



# BUFORA BULLETIN

No. 27

**bufora**

British UFO Research Association



COUNCIL 1986-87

PRESIDENT: Post to be filled  
VICE PRESIDENT: The Rt. Hon. Earl of Clancarty  
FOUNDER PRESIDENT: G.F.N. Knewstub, CEng., FBIS  
COUNCIL CHAIRMAN: Arnold West  
VICE CHAIRMAN: Stephen Gamble, FIMLS, FRAS, AFBIS

COUNCIL MEMBERS

Lionel E. Beer FRAS	Kenneth Phillips
Manfred Cassirer	Miss Jenny Randles
Hilary Evans	John L. Spencer
Robin Lindsey	Michael R. Wootten

**bufera**

MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY

c/o Arnold West,  
16 Southway,  
Burgess Hill,  
Sussex, RH15 9ST  
Tel. (044 46) 6738

LIBRARIAN

Robin Lindsey,  
87 Station Road,  
Whittlesey,  
Peterborough, PE7 1UE  
Tel. (0733) 203414

SECRETARY TO COUNCIL

Post to be filled

RESEARCH AND INVESTIGATIONS

DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH

Stephen Gamble,  
16 Southway,  
Burgess Hill,  
Sussex,  
RH15 9ST

DIRECTOR OF INVESTIGATIONS

Miss Jenny Randles,  
37 Heathbank Road,  
Cheadle Heath,  
Stockport,  
Cheshire, SK3 0UP

TRAINING OFFICER

Post to be filled

ASSOCIATION HISTORIAN

Lionel E. Beer,  
16 Southway,  
Burgess Hill,  
Sussex,  
RH15 9ST

# BUFORA BULLETIN

THE BRITISH UFO RESEARCH  
ASSOCIATION BUFORA Ltd  
(by guarantee)

Founded 1964. Registered office,  
16 Southway, Burgess Hill,  
Sussex, RH15 9ST. Registered in  
London 1234924.

Incorporating the London UFO  
Research Association (founded  
1959) and the British UFO  
Association (founded 1962).

## AIMS

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

## MEMBERSHIP

Membership is open to all who support the aims of the association and whose application is approved by the Executive Committee. Applications, forms and general information can be obtained from any association officer.

## MEMBER SOCIETIES

Includes Britain's oldest UFO group, BFSB. 15 Gledemoor Drive, Frampton Cotterall, Bristol, Avon, BS17 2NZ

## Contents

JANUARY 1988 NUMBER 27

Editor : Mike Wootten  
Sub Editor: Gaynor Sunderland

2. **Editorial**
4. **Ufological Pie**  
Paul Deveraux
7. **The Orb-server**  
John Merron
10. **Earthlights - My Experience, Ten Years On**  
Paul McCartney
13. **What Price Credibility?**  
Marion Sunderland
18. **Booklook....Reviews**  
Nigel Smith, Jenny Randles,  
Gaynor Sunderland
21. **Are UFOs Basic or Incidental?**  
Manfred Casserier
24. **Possible Characteristics of True UFO reports Part Two**  
Robert Moore
- 28 **Readers Write**

(c) BUFORA Ltd 1987.

It is permissible for members to use material in this publication for their own personal use, providing it is done on a limited basis. Where material is used for publication, acknowledgement should be given to BUFORA and the appropriate contributor.

## Editorial

Recently, I and many other researchers were invited to participate in the popular BBC television debate programme, Kilroy. The researchers for the programme certainly did their homework, involving every polarising view imaginable, ambitiously intending to have each of these views aired in the forty minute programming schedule.

As expected, nothing new was achieved. Only the usual media argument of, 'are alien spacecraft visiting planet Earth or not'. When will the media in general pick up on the idea that thinking ufologists actually do look further than little green men from Mars and that we do search for other theories, including ones that are very down-to-earth.

However, a very strong point was brought out during the debate; the overwhelming fanaticism of debunkers. Adrian Berry, Science editor for the Telegraph newspaper showed such utter ignorance of the subject in question and of science as a whole that I am at a loss to understand how he ever secured such a position with a heavyweight and usually intellectual paper as the Telegraph in the first place.

We were shown the classic Peter Day film, which was shot in January 1973. Immediately, Mr Berry proclaimed that the object filmed was in fact a meteorite. He went on to say that the effect in the last frame of the film ( which allegedly shows the trees beneath the object 'bending' under some force) was in fact

where the said meteorite crashed into a forest. I wonder if the naive Berry has ever heard of camera shake! But seriously, a meteorite was certainly ruled out after many hours of investigation by both BUFORA and SCUFORI.

The witnesses to this event were plentiful and placed favourably for accurate triangulation of the object's trajectory to be calculated. We can then deduce that if the object was a meteorite then it would have caused such tremendous damage to the English countryside, that indeed, we would have heard about it. Mr Berry was ignorant of these facts, and indeed, the whole subject of UFO research. One wonders why the BBC asked such a babbling ill-informed person as he.

But on the other side, gold stars all round to the many researchers who injected some fresh food for thought to the programme. Especially Gaynor Sunderland who certainly made some people sit up and listen to enlightening and thought provoking ideas, from a witnesses point of view.

---

Continuing the theme of the media. Reporting UFO stories certainly seems to be the flavour of the last two months, not only in the tabloid press but also the broadsheet press.

Many will say that this is simply due to an upsurge of cases reported by the public. This may be so, but it is my opinion that the media cause

more UFO flaps than the UFOs themselves (see The UFO Handbook, Allan Hendry, Sphere 1980, pp 254). We will no doubt see whether these cases are valuable after their investigation. But, if most of them turn out to be aircraft lights or the misinterpretation of the venus/Jupiter conjunction that is apparent at the moment, it would be interesting to see if these cases were reported after any significant press coverage of the subject.

Unfortunately, it was media coverage that created the August UFO flap that occurred in London. One significant case caught the media's eye and in no time at all my telephone was buzzing for a full week. It may be fair to say that with out the media attention the public would not have known who to report their cases to and thus BUFORA would have lost out on valuable data. It is my feeling though, that no UFOs would have been witnessed in the first place if the media had not been involved.

It would be advisable not to follow in the shadow of media hype as it could be a wasted effort. But, of course, do put aside, cases that may be worthy of thorough investigation and research.

Interview of the week must surely be between Chris Tarrent, co-host of London Weekend Television's 6 O'Clock show, Richard Lawrence and Ian Ridpath, that was televised on

March 4th (with all the usual media cliches).

Ian Ridpath: "Many UFO people will quote the case of Jimmy Carter reporting a UFO. In fact, it is well known that he mistook Venus for a spaceship"

Richard Lawrence (at a different location): "Many well known people have reported seeing UFOs including Jimmy Carter who officially filed a UFO report".

It seems that the Aetherius Society scored a rather embarrassing own goal!

---

It is hoped that this will be the last time that the Bulletin will appear in its present form. A new editorial board has been established to create a publication with a high quality content. The new board has worked hard to commission an international assembly of writers, which will compliment existing authors who regularly submit papers to the Bulletin.

With the success of UFOs 1947-1987 and the imminent publication of PHENOMENON BUFORA has gained and will continue to gain further international recognition. With this recognition it is hoped that we will continue to improve the content and presentation of all our periodicals.

**Watch this space!**

---

# EARTHLIGHTS FEATURE

## UFOLOGICAL PIE

by Paul Devereux.

Paul Devereux, author of Earthlights, editor of The Ley Hunter and co-ordinator of the Dragon project relays his thoughts of where Earthlights connect and interrelate with the other facets of the UFO phenomena.

