


# BUFORA

## JOURNAL

### In this issue

UFO conference hits it off in Hanley  
UFOs or FFPs  
First Liaison Officer's report

Volume 4 Number 8 July/August 1975



Published by The British U.F.O. Research Association

# **The British Unidentified Flying Object Research Association (Founded 1964)**

Incorporating the London UFO Research Organisation founded 1959 and the British UFO Association, founded 1962.

## **Officers**

*President:* Dr Geoffrey Doel MRCS, LRCP, DMRE

*Vice-Presidents:* L G Cramp ARAES, MSIA; R H B Winder BSC, CENG, FIMECHE;  
G F N Knewstubb CENG, MIERE, AINSTE, FBIS; Hon Brinsley Le Poer Trench

## *NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE*

*Chairman:* R Stanway FRAS, MBA

*Vice-Chairman and Public Relations Officer:* L E Beer

*Honorary Secretary:* Miss B Wood

*Honorary Treasurer:* A West

*Assistant Secretary:* Miss P Kennedy

*Subscription Secretary:* Mrs A Harcourt

*Research Director:* A R Pace FRAS

*National Investigations Co-ordinator:* K Phillips AMSERT

*Research Projects Officer:* C F Lockwood BA, DIP ED STUD

*Journal Editor (co-opted):* Richard Beet FRAS, AFBIS, MAIE(DIP)

*Committee Members:* P Wain; R J Lindsey; C A E O'Brien CBE, BA, FRAS, FRGS; N T Oliver

## *OTHER OFFICERS*

*Librarian:* Captain E I A Mackay

*Publicity Secretary:* Miss C Henning

*Historian:* J Cleary-Baker PHD

*Assistant Editors:* Miss Carol Godsell; M G Prewett AFBIS

*Group Liaison Officers:* A C Fossey; J Porter

## **Aims**

To encourage and promote unbiased scientific investigation and research into UFO phenomena. To collect and disseminate evidence and data relating to UFOs. To co-ordinate UFO research on a nationwide scale and to co-operate with people and organisations engaged on similar research in all parts of the world.

## **Membership**

The annual subscription is £2.40, \$6 in the USA and Canada. Membership is open to all who support the aims of the Association and whose application is approved by the National Executive Committee. Application/information forms can be obtained from any officer.

*Continued on inside back cover*

---

# BUFORA JOURNAL

Volume 4 Number 8

July/August 1975

---

Editor: Richard Beet  
Deputy Editor: Arnold West  
Assistant Editors: Carol Godsell  
Michael Prewett

Editorial Address: 316 Pinewood Park  
Farnborough  
Hampshire  
GU14 9LJ

## Contents

- 1 One small step for BUFORA
- 3 Laser to UFO TV system
- 4 Review
- 5 Vice-Chairman's Column
- 6 Uforum
- 9 National Conference
- 11 BUFORA hits it off in Hanley
- 12 Conference Personalities
- 15 . . . and, in France
- 16 Northern News
- 17 UFOs or FFPs
- 19 Liaison Officer's Report
- 20 Research Department News
- 24 People

## One small step for BUFORA

It would be easy to devote this editorial to columns of self-congratulatory waffle about the success of the two-day National Research and Investigations Conference held at Hanley in May. It is true that nearly all delegates were impressed, not only with the organisation, but also with the quality of the material presented at the conference.

But the conference is only one small step for BUFORA if its ideals to become established as a leading scientific organisation are to be realised. As I stated in the last issue, BUFORA is now on the map. But so are many under-developed nations in the world. And it will take many years before countries such as these are accepted as a force to be reckoned with. They will need money; they will need scientific and technological know-how; they will need diplomacy; and most of all, they will need time.

BUFORA's acceptance in the world's scientific community will not occur overnight. We must continue to build on our experiences—and learn from our failures.

*continued overleaf*

*BUFORA Journal* is published six times a year and is available to members only, or by exchange. The British UFO Research Association does not hold or express corporate views on UFO phenomena. Contributions reflect only the views of the editor or the authors. Copy for publication in the *Journal* must be sent directly to the editor and not to any other BUFORA officer. Original material is copyright to both the contributor and to BUFORA. Requests for permission to reproduce material from the *Journal* should be addressed to the editor.

## ONE SMALL STEP

*continued from p1*

Let us look again at the qualities required by a developing nation—they can equally be applied in our situation.

Firstly, money. BUFORA probably has more than most UFO research organisations, but still far too little to conduct a great deal of in-depth research. Still, we can be consoled that many inventions and discoveries were established on minute budgets.

Secondly, know-how. Here we are comparatively rich. We have an excellent Research Department, manned by extremely competent staff, and backed up by specialists from within our own membership.

Thirdly, diplomacy. In the past this has not been our strong point. Many criticisms about our remoteness in our relationships with other organisations have often been justified. Indeed, even in this issue of the *Journal*, it seems that we have been guilty of ignoring a request for help by one of the organisers of a UFO conference in France. There may well have been good reasons for this, but if there are, then we have failed to communicate them.

But of course, it is easy to criticise. BUFORA's strength lies in its ability to ride rough-shod over hurdles which would destroy lesser organisations. There is much to be said for the careful step-by-step approach generally employed by BUFORA.

Finally, there is the problem of time. There is of course, no way of knowing how vital this factor is in the study of the UFO phenomenon. But for the peace of mind of all of us who study this elusive subject, the sooner we find an answer, the better.

RICHARD BEET

## London Lecture Dates

The dates for the first two lectures in the 1975/76 season at the Lecture Theatre, Kensington Central Library have now been finalised.

On 6 September 1975, we shall be pleased to welcome Bernard Delair, Secretary of Contact UK and editor of *Awareness*. Bernard, by profession an executive with Macmillan International, was at our recent conference. His expertise and experience in ufology will no doubt be of great value to all of us.

The following meeting will be held on 4 October 1975. Further details will be available on the Lecture Card, to be issued with the next *Journal*.

## Remember the flying crosses?

The next generation of passenger jets may be a flying 'X' with a movable wing that crosses the fuselage at a 45 or 50 degree angle so one tip points forward and the other backward.

You think such a weird craft would be off balance and spin into Earth with a couple of hundred passengers?

Not so. Despite the tradition of the straight-wing design of a First World War span, or the outstretched wing image of a bird, it turns out that at speeds of 500 to 900 mph, an X design is far and away the most efficient.

At NASA's Ames Research Centre, the X design is being pushed by Robert T Jones, an imaginative theoretician, credited with development of the swept-back wings of conventional jets.

The oblique wing, Jones explained, is more efficient because it develops less drag at the wing tips and the point where the wing crosses the fuselage.

*Credit: Evening Standard (London).*

# *Laser to UFO TV communication system demonstrated in US*

A laser transmitting and receiving system for experimental communication attempts with UFOs was demonstrated to the press on 12 June at the Project Starlight Research site in the hill country northwest of Austin, Texas, USA.

Project Starlight is a research division of the Association for the Understanding of Man, Incorporated—US non-profit research organization.

## *HELICOPTER*

Electronic light-detecting components similar to equipment which some scientists reason may be aboard UFOs, was taken aboard a helicopter. The equip-

ment was used to detect, video monitor and record the 'symbolic display of intent' laser TV programme beamed from the ground.


## *FIELD EFFECTS*

Transmission of TV via laser to an *aircraft* has never before been accomplished, so far as the Project staff has been able to determine. So apart from the potential significance toward communication with any UFO intelligencies, the experiment has been a technological first.

