

NORTHERN UFO NEWS



NORTHERN UFO NEWS is the publication of the NORTHERN UFO NETWORK (NUFON)
 Published eight times a year in monthly series with NORTHERN UFOLOGY
 Edited by: Jenny Randles (MUFORA) Cover Design by John Watson (CHRYSTIS)
 Address: 8 Whitethroat Walk, Birchwood, Warrington, Cheshire WA3 6PQ

EDITORIAL: "Separating Weetabix from Shreddies" (or How to Identify The UFOs)

In UFO STUDY I devoted three chapters to what I see as wrong with UFO research. Unfortunately, few people seem to have grasped the main purpose of this...at least the reviews concentrate on an aspect of these chapters I consider to be unimportant, compared with what seems a crucial issue. So I will elaborate...with a specific proposal for you to ponder. If you care to submit your views we can continue the debate.

One thing bothers me a great deal about any kind of research. All data are (almost always) lumped together into a vast stew, out of which answers allegedly distill. Occasionally someone recognises the obvious truth that 90% PLUS of all those data are in fact nothing to do with UFOs. Consequently, any studies made of unfiltered evidence can hardly be expected to teach us anything about UFOs. Imagine digging up a bucketful of material off a beach then tipping it onto your tabletop. When you sift all the grains of sand, bits of seaweed and the occasional pebble into piles (according to colour, texture or whatever, apart from what they really are) then you think you have achieved something. But if you then start to make assumptions about pebbles, on the basis of piles of seaweed, the error is obvious. Yet we still do this in ufology. There are probably only two ways such folly can be valid. Either if we study sociology, perception or reporting factors (where IFO and UFO present the same basic problem) or if all UFOs are simply not-yet-identified IFOs. But if (as most of us believe) a small proportion of UFOs are totally distinctive from IFOs then it is a complete waste of time doing any kind of research on a mixed UFO/IFO sample. The samples of data must be filtered (to maximum efficiency) Of course there will still be IFOs in them...but these will now be swamped by the residual UFOs...whereas in an unfiltered sample the few UFOs will almost certainly be deluged by the mass of IFOs.

A similar (but not quite so apparant) problem still remains even when we take this factor into account. For there is a gross presumption that all UFOs originate from one source. Any study of a sample of reports will indicate that this is quite probably nonsense. Whilst it remains vaguely possible that some source is responsible for producing multiple (seemingly unrelated) images...it is still very clear that witnesses report to us phenomena which they interpret as UFOs. And amongst those there will be unusual optical effects, rare meteorological conditions, piezo-electrical anomalies and many other curious things. There may be some hallucinations (or rare forms of psychological experience not actually hallucinations) And there may be what most of you would call REAL UFOs (whatever they might be!) This (to me) undoubted fact makes it ludicrous to conduct research even on a mass of reports which has filtered the wheat from the chaff. It's like studying a sample of cars, cows, church steeples and cobwebs and being puzzled when the results regarding their apparant intelligence differ, conflict and baffle. Of course they do. And we know why. Just as it seems obvious to me why we are not solving THE UFO phenomenon. There isn't one. But there ARE UFO Phenomena.

Unfortunately, we seem to overlook this with incredible oversight. Our classification schemes are therefore pretty useless. For we define UFO types in such haphazard ways that it makes no sense. Both a car and a cow could come with 100 metres and generate a Hynek CE 1... but there all similarity ends. The only rational way is to define individual classes of UFO according to very specific comparisons. Vallee had the right idea but did not go nearly far enough. It could be that there are hundreds of unique UFO stimuli, and some stimuli may prove very hard to box up into readily identifiable packages. There is little we can do about that...but this is not the same as saying we can do nothing. Here is what we can do.

Identify as many specific sub-types of UFO as we can (I expect we may find ten or so quite easily) This we do on the basis of our records...phenomena which crop up repeatedly with closely similar characteristics. One obvious example is the orange/yellow/blue oval seen in association with power sources. Whatever it is this UFO reappears and is distinct from other UFO types. It should be treated as such. A rarer form I have found is the triangle of three spheres or lights. There will be more.