Ufology is not synonymous with UFOs. It is a web of research, knowledge, ignorance, truth, falsehood, prejudice, insight, physics, psychology and much else which has become woven around the attempt to understand strange things seen in the sky. ETH adherents often attack earth lights theory, assuming the two ideas are mutually exclusive. This is nonsense, of course: both could be correct: Earth lights theory does not comment on the ETH. It is my personal prejudice that ET craft are not involved in any of the phenomena considered by ufology, but that is beside the point. It could even be that the earth lights theory has been implanted in our minds by ETs, to enhance our understanding of our relationship with our planet! The possibilities are endless.

Let us picture ufology as a pie. No one knows for sure how many portions it needs to be divided into, nor how the sizes of the slices have to vary. my guess is depicted in figure 1. I would cut it into five basic portions - one could argue about a few of the crumbs, perhaps.

1. Identified flying objects (IFOs); Misperceived mundane objects such as aircraft, astronomical bodies, etc. Definitely the largest slice, although the exact size is open to debate.

2. Psychological; Where the stimulus of some sort, whether a cloudy moon, a piece of paper blowing in the wind or other misperceived normal object, triggers an inner episode in the witness' mind. This episode derives from an inner tension created by psychological problems, mental need to escape from social stress, or some form of physiological pathology. These people are in effect carrying a UFO sighting around in them like a time bomb. They are a close encounter waiting to happen. This sort of emotionally-based episode is also found in other contexts. The episodes are real to the percipients. In such cases, slices 1 and 2 have to be eaten together.

3. Hoax: I suspect that this is a bigger slice of the pie than some ufologists think.

These first three slices,



then, however they are cut, take up the greater part of the pie.


4. Actual UFOs (AUFOs); But things are being seen in the sky (and elsewhere) that cannot all be explained away. This slice has a number of flavours, and most if not all are unfamiliar forms of natural phenomena:

a) ball lightning - can only

be claimed if electrical atmospheric conditions are prevailing (and, possibly artificial energy production conditions);

b) earthquake lights (EQLs) - can only be claimed in connection with known seismic activity;

c) mountain peak discharge (MPDs) - can only be claimed in connection with hills and




mountains!

d) earth lights - the truly mercurial phenomena, linked with faulting, possibly mild tectonic stress and a subtle range of other (and perhaps more important) conditions not yet sorted out or fully identified. Geology is its gateway, one way or another.

These four unfamiliar natural phenomena are almost certainly related, but like members of a family, they have their own individuality as well.

If ET craft really exist in our skies, if there really are dimensional intrusions into our atmosphere, our world, then they occur in this slice of the pie.

5. Geopsychic: This is perhaps the most mysterious ingredient in the pie, and one we are only just beginning to appreciate. The creation of psychic (eg OOBIE; NDE: poltergeist; perception of elemental entities) or mystical (eg archetypal; visionary) episodes triggered by the percipient's exposure special concatenations of geophysical forces such as natural radiation, magnetic and gravitational anomalies, electrical effects, planetary rhythms such as the Schumann Resonance, and so on. In some way these fields affect brain function allowing psychic or mystical experiences to flow through suitable people. These same fields may also produce light, sound and other phenomena under certain circumstances. In some instances, proximity to such phenomena may in itself



trigger the percipient response. In such cases we are biting into slices 4 and 5 simultaneously. Knowledge of this may have been used in some ancient shamanic and magical practices. In these experiences there may be a channel opened between our minds and those of apparent other entities.

All these slices make up ufology. However, only one slice relates to actual unidentified flying objects. I think it is confusing to talk of UAPs (Unidentified Atmospheric Phenomena). Even though this term is a more accurate descriptor, its use implies that there are still "UFOs" to be explained. In the ufological pie model, this is not the case. But the entire ufological provides food for thought, even though only one slice tastes truly of UFOs.



# EARTHLIGHTS FEATURE

---

## THE ORB-SERVER

by John Merron.

John Merron is a long standing researcher with the Dragon Project and has been extensively involved with laboratory testing of the the Earthlights hypothesis. John is also a director of the ASSAP executive.

This is an extension of Paul Devereux's Earthlights hypothesis, taking a few of the established facts about the various 'UFO' and 'lights in the sky' cases, and their relationship to Close Encounters of the Third Kind.

I personally have no doubt whatsoever, that people see and experience phenomena of the kind that have been described in the past as abductions, and that, these experiences do have an objective reality. The big question is; an objective real what?

### EVASIVE

Somewhere within the history of Ufology, a real Extraterrestrial visitation may have occurred, but the evidence for any visit from outer space seems a little too evasive. It is possible that many cases are totally in the minds of the witness, but this does not detract from the fact that an outside influence may have triggered the event in the first place. Whether it occurs internally as an electrical aberration in the persons' mind, or externally as some kind of light display, both are interesting points in themselves, or as proposed below, a mixture of the two!

Firstly, I will cover the 'mechanical' side to the sightings within the conceptual framework of Earthlights.

Deep within the Earth's crust there is a molten core which is effected by solar and lunar cycles in the same way that the planet's seas and oceans are. Floating on this core are large crusts of rock known as the Continental or Tectonic Plates. In parts, these plates have become weakened over millions of years of stress and have produced cracks or 'faults', and it is in these faulted areas that small tremors, in geological time, occur frequently.

In some places where these cracks reach relatively close to the surface, water percolates up, emerging as springs. Often, where there is a major fault in the Earth's crust, there will be several springs dotted along its length.

When rock of any kind is put under stress, the energy is transduced into an electrical energy that is very similar to peizo-electricity. This energy usually manifests as light.

## SPECULATION

It is most likely that where water flows through the faults, it acts as a conductor, carrying the 'electrical' energy up to the surface. If this is the case we would expect there to be substantially more UFOs in areas where there are geological faults.

Paul Devereux and Paul McCartney's evidence has shown this to be the case.

Personally, I see this energy which is produced as a kind of planetary ectoplasm created at certain places linked with underground water, using springs and wells as orifices. This analogy may seem a little strange if not far-fetched, but if we accept that the earth has some kind of consciousness and look at the planet as a living organism, it is not such a strange conceptual leap.

A little known fact about many 'physical' mediums is that a number of them have had UFO experiences of one kind or another. Also, most 'contactees' seem to have strong mediumistic abilities. I believe that this is no coincidence. There is though, a 'chicken and egg' paradox with this. Does a close encounter experience only happen to people with strong mediumistic abilities? Or does the experience unleash these abilities within a dormant psychic?

Generally, when 'contactees' are questioned about their earlier life, many recall

situations where some hint of their latent psychic abilities have become evident.

So, it would seem that some of these CE3 percipients are actually experiencing an event that is yet another one of those 'odd' experiences that have occurred throughout their lives. Wrong! A Close Encounter experience is beyond anything that can be created by human paranormal agencies alone.

The experience almost always has a profound effect upon the belief system of the witness. The reason for this could be many things:-

a. It maybe because the sub-conscious mind of the witness is aware that the events are exterior to the witness.

b. It could be that a section of the physical mind of the witness is opened or stimulated into action by the event (many witnesses have reported becoming psychic, or sensitive or artistic as a direct result of such an experience).

c. An 'intelligence' wishing to change the belief system of the witness. By intelligence I suggest something like the 'collective unconscious' made popular by Jung.