Magnetic and Electrostatic disturbances observed around UFOs might prevent

*continued overleaf*

*The UFO|Vector Laser Transmission-Reception Console on its remote control, TV-aimed pan and tilt head. Remote control is a precautionary measure so that the operator can be in a safe position in case a UFO should respond with a laser containing an infra-red (hot) component.*



# Review

## Ufology—New insights from Science and Common-sense

by J M McCAMPBELL

Jaymac-Hollmann, 1975

\$3.95

If you think this is another American 'they're-coming-to-get-us' UFO book, then you are in for a big surprise, for 'Ufology' must be one of the best books on UFOs. And for once, it is well presented and printed. The author has brought together a wide range of scientifically based subjects, all relevant to the study of UFOs. There are plenty of facts and figures to supplement the writing which is well-organised into short sections each dealing with a particular topic, thus making the book an ideal reference work. And although there is no index, the book is suitably divided into chapters and sections.

Despite his attempt to be impartial, the author's own ideas do come across as being in favour of ETH. This, perhaps, is acceptable, but my only real complaint is that he does not name cases or witnesses, and this sometimes makes the book difficult to follow. His concluding remarks about research and investigation are worthy of note.

On the whole, the book is best described as an organised conglomeration, yet is very readable indeed. I would grade it along with some of the UFO 'classics' of the Hynek and Vallee calibre. I look forward to publication in the UK.

MIKE DEAN

'Ufology' is, at present, only available in the USA; but details can be gained either from Lionel Beer or Mike Dean, (c/o Wirral UFO Society or the Northern UFO Network).

This review was originally published, in a shorter form, in the WUFOS magazine "Skylink."


## LASER TO UFO SYSTEM

continued from p3

normal TV signals from reaching such an object. The 'UFO/Vector' system uses laser to overcome those obstacles. UFO/Vector is an acronym for: 'UFO/Video Experiment Console for Transitional-Overt Response.'

Another important feature of the UFO/Vector laser is its built-in capacity to determine whether there is any degree of bend of the laser beam caused by UFO field effects. Persistent reports describe UFOs bending spotlight and headlight beams, but to physicists the reported phenomenon remains puzzling.

Another piece of sophisticated electronic equipment was demonstrated: the precision monitoring systems recording magnetometer model 100. Designed specifically for UFO field-effect research, the device is thought to be able to detect and automatically record UFOs as far away as twenty miles. Even the minute magnetic effects of steel taps on shoes walking within about 100 feet can be detected.



"It's nothing compared with the mark on our front room carpet that the wife's Denture Cleaning Acid made when she spilt it last week!"

# Vice-Chairman's Column

LIONEL BEER

## The Tungus saga

A popular 'pot-boiler' among writers of UFO and Fortean style books, is the mystery of what caused the Tungus explosion in Siberia in 1908. A recent work to discuss this subject in some detail was *UFOs Behind the Iron Curtain* by Ion Hobana and Julien Weverbergh. Orthodox Soviet scientists are not very happy with the way-out theories purporting to explain the explosion—one of the more popular being that the atomic motors of an alien spaceship disintegrated when the spaceship entered the earth's atmosphere. One recent and highly improbable theory postulated that the devastation was caused by a stray 'mini black hole' from space! An official Soviet press release issued in March says that the latest data obtained by Soviet scientists has confirmed that the Tungus meteorite was the nucleus of a small comet. In a peat bog near the centre of the catastrophe, a profusion of once-molten glass spheres with bubbles of gas inside was found at a depth of ten inches. The bubbles in some spheres were filled with carbon dioxide or hydrogen sulphide. The spheres were unusual as the silicates included in them had a high content of silicon and alkaline metals. The comet hypothesis is said to be the only one which explains the bright nights, and the glow of the sky observed for several days after the event, was probably caused by the scattering of the comet's tail. Under the pressure of the sun's rays, the particles of the tail deviated to the west of the site of the fall. Much of the comet, which exploded on entering the atmosphere, could have liquefied or vapourised. The resulting formation of an aerosol cloud could have been carried by stratospheric winds in a north-westerly direction. Consequently the bulk of the material might not have settled at the centre of the explosion as was previously thought, but in the direction of the wind and at a distance of a hundred or more

kilometres. And it is in this direction that the scientists intend to look. Erich von Daniken *et al* please note!

## Jeane, Jeane . . .

Recently I happened to be glancing through a paperback kindly sent to me by Mr F V Hughes of Betws-y-Coed, called *A Grain of Mustard*, first published in 1969. It is co-authored by clairvoyant, Jeane Gardner, and tells of Jeane's ability to prophecy national and international events, such as the death of Robert Kennedy. The book is mainly concerned with Jeane's—or her guiding voice's—compulsion to build a Cathedral of Prayer for people of all faiths that would be a place of comfort and cure. Religion is wasted on me, but like most I was curious to read her predictions for future world events. In what appears to be a supplementary chapter, she answers questions regularly asked by enquirers. The first question turns out to be: "Are there really such things as flying saucers?" Presumably to which the 'voice' answered "Very definitely." Followed up by "Are these vehicles piloted by creatures from other planets?" (A definition of 'other planets' is not given). Answer: "They are. There is life on other planets, not with the same physical characteristics as earth people, but with high intellect." "Why do these creatures not attack us?" Answer: "They are curious; they do not wage warfare."

Now as a confirmed ETV hypothesis supporter, I thought to myself, maybe I have stumbled on something? But wait, what did I write in *Lionel's Litter*, No. 3 towards the end of 1967? "*Jeane Dixon, the celebrated Washington clairvoyant, who foretold the death of President Kennedy, made a number of predictions for 1967.*" Of flying saucers she said, "*They will make even more numerous appearances in*

*continued on p14*

# UFORUM

## Some advice for Liaison Officers

Dear Sir

Now that BUFORA has succeeded in putting into practice at least some of its proposals for closer liaison with independent UFO organisations, the question must now arise what is to be done with this new situation?

The most important development is the appointment of the Group Liaison Officers. They should be under no illusions about the magnitude of their task and although in many cases they will be left free to act as they think best, *they must* themselves forge strong links with the other regional BUFORA officers—that is, the RICs.

The chief problem at present is the divergence of separate sets of information. The RIC and his investigation team follow up one set of cases whereas, the local groups (usually unrelated) follow through a separate set of cases. The task of the new Liaison Officers must be to bring these closer into line—and to do this they must get the co-operation of the RICs. Ideally what should occur is that the RICs still act as the central administrator at the head of an investigative team, *but* that they should now feel this team has grown to include local groups within their region. Hence the RIC and Liaison Officer in conjunction should be able to ensure that information on *group* investigation reaches BUFORA and also that local groups are used in conjunction with local investigators to follow through BUFORA investigations.

Fortunately in the North this situation is easy to achieve because of NUFON and its close links with both the Liaison Officer *and* the RICs. Most group investigation work *already* reaches BUFORA. Let us hope a similar situation of integ-

rated co-operation can now be achieved nationally.

The way is now open to set out on major projects of a size which could not previously be contemplated. The resources and manpower of the groups can now be harnessed with profitable results. Liaison Officers should maintain a close link with the Research Department and so put the material and physical resources of the groups at the disposal of these for various projects. This material *added* to that already possessed by BUFORA will help to make the projects far more comprehensive. What about also taking on the task of compiling a report on *major* British cases and landings? There is immense potential here for a study of great value to Ufology.

Let us view this new development as a step in the right direction. But it must be viewed as co-operation, not an amalgamation. In this spirit, I believe *all* groups, certainly those in NUFON, would be prepared to help do something *positive* towards solving this puzzle of the UFO phenomena.

