

PEGASUS



MONTHLY JOURNAL OF THE
SURREY INVESTIGATION GROUP
ON AERIAL PHENOMENA

VOL. I No. 5
NOVEMBER, 1969.
Price: 2/-

++++
+ E D I T O R I A L +
++++

Flying-saucers do not exist. How many times have we heard that said - from the man in the street to eminent physicist Dr. Edward U. Condon, who was in charge of the controversial University of Colorado UFO investigation programme. Now it has been said by Mr. David Simpson, chairman of that other Surrey group, Society for the Investigation of UFO Phenomena (SIUFOP). Apparently he and his group came to this conclusion after a two-year investigation into the subject. Mr. Simpson was quoted as saying in the London Evening News of October 24: "We realised after interviewing a mere handful of people who claim to have seen UFOs, that nearly all of them had two things in common - a large science-fiction library and a vivid imagination. Nearly everywhere we went we found bookcases full of science fiction and material on flying-saucers. A lot of people are obviously brainwashed by what they read and firmly believe flying-saucers exist. It is no good explaining that what they actually saw was car headlights, satellites, shooting-stars, unusual clouds or some other natural phenomena, because they just don't want to know". Even photographs didn't convince Mr. Simpson and his fellow researchers. "Any photograph can be faked and virtually all the photographs we examined were obviously faked". The sightings investigated by SIUFOP may well have been misinterpretations of natural phenomena, or even the work of hoaxers; but this still does not give Mr. Simpson the right to blandly state in a newspaper that flying-saucers do not exist. He goes on to say in the Evening News: "Personally after looking into the subject I don't believe flying-saucers exist, or if they do, they certainly haven't visited us yet. But we'll wait and see". In all probability Mr. Simpson has only examined a very small sample of the increasing masses of evidence for the existence of saucers. For if he had carried out a full-scale impartial investigation, surely he would have at least come to the conclusion that there was a possibility that a percentage of UFOs were in fact flying-saucers. I have my suspicions that Mr. Simpson set out to prove that flying-saucers did not exist, especially in view of the following comment he made in the September "Pegasus", in reply to SIGAP member Mr. Peter Hill's views on the Condon Report: "Does Mr. Hill join the ranks of those who would only have been satisfied by a conclusion something like 'Flying-saucers originate from unknown planets and we would do well to study their behaviour'?" In conclusion, I would just like to point out that SIGAP does not share Mr. Simpson's views. Since May, 1967 when our group was formed, 171 sightings have been investigated. Of these, 47 have been filed away as defying logical explanation. Enough said? A complete breakdown of the figures will be published in next month's magazine.

- Ron Toft.

```
+++++
+
+   UFOs - UNSOLVED:  A  SCIENTIFIC  CHALLENGE  +
+
+       By Professor James E. McDonald         +
+
+++++
```

Few scientists have taken a responsible attitude towards UFOs. An exception is Professor James E. McDonald, of the University of Arizona's Institute of Atmospheric Physics. The following is a transcript of a particularly interesting lecture he gave in Washington this summer, to the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP):-

"If in any branch of knowledge the possibilities of penetrating a new, virgin field of investigation are opening, then it must be done without fail, because the history of science teaches that, as a rule, it is precisely this penetration of new fields that leads to the discovery of those very important phenomena of nature which most significantly widen the paths of the development of human culture" - P. L. Kapitza (1959).

"By far the most usual way of handling phenomena so novel that they would make for a serious rearrangement of our preconceptions is to ignore them altogether, or to abuse those who bear witness to them" - W. James (1907).

When one looks back on the past 22 years of reports of unconventional objects seen in our skies, one is forced to conclude that the scientific challenge posed by the UFO problem has not evoked the kind of response for which Kapitza was pleading in the above quote. Rather it seems that the more disillusioned viewpoint of William James applies.

But it is quite important to realise that the history of science is just about as full of instances of the one kind of response as the other. Lavoisier brushed aside reports of what we now call meteorites with the suggestion that they resulted from lightning hitting certain kinds of soil or rock. Humphreys, an outstanding American meteorologist, could review dozens of reports of ball-lightning only to come up with the conclusion that negative after-images and other illusory effects were responsible for the reports. Lord Kelvin, upon hearing of Roentgen's X-ray discoveries in 1896, felt sure they were only an elaborate hoax. Skeptics who rejected Pasteur's radical views concerning the role of airborne micro-organisms in spreading diseases, scoffingly pointed out that his ideas were absurd because if there were such things floating around in the air all the time, we'd be inhaling them with every breath we took. Just four

years before nuclear fission was demonstrated, Rutherford insisted in a speech before the British Association for the Advancement of Science that, 'anyone who talks about getting power out of the transformation of atoms is talking moonshine!' About two weeks before the Wright brothers got into the air, astronomer Simon Newcomb published a sober and seemingly authoritative article in the North American Review, explaining that, since lift increases only as the square of the linear scale of a flying device, whereas mass increases as the cube of the dimensions, it would remain forever out of the question that any heavier-than-air objects much larger than a bird would ever be able to fly. And to tell one on myself in order to keep due balance, I recall my unexpressed reactions of more than mere incredulity when a colleague, Dr. Aden Meinel, first brought to my attention a decade ago the idea of putting a telescope into orbit for extended astronomical observing. That certainly sounded utterly impractical to me! Yet the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory launched in December, 1968 is now in polar orbit gathering ultra-violet data on stars at a rate about 5,000 times faster than all prior methods.