Scientists working with high electrical fields and their effects on the brain have discovered that incredibly vivid hallucinations can be experienced by percipients during experiments. I would be very interested to discover if their subjects become psychic

or artistic after such testing. Also, it has been suggested by Persinger in the United States, that it is the same phenomenon occurring at sites geological stress; therefore, in his hypothesis, 'solving' the mystery of the CE3 cases.

There is though, another common factor within these encounters; The 'Message'. Amongst the variety of events that occur during abductions and close encounters one message seems to stand out: "Save yourselves before it is too late!" It is not a new message. In fact, various angels and demigods and goddesses have been telling us this for centuries. Why is there this preoccupation amongst our ethereal heirarchy for our, or our planet's well-being? Could it be the collective unconscious, or something greater?

The close encounter experience is not new. In the past, various visionaries have come out with messages of doom and destruction, "If we do not change our ways." In recent years it has been the Blessed Virgin Mary appearing to various isolated children usually in fairly remote communities. But where does this link with CE3s?

It is my belief that the planets 'mind' is contacting us though events that will have a profound effect upon us individually also in ways that our various minds would be able to accept the message. If Buddah had appeared to Bernadette, she would have probably have ran home

wondering what this strange, dark-skinned man was talking about. If the Blessed Virgin had appeared to an Aborigine what would he make of her? If a silver suited alien appeared to a Tibetan Buddhist monk, would he take anything it said seriously?

#### CONCLUSION

The Earth as a conscious being, understands our conceptual limitations and adjusts the image, or script, to match the belief system or cultural background of the witness.

Is it necessarily the Earth creating this phenomenon? I think not. I personally feel that a powerful enough medium could create such effects as Earthlight phenomenon at places of geological stress and, to a degree, have conscious control over it.

But what is the phenomenon generally? Are the witnesses chosen? Or is it chance that so many witnesses seem to be psychically gifted when others nominally sensitive are unaware of any anomaly?

Another possibility is that the occurrence of such phenomena could be picked up precognitively by a psychic either consciously or unconsciously, thus drawing them to the place so that they are there when it happens.

Whatever the real answer is and whenever it is validated, might not be in the lap of the Gods, but hidden deep within our consciousness waiting to be recognised.

# EARTHLIGHTS FEATURE

## EARTHLIGHTS - MY EXPERIENCE, TEN YEARS ON

by Paul McCartney

Paul McCartney, geology lecturer, original exponent of the earthlights theory with close friend Paul Devereux, and consultant to that well respected book Earthlights, details his views of the subject after ten years of research.

I really had no idea what I was getting myself into when, on an October evening in 1977, I attended my first Ancient British Sites & Lore class, hosted by Paul Devereux. It wasn't even the course of my choice! Mythology and astrology groups were oversubscribed and this was the only one left that sparked any interest in me. However Paul was a charismatic lecturer and I was pleased (and surprised) to see him concentrate on pre-Roman sites, particularly stone-circles.....rocks were my game, having taken degrees in Geology and Chemistry at university.

He soon introduced a multi-faceted study of sites, ley-lines, abnormal events and UFO's in his native county of Leicestershire. He made tentative but inspirational links between them all and the complex geology of the Charnwood Forest area in which they tended to congregate.

His proposals seemed outrageous. Full of scientific scepticism, I was eager to deflate some of these extraordinary claims.....my own training and its associated inbuilt prejudices demanded it of me.


I was behaving like a typical blinkered scientist, but this was soon to change with our

second meeting. We were looking at our distribution map of British stone-circles, and listening to Paul's ongoing account of some of the unusual happenings associated with these areas. It then hit me square between the eyes that I had seen this distribution pattern before; it mirrored the geological diversions between older and more complex rocks of the western and northern parts of Britain with the younger and more docile deposits to their south and east. All rational explanations were considered and then discarded; we were dealing with a complex phenomenon which nobody, to date, had satisfactorily explained.

The research we subsequently undertook culminated in the book 'EARTHLIGHTS' published by Thorsens in 1982 (but now seriously requiring updating due to the wealth of research since that time). Although I was pleased to play a role in the formulation of the theories laid down in Earthlights, I also had deep regrets.....I was a confirmed E.T. devotee and here I was, one of the central figures in the deromanticising of much UFO literature. All those childhood and adolescent years buried in comic books and sci-fi novels, just to de-alienize UFO's!

Earth-light theory has truly upset many interested factions; probably most of you reading this article and certainly some scientists who consider our work as hovering near the lunatic fringe. But it is worth more than a cursory browse on the bookshelf.

We have all seen those perception drawings of the young woman/ old hag, pair of faces/vase or of ascending/descending stairs. Most of can eventually visualize them in both guises (a so called Gestalt Switch).....but a few of us cannot. Scientific advancement often occurs along loosely analogous lines. It happens in dramatic quantum leaps when some innovative researcher perceives a problem in a manner different to that of his predecessors; this is usually followed by a period of consolidation with less spectacular progression as more and more people are eventually won over to the new viewpoint.



A Gestalt Switch

But it is not unusual for people with radical new theories to encounter considerable hostility from those in high places who cannot switch from their entrenched beliefs; after all, they have built their reputations on their previous outmoded hypotheses. This may well lead to the researchers being shot down without fair trial by people whose minds are too closeted to listen to the new usurper. Has not Earth-Light theory so suffered? What is so threatening about a concept that demystifies and eliminates from UFO case-lore events which can be so explained? Does it not leave behind a small number of cases that will be all the more intriguing and creditable as a result?

It is MY (and not necessarily Paul D's) belief that a few sightings will still need alternative interpretations outside those offered by E-L theory.

I do believe in E.T. and would like to defend his existence with an interesting equation ....although naturally subjective in quantification ... which is good ground for suspecting that we are not a uniquely intelligent life-form in the universe. See figure 1.

All the expressions on the right hand side of the equation are fractional and will reduce the total number N. detailed explanation of such an equation is best left to a more technical publication but several points can be highlighted.

$$N = R^* fp fe fl fi fc L$$

where N = number of civilizations  
 R\* = rate of star formation  
 fp = number of stars with planets  
 fe = number of planets with an ecology suitable for life  
 fl = number of these planets on which life has evolved  
 fi = number of planets with intelligent life  
 fc = number of planets where the intelligence is capable of communicating with other planets  
 L = longevity of a civilization

1) The universe is at least 13 billion years old...we are not! We are relative newcomers at merely 4.5 billion years.

2) Planets are virtually impossible to detect with our present technology and no planetary system other than our own, and possibly Vega, have been possibly identified. (N.B. if our theories regarding star synthesis are correct then planetary systems will be very common).

3) Only Earth of the planets in our Solar System can presently support life of an advanced nature.

4) Have we got sufficient communicable skills to converse with an alien life?

5) We have only moved outside our world in the last 30 years...not long in a 4.5 billion year history!

6) Will we be sensible enough to sustain our species long enough for E.T. to come and visit?

Even with the pessimistic estimates, there are probably millions of civilizations out there...but 'out there' covers distance beyond our comprehension. Life is bloody rare! It is likely to be

extremely sparsely distributed throughout the countless galaxies in the skies. Visitation will be extremely difficult and may not even be desirable.

Is it not likely that a boring old earthbound theory will account for the preponderance of UFO-type phenomena documented each year? It is more plausible to think so and sadly, for many of us, it is likely to be true!



## WHAT PRICE CREDIBILITY?

by Marion Sunderland

I am writing in response to an article by Jenny Randles that appeared in a past issue of the Bufora Bulletin. I have not had the opportunity to comment until now. Entitled 'The Depths Of Credibility', it was supposed to be a review of the book 'The Eye Of Fire' by Phillips and Keatman. Instead Jenny took the opportunity to re-hash the 'Alien Contact' story. I have been nominated by my family to review her review.