JENNY RANGLES  
48 Park Drive  
Manchester  
M16 0AH

## Support for the Loch Ness 'football'

Dear Sir

I refer to the 'Sighting Summaries' article in the last issue of the *Journal* (Volume 4, Number 7), in which there was an item headlined 'Loch Ness football.' It described a 'red/orange football-shaped object' seen near Loch Ness.

In an article 'Goal! It's a UFO!' which appeared in the *Sun* sometime in January this year, it was stated that 'Dozens of people claim to have seen an orange coloured 'flying football' land on the River Dart, Dartmouth, in Devon—and take off again.'

It is possible that the object seen in Devon was a weather balloon (apart from its taking off again). But the sighting of a similar object near Loch Ness lends support to a UFO explanation. Can a weather balloon travel at 200 mph?

Another interesting fact is that the 'football' was travelling along the loch—presumably parallel to it. Glen Mar, in

it a fake? This imbalance is only accentuated by such highly emotive comments as "Come on now—who was the spokesman—. . . RUBBISH." If the SCAN investigation was as thorough as they say, this certainly does not show too well in the resultant article.

It is nonsense to compare the 'Marchant' UFO to the 'Adamski' UFO. This only

---

**Readers are invited to comment on any article appearing in *BUFORA Journal* or on any other relevant topic. Letters should be kept as brief as possible. The editor reserves the right to publish and to extract from letters where necessary. Letters of some length may be considered by the editor to be suitable as features.**

---

which Loch Ness is situated, is a large fault extending across Scotland. This lends support to some Doomsday prophets who predict world-wide earthquakes and who point to the fact that many UFO sightings are seen near faults in the earth's surface. These prophets claim that UFOs may be expecting large earthquakes and are keeping an eye on these faults.

Yours sincerely

G P HUGHES  
18 Picton Terrace  
Dyfed  
SA31 3BX

## The Marchant Sighting

Dear Sir

May I comment on your article in the March/April edition of the *Journal* about the Marchant sighting at Bournemouth. The SCAN report seems to have a streak of rash credulity running through it. Perhaps this is to serve the sensationalism of the article, and I agree that it is necessary to portray UFOs in a vivid way in an attempt to persuade the public that UFOs exist. But it only damages our cause to advertise uncritical gullibility in a willingness to believe in such controversial phenomena.

There is a singular lack of a search for alternative explanations—for instance, is

forces the suspect nature of the sighting and discredits it by association. Christopher Evans in his recent book *Cults of Unreason*, states on page 149 that: "The late Frank Edwards, a pro-saucer journalist who was, however, immeasurably scornful of most contactee stories, believes that the (Adamski) spaceship was the top of a canister-type vacuum cleaner, made in 1937—a device most unsuitable for extended space travel." We might as well compare the Marchant UFO to a Rowntrees jelly, as to the Adamski craft. BUFORA has built on the mass of cold logical evidence to prove the existence of UFOs. Facts speak for themselves. People will not be helped by the treatment of this particular case.

Yours sincerely

DAVID STRICKLAND  
49 Wentworth Road  
Swinton  
S Yorks S64 8JZ

*Editors note: I can sympathise wholeheartedly with Mr Strickland. It was precisely because of their presentation that I offered to condense SCANs original feature. But they were insistent, both on the telephone and in correspondence, that no editorial alterations were to be made. I*

*continued overleaf*

UFORUM  
continued from p7

*complied with their request and said so at the beginning of the item.*

*There were two reasons for going ahead with this feature. Firstly, that we must all learn to accept the quite natural enthusiasm of our less experienced colleagues. This article demonstrates an enthusiasm we probably all pass through at some time. And secondly, as Allen Hynek has said, "Somewhere, among the noise, there is a signal." The Marchant sighting can teach us all something, if not about the origins of the UFOs, then about ourselves.*

### Conference praise

Dear Sir

I would like to take the opportunity of using your correspondence columns to

thank the organisers of the recent two-day conference at Hanley.

The speakers were of the highest calibre, the hotel was good and the organisation ran smoothly. In fact, I find it difficult to fault the conference at all. I'm sure that it would compare very favourably with any of the many professional conferences I regularly attend.

BUFORA really does seem to be getting more and more professional in it's approach. I only hope that these standards can be maintained.

Yours sincerely

OMAR FOWLER

Chairman, Surrey Investigation Group on Aerial Phenomena.  
149 Mytchett Road  
Mytchett  
Camberley, Surrey.

## A CHALLENGE TO SCIENCE

### *BUFORA's first scientific report*

'A Challenge to Science' is a 42 page preliminary report about a UFO event recorded on 16mm cine film on 26 October 1971, near Banbury in Oxfordshire.

By means of recorded interviews and investigations carried out by BUFORA investigators, Charles Bowen (editor FSR) and Julien Hennessey the report sets out all the known facts about a UFO sighting observed and filmed by a television outside broadcast team.

The report includes correspondence between the investigators, the Ministry of Defence, the USAF and the then Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence, Antony (Lord) Lambton.

Only 200 copies of this valuable report have been printed. The cost to BUFORA members is £2.00 + 15 pence post and packing. To non-members the report is available at £2.50 + 15 pence post and packing.

Write to:

Roger Stanway, MBA, FRAS  
Chairman BUFORA  
Old Brook Cottage  
Whitecross, Houghton  
Staffordshire

# *National Research and Investigations Conference*

## *10 to 11 May, 1975*

Most meetings devoted to UFOs in the past, certainly in this country, have been concerned with proving that UFOs exist. We in BUFORA feel that we must now follow the lead of organisations and individuals abroad, and, accepting that the UFO phenomenon is a real one, we must specify ways in which we can attempt to quantify some of the characteristics of the sightings.

The three main areas in which study is required are firstly, the UFO itself (and occupants, if any), with temporary environmental changes, which occur at the time of the sighting; secondly, the more permanent traces or residues which may be left, and thirdly, the data obtainable from the witnesses (given consciously or unconsciously).

While BUFORA's progress in research has been very modest so far, the reasons for delay are probably obvious. Insufficient finance, no full-time workers in the Association, lack of time on the part of the most enthusiastic members, and, perhaps most important of all, lack of guidance by the most highly qualified scientists in the application of our efforts to the most productive aspects of UFO Studies. Members of UFO societies in other countries have been much more successful.

### *THE SPEAKERS AND THEIR SUBJECTS*

*Professor John Taylor*, of King's College, University of London, is probably best known for his appearances during the past two years in television programmes concerned with the phenomenal Uri Geller. It is doubtful if anyone has not heard of Geller, but so many conflicting and ex-

aggerated accounts have been published that we were extremely fortunate in having Professor Taylor to come and discuss the Geller Phenomenon in its true perspective.

Our objective in inviting Professor Taylor was not to suggest that we all accept that there is a direct link between Geller and UFOs (although Uri himself refers to this), but to ask whether there is the possibility that the techniques of research appropriate to the study of the Geller Effect can be used by the UFO researcher. Professor Taylor must command the attention of all scientists, whatever the field of physics or mathematics on which he writes. He has published over 100 articles in numerous scientific journals and an impressive list of books. He has also been a student of the UFO phenomenon for a number of years, as his readers will know.

Apart from his academic achievements, having held Chairs of Physics at Southampton and at Rutgers, he trained as an actor, and has written, performed, and directed dramatic productions. Professor Taylor has, in short, the highly gifted, but flexible mind, which is so necessary in the study of the UFO Phenomenon.

*Leonard Cramp* a BUFORA Vice-President, is well known in the field of UFO research as an aeronautical engineer, who has applied his extensive knowledge of his subject to the analysis of the characteristics of UFOs, as they have been photographed and reported for a number of years. His publications include *Piece for a Jigsaw*, and *Space, Gravity and the*

*Continued overleaf*

*Flying Saucer*, in which he showed that the Adamski and Stephen Darbishire photographs could be related by means of orthographic projection.