Once we have a number of sub-types we can perform research individually on them, working out their characteristics. In this way, one by one, I suspect we shall find plausible explanations for some UFOs and be able to recognise them when they appear in future. Then our research may stop going round in circles. For serious students of enigmatic wonders, we have a remarkable talent for doing virtually now't!

IMPORTANT.... NUFON Publications in 1982

It has been decided to make some changes in newsletter publications for 1982. Whilst in one sense inflation will force an increase in subscription rates (the first for THREE years), in another you will be offered more choice and even a reduction. NORTHERN UFO NEWS will continue to be published (as now) EIGHT months of the year and this will be offered at the new subscription of £2.80 pa. (1982) Northern Ufology will no longer be published in the intervening months, but instead a new publication will take its place. This will be used as a vehicle to publish in much more detail important current case histories (CE 4s, CE 3s and so on) where it is felt valuable to provide a better description of the case than brief summary in this newsletter allows. NORTHERN UFO NEWS and Issues 1 to 4 of CASE HISTORIES will be offered on a joint subscription of £4.20 pa (1982) You may choose which option you wish to take, and 1982 subscriptions are now being taken. If you have previously subscribed early for 1982, at the old rate, you will be rewarded by receiving both publications. Please state clearly when submitting your payment which option you prefer.

Articles which might formerly have been published in Northern Ufology should now be submitted for consideration to UFO RESEARCH REVIEW (443 Meadow Lane Nottingham NG2 3GB) and readers are advised (if they can afford to do so) to subscribe to this excellent, long-standing publication in addition to Northern UFO News.

NEWS: :: PARASEARCH (the West Midlands group) are back in business with a new centre of operations. They are still being coordinated by Martin Keatman & Graham Phillips and whilst now involving themselves in a broader field of interest they still intend to investigate UFO activity in the region. Their new address is: 73 Sir Thomas Whites Rd Earlsdon Coventry CV5 8DP (Tel: 714484)

:: UFOIN has recently gained a new consultant who may prove of value in future investigations. He is Dr A.M. Alnahhas, who is a specialist in the fields of Radiology & Nuclear Medicine. His advice on physiological effects may prove a great asset to us.

:: I have been advised by Cyril Permutt, director of the BUREAU FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF PARANORMAL PHOTOGRAPHS, that his team would be very interested in hearing of any anomalous UFO photographs you may come across. The group claims to have technical and advisory support for analysis and an extensive archive of curious images from all over the world (although mostly psychic rather than UFOs) Address: 49 Cranbourne Gardens Temple Fortune London NW11 0HU (01-458-4002)

:: Following the abortive "Ufologists Condon Report" recently proposed as a research venture in the UK a team of Italian ufologists have picked up on the idea and now intend to attempt this. The plan will involve re-evaluating a number of classic cases and publishing a detailed report. They would like a group of UK researchers to join with them (re-evaluating UK cases) so that a joint report on the venture could be produced. Are there any takers for this excellent idea?? Write: Massimo Greco via Gramsci 12 25100 Brescia ITALY.

ELSEWHERE THIS MONTH.... BUFORA BULLETIN (No 2) provides a much better offering in the new (cheaper) format with 24pp of articles, information & reports. (BUFORA's 1981 running total is even lower than NUFON's which shows how quiet the UFO scene is) MAGIC SAUCER (17) seems to get odder and odder. This issue has lots of strange sightings, poetry, cartoons, letters, stuff about unicorns, pixies, space messages, universal love (and so on). It certainly is never dull, that's for sure! MERSEY NEWS (22) apart from articles, has an interesting survey on MIGAP members and a full report on the CE3 case summarised in this NUN (p 6) SUFON bring out a new "Circular" to fill the gaps between the Scottish network magazines. Neww and stuff mostly. GUERNSEY UFO RESEARCH GROUP Circular (11) reviews latest news and contains the first Channel Island UFOs recorded for a good while. SIGAPs PEGASUS (Jul/Aug) show some pictures from the BUFORA Congress and summarise Bruce Maccabee's paper on the new approach to the ETH. It has also has Surrey area UFOs.