I'd like to set the record straight regarding the origins of 'Alien Contact'. In early 1978, I heard a programme on Radio Merseyside - not Radio City as Randles states in AC. It featured a UFO investigator named Terry Bellis, from the Wirral UFO Society. I contacted him, as I was looking for answers to my children's sightings. We received only one form from him, so tossed a coin to see whose case should be sent. Gaynor won (or lost so it would seem now!) and this is important, as many people assume that Gaynor was the first to tell me of her experiences. Her brothers have since been accused of 'trying to get in on the act'. In fact THEY told me first.

I requested additional material to record Darren's and Barry's sightings on, but I never received a reply from Mr. Bellis. Jenny later informed me that this was because he considered the case a child's rampant imagination.

Some months later, I had a telephone call from the Liverpool Daily Post asking if they could use the story Mr. Bellis had given them! We were furious, but the paper wanted the story badly. We said it could be used, but only with no names or locations mentioned, and only after we had discussed it with Gaynor and she had given her permission.

Then came Jenny's letter in August 1978. She gave her credentials in Ufology and showed a keen interest in the case. We were astonished! Twice Mr. Bellis had made free with our names and address! We'd had the worst possible introduction to Ufologists, but Jenny appeared to have a genuine interest, so we decided to give 'experts' another go.

When Jenny first put the idea of a book to us in a letter (March 11th 1980) she said that the story was very important and should be told in a straight forward manner. We were concerned when she also said, "it would be best to do the book with your full co-operation", the heavy emphasis being that she would write it anyway. We decided to go along with her, at least we should have some say in it. When Paul Whetnall arrived with the draft, we were so unhappy with the content, that we told him we would do all in our power to prevent it being published. We were assured that alterations would be

made, but the next draft we received was about two weeks before the book was released, containing most of the stuff we wanted removed. We didn't have the financial means to sue at that time. This book and the many articles Jenny has written have caused considerable anger within my family circle. People's opinions of us are based on what she has written, and we are particularly concerned about the spurious views of those who have only met the family a couple of times or not at all.

My children, now adults, have minds of their own and are very strong personalities, as Jenny has now found out. They dismiss with contempt some of her theories about their family set-up and motives. We did express our annoyance before - and Jenny knows this (letter dated October 22nd 1982) but not much has been said publicly before as in her book, and subsequent articles Jenny puts a lot of emphasis on suggestion - mainly mine on my children. The article in this magazine was the final straw. I'd like to point out some of the erroneous statements in it and correct them.

Jenny says:- "We didn't know the UFO saga was but the start of one of the greatest fairy tales the twentieth century has ever known." Barry tackled Jenny about this face to face, pointing out the implications of such an expression. Her reply, not given then (she said she was caught off guard) came in a letter dated November 4th 1986. It was "my dictionary

definition says 'small elemental creature with powers of magic, and folktale when coupled with tale'. Our dictionary definition is:- 'unreal or incredible story - falsehood.'

Jenny says:- "I felt reasonably confident there were sociological factors at work. The younger children wanted to 'get in on the act'." As I've pointed out there was no 'act' to get in on, and how would she know? She only met the younger members of my family twice - Darren once - he was not impressed.

Under the heading 'Self Deluded Fantasies', Jenny tells you "I did not include comment about the social structure of the family, or much else that emerged from my discussions with Dr. Shirley McKiver and Dr. John Shaw." We were enraged that she had taken personal family information to these people! When she told us she was writing a book about us, she said in a letter (July 28th 1980) "there are bound to be a few times when you could claim 'I never said precisely that.' Such re-constructions are not meant to be precise, just convey gists." Needless to say, her analysis, and that of these strangers, WAS precise! Her letter told us "The last quarter of the book will be devoted to 'what does it mean?' This will include correlation with other cases, and the thoughts of those involved (Andy, Graham, Martin) and considerable emphasis on your own feelings and comments. It is important for us to set out all your



views correctly. We have no intention of implying slant or belief from our comments. It is emphasised throughout the book that we accept your testimony and we shall not try to dissect you or it, or create fancy hypotheses to explain it." As you can see, there is no mention of the case notes being hawked around sociologists or psychologists. We do not think Ms McKiver is particularly qualified to pontificate on a family she has never met, anymore than we would dissect the motives that directed her to occult practices within the Order Of The Cubic Stone. John Shaw who Jenny says in 'A C' wished to remain anonymous, but whom she has since named in various articles, has proved elusive. She says he is a psychologist at Manchester University. Although he was kind in his judgement of us, we think he was wrong to do it. We cannot find him.



Next to the 'Eye Of Fire'. Yes, Jenny, we did think that you had forgotten the review you were meant to be doing! Jenny considers it odd that we didn't tell her what was going on. The answer's obvious. It was none of her business. Why should she feel so aggrieved at not being involved in the Meonia quest? It seems our oh-so-credible investigator wanted to be part of things.

Why didn't we show Paul the stone? Were we obliged to? From the moment he entered our house (and that as a favour to Jenny) he made his attitude to ufology and ufologists clear! The most charitable thing that can be said is that he was not sympathetic to the subject.

That we were aware of some fanatical interest of Paul's in "The Lord Of The Rings", and that Phillip s and Keatman also knew of it is a complete fabrication. They had nothing to do with him and didn't harbour any burning desire to find out where his fanaticisms lay! Jenny says:- "When he heard the claims, he didn't want anymore to do with the case, and I had to promote 'A C' on my own. I cannot say I blame him." That statement is disgraceful! Paul parted company with Jenny for far more personal reasons than us and we strongly resent her using us as an excuse to explain his departure from the scene.

Now allow me to play ufologist, and deal with the three lights that Jenny makes such a noise about. I quote:- "The thing decidedly odd concerns the charging up of the stone at the third light. This was at the Avebury stone circle in Wiltshire. It was September 1980 and we were well into writing our book. We had gone to the Farnborough air show and were setting off on the long trek home to Warrington. Suddenly we observed three yellowish white globes of light line up into a triangle. We both saw them clearly and at the next service station worked out that they had been on top of the Avebury stone circle. I did think that they may have been parachute flares and asked Probe and Scufori to look into them. They found no explanation, save that they might be wing lights from a hercules plane. There is no way on this earth that they were that. Had they been, it

# CENTRE



Chatham Disc




Rainforc



1956 "Frogmen"



Humanoid



Stafford 'Saucer' 1977

**EXTRA**

would have fallen out of the sky, as it was standing still, and would have hit us on the head, as the spacing would have put the 'plane right on top of us. Three lights seen at the site where the stone was later charged with the third light? Sounds like we were partially involved in the quest. Or else the team invented the location of the third light based on our story, because we naturally told Marion Sunderland immediately we returned home."

I state categorically that I have no recollection of Jenny telling me of this incident. If she had, I would not have been burning the telephone wires telling anyone about something we regard as a non-event. The suggestion that the team invented the third light is dispicable. Is it possible that Jenny is making a massive error in her attempts to link her three lights to something that gets her 'in on the act'?

Now many people credit the Avebury megaliths with special properties, but wrenching themselves out of the ground, marching across Wiltshire, re-arranging themselves on the M4, then going back up again is a bit much! Come come, were the lights over the M4, or were they over Avebury? If it was Avebury, how can Jenny see so far in the dark to work out such a precise location?

Perhaps the lights covered all 8.25 miles. If so, a UFO of such gigantic proportions would have caused the traffic on the M4 to grind to a halt with everyone looking upwards in wonder.