However, in studying a much longer list of such examples that I have in my files, I note that one must try to be careful to separate out expressions of skepticism such as Rutherford's or Kelvin's, in which the declaration of doubt was made in a context such that there was no paralysing effect on others who might disagree. One must treat such cases much more lightly than those other instances in which the scorn and the rejection of new conceptions came from scientists whose very position lent unfortunately heavy weight to their negativity, scientists whose position demanded that they make a much more thorough review of the facts in the case before pronouncing that the bumblebee can't fly, that the chemical composition of the sun and stars must remain forever unknown to us, that stones can't fall from the sky, that visitation from intelligent extra-terrestrial beings is not possible in the next 10,000 years, that there is nothing of scientific significance in the UFO problem warranting further serious attention, and so on.

The cases that go down in scientific history's catalogue of unconscionably closed minds are those that parallel the French Academy's late 18th century insistence that one cannot believe what all those peasants are saying about stones falling out of the sky, above all when it's abundantly clear that nothing in the beautiful Newtonian synthesis supports such absurdities. Those are the disillusioning instances to review if one has a notion that Science always operates in the judgement-suspending, testimony-balancing, always-ready-to-reconsider manner that some textbooks would have students believe.

We have, I believe, another such instance before us this year. Following upon a long series of prior assurances from the scientists who have, in one way or another, contributed to two decades of Air Force assurances that there's nothing to all this

talk about UFOs, nothing "defying explanation in terms of present-day science or technology" (to use the oft-reiterated Pentagon press-desk phrase), we have recently been given the Condon Report on UFOs with its Conclusions and Recommendations that add up to about the same phrase with which Dr. Irving Langmuir, back in 1948, offered one of the first bits of advice the Air Force got on UFOs: "Forget it!" The same advice came from scientists and engineers called in to advise Project Sign in 1949, from the famous Robertson Panel whose mere three days of case analyses back in 1953 led to decidedly adverse over-all recommendations, from staff members of the Battelle Memorial Institute who participated in Bluebook Report 14's well-known writeoff of the UFO problem, from Bluebook consultant J. A. Hynek's nearly 20 years of failure to vigorously and thoroughly study the subject on which he served as the sole continuing Air Force scientific advisor, and from a lot of other less well-known technical advisors who helped convince the Air Force that the UFO problem was a trivial matter. As nearly as I have been able to discern, probably the best scientific advice ever laid before the Air Force resulted from a morning session of the Ad Hoc UFO Committee (O'Brien Comm.) of the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board, whose roughly three-hour review of Project Bluebook in February, 1966, discerned the serious lack of scientific content in Bluebook's operations and urged creation of an independent university-based study of UFOs to shed some real light on the matter.

The O'Brien Committee was assembled as a consequence of Air Force concern over bad public relations growing out of the August, 1965, wave of sightings throughout the Midwest. The O'Brien Committee's recommendations came to light and were put into action as a consequence of Air Force discomfiture over public indignation aroused by Hynek's "swamp-gas" explanation in two UFO incidents in southern Michigan, March 20-21, 1966.

The net result, as we all know, has been the Condon Report. Dr. Condon has advised the Air Force that it might as well disband Project Bluebook and has urged that no other governmental response is justified on any grounds that science would be furthered by pursuit of the UFO question. An 11-man review panel of the National Academy of Sciences has unequivocally endorsed Condon's negative recommendations.

The title I have chosen for my remarks attests to the fact that I unequivocally reject Condon's negative recommendations and conclusions.

On the basis of my examination of the UFO problem during the past three years, I regard it as probably the outstanding scientific problem of the century. I believe the evidence clearly shows that Dr. Condon, like a number of other scientists who have previously had responsibilities in advising the Air Force on its task of sorting out the mysteries of the steady flow of UFO reports, really never opened his eyes to the significant evidence, never dug in and undertook the kind of extensive case-

checking and witness-interviewing that leads one to see that in the UFO problem we are probably confronting a phenomenon of unprecedented scientific significance.

I have been told that many NICAP members are writing in to say they aren't interested in hearing any more about the Condon Report and all of its many shortcomings. My advice to NICAP on that score would be to reflect on the all-too-clear evidence that Condon's negative conclusions have been received in the offices that count, here in Washington, as definitive indication that it's high time to forget all this nonsense about UFOs. Reflecting on that point, on the goals that have led NICAP over the past dozen years to push steadily for increased scientific and Congressional attention to the UFO problem, NICAP members should sense that, until the substantial shortcomings of the Condon Report are clearly documented and elaborated, no real progress towards further significant elucidation of the UFO enigma will be forthcoming here in Washington. And that would be most unfortunate.

NICAP's contributions to clarification and airing of the UFO problem are most impressive, above all when measured against the shoestring budgets on which NICAP has had to operate. The goal of a truly adequate and truly open Congressional hearing on the entire spectrum of UFO questions has been a major NICAP target almost since its inception in 1956. That goal still lies ahead; and it certainly will not be attained if the credence now given to the Condon Report by press, by representatives of influential science agencies in the Capitol, and by key Congressional leaders, is not altered by holding up the serious shortcomings of the Report, and particularly of the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Report, to searching light of scrutiny and discussion.

Fortunately, NICAP is currently preparing a rebuttal volume