Dr Joachim P Kuettner, formerly of the ESSA Research Laboratories, now a leading meteorologist of the World Meteorological Organisation, Geneva, was appointed Chairman of the UFO Subcommittee of the AIAA, the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, which in December 1968, in the *Journal of Astronautics and Aeronautics*, issued the following statement: *The committee has made careful examination of the present state of the UFO issue and has concluded that the controversy cannot be resolved without further study in a quantitative scientific manner and that it deserves the attention of the engineering and scientific community.*

This was stated in the month before the release of the Condon Report, which so misled the majority of people that the valid scientific comments by Dr Kuettner's Committee were overlooked by many scientists, especially abroad. We are all fortunate that the AIAA did not overlook the Committee's courageous objectivity.

Dr Kuettner has examined all the major UFO reports from all parts of the world, and his experience of this phenomenon through the study of photographs and witness accounts is unrivalled among scientists.

C A E O'Brien, CBE, is known to all who attend the Kensington BUFORA lectures for his thorough and extensive analyses of the UFO Phenomenon. 'Tim,' for many years a leading scientist and businessman in the oil industry, is a geologist and author of a number of publications dealing with the structure of the earth. He has also studied ancient monoliths in East Anglia, and is a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society. He is the BUFORA Evaluations Co-ordinator.

Trevor Whitaker, an ophthalmic optician who, since he was a founder member of the Yorkshire Branch of BUFORA, has been an outstanding investigator for BUFORA for many years, told us a great deal about the art as well as the science of obtaining information from witnesses. Many valuable sighting reports are ruined by bad handling of a witness. Trevor seems to be able to extract data where many would give up the search. While some of these abilities are personal traits, we can all learn some of the techniques which we need in the pursuit of the truth about UFOs.

## ***What the papers said!***

*Modest to good press coverage helped to spread the word about our conference, although, predictably, some saw the event less seriously than we would have wished.*

*'The Guardian' on 10 May used a typically punny headline, 'People may be seeing things.' Although the right message was conveyed using well-worn cliches, the paper couldn't resist the old adage, 'I've just seen a flying saucer—the wife threw it at me!*

*The 'Daily Mail' was much bolder than 'The Guardian.' It led with the screamer 'Stand by for Invaders from Space!' But despite this, and despite misleading comments about UFO predictions, the item was not as bad as the headline would have us believe.*

*'The Daily Telegraph' in a short news item on 12 May gave a sensible and balanced synopsis of the conference aims. Local newspapers were good in their reporting too, and the best reports appeared in the Staffs 'Evening Sentinel,' Wolverhampton 'Express and Star' and the 'Birmingham Post.'*

# A Success— BUFORA hits it off in Hanley

*Impressions by CAROL GODSELL*

The first BUFORA conference was received with great enthusiasm and I think that few people would not agree that it was a success. Already, people are talking about what should be done next year.

The choice of Professor John Taylor as first lecturer was excellent and really got the conference off to a good start. It gave a particularly good impression to members of the public and other groups. Professor Taylor's lecture was fascinating, particularly in view of his connection with Uri Geller. In spite of some interesting slides, it would have been interesting to hear more about the British experiments that have been carried out with spoon-bending. I felt that there were a number of topics which could have been covered in question time if questions had been shorter and more relevant.

## ENTERTAINING

Leonard Cramp, BUFORA Vice-President, produced an entertaining lecture. But he had some problems with models which had been designed to demonstrate certain physical laws. I found particular amusement in the table tennis ball trick. Dr Kuettner was also a most interesting and entertaining lecturer, but I am still slightly perplexed at his final conclusion. I am not certain whether he wanted us to concentrate on statistics or unbiased research into investigations as they occur. It certainly appears that these days there are no lack of statistics from all parts of the world. One amusing point, at least to some of the audience, was when the poor slide operator could not put a picture into focus. The incident nearly threatened the whole lecture, but the situation was saved when an expert in the audience managed to solve the problem and the lecture continued.

*Mars—the search begins*, was a very informative film and highlighted our activities in outer space. There are experiments aboard the 'Viking' spacecraft to look for evidence of life on Mars.

Tim O'Brien presented substantial evidence which gave weight to the argument that UFOs may still come from within the Solar System. Tim concluded by saying that Venus may well be the most likely planet.

Charles Lockwood, Tony Pace and the Staffs Branch of BUFORA should be congratulated on their programme. But I have one small reservation. I don't

*Continued on p14*

---

*Below: Editors meet at the conference. Left is Charles Bowen, FSR editor with Journal editor Richard Beet.*





## *Conference Personalities*

*Pictures by OMAR FOWLER*

*Top left : Roger Stanway, BUFORA  
Chairman, opens the conference.*



*Top centre : Second day. A group  
discussion in progress. Richard Colborne  
poses a question as Trevor Whitaker  
(right) listens pensively.*

*Far right : Professor John Taylor.*

*Bottom left : An expressive Dr Joachim  
Kuetner, Chairman AIAA UFO sub-  
committee.*

*Bottom right : David Viewing from the  
Extraterrestrial Society.*





feel that my full attention was paid to Tim O'Brien, a) because of tiredness and b) because of an uncomfortable seat—and you can read that whichever way you like!

My initial disappointment that our continental lecturer from SOBEPS could not attend was fully compensated by David Viewing's talk about the work of the Extra-terrestrial Society. He and his colleagues had obviously devoted a lot of effort both in terms of time and money. His slides high-lighted the versatility of the monitoring equipment.

After coffee we dispersed into three groups to discuss different aspects of BUFORA's research projects programme—Projects Audi, Dataval and Trace. I do not feel that sufficient time was allowed for this section of the conference and therefore may not have been as productive as it could have been.

Here I must comment on the lunch which followed the group discussions and we can only learn from experience, but I feel further discussion was hindered by inadequate seating and I felt extremely awkward and ungainly trying to talk, eat and grip conference papers between my knees—all at the same time. And my pasties are usually a little cheaper!

## TWO LESSONS

Most delegates felt that the conference had been a great success. It was agreed that we must make every effort to continue communication between ourselves and others interested in ufology.

BUFORA can learn from the experience of the conference in two ways.

The first thing that struck me was that we were amateurs, desperately looking for scientific recognition, but doing nothing except talk. If we could only get down to some good hard research projects and

come up with something outstanding or at least constructive, it would give us more status in the UFO world. Lets hope our Research Projects programme will help us to achieve that goal.

Secondly, our ideas are good, but we are not a united force. At least the conference proved that we can exchange and improve ideas. We all had an opportunity of exchanging information and I, for one, found these exchanges entertaining and useful.

I think also that the Hotel was a good choice and it gave us ample room to go off and chat if we wanted to, eat when we wanted to and drink when we wanted to. Even the rooms were well equipped and comfortable and the luxury of telly in bed was a great delight.

So—lets have less talk and more action!

But it was a good conference and I enjoyed it very much.

*Editors note: Proceedings from the conference should be available later this year.*

---

## VICE-CHAIRMAN'S COLUMN

continued from p5

1967, (the U.Ks flying cross flap maybe?), but they do not come from outer space. They are unmanned devices (satellites?) being tested by the U.S. and Russian governments." In the same issue I mentioned that Samuel Shenton of the Flat Earth Society said that they were machines operated by people from Atlantis . . . Let's toss for it. Heads Jeane wins, or tails Jeane wins . . .

---

## Personal Column

**Large** semi-detached older style house, 5 minutes station and new town centre. £14,000 or offer. Write to: A West, 16 Southway, Burgess Hill, Sussex RH15 9ST or phone Burgess Hill 6738 (STD code 044 46).