Shouldn't witnesses be clearer than this? Where's the evidence? Did they talk to other witnesses?

It looks most emphatically like Jenny's three lights have no connection what-so-ever with the third light of knowledge in 'The Green Stone'. Well we can all make mistakes, can't we? By the way, Paul Whetnall denies ever having seen them! (Letter Feb. 13th 1983).

In her summing up of the 'three lights' that may or may not have been over Avebury, under the heading 'Hoax' Jenny says "I do not know which version of the truth applies here, but it may be crucial." Yes, it is crucial. Has a hoax been perpetuated, and if so by whom? Where does the truth lie? Do UFO investigators have a monopoly on truth?

Jenny then tells you she was shown 'the blue stone'. She was shown a stone. It was not 'the blue stone'. Her disclosure of the existence of this stone I regard as unethical and downright irresponsible. She was shown it in the strictest confidence. I impressed upon her the importance of this. Thanks to her, the stone has to spend most of the time in a bank, not where it should be. Oh yes, Jenny, it cuts glass, and no, Jenny, there won't be a book about it.

Such glaringly bad errors, omissions and manners from a Ufologist? Would they be so tolerant with witnesses.

What price credibility? And whose?

UNIQUE SOUVENIR BALL PENS

These ball pens denote 40 years of the UFO phenomena and the 25th Anniversary of BUFORA. Ideal as small gifts or help publicise the Association with them! Each side carries a separate caption, blue on a white background. Unusual click-action retractable point. Only 45p each plus 14p post and packing. Available at meetings or from: Lionel Beer, 15 Freshwater Court, Crawford Street, London W1H 1HS.



## Booklook..... Reviews

### GENESIS SEVEN by L. FARRA

Hardback 127pp  
Review by Nigel Smith

The plot is this: Earth was visited 5000 years ago by an expedition of seven flying saucers each with a crew of seven, under the command of an archangel. Not only did they design and initiate civilisation, they have occasionally destroyed it, have constantly monitored our progress and despite having the offer of a summit conference recently turned down by the Americans, are known by all the major governments of the world. Also thrown in for good measure are King Arthur, Noah, The Maya, The Dogon, The Basque Separatists, Zimbabwe, Easter Island, Babylon, Atlantis and the Seven Sisters Road.

Now all of this could well be true but it is hardly original and L Farra provides no more evidence or insight than any of his predecessors. Much of his information has supposedly come via medium Gerry Sherrick from a variety of spirit guides ranging from that ubiquitous and ever popular red indian to Tom Lethbridge himself and you either believe it or you don't. Although Sherrick has a good reputation on more mundane matters, there is nothing he says that can't be found in the 200 or so books listed in the bibliography; Berlitz, Blavatsky, Von Daniken, Velikovsky, Brad Steiger, Edgar Carce - all the old favourites (with the exception

of Jenny Randles) are here. Even Tom Lethbridge has little more to say than 'keep up the good work'.

L. Farra's real passion is, and is hardly surprising considering he is an accountant, numbers. At least half the book is taken up by cataloguing all the occurrences of the number seven in mythology and religion, and the extent to which it is achieved is staggeringly impressive. Unfortunately is breathtakingly dull and often unsubstantiated. In one instance he asks, "can it be a coincidence that there are at least six places called Seibenichs in Germany, and a Sevenoaks in Kent?" well, yes, it could be actually.

All we really learn in the end is that God was a tall white man with a long beard and a staff and came from another planet. Haven't I heard that somewhere before?

**Genesis Seven** is available from Psychic Sense Bookshop, 1 Antique City, 98 Wood Street, London, E17 3HX. £6.95 including postage.

### FATIMA....A close encounter of the worst kind. by David Barclay

Paperback 198pp illustrated.  
Review by Jenny Randles.

Most of you will not have heard of Yorkshireman , David Barclay, unless you have read his book reviews in places such as 'The Unknown'. He quit his job two years ago to write UFO books, and this is the first, long promised, fruit of his labours.

You may also not have heard of his publishers, and I as a professional writer myself must admit that I haven't either. I suspect that they are a home-brew outfit, and there are plenty of indications of that from the terrible gaudy red and yellow blotch of a cover, the waywardly inconsistent light/dark shades of the print, and the so-called 'photographs'. They appear to be very poor quality photocopies which resemble nothing so much as one of those psychological games where you are supposed to guess what the picture represents when all the fine detail that might inform you has been removed.

These (hardly minor) quibbles aside, what about the book itself? Well, it is cheap, and it is a nice change to see a new, young writer from Britain producing a book on the UFO subject. In the main David Barclay does a good job. He reads well, makes his points effectively and argues in a tone that is reminiscent of John Keel. Indeed Keel and Jacques Vallee seem to be particular heroes of his, and from this it is not too hard to deduce the flavour of the theories that lie behind this story.

That story is interesting. it is set in 1917, when a group of young Portuguese children are ordered by the 'virgin' to make several visits to a local grove, where on the same day every calendar month, the same strange little glowing lights in the sky manifest. After issuing prophecies about the future of the earth, a great miracle is promised for the final October appearance. Not surprisingly, nearly 100,000 show up, from religious diehards to sceptical journalists. Sure enough the miracle happens. The sun dances in the sky!

This is a true story, of course, and moderately well known, but this is the first attempt in the English language to set it into a UFO context. I will not spill the beans as to exactly how Barclay proposes this, as it is best followed from his own arguments. But however much you agree or disagree it is presented in a lively and interesting manner.

Suffice it to say that the 'virgin' might not have been 'Our Lady' after all..and what would YOU call a silvery disc of light that glowed like the sun but swooped down low from the heavens, before sailing gracefully and silently into the sky?

Your mind will also doubtless ring lots of little bells when you see reference to a rain of white particles dropped onto the grove from above. These dissipated into nothing before they touched the ground. If you are still bemused you

might consider looking up  
'Angel Hair' in UFO  
encyclopedias.

This is in many senses a classic contactee story, which even fits quite remarkably into the years ending in 7' pattern, which has dominated the UFO scene from 1947 through to 1987. If a big event took place in 1917...we might wonder what lurks in the history books for missing 7' years of 1927 and 1937.

We have needed a study of the Fatima case in English, and on the whole David Barclay seems to present the mystery very well. I have some reservations however. There is no index, which is a considerable omission given the number of things being discussed. But there is a good bibliography. This does tend to illustrate, mind you, that the book has been cobbled together from already published religious tracts. Not a surprise, though a little disappointing. And I am left vaguely worried about how accurate some of this transposition of material might be.

One also rather hopes none of the ideas are based on the many photographs in the text, since they so resemble ink blots that only a good psychologist could interpret them.

FATIMA...A close encounter of the worst kind is available from Mark Saunders publications, Austin Close, Irchester, Northants. NN9 7AX. £2.95.

#### UFO'S...CHRISTIAN RESEARCH OF AERIAL PHENOMENA.

Review by Gaynor Sunderland.

This particular issue of early Autumn last year, concentrates on reviewing three books; Communion by Whitley Streiber, Intruders by Budd Hopkins and Light Years, the controversial story of Eduard Meier.

Turning their mind to Communion first, they give a brief account of Streiber's story, and then go on to explain that what really happened was that he was having an encounter with demons...justifying this because the bible quite clearly states that "Satan claims the right to interfere with the lives of unregenerate men, and he has transferred this right to his legion of demons". So, there you have it, mystery solved.

