-collision lights are red flashing lights about the size of the blue ones on the roof of police cars and ambulances. These anti-collision lights are normally fitted either midway along the tail boom on the top or somewhere near the tail rotor. The second anti-collision light if carried is fitted underneath the cabin and is shielded on two or three sides so that it can only be seen from the front.

Apart from these mentioned lights there is of course the landing light. This is carried underneath the cabin and can be either a fixed type facing forward and slightly down, or you can have a dual position, facing either directly down or slightly down facing forward, this is left up to the pilot.

These are the only lights carried by helicopters, though I cannot say that every civilian helicopter carries an anti-collision light.

Light Patterns at Night

Because of the low level at which helicopters normally fly and the lights they carry, it is possible that helicopters could explain some UFO sightings at night and below I set out the combinations of lights that can be seen at night by an observer on the ground, reading from left to right in each case.

GREEN - FLASHING RED - RED

A front view. If the landing light were on a blinding white light will be seen coming from between the green and red lights.

RED - FLASHING RED - WHITE

A view from the port side. In forward flight lights move from right to left.

WHITE - FLASHING RED - GREEN

A view from the starboard side. In forward flight lights move from left to right.

WHITE - FLASHING RED - WHITE

A view from the rear. The lights could also be arranged with a flashing red light above and a white light below.

Some helicopters have the flashing red anti-collision light mounted near the rear and so from the side this will be seen above the rear white light.

It must be noted that navigation lights on helicopters can only be seen at night when the aircraft is at a relatively low altitude and fairly short distance from the observer, otherwise all that can be seen with the unaided eye is the flashing red of the anti-collision light. This leads to an interesting fact that helicopters are the only aircraft that can do tight turns of 180°. This means that the aircraft can turn completely about within a few feet much as a car can do a 'U' turn. The point I am making is that helicopters seem from a distance appear as nothing more than a flashing red light, then should the pilot decide to reverse his flight path and turn through 180°, the observer would see a flashing red light travelling across the sky, then the light would hover for a few seconds and then appear to go back the way it came. So anyone whose hearing was imperfect or was observing from inside a building, or from a long distance from the aircraft, would see something that might cause them to assume they were watching a UFO.

### Military Fixed Wing Aircraft

Military fixed wing aircraft again carry the standard navigation lights, but have several variations of auxiliary lights, for example military fighter aircraft only carry navigation lights, they do not carry anti-collision lights. Therefore at night it is only possible to see combinations of red, green and white lights.

Bomber aircraft do and do not carry anti-collision lights and this depends on the role of the particular aircraft concerned.

Transport command mainly carry two anti-collision lights which can be placed either midway along the top of the aircraft, or on the fin. The lower one can be just aft of the nose or midway along the belly of the aircraft.

The use of landing lights can vary from one to as many as six. These can be positioned under or in the wings, or again just aft or in the nose.

Important factors to remember about large fixed wing aircraft especially military aircraft is that in the majority of aircraft the navigation lights are so wired up that they flash on and off independently of one another, so that at night you can see combinations of flashing red, white and green lights. To list the various combinations is virtually impossible because of the variations of positions of the anti-collision lights and sizes of aircraft.

Finally on the subject of military aircraft I had better point out that some bombers and transport planes carry a device known as the downward identity system. This is simply three lights attached to the belly of the aircraft, which are normally red, green and amber. The purpose of this system is that during exercises the airfield control tower can radio the aircraft and demand identification. The aircraft would then flash a pre-arranged colour code with the three lights. It can well be imagined that an aircraft with flashing navigation, twin anti-collision lights and a downward identification system must look confusing at night.

### Civilian Airlines

These are identical to the transport planes used by the armed forces, i.e. flashing navigation lights, one or two anti-collision lights, one to six landing lights. The only variations here are that the anti-collision light fixed on the aircraft belly can be red, white or orange.

### Private Civilian Aircraft

These normally carry the three basic navigation lights and one landing light under the port wing. Very few carry anti-collision lights and identity lights are generally banned.

### Summary

I have in this article tried to explain all the various types of lights carried by aircraft and I think that you will agree that to attempt to list every combination of lights is virtually an impossible task, mainly because there are so many aircraft flying today, literally thousands of different makes and marks. All of these aircraft carry the required lights but in so many different positions that some of them seem at night light up the sky like Christmas trees, whilst others are almost impossible to see even on the clearest of nights.



In short the only colours used in aircraft lights are red, green, white, amber, and orange. Under aeronautical navigational law no other colours are permitted.

Should for any reason an aircraft have its landing light on during flight, it will appear as one large bright moving white light as all other lights will be obliterated in the glare of the landing light. However it is not normal practice to turn on landing lights when not necessary as they consume a lot of power. But it should be remembered that the switch for the landing lights is normally situated adjacent to other lights switched and it is always possible for the student pilot and the experienced pilot to switch the lights on accidentally for a few seconds, thereby causing a considerable amount of confusion and speculation to any inexperienced observer on the ground.

J.T.S.

### The National Sky-watch, 1969

#### A Further Report on the Spectrogram Secured at Watching Point No.6.

The last Research Bulletin contained a report on the National Sky-watch as observed from Warminster, watching post No.6. In it the authors, Tony Pace and Roger Stanway recounted how they managed to secure a spectrogram of an unusual light seen rising from near the watching post, using an ordinary camera with a prism attached in front of the lens. Pace and Stanway have now written to the Director giving details of an independent analysis of the photographs obtained. The Director has also been able to see the photographs and the enlargements of the spectrograms and he agrees with the independent analysis.

The photograph was taken with Kodachrome colour reversal film for prints, which unfortunately is rather slow for the task of obtaining spectra of light sources at night, however, the negative and the black-and-white prints made from it show the unidentified object split up into a spectrum, as well as a number of street-lamps that were in the field of view of the camera. The street-lamps are extremely useful as they give a direct comparison spectrum on the same negative as the UFO. The street lamps were of the metallic vapour variety and clearly show as the expected bright line emission spectrum, though this is slightly confused by camera shake.

In contrast the UFO is distinguished by a continuous spectrum, similar to that emitted by a tungsten filament lamp or a candle. The camera shake has prevented any detail study of the spectrum that might have thrown light on the exact source of the light photographed, but nevertheless the type of spectrum is consistent with the balloon-carrying-a-light-source explanation and only adds to the weight of circumstantial evidence pointing towards a hoax at Warminster perpetrated for the benefit of the Sky-watch.

Tony Pace and Roger Stanway are to be congratulated in obtaining the first ever spectrogram of a UFO. Knowing their enthusiasm for the scientific investigation of the UFO phenomena, we are sure that it will not be long before another and better spectrogram is obtained by them, the UFOs being willing of course.

BUFORA RESEARCH STATION

\* \* \* \* \*

#### Praise is Encouragement Indeed.

In sending in his subscription, one member has said the following:

"In closing, I would like to congratulate you all on producing such an interesting and informative Bulletin - it is well edited; and contributions from members held my interest from beginning to end - I look forward to the next Bulletin - it has been a joy to read".

Notwithstanding the above, we still require contributions in the form of articles and letters from you, our reader. Please send them in to The Director of Research, Hill House, Melton Road, Edwalton, Nottingham NG12 4BU. Your Press cuttings are also very welcome and should go to Mr. R. Farrow, 95 Winner Street, Paignton, South Devon.

\* \* \* \* \*