# . . . and, in France . . .

Five thousand visit UFO Congress

Report by BRYAN JEFFERY

For six days in April, the town of Morlaix, in Northern France was host to the first 'Congress International d'Information Publique sur les Soucoupes Volantes'—International Public Information Conference on Flying Saucers.

There were 5000 visitors, including large school parties, who came from throughout France to visit a massive exhibition of photographs, diagrams, sketches and explanatory panels. They were able to watch audio-visual montages and documentary films and there was a panel of experts on hand to answer questions.

Represented at the Conference were the French organisations GEPA and LDLN, together with the Belgian SOBEPs, the American APRO, the Italian National UFO Research Commission and the Cambridge University UFO Group. The more 'colourful' elements of the saucer scene had previously been ruthlessly excluded. So the information presented was objective, serious, and, it appears, convincing. The younger visitors went away enthusiastic, their elders disturbed. The nationwide press, radio, television and even cinema coverage was refreshingly devoid of ridicule and belittlement.

## SUCCESS

All things considered, the conference was a success, and important conclusions may be drawn.

Firstly, the public *are* interested in a serious presentation of the UFO phenomenon.

Secondly, the media *can* be persuaded to take the subject seriously, provided they are presented with a sufficiently interesting case.

Thirdly, individual UFO societies are so riddled with petty jealousies, bureau-

cratic asphyxiation and pseudo-science, and their representatives of so low a calibre, as to render conclusions one and two extremely difficult.

And finally, those scientists who have made a name for themselves by their interest in the UFO phenomenon are in general too inflated with self-importance and too anxious not to affect their status with their colleagues to participate in the task of public information.

## BUFORA CRITICISED

Who initiated the conference? Just two people, myself and Mlle Marie-Francoise Lepeltier, teacher of electro-acoustic music at the University of Brest. A committee of two, doubling as poster-stickers, panel-writers, scene-shifters, projectionists, ticket sellers, animators of debate and authors and printers of an introductory booklet on the UFO phenomenon. In the later stages we were aided by a few friends. Assistance from established organisations and regional cultural agencies was negligible. And BUFORA's contribution, despite much time and effort on my part, specious promises on their's and several months notice was zero.

Major research must be undertaken, must be funded, and must be 'respectable'—yet how can this latter aim be achieved while the principle public sources of information on UFOs are the pulp saucer-and-spaceman literature and the 'balanced' media presentations, in which such paragons of objectivity as the BBC's parlovian pundits are allowed free rein.

Instead of wallowing in a millerian faith in the magical scientific community, should we not be trying to alter the general climate of opinion on this subject? . . . which is where we came in.

# Northern News

by JENNY RANDLES

Currently, the full results of an attempted week-long publicity campaign co-ordinated among NUFON groups by Ken Green of WUFOS are not known. The week selected was the one leading up to the BUFORA Conference at Hanley, since it was felt that this might give an added boost to the whole subject. A skeleton press release was drawn up as a guide to groups who asked their members to inform the local media that a sensible investigation body existed in their area. Certainly during the period both WUFOS and RIGAP were interviewed by Radio Merseyside and Radio Blackburn respectively and MUFORA were invited to do a follow-up on Piccadilly Radio to their successful phone-in show of February last.

This latter programme went out live on 16 May with Jenny Randles and Pete Warrington on the spot to answer questions on UFOs. Several sighting reports came through, most of which were given possible explanations by the panelists. The opportunity was used to answer the many public misconceptions about UFOs, such as the percentage of unidentified cases, the lengthy history of sightings and the fact that the proven existence of a genuine *unknown* phenomena is not the same as the proven existence of extra-terrestrial vehicles. There were a couple of interesting reports—such as an alleged ‘telepathic’ communication with mysterious voices connected with the sighting of lights in the sky and a most strange report from 1956 of a hovering object over Catterick Army Camp. Once more the popularity of such programmes was shown when the switchboard was overburdened with calls.

## SIGHTING REPORTS

NAPRA discovered the sighting of a

farmer and his wife on an isolated farm at Gwalchmai, Anglesey. The date was 19 January 1975, and the time, 00.15. Their attention was caught by a huge cartwheel of flame which seemed to fill the window. They watched it through opera glasses as it moved slowly on a west-south east path. It was visible for six minutes and seemed to be rotating and emitting smoke from the rear. There was no noise. Eventually it turned into a reddish glow which faded to white and then cut off instantaneously.

## SILVER CIGAR

What may be an even more interesting case is being followed through by RIGAP. This occurred on 20 February 1975 at 20.30 on the moors near Haslingden (the scene last November of a multiple witness case). The only witnesses known to this new report are schoolboys, but of seemingly high integrity. They observed the slow passage of a silver elongated cigar shape with a bright white light plainly visible at either end. It moved silently on an east-north-east path and was very low down (elevation 10 degrees), though clearly a solid object in the hazy surroundings. The light of the object seemed to flicker slightly. The boys quickly made a dash down the hill with their backs turned but caught a glimpse of the object as it moved out of sight over a hill. All the time it was within a few hundred feet of their position and they were able to ascertain that its size was small.

The unlikely possibility of an aircraft, which as yet has proved negative, is further decreased since a light aircraft was seen shortly after following a similar course, but the sound, shape and navigation lights made this easily distinguishable.

If this reflects genuine UFO activity then we may hopefully anticipate a further development—perhaps a landing with direct physical tracings.

# Unidentified Flying Objects or Future Flying Projections

A new theory from  
CAROL  
GODSELL

The following is only a summary, based on preliminary ideas which require a great deal of further thought. I mentioned to Richard Beet a few weeks ago after a BUFORA meeting in Kensington, that I had some ideas for another theory for UFOs and he told me to write it down so that it could be published in the Journal. After talking to a number of people at the May Conference, who knew nothing of my ideas, or even that they were helping me with my theory, I came to even more positive conclusions than I had before. I thank them all very much for their suggestions.

When I first became interested in UFOs, which must have been at least 15 years ago, I thought of them only in terms of what we now call the *Extra-terrestrial Hypothesis* (ETH).

It was not until I joined SIGAP and BUFORA over three years ago that I began to learn of other hypotheses such as the psychical or parapsychical. Although I have dabbled in ESP and similar fields I am still rather sceptical and not wholly convinced. However, I do believe in ghosts and other manifestations, but without any religious connotations of any sort.

I believe that ghosts are the misplaced projections of living bodies. These can be stimulated psychically or electromagnetically depending on where they come from. This may, you think, have nothing to do with UFOs, but how many times when interviewing a person who has reported a sighting do you also come across someone (the same person) who has also seen a ghost. This is quite common, if only investigators took the trouble to ask. The most ordinary of people see ghosts and likewise the most ordinary people see UFOs and it occurs to me that they (that is ghosts and UFOs) have something in common that the people who see them must be *sensitive* in some way.

I then began to find other similarities

between the two experiences. Here are some examples.

Many landing case reports involving occupants state that the creatures did not appear to have feet or be touching the ground—a ghostly characteristic.

Many reports mention a shimmering effect of the being, or the craft, or that the image is not totally clear—this also applies to ghosts. But then we assume that ghosts come from the past. That they are often beings who have met unpleasant ends. But do they *all* necessarily come from the past?

## VISITS

To accept that ghosts occur at all is to accept something outside the physical world as we know it. If we can accept visits from the past, albeit accidental—why can we not also accept visits from the future, perhaps *not* accidental.