An analogy is then drawn between Intruders and the story of Noah, because Noah was unlike a normal son. Intruders, part of which describes a young girl being artificially inseminated by aliens, is described as stretching credulity beyond belief.

The review of Light Years continues in a similar vein, and the article itself finishes by warning us that these 'evil emissaries will continue to do their work under a cloak of deception.'

Now of course everybody is entitled to their own opinion, but this kind of

Continued on Page 23.



## ARE UFOS "BASIC" OR "INCIDENTAL"?

by Manfred Cassirer

Manfred follows on from his recent article in the Bulletin and discusses further connections with the UFO phenomenon and psi anomalies.

Once in a while it may be a good idea to go to the roots of the UFO enigma for a really close look at what it has to offer that others haven't. In putting everything on the line one should be careful to distinguish between what is mere assumption and what is apparent fact, between hypothesis and hard data. The former is presented by the ET fantasy, which some accept as a self evident truth rather than science fiction. Meanwhile, it may well be true that our subject is kept alive and commercially viable by faith in visitors from outer space, adjunctively travelling along imaginary laylines. I have elsewhere argued against this (1), and need not repeat the objections which are so widely appreciated.

What then of the phenomenology? This is all there is to go on, and it is idle to speculate about the 'whence' (Mars; the Moon; or even the sun!).

The late and lamented Dr E.J. Dingwall "was intensely interested in the UFO phenomenon, and regarded it as probably the most important areas of anomaly research of our time." (2). This, then, is the considered verdict of one of the world's foremost authority, a man without equal in his time.

Confining oneself to the 'down-to-earth' factual parameter, it soon becomes evident that they are of no exclusive property. A cluster of data is attached itself to the observational reports of 'flying saucers' over the last forty years or so, if not earlier. Few are news to serious students of anomalies, while some are very old hat indeed. Small wonder then that the Sage of Hastings was fascinated by our subject in spite of or, (more likely) because of its intractability when it bears such uncanny (and hardly accidental) resemblance to his own life-long interest (psychic research).

At Congress '87 Jenny Randles among other things discussed "the actual energy associated with UFOs. This put me in mind of the 'energy' implicit in psychic manifestations with their often almost identical physical and mental effects. Are the sightings which are so fond of subdividing according to their supposed proximity to us incidental only, and is the energy displayed for our apparent benefit the basic essential element or driving force for some obscure purpose; or is it perhaps no more than a 'wild' forteen 'talent'?

If so, the lights and configurations which are so

puzzling to the percipients are conceivably the spectacular manifestations (or decoys?) of some unfathomable power occult power in the same way as Dingwall's familiar phantasmagorical friends who, on close inspection, are often distressingly insubstantial. Both UFOs and apparitions are at best semi-physical and successfully evade capture or even registration by mechanical means, such as photography.

Jenny Randles singles out the presumed EM effects on cars that are stopped and stalled coincident (though not always so; 3) with sightings. What causes the interference in the first place? Falla admits in his valuable report that it, "does not answer the question, 'how does a UFO cause vehicle malfunction?'" If they are mechanical devices of advanced intelligence or technology, the problem is somehow reduced in magnitude, though by no means even than solved; but this assumption has to be rejected for the majority of cases. As applied to simple forms of transport the syndrome is no novelty since it is well attested from the pre-mechanical age (4). The EM dimension is therefore not of the essence, the idea suggested that its manifestations are plastic and neutral rather than concrete, capable of assimilation and adaptation to a variety of disparate apparently unrelated syndromes. Present day obsession with technological systems may only serve to distort the problem: seventeenth century scholars were as happy to interpret in

accordance with their ideas derived from demonology.

"Physiological effects" can also be considered from more than one point of view. In a previous age it was thought that witches both harmed and healed. Hurt by their act of malevolence, you consulted a 'white' witch or a 'cunning man' who pin-pointed the culprit in a crystal, and relieved your symptoms by counter-magic. By scratching your adversary's face so as to draw blood, you were made whole; just as by burning a chicken or pig the other animals became immune (5). Reginald Scoot, in the 16th Century ridiculed these ideas. UFO encounters can "damage your health", says Jenny Randles. The reverse of the coin is less in evidence, though there is the justly famous case of healing of Dr "X" (Vailey).

Alleged radiation effects are explicable as psychologically as psychosomatic. We are in the dark about what triggers off Close Encounters, and how and why, but know of their often severe implications. It is only too obvious that the whole field of psychology with its altered states of consciousness (ASCs; J.Randles' "Oz Factor") pervades the whole gumut of human experience. This includes the controversial paranormal parameter, and to the "UFO prone" is truly to be "psi-conductive" (1).

Things in or from the sky disguised as space-craft can be compared (as above) with apparitions as the respective hall-marks of two disparate

disciplines; they may, in actual fact, be apparitions. In addition, the former often conceal a peculiar species, an entity that lacks credibility as a biologically functioning organism posing as an astronaut (1). This phoney spaceman is only marginally more convincing in his up-to-date gear than the old fashioned and discredited bogeyman (demon; devil), but is endowed with a certain unearthly neutral ambivalence that renders him, per se, neither intrinsically good nor bad, beneficent or malignant, since either aspect of his persona may emerge or demand depending on the scenario. As to the UFO, it may be subsumed under the heading of 'luminosities', as the vast majority are nothing more substantial than obscure lights (6). But strange inexplicable lights are just as much associated with the paranormal sphere in a variety of contexts. Odours are also common ground, as are auditory aspects (1).

A group of effects, finally, embracing teleportation and levitation must be included in this study along with the alleged assaults inherent in the mythology of various anomalies.

To sum up, it is not suggested that there is no distinct Gestalt peculiar to the diverse configurations that are manifesting in a number of guises, actioned by an underlying dynamism but rather to warn against a naive acceptance of the "facade" at its face value. The apparent common origin fails to support the conclusion (in some

quarters) that UFOs are "hostile" rather than "serious business", and some features may be interpreted as pointing in the opposite direction - if indeed anywhere. Iterfacial study brings to light a measure of commonality that is otherwise effectively obscured and all too easily perverted.

#### REFERENCES

1. "Towards a PSI/UFO Interface". JTAP, April 1984 ff.
2. JSPR April 1987 164 f.
3. Falla, G., Vehicle Interference Project BUFORA 1979.
4. BUFORA Bulletin May 1987. 6 ff.
5. Gifford, G., A dialogue Concerning Witches and Witchcrafts. London 1593.
6. Hynek, J.A., The UFO experience, Corgi, 1972.

REVIEWS... cont. from page 23.

indoctrinatory paranoia is, to coin a phrase, stretching credulity beyond belief.

The reviewer of the books, one J.R.Church (and that's no joke), talks about similar stories occurring in the Bible, but apparently that's alright for them. Ezekiel may have seen the wheel, but it must have been a good one because it's in the Bible. What a close-minded way of explaining the phenomena.

Presumably, if the Pope saw a UFO, it would be a sign from God, not the Devil at all!

# Feature

## POSSIBLE CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUE 'UFO' REPORTS


by Robert Moore.

Robert continues his theories on this topic.

### (3) ELONGATED UFO'S

#### BASIC CONFIGURATIONS:

A horizontally orientated tube with rounded or flattened ends. Occasionally the sides of this form are said to bulge outwards ("Cigar-like"). Surface often featureless.



(a) Ratio of occurrence: There are about 2 nighttime reports to every 1 daytime report.