NATURALLY SUPERNATURAL Review: THE SUPERNATURALIST Issue 1 £1.50

It seems to be "new magazine" time all of a sudden. What with COMMON GROUND having launched itself so excellently one might think there could not possibly be scope for yet another "broadly based" publication...but here it is. Edited by Andy Collins (UFOIN investigator) and billed as a "Parasearch Publication" it aims itself at a different (more public) audience...and finds its target extremely well.

No doubt you may be thinking that £1.50 is a bit steep (even nowadays) but in truth you get good value for your money. In the same format as COMMON GROUND (so readily pocketable) it has 64 extremely small-type pages (so containing about 25,000 words in all) and it has a large number of photographs in it too. The style is somewhat akin to the earlier, unfortunately abortive, STRANGE PHENOMENA with a decidedly unique magic, mystery and curious phenomena. It is an acquired taste (in that one has to have a broad interest) but if you go for that sort of thing then THE SUPERNATURALIST is sure to appeal. Issue One contains a review of the history of earth mysteries and a survey of the theories to explain ghosts. For Ufologists there is much of interest (hardly surprising in view of Andy's pedigree). There is a reflective review of the birth of ufology and a long survey of the Aveley abduction (one of the major UFO events to have been uncovered in the UK) If you missed the FSR articles in this case some years back this review is extremely useful, and even if you did see them it promises (along with future parts in a series) to reveal new facts which post-date the 1978 investigation. Having learnt from past excursions into commercial venturism THE SUPERNATURALIST will be issued on a one-off basis. Those who buy issue one will be informed when Issue two is out and what is in it. Purchase also entitles the membership of PARASEARCH to be obtained by the reader FREE. There is certainly plenty to read and think about and it is recommended...c/o 19 St Davids Way Wickford Essex SS11 8EX.

 ASSAP - What is it about?

In June a new national body was launched - ASSAP (Association for the Scientific Study of Anomalous Phenomena). New groups come and go, of course. Brave ventures flare into prominence and then die through apathy. What fate befalls ASSAP relies largely upon the number of serious minded folk who give it a chance, and this is not helped by the almost inevitable misunderstandings of motive and suspicions of intent. Ufology is full of such unfortunate neuroses.

Firstly, it should be made clear that ASSAP is not a UFO group. As its title indicates it is an attempt to investigate, and perhaps correlate, scientific enigmas. Undoubtedly UFOs are such an anomaly - but there are many others (from ball lightning to teleporting beetroots) which defy present understanding. The (perhaps too ambitious) aim of ASSAP is to bring to many of these for the very first time serious, scientifically-orientated investigation. The group will work to strict standards of methodology in investigation and research, but will stimulate membership involvement on a national scale by meetings, seminars and discussion papers. ASSAP seems to be a God-send for those who recognise that subjects which are scientific taboo nevertheless give hope of providing fruitful insights for mankind. Because of this, many of you would no doubt wish to support the aims of ASSAP (either passively or actively). Indeed I make no bones of the fact that I strongly support ASSAP. For this reason membership has been kept to a very reasonable cost of £6 P.A. (contact: 11 Granville Park London SE13 7DY)

Of importance to us, of course, is the role ASSAP will play in ufology. It has been made very clear that ASSAP see themselves as coordinators, rather than a new society. But in a subject already as established as our own there would be no advantage in duplication. Rather ASSAP wish to act as a catalyst for reform within our movement... a kind of neutral outside force (like a magnetic field which - when placed over a scattered mixture of unaligned pieces of metallic dust - can cause them to suddenly take up a shape that is uniform, organised and most effective). It could be that ASSAP (via its standardised network) would be directly able to rationalise ufology... but this is recognised as a "last resort". It would be preferable if ASSAP set about ordering all the other, unorganised, fields of anomalous study and merely goaded ufology into self action. ASSAP could then work with this new aligned UFO system to provide comprehensive, scientific study of investigatable mysteries which confront our modern world.