Many science fiction authors propound the possibilities of beings from the future discovering time travel and visiting not only their future but also the past. Say that in 2000 years time, perhaps not even that far advanced, man creates a form of time travel possibly only limited to the Earth. He can at will return to the Earth hundreds of years before and, for the most part, do it unobserved.

*Continued overleaf*

It would be feasible that tours could be arranged for groups of people wanting to see certain ages, just as we organise trips to places of interest today. Just as we have aircraft today maybe the future means of transport is a craft which is saucer-shaped. The fact that there could be many designs for these craft would account for the widely varying shapes and sizes of the UFOs reported.

### *SUDDENLY APPEAR*

I have said that for the most part they are unobserved. But on certain occasions perhaps due to slight faults in the equipment or movement of the Earth, they suddenly become visible and aware that they are visible might not they try and alter their course and suddenly disappear as quickly as they appeared. This would account for the many reports of people who say that the object simply disappeared from sight as they were still looking at it. What I am really suggesting is that our descendants have invented the power to project themselves and their vehicles into the past.

### *PRAY FOR PEACE*

Might they not on occasion be tempted to make contact with disastrous results, as they are not physical but pure energy. Might they not attempt conversation and utter such phrases as 'pray for peace.' This may sound fantastic but it has been said recently that science fiction in our increasingly technological age is fast becoming science fact.

All that we see are projections not physical objects. I am not saying that this accounts for all UFO sightings for it is still feasible that ETH is also correct but I personally feel safer in believing that they are our own and not somebody elses.

## **Contact!**

### **Fresh moves to establish firm relations with Contact UK.**

The National Executive Committee ratified a proposal at its last meeting to forge new links with Contact UK, the national UFO organisation based at Oxford.

The scheme, which is to be sent in the form of a letter to Secretary Bernard Delair, will include a proposal for experimental liaison for one year comprising four principles. These are, firstly, to liaise on policy matters; secondly to study investigation methods—this is aimed at providing an eventual national investigation network; thirdly, to establish a flow of information on research matters and finally, to inform members of each organisation of the other's activities.

Part of a continuing process to improve BUFORA's image, the move is seen as the first result of action taken by recently appointed Liaison Officers, Alan Fossey and Jeff Porter.

---

## **MUFORA stage lecture programme**

'A general appraisal of the UFO phenomenon' was the title of the first talk presented by the Manchester UFO Research Association on the occasion of the second Annual Ufology Lectures held on 7 June.

Given by Arthur Tomlinson, BSC, MIEE, the talk was illustrated by the use of 150 slides. In the afternoon, a further lecture was presented by Norman Oliver, BUFORA Committee member and immediate past editor of *BUFORA Journal*. The event was staged at the Renolds Building, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, Sackville Street in Manchester.

# Liaison Officer's Report

ALAN FOSSEY—SOUTH

Since my appointment, I have to admit that progress has been slow. However, there are no grounds for disappointment, particularly as barriers created by lack of contact between BUFORA and other groups have to be removed gently. I have been working along these lines and have found that they can indeed be fruitful. I would say, from recent experience, that discord between groups of all shades of opinion is not so much a result of differing philosophies but of the closed community syndrome.

The job of the Liaison Officers is to bridge that gap. Believe me, in some places the void is treacherously wide and deep! I have written already to many groups in the South and reaction, although limited to about 30 per cent (in the circumstances, quite high), has been favourable and in some instances most pleasing. Many groups appear, in their isolation, to have developed the most frightful ideas about the Association, its activities and intention. The most recurrent of these has been that of absorption. As you know, BUFORA has no intentions of taking over other groups or eating them alive. What would we do with them once we got our hands on them? I address the latter comment to members of BUFORA belonging to other groups, as I am sure you can help to allay their fears. We would hope of course that groups would want to affiliate with us. And in return, we would help them wherever possible within our means.

I must say that the weekend conference in Hanley did more for liaison than any amount of letter writing could achieve. Probably BUFORA's most spectacular event to date, the conference provided an excellent forum for working out our differences. My only complaint was that I came away both hoarse and partially deaf as a result of talking to and listening to

people from many different groups. I established open channels with Leicester Aerial Phenomena Research Group, a fine group of young people attempting to investigate UFO phenomena in the East Midlands. Established for only six months, they have done remarkably well—they even have an office suite in the centre of their city! I also made contact with the Essex UFO Research Group and hope to see them soon to arrange some regular information flow, particularly on a fascinating repeater case they are working on. I spoke, also, to many other groups and individuals, including one group of people with whom regular liaison could have important and valuable implications for BUFORA. More on that another time.

Finally, I would like to make one point which affects us all. It has been said that a man is an island. If we were to work entirely independent of each other, not even the Association would exist and worse, we would find ourselves moving farther and farther from the truth, and far out of range of the UFO phenomenon. We must work together and where possible encourage other groups to work with us. Maybe, together, we will collect sufficient data for the scientists among us to come up with an answer.

---

## ***BUFORA Library in 'mothballs'***

The National Executive Committee regrets that it will no longer be able to offer a comprehensive library service. In a tribute to Ivar Mackay, who has held the library for many years, the NEC issued an appeal to members in the hope of finding a suitable and accessible location. Until such a location is found, the material is to be stored by Treasurer Arnold West at his Sussex home.

# Research Department News

## An Analysis of the Fish Model

(Continued from *BUFORA Journal Volume 4, Number 5, Winter 1974/75*)

(3) Single stars are more likely than multiple stars to have habitable planets. Binary stars, for example, could perturb planets into unstable orbits although such effects would depend upon how closely separated the stars were in the system. The problem is a complicated one, but at present it seems best to favour single stars over multiple systems as better prospects for life.

(4) Massive O to early F stars tend to have high rotational speeds (100 to 230 km/sec) with an abrupt slowdown occurring between F2 and F5, decreasing to only a few km/sec in G stars like our sun. Such slow rotations may indicate planets are absorbing the angular momentum of the star from early F through M. If this is true, it is interesting that the emergence of planetary systems coincides with the estimated cutoff for spectral types suitable for life.

### INTEREST

Ms Fish restricted her selection of stars even further, confining her search ultimately to only single, nonfluctuating, main sequence stars between F8 and K1—her 'Group 1' stars, those with the best chance for producing terrestrial planets with intelligent life. (According to Sagan, F8 is the point where intelligence may emerge). She reasoned that if the Hill story were true and extra-terrestrials visited our solar system and the earth, other stars similar to our sun should be of interest to them. In fact, by reversing the argument, it also was likely their origin star was similar to our sun. Marjorie discovered that about 200 stars within 22 parsecs (72 light years) of the sun lie in the F8 to K1 spectral range.

Marjorie Fish's six-year search yielded only one unique three-dimensional dup-

licate of Betty Hill's star map, and a continuing inspection since then has not uncovered any pattern remotely resembling the original discovery. The match-up includes not only the 12-star network connected by lines but also three background (actually foreground) stars that formed a prominent triangle in Mrs Hill's drawing.

### MAIN SEQUENCE DWARFS

The stars that make up the pattern in the Fish model fulfil the above exobiological criteria. For example, *the lines in the map connect stars that are exclusively the type defined as suited for life*. All 12 stars are single, nonfluctuating, slowly rotating dwarfs residing on the main sequence for life times of from about seven to 30 or 40 billion years, ample time for the evolution of life to take place. Tau Ceti seems to be a special borderline case. It has been listed either as lying between the main-sequence dwarfs and subdwarfs or as a subdwarf. Sagan believes full-fledged subdwarfs would not likely possess terrestrial planets although they might have Jovian-type gas giants orbiting them.