(b) Most common colour of form: With daylight reports the colour is often reported to be silver or dark. 1 in 4 daylight reports are apparently an object with a non-metallic colour. The nighttime sightings tend to

nighttime sightings tend to report the object as a yellow, orange, red or pink colour (although there is no clear pattern to this). 1 in 3 objects is described as darkish-hue in form. In half of the reports the object is said to be self-luminous or glowing, the other half refer to a form luminated by apparent 'body lights'.

(c) Colour of body lights: White, red, green, blue, orange or combination of all...with no clear pattern.

(d) Sounds emitted by UFO: About 4 in every 5 describe a SILENT object. 1 in every 5 reports describe the object as emitting a hissing, buzzing or crackling sound; again with no apparent pattern.

(e) Manner of appearance and disappearance: In all reports the form or object was seen by chance alone. Sighting often ends with UFO moving away at rapid speed (often horizontally).

### (4) SPHEROID UFO'S.

#### BASIC FORM:

A luminous ball-like form, or, less often a metallic non-luminous object.

(a) Ratio of occurrence: There are around 10 nighttime reports to every 1 daytime report.

(b) Most common colour of form: Daylight reports tend to have a metallic sheen (ie. aluminium-like). The nighttime reports have colours red or orange, white or blue, with other colours (or combination of other colours) occasionally appearing. All nighttime reports involve observations of self-luminous forms (object often described as being akin to a 'ball of fire').

(c) Sounds emitted by UFO: Around 15 out of 16 reports describe a silent object. No clear pattern with regard to sound emitting forms. (Ticking and whooping sounds were alleged in the 2 reports which involved a sound emission).

(d) Manner of appearance and disappearance: The object in all reports was again seen by chance alone, and the sighting often ended by UFO moving away to various speeds either horizontally or vertically.

#### **(5) LITS-TYPE UFO'S.**

##### **BASIC FORM:**

Apparently a small light emitting body described as either being "star" or "aircraft" like.

(a) Ratio of occurrence: This UFO form seems to be exclusively nocturnal.

(b) Most common form of colour: Nearly always white. Other colours such as red, yellow or blue (or coloured combinations) occasionally appear. All objects of this type are reported to be self-luminous.

(c) Sounds emitted by UFO: About 3 or 4 reports describe a silent object. Those involving sound are said to be humming, hissing, roaring, crackling or whistling noises apparently produced by UFO.

(d) Manner of appearance /disappearance: Again observed by chance alone. Sighting often ended by UFO moving out of sight, often horizontally and at various speeds.

#### **(6) TRIANGULAR, HEMISPHERICAL AND CONICAL FORMS.**

These final three UFO form categories are briefly summarised, as the few reports discovered in this project referring to these shapes are insufficient in number to allow for a detailed analysis of this data. However the basic appearance is described below:

**TRIANGULAR:** Seem to be observed mostly at night. The basic appearance of this form is of a dark shape with a light at each point. These lights appear to usually be white or red in colour. A small number of reports refer to a clearly observed self-luminous (glowing) triangular form.

**HEMISPHERICAL:** Also most often observed at night. This form is reported to resemble a half-circle with its flat edge downwards. Most reports refer to a self-luminous object.

**CONICAL:** Reported to be observed night and day. This UFO form can either have its apex pointing downwards

(spinning-top like) or upwards (cone like). Daylight reports refer to an object with a metallic appearance. Nighttime reports refer to a self-luminous object, red or orange in colour.

#### (7) OTHER FACTORS.

The following section defines (or attempts to define) alleged UFO attributes which are not exclusively linked with any apparent form.

(1) **ROTATION:** Discoid forms are most often associated with this motion. Most reports refer to a form whose lower section was observed to spin. Discoid forms which resemble a convex lens could have both its upper and lower sections revolving simultaneously, even in different directions. Rotation appears to be an uncommon UFO characteristic, occurring in approximately 1 out of 40 cases.

(2) **ROCKING:** This is described as a slight side to side wobble made by airborne UFO's. Was more common in reports of discoid and ovoid UFO's than any other. Rocking appears to be an uncommon characteristic of UFO'S (approximately 1 out of 30 reports).

(3) **TRAILS :** Trails were most often associated with reports of elongated and discoid forms. Most trails were mainly reported at night, often luminous in appearance. Colours being red, white or blue/white. Emissions of sparks were also reported (although, less often than trails). An emission of the above kind appears to be an

uncommon 'UFO' characteristic (1 in 19 reports).

(4) **SMELLS:** The most common smells reportedly emitted by a UFO were described as being akin to sulphur burning, nitro-benzene, burning gasoline, formaldehyde or 'oppressive' odours. This particular characteristic appears to be uncommon with only 1 in every 30 cases involving odours.

#### CONCLUSION

Although the above UFO forms share some similarities with each other, one or two types appear to possess attributes exclusive to themselves (such as red colour often associated with nocturnal spheroid forms). Whether these indicates a separate origin for one or more of these UFO forms, only further research can determine. However, such a study should only use the highest possible quality data available in order to avoid the problems inherent in the sample used for this project. I also advise that any follow-up study working to the approximate guidelines outlined in this article should use a much larger sample, say 400-600 reports selected at random. Other parameters could also be included such as duration, speed and apparent motion. The possible list is endless.

It would be interesting to observe how results of such a study would agree or of course, disagree with the finding presented in this paper.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The UFO Handbook A Hendry, Sphere 1979.  
The Hynek UFO Report Dr J Allen Hynek, Sphere 1978.  
Challenge to Science Dr J Vallee, Tandem 1974.  
UFOs: Interplanetary Visitors R Fowler, Prentice Hall 1974.

Also including a wide selection of magazines.



## IMPORTANT NOTICE

Would all members please note that the BUFORA Lecture that was scheduled for 2nd April 1988 will now be held on 9th April. This is due to the Easter holidays. Apologies for any inconvenience.

## MEMBER NOTICE

Any BUFORA members who live near Canterbury, Kent and travel to BUFORA lectures and are able to offer a lift there and back please contact: Michael Hudson, 71 Knight Avenue, Canterbury, Kent, CT2 8PY. Will split costs.

## FOR SALE

Commodore C16 computer with 1531 Datasette and books. As new. £80.00 o.n.o.

Enquiries to: BUFORA, Box No 15, 16 Southway, Burgess Hill Sussex, RH15 9ST.

BUFORA Bulletin Number 27

## RESEARCH REQUEST

### LAKENHEATH / BENTWATERS REVISITED

Martin Shough is an independent investigator who is conducting his own retrospective investigation of the legendary Lakenheath / Bentwaters radar-visual case of 1956. Ufologists everywhere recognise this as being one of the most interesting and significant incidents in British UFO history and the results of Martins research will be available to BUFORA.

If anyone has any relevant information or insight into this case apart from what has been widely published, then please write to: Nigel Smith, 125 Boscobel Street, London, NW8 8PS

## FOR SALE

Storage Heaters, brand new and never assembled. Four only £50.00 or offer. Can arrange delivery.

Enquiries to: BUFORA, Box No 18, 16 Southway, Burgess Hill, Sussex, RH15 9ST.

## RESEARCH REQUEST

Philip Mantle and Andy Roberts are conducting collective research involving British abduction cases. If you have any material that would be of use or would like to assist in this research then please write to: Philip Mantle, 106 Lady Ann Road, Soothill, Batley, West Yorkshire, WF17 0PY.