We have time to do this... but not a lot of time. I hope ufology will take note of all this and get on with the job. I believe it will - indeed must do. The fact that we have created a Code of Practice from nothing in under a year proves what the force of mutual cooperation can do. The air is alive with the crackle of new initiatives, with BUFORA, UFOIN and others alert to the potential. The first step will be taken in Nottingham on November 14 when we meet to discuss implementing the Code. I hope we shall see the launch of a dramatic new cooperative venture which might revolutionise ufology overnight. I shall report on this in the next issue.

Meanwhile we should welcome ASSAP. It may be that it has shown us the way.

ASSAP has staged launch meetings already in London and Bristol and on November 21 will hold one in Manchester (UMIST, Renold Lecture Theatre, in the City centre 2 - 6 pm) Those of you from the north who want to meet ASSAP, see what it is all about and see if you sympathise with its aims are welcome to attend. (Call me for details)

INVESTIGATIONS

THE NOVEMBER 1980 Wave.... Why is it that we only seem to recognise UFO waves after they are over? Certainly November 1980 seems to have provided us with a classic, but by the time we spotted it there was nothing we could do. Between Nov 21 and Nov 28 the north, particularly, experienced 8 cases (including the Kendal and Todmorden CE3/4s, a police chase involving radar tracking, a TV disturbance & animal interference case and another with severe witness effects) (Another case in the wave is featured below). Not only did this concentration occur in a year when UFO sightings were well down on average and interest was at a low ebb, but the calibre of cases was far above normal for a sample of 8. Since media promotion on a national level did not occur we seem to have a genuine manifestation of the UFO phenomenon here. It would be interesting to know if BUFORA and CONTACT recorded anything unusual for this spell, but CONTACT seem to have gone into a shell and neither information or even publications are emerging from them any more. Have they collapsed in these hard-pressed times? Does anybody know?

Snippets.... :: On September 12 a yacht from Liverpool searching for a treasure galleon off the French coast sank after striking a mysterious underwater object. The sea was calm and the object was said to be heavy and metallic. A Russian submarine was suspected but this was (suprise, suprise) denied. Nobody seems to have considered the possibility of a UFO but the owner, sadly reflecting on his sunken possession, said "I'd like to get to the bottom of it!" (True - honest!)

:: On September 20 it was windy and stormy in North Wales and a family in Prestatyn were alarmed when a huge bang woke them in the middle of the night. They called the police to report that a 40 foot long weird object had landed on their lawn. The police regarded their story as "very fishy", which was a fair prognosis as this particular U.F.O. did turn out to be an unidentified fishy object.... a large inflatable shark which had blown there from a nearby pleasure port.

LOW DEFINITION ACTIVITY

70-22 Winter 05.10 Brough, Humberside Derick Shelton (SUFORS) C
Almost no details on this, not even a date, the year being unknown. Witness worked at the Hawker Siddley factory and came out to see a glittering half-moon object over the hangars. After some moments it shot upwards, hovered and then accelerated away at an angle (having dimmed somewhat) INSUFF DATA

81-32 APR 17 22.15 Stoke Golding, Leics G.HALL (HAPI) C
Large W LITS seen by two men and two women getting into car. It then moved off in a zig-zag. Car drove towards Hinckley and LITS vanished but "smog" of red & white LITS came towards them. Stopped car and it passed over as dark unedfined triangle mass @ making slight burring noise. Steady course. Lights did not flash. No checks made by HAPI, who offer no explanation. INSUFF DATA

81-33 JUN 13 19.42 Coventry, W Midlands M.BROWN (HAPI) A
Detailed UFOIN report of a W Oval LITS seen by two boys to move across daylight sky. Mother saw last stage of encounter. Seen for 2½ mins, steady course, passing through wispy cloud. Light source was internal to object and not reflection. HAPI think object meteor. I am unhappy about this. 20 M P S. METEOR? / AIRCRAFT?