The pattern stars range from F6 to K1. All 12 are 'Group 1' stars (having terrestrial planets with intelligent life) except Tau<sup>1</sup> Eridani, which is F6. This latter star is a member of Ms Fish's 'Group 0,' stars possibly possessing terrestrial planets with *non-intelligent* life. Marjorie feels such bodies would be suitable for colonization or the establishment of bases. One of the most striking features is that *eight of the 12 stars are G types, probably the optimum range for intelligent life*. The so-called 'base stars,' Zeta<sup>1</sup> and <sup>2</sup> Reticuli, are included in this category; they are G2 and G1, respectively. It should be emphas-

ized the two stars are not components of a binary system (they share a common motion through space) and therefore fulfil the single-star requirement for life. Both bodies are quite similar to our sun (G2) in mass, temperature, luminosity, and residence time on the main sequence. Marjorie, it will be recalled, assumed from the beginning that the home star of the Hill's abductors probably would resemble our sun and that they would seek out stars similar to theirs.


Especially noteworthy is the fact that *the pattern happens to contain a phenomenally high percentage of all the known stars suitable for life in the solar neighbourhood.* Employing her own critical standards, Ms Fish found only 12 (5 per cent) of 259 known stars within her 10-parsec model were suitable for life; *five of the 12 (42 per cent) occupy positions in the Hill pattern* (six, if we include the occulted Zeta Tucanae)! Interestingly enough, when multiple stars, probable

variable stars, and stars later than K1 are removed from Sagan's list of 20 nearest stars most likely to have habitable planets within 6.7 parsecs (22 light years), only two stars meet Marjorie's stringent requirements—Tau Ceti and 82 Eridani—and both are in the Hill pattern! (The former object has been the target of at least four radio-telescope searches for artificial signals).

The star pattern fills a volume of space determined by Marjorie to be 48 light years (14.7 parsecs) wide by 48 light years deep by 32 light years (9.8 parsecs) high ( $+1\frac{1}{2}$  light years per side) — a two-thirds cube. *This volume actually contains over 100 stars and yet all the stars within the volume compatible with life are included in Betty Hill's drawing.* This would hardly seem coincidental.

The solid and broken lines allegedly representing trade routes and expeditions

*continued overleaf*



*The diagram above is based on the original sketch by Betty Hill of a map shown to her 'by the leader aboard the ship.' She was told that the heavy lines marked regular trade routes and the broken lines recorded various space expeditions.*

do indeed depict a logical travel sequence from star to star. The routes link Zeta<sup>1</sup> Reticuli with only the nearest stars having spectral classes that favour the emergence and evolution of life — especially intelligence. For the reasons cited previously, all other stellar types appear to be avoided: fast-rotating stars earlier than F2, stars later than K1, multiples, and variables.

Concerning discrepancies between the drawing and the model, Ms Fish feels, and I tend to agree, that these differences are relatively inconsequential and can be justified in a reasonable manner. The drawing, as mentioned earlier, was created under post-hypnotic suggestion, and a comparison with the model demonstrates what would appear to be astonishing accuracy in recalling forgotten details. During a moment of conscious control, Betty erased the Zeta<sup>1</sup>

Reticuli-Gliese 86 line twice before settling on the *wrong* position. *The longest erasure appears to be the correct angle for the Zeta<sup>1</sup> Reticuli-Gliese 86 line while the short erasure is the correct length.* Improving the angle would also correct the angle of the line to Alpha Mensae on the opposite side of Zeta<sup>1</sup>.

Both Zeta<sup>1</sup> and <sup>2</sup> Reticuli are large and widely separated in the drawing probably, according to Ms Fish, because (1) the two stars were located very near the map's front surface and (2) they may have been deliberately dramatized by using a larger scale (on the original map).

### SHAPE

The representation of the background triangle (stars Gliese 86.1, 95, and Kappa Fornacis) is larger than the one in the model. Marjorie believes it was drawn larger because it is near the front surface of the map and would have been quite prominent. Moreover, the shape would have been relatively easy to recall in contrast to most of the other background

### PROBABLE STARS IDENTIFIED BY FISH IN THE HILL MAP

Name	SAO Catalogue Number	Gliese Catalogue Number	Constellation	Spectral Class	Distance from Earth (light yrs.)
Zeta Tucanae	248163	17	Tucana	G2 V	23·3
54 Piscium	074175	27	Pisces	K0 V	34·3
—	167134	59	Cetus	G8 V	52·6
—	037434	67	Andromeda	G2 V	37·5
107 Piscium	074883	68	Pisces	K1 V	24·3
Tau Ceti	147986	71	Cetus	G8 V <sub>p</sub> (or VI)	11·8
—	232658	86	Eridanus	K0 V	36·6
—	167613	86·1	Fornax	K2 V	42·3
—	167697	95	Fornax	G5 V	44·7
Kappa Fornacis	167736	97	Fornax	G1 V	42·3
Tau <sup>1</sup> Eridani	148584	111	Eridanus	F6 V	46·6
Zeta <sup>1</sup> Reticuli	248770	136	Reticulum	G2 V	36·6
Zeta <sup>2</sup> Reticuli	248774	138	Reticulum	G1 V	36·6
82 (e) Eridani	216263	139	Eridanus	G5 V	20·2
Alpha Mensae	256274	231	Mensa	G5 V	28·3
Sun	—	—	—	G2 V	—

stars. Indeed, the other objects were included by Betty simply to show there was a backdrop of other stars.

### EVIDENCE

Marjorie is satisfied any residual differences between the drawing and model can be explained plausibly as due to Betty Hill's recall and sketching ability and to the possibility of somewhat incorrect star positions in the model owing to still inexactly known parallaxes. An important piece of evidence uncovered by Ms Fish, strongly suggesting the map is not a hoax, is the fact that *the background triangle could not have been drawn prior to the publication of the 1969 edition of Gliese's 'Catalogue of Nearby Stars.'* Not only was the star Gliese 86.1 not listed, so far as is known, in any (earthly) star catalogue in 1964 when Betty drew her map, but also Gliese 95 and Kappa Fornacis, their parallaxes imperfectly known in 1964, would not have created the triangle Betty drew on the map. I

checked this out in several of the catalogues. Marjorie used and confirmed the accuracy of her discovery.

In addition, it is improbable Mrs Hill could have devised a pattern of 12 stars, all of which would turn out to be candidates for life; it is improbable she could have had access to the proper star catalogues, and even if she had located them, it is improbable she knew how to interpret them. As the initial investigator of the Hill affair, I happen to know Betty's knowledge of astronomy is severely limited. Zeta<sup>1</sup> Reticuli, the probable origin star, is a faint fifth-magnitude star located in the tiny, undistinguished, southern-hemisphere constellation known as Reticulum the Net. Under favourable conditions nine, and possibly 11, of the 12 stars are detectable with the naked eye. The remainder require binoculars. *To be continued.*

*Credit: A.P.R.O. Bulletin, November/December, 1974.*

## ***Subscriptions to go up on 1 September***

*The standard membership subscription rate is to go up from £2.40 to £4.00 per year on 1 September 1975. Students under 18 and senior citizens will pay £3.00 per year.*

*The increase, the first since September 1972, will apply to both new and existing BUFORA members. It was authorised by the Annual General Meeting back in October 1974.*

*Prompt—or early—payment would ease our administrative burden. Please forward your renewal—and donation, if any—direct to the Honorary Treasurer:*

*Arnold West  
16 Southway  
Burgess Hill  
Sussex RH15 9ST*

*Receipts and membership cards will be forwarded with your next Journal, in an effort to save time and money. Should you require your membership card or receipt sooner, please enclose a stamped addressed envelope with your renewal.*

*INFLATION NOTE: Members are reminded that their current subscription of £2.40 is now worth only 63 per cent of its value in 1972. Put into today's values, the 1972 subscription of £2.40 would now require a rate of £3.81. And with the new rate of £4.00, that's small change.*

# People

We extend a welcome to the following, who have recently been admitted to membership of BUFORA :

## London :

S Bremner, 42 Niton St, Fulham Palace Rd, London SW6.  
G J Conway, 121 Fermain Court, 53 Hertford Rd, London N1 5SY.  
R I Digby, 18 Thaxted Rd, New Eltham, London SE9 3PU.  
M Dobson, 369 Well Hall Rd, Eltham, London SE9.  
J W Fellows, 1 Marqueen Towers, 612 Streat-ham High Rd, SW16.  
Mrs J P Gibson, 32 Lansdowne Rd, London W11.  
C J Lonnon, 15 Lavington Rd, Ealing, London W13.  
Mrs L Moore, 17 Fawley Rd, West Hampstead, London NW6.  
M Withey, 68 Park Rd, Hendon, London NW4 3PH.  
Com P R G Worth, 131 Blackheath Park, Blackheath, London SE3 0HA.