Page 27

# readers ~ write

---

Sir,

It is most unfortunate to note how secretive the NIC has become of late. It has been YEARS since the minutes of any meeting have been published in the BULLETIN. Therefore one could state that its membership is being kept in the dark about vital issues, general developments and projects. One also must point out that BUFORA investigators are unable to influence any council decisions. Even at NIC meetings investigators no doubt feel intimidated from making any suggestions...as more than half those attending are council members! The only suggestion regarding investigation matters which are heeded are those made by a member of council! I have yet to hear of the suggestion of a humble investigator being taken up!! It is very worrying to note this, for how could one check unethical behaviour perpetrated by a council member??

A final note...One wonders why Steuart Campbell was dismissed from BUFORA's investigation network? BUFORA by holding code revision meetings, have admitted that its original code of conduct was flawed. So is it any wonder that Steuart objected to subscribe to it?? Steuart's rejection of this code was no shame on his part (does an investigator such as he NEED to prove that he is ethical?) And whilst on the code of conduct-it is strange how suddenly this code became compulsory, when once it was optional. Again, this ruling was made WITHOUT consultation with BUFORA's investigators.

from Robert Moore.  
Somerset.

## Editor's comment.

I have been involved in active investigations for approximately eight years, being a member of the NIC since its inception. Therefore, I feel that I can speak with authority when discussing the stewardship of this committee.

As many investigators are aware, the NIC acts as an autonomous body within BUFORA, with its own budget to use at it sees fit. After each NIC meeting, minutes are sent to all accredited investigators, highlighting points raised and reporting on the current status of major investigations and projects. And there are projects that the NIC are working on; such as the IFO sensitivity index, computer indexing of case reports and a major project involving the Storm and Tornado Research Organisation to name but a few. Despite this I do accept that there may have been an editorial oversight regarding the relaying of NIC minutes to the membership.

In recent years NIC members have also become members of the Council. Surely, new recruits to Council do not suddenly become changelings, losing the ability to go out and investigate cases if they so wish and thus earning the right to put their views forward at an NIC meeting? I for one will certainly continue to do so as I feel it is important.



To be frank, you insult the intelligence of the investigators who do attend NIC meetings by saying they are intimidated by council members. I have never seen an act of intimidation (before, or after I, myself, became a Council member) at such meetings. I also resent the fact that you call investigators humble, especially when most of them have no need to be.

With respect to the Code of Practice and Stuart Campbell, there were many NIC meetings where his status was discussed. His involvement with the updating of the code was always requested. Unfortunately, after several attempts to resolve the situation amicably, it was the NIC that terminated Stuart's AI status, not the Council. As far as ethics are concerned, why should we presume that any single researcher is above the code, it has been proved in recent times that there are some very unethical investigators acting in their own interests and not those of the witness.

The subject of ufology must continue to strive for professionalism, especially with respect to an investigator's conduct with witnesses. That is why the Code of Practice is compulsory, and I for one welcome it.

Dear Sir,

Received and read BUFORA Bulletin this morning and thought you might like some

'feed-back'. It was certainly the best issue for as long as I can remember. The Strieber article/interview was outstanding and put Strieber's views/beliefs/experiences into perspective far more concisely than communion itself ever did. Earthlight aficionados will be very pleased at what he is saying as he seems to be independently confirming the theories which have been slowly growing over the past ten years. The rest of the mag was excellent too, well balanced and always thought provoking and intelligently written. What more can I say, well done! There is hope for British ufology yet.

from Andy Roberts.  
West Yorkshire.

#### Editor's comment.

Thanks, Andy, for your vote of confidence. We will continue to do our utmost to maintain the high standards we have so far achieved. All credit to the researchers who submit their work for inclusion in this magazine.



Please note that any correspondence for inclusion in the Bulletin should be addressed to the editor at:

4 Ivy Road, Leyton, London,  
E17 8HX.

BUFORA PRESENTS A NEW PUBLICATION

THE UFO WORLD '87

Compiled by Jenny Randles The UFO World '87 catalogues the major work carried out throughout the world. Highlighting research work from Australia, Canada, Chile, France, Italy, Mexico, Poland, Scandinavia, United Kingdom and the United States.

There are also summerized cases studies and an article by David Clarke and Andy Roberts.

The UFO World '87 is a must if you want to keep up to date with the Global UFO situation. Price £1.50, £1.75 overseas.

Order your Copy NOW! from BUFORA (Pubs), 16 Southway, Burgess Hill, Sussex, RH15 9ST

BUFORA CORRESPONDENCE COURSE

To supplement the investigator training workshops, that are organised during the year, a correspondence course which will cover basic investigation techniques and procedures will be available shortly to members interested in active UFO research.

Enquiries and constructive comments to:

BUFORA (CC), 16 Southway, Burgess Hill, Sussex, RH15 9ST

BUFORA POSTAL LIBRARY

As a service to members, BUFORA has set up a new postal library, with a wide range of UFO books, including most of the old 'classics'.

The books will be made available against a returnable deposit (less postage costs).

Any member interested in this service please write to:

BUFORA (PL), 16 Southway, Burgess Hill, Sussex, RH15 9ST

# PHENOMENON

A NEW BOOK EDITED BY JOHN SPENCER AND HILARY EVANS

COMMISSIONED BY

**bufora**

IN HARDBACK £11.95 Available 21st April 1988

IN PAPERBACK £ 3.95 Available 17th March 1988

A COMPLETE ANTHOLOGY OF INTERNATIONAL UFO RESEARCH

AVAILABLE FROM: BUFORA (PUBS), 16 Southway,  
Burgess Hill, Sussex, RH15 9ST.

OR FROM ALL GOOD BOOKSHOPS

## MEMBERS NOTICE

Is there anyone with an open mind, interested in starting a UFO investigation network for the **West Country**. If so please contact: Robert Moore, 83 Church Road, East Huntspill, Highbridge, Somerset, TA9 3NG.

Also, can a Mr Gordon Wood and Mr John Walker please contact me at the above address as they have expressed an interest in the forming of such a local group.

## Diary

9th April

BUFORA LECTURE **Mind and Magic**  
Speaker **Guy Lyon Playfair** at  
the LBS. Please note revised  
date.

7th May

BUFORA LECTURE **UFOs and Astro-  
nomy**. Speaker **Philip Taylor** at  
the LBS.

4th June

BUFORA LECTURE **The Reality of  
the UFO Phenomenon**  
Speaker **Martin Shough** at the  
LBS.

BUFORA Lectures are held every first saturday of the month at the London Business School, Sussex Place, Outer Circle, Regents Park, London, NW1. The LBS is only a five minute walk from Baker Street tube. Lectures start at 6.30pm. All are welcome. Full lecture programmes are available from BUFORA (LP), 16 Southway, Burgess Hill, Sussex, RH15 9ST.

If you have an event that you wish to publicise on this page, free of charge then please write to the editor (Diary) 4 Ivy Road, Leyton, London, E17 8HX. Three months in advance.

# UFOs 1947-1987

## THE 40-YEAR SEARCH FOR AN EXPLANATION

COMPILED AND EDITED BY **HILARY EVANS**  
WITH **JOHN SPENCER**  
FOR THE **BRITISH UFO RESEARCH ASSOCIATION**

UFOs 1947 - 1987 is an anthology of commissioned articles compiled for BUFORA by Hilary Evans and John Spencer, to commemorate the 40 years of Worldwide investigation of the evidence for unexplained aerial phenomena. Commonly termed UFOs.

Contributions represent a statement of current informed opinion about UFO sightings, reports,

the wide variety of related subjects including: selections of significant cases which continue to defy explanation and a wide range of current thinking relating to the origin of the UFO. Available from BUFORA, 16 Southway Burgess Hill, Sussex, RH15 9ST. £12.50 including postage and packing. Essential reading.