8135 AUG 28 21.15 Prescot, Merseyside L.BARLOW (MIGAP) C
Woman heard bang & saw large number of starlike lights explode into sky (R & silver) and then fade out over several minutes. FIREWORK/ FLARE

81 - 38 OCT 15 19.00 Bacup, Lancashire A.TOMLINSON (DIGAP) A
Several farm owners and children at the farms observed a large number of LITS(W) moving very fast across the sky over the hills between Bacup and Rawtenstall (scene of many recent sightings). Seen close to power lines but investigator does not think these were source (witnesses say they are used to seeing discharges from here). LITS only visible for seconds at time. INSUFF DATA

• MEDIUM DEFINITION ACTIVITY

80-52 JUL 28 18.06 Hinckley, Leics P.BERRY & G.HALL (HAPI) A
Graham Hall of HAPI saw this one himself- an object which looked manmade and to
be covered in reflective tinfoil. Was rotating (not continuously) and coloured
red/green amongst others. Was kite shaped and travelled on a steady E-W course
for about 30 secs plus. Slight droning sound heard. Follow-up failed to identify.
Could it have been a balloon? INSUFF DATA

80-77 NOV 23 01.30 Burley-in-Wharfedale, W Yorks N.MORTIMER D
Woman saw object float slowly by her bedroom window. In view 2-3 mins as star-
like oval with square windows half way up side. Dissappeared in vicinity of
Menwith Hill. INSUFF DATA

81-37 OCT 14 00.15 Hr Openshaw, Manchester A.TOMLINSON (DIGAP) A
Man taking dog for walk (dog undisturbed). Saw W LITS stationary over rooftop in
W. Rushed back home for wife. 4 mins later they both arrived and it was still in
same position. They watched it for 1/2 minute more and then it shot off very fast
to the S. As it moved man caught glimpse of its shape: It was a dark top-hat with
the W LITS being on its domed top. INSUFF DATA

81-32



80-52



80-77



81-37



TIME DISTORTION ON THE TELFORD ROAD Summary of 34pp UFOIN report by S.Banks
JULY 16 1981 02.15 Uppington, Salop CE 1 Psycho Level A

This is a fascinating report, very well investigated by Stephen Banks. UFOIN has
decided to continue work on it, now that Stephen has moved south, and regression
hypnosis will be explored with the witnesses.

Three young women (ages 25 & 26) are involved. One is married, two are separated,
and all three live in Telford New Town. On the date in question they had been to
a disco in Shrewsbury (consuming only Coca-Cola) and were returning home in a
lively conversational mood. However, some moments before the sighting this mood
altered and conversation ceased. They cannot explain this, and find it odd.

The object was first sighted to their left above a field (in wide open country).
It seemed to be about 200 ft up and consisted of four white lights in a ring
with two red lights inside this. These were clearly seen to be connected to a disc shaped
object which was tilted so as to reveal its underside to the women as they drove
past. There was no other adjacent traffic, and all three immediately recognised that
they were observing a UFO. At interview they remarked how they felt so ridiculous



with an apparently "impossible" flying saucer suddenly in plain view as if it
were the most natural thing in the world. They took half a minute or so to drive
past and slight discrepancies occur, in that the girl in the back (who had the
best view) says it moved upwards into low cloud after they had passed. She claims
to have seen a row of windows on the side. The other girls only say the lights
noticeably dimmed as they passed by. They were all frightened and the driver attempt-
ed to accelerate away, but the car engine seemed to lack power. They all describe
a most odd sensation saying that it seemed "to take ages" to reach Telford (only
4/5 miles away).

They drove straight to the police station (where their report was logged). The
experience was timed accurately by a watch in the car (at 02.15) but by that
watch they arrived at the police station at 02.55 (the police logged their report
at 02.40) By either estimate there is an appreciable time discrepancy which
baffles all three girls. On reconstructing the experience this time distortion could
be as much as 25 minutes. Whether this was due to the alleged "power drain" or
some other factor remains to be ascertained (hence the consideration of hypnosis)

It has to be said (for what it is worth) that all three girls seem psychic and
suggestible, with an extensive track record of visionary experiences. The girl who
had the best view (moreover) is apparently very susceptible to trance states, had
a UFO sighting when a child and claims she has always had the feeling that she
would be "contacted" one day!