## Home Counties :

A J Andrews, 61 Rosecroft Gdns, Twickenham, Middx.  
H C Aylett, 27 Cambridge Gdns, Hastings, Sx.  
R A D Berelson, 34 Fallowfield, Stanmore Hill, Middx HA7 3DF.  
S F Bygrave, 46 Orchard Rd, E Twickenham, Middx.  
S Edwards, 91 Ravensbury Rd, St Pauls Cray, Orpington, Kent.  
D H Magnus, Woodland Cot, Linkside East, Hindhead, Surrey.  
L Walder, 2A Sturges Rd, Bognor Regis, Sx.  
P Walsh, 103 Ravensbury Rd, St Pauls Cray, Orpington, Kent.  
A P Weston, 118 Lyndhurst Ave, Twickenham, Middx TW2 6BU.

## National :

G Andrews, Kilmanawydd, Llandegley, Llan-drindod Wells, Powys.  
P G Beaugeard, 10 Jardin des Caurreaux, St Helier, Jersey CI.  
A Birnie, 92 Colwell Dr, Witney, Oxon.  
M C Burnett, 64 Fonthill Rd, Kirkdale, Liverpool L4 1QQ.  
P J Clarke, 67 Parkway Crt, Seacroft, Leeds 14.  
Mrs L A Farnell, 2 Links Rd, Marple, Stockport, Cheshire SK6 7NX.  
M Gamble, 187 Bradgate Rd, Anstey, Leicester.  
B Gobourne, 53 Burland Av, Tettenhall, Wolverhampton WV6 9JJ.

K M Granfield, 36 Pinewood Gdns, North Cove, Nr. Beccles, Suffolk  
B R Green, 4 Monkbridge Mount, Meanwood, Leeds 6.  
J Greenwood, 26 Greenland Rd, Weston-s-Mare, Avon BS22 8JP.  
P Grinham, 293 Witcombe, Yate, Bristol BS17 4SB.  
W H Holt, 35 Farmhill Cres, Meanwood, Leeds LS7 2QA.  
T Hooper, 20 Vinny Ave, Blackhorse Est, Downend, Bristol.  
J Knox, 21 Glynn Rd, Larne, Co Antrim, N Ireland BT40 3AY.  
Miss S A Lawrence, 32 Dutton Ave, Skegness, Lincs PE25 3NL.  
I Mellor, 146 Buckingham Rd, Maghull, Liverpool L31 7DR.  
M Moffatt, 142 Frobisher Dr, Walcot, Swindon, Wilts SN3 3HF.  
R Oliver, 97 Owllet Rd, Windhill, Shipley, Yorks.  
M Pryce, The Chateau, Bryn Rd, Aberystwyth, Cards, Wales.  
J Pugh, 43 Lake Rd, Sandfields Est, Port Talbot, Glam, Wales.  
Mrs W Ratcliffe, 3 Spital Lane, Cricklade, Wilts.  
D Reen, 76 Harrington Rd, West Hill Est, Bridlington, N Humberside.  
N Ruparella, 73 Denzil Ave, Southampton, Hants.  
W Skellon, 18 Lansdowne Rd, Flixton, Manchester M31 3PX.  
D H Snapes, 21 Flax St, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffs.  
C Sparrow, 77 Seaward Ave, Leiston, Suffolk.  
I F Street, 10 Copeland Rd, Kirkby in Ashfield, Notts NG17 8BZ.  
R Taylor, 52 Arbury Hall Rd, Shirley, Solihull, W Midlands B90 4PZ.  
G Williams, 25 Bodelwyddan Ave, Kinmel Bay, Rhyl, Clwyd, N Wales.  
B D Williams, 5 Comet Dr, Ditherington, Shrewsbury, Salop SY1 4AY.  
K Williamson, Glenroy, Chapel Lane, Hainford, Norwich NR10 3NA.

## Overseas :

J Brod, 4111 Illinois St, Apt 10, San Diego, Ca 92104, USA.  
B Gontovnick, 1424 Vendome Ave, Chomedey, Laval, Quebec, Canada.  
R Kuzee, St Eloystraat 33, Schoonhoven 2350 (ZH), Holland.

*continued from inside front cover*

### **Advertisements and Public Relations**

Personal column: 2p a word. Display rates: whole page £10·00; half page £5·00; quarter page £2·75. Please send advertising copy and related correspondence to the Vice-Chairman and PRO: *L E Beer, 15 Freshwater Court, Crawford Street, London W1H 1HS. Telephone 01-723 0305*

### **Correspondence**

Send to the Honorary Secretary:

*Miss B Wood, 6 Cairn Avenue, Ealing, London W5. Telephone 01-579 3796 (evenings only)*

### **Subscriptions**

Send to the Subscription Secretary:

*Mrs A Harcourt, 170 Faversham Road, Kennington, Ashford, Kent*

### **Publications Department**

*A West, 16 Southway, Burgess Hill, Sussex RH15 9ST*

### **Librarian**

*Captain E A I Mackay, 5 Pitt Street, London W8*

### **Research Director**

*A R Pace, Newchapel Observatory, Newchapel, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire*

### **National Investigations Co-ordinator**

*K Phillips, 26 Chevening Road, Kensal Rise, London NW6 6DD. Telephone 01-969 8847*

### **Group Liaison Officers**

*A C Fossey, 21 Laitwood Road, London SW12 9QN*

*J Porter, 2 Kingsley Avenue, Whitefield, Manchester M25 6HA*

---

## **BUFORA BRANCHES**

### **Yorkshire**

*T Whitaker, 'Sheraleigh,' 8 Central Park, Wellhead, Halifax, Yorkshire HX1 2BT*

### **Staffordshire**

*P Gregory, 25 Wye Road, Clayton, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire ST5 4AZ*

**with Member Societies**

**" By general acclaim, the best in the world !"**

## **FLYING SAUCER REVIEW**

The international UFO journal

FSR has presented the facts about UFOs for over 20 years

FSR has promoted worldwide serious discussion on UFOs

FSR has established itself as the leading publication in the field

Three good reasons why you should take a subscription to FSR  
£3.25 a year (\$8.50 US and Canada), airmail extra. Write to:

*The Editor, FSR Publications Ltd, PO Box 25, Barnet, Herts, EN5 2NR*

**FSR** ————— **Can you afford to be without it ?**

### **Featured in your next Journal**

Satellite searches stars for signals

From Zeppelins to UFOs

and regular contributions will include:

Vice-Chairman's Column

Research Department News

Sighting Summaries

and of course your letters in:

Uforum