Investigation proceeding.

Two women working in the city centre saw an object in bright daylight over the skyscraper building of the West Yorkshire police! It seemed to be a solid sphere of dull metallic colour, standing out against the blue sky. After a moment it vanished instantly for 3/4 seconds and then reappeared out of nowhere in a different location (45 degree angle and closer to the roof of the police building) At first this was just a point source but it grew rapidly into a cigar/oval, the increase in size giving the distinct impression that the object was hurtling straight towards them! After about 15 secs it suddenly plummeted downwards and was lost to view behind the police building. The two women were very upset and both remained so disturbed that three days later (after the weekend) they could not return to work. One of them had bitten her fingernails down! Leeds/Bradford airport had no explanation but the police had reported to them a sighting at 20.19 that evening - from Armscliffe Crag (a disc with a firey tail) Neither object was tracked on radar (so L/B told Nihel)..... Just as a thought... Could this have been a tethered object (balloon? Kite?) from the roof of the police building?

APPARITION AT THE P.O.W. CAMP Summary of 22pp report by L.Barlow (MIGAP)
FEB 28 1981 Prees Heath, Nr Market Drayton, Salop 01.00 CE3 B

This is certainly not a typical UFO event. Indeed it may not even be a UFO event. For there is no UFO, and the entity (whilst quite bizarre) is not typical either. But as it fails to fit into any other category (eg a ghost) this seems the only place to record it! It certainly has many consistancies with UFO events.

Three men (in their 20's and 30's) were on a midnight poaching trip for rabbits at an old (and long abandoned) rather derelict P.O.W. camp in a side lane off the A 41 (a "Roman Road" if that is relevant). There was gusty wind. It was overcast and raining. The figure was first seen by one of the men (George) who pointed him out to the others. Whilst it was taken for another poacher it was odd that he was dressed so inappropriately. He seemed to wear a bright white, three-quarter length mac - which is hardly the best way to hide in the undergrowth. Suddenly the "man" began to glow very brightly, and as the area was dark (with no moon and no nearby lighting) this somewhat perturbed the watching young men.

The figure now began to pulsate or throb in different colours. The head was red, the eyes a kind of laser red and the rest a mass of luminous green and yellow. The eyes allegedly did not look solid, but more like a wobbling jellyfish! What was more the figure seemed to be floating about three feet off the ground and bobbing up and down like a cork in a bottle!

Malcolm (who was gripping George's arm with fear) saw it start to bob in their direction and decided that that was enough for him. He dropped all his nets and tackle and fled in a blind panic through the pitch dark across a freshly ploughed field towards the car! Ivan, the third man, saw that the figure was now tilting at a 45 degree angle seemingly inspecting the rabbit warrens. Summoning up courage he told his friend he was going to get closer. He expected George to follow, but he did not. George admits he was completely terrified that he rooted to the spot. The hair on his neck stood on end and though he wanted to go with Ivan he was quite unable to move. Meanwhile Ivan had reached a boulder about 20 feet from the warrens and squatted, partially hidden. The figure was now bobbing towards him!

Ivan, bravely or foolishly, stood up to confront it. He got the view from which the sketch above is taken. Apart from being three foot off the ground it was of normal height... and it seemed to him to be intelligent... aware of what he was doing, but remaining silent. He tried to get it against the skyline to see if it was solid, but as he rose and bent down again it copied his movements. It then began to pulsate faster. Ivan looked round for George at this point and found he was not there. In fear he picked up some stones from the ground and threw them at the thing. He does not know if he hit it, but it stopped. And then it just seemed to fade and blend into the background like a projected slide being switched off. It had been in view 10 mins. They ran back to the car to join Malcolm and went straight home. George woke his wife and she attests to how horror stricken he was. The incident was not reported to media or police, but came to MIGAP through family connections. The witnesses admit they felt most unlike trying to convince anyone this really had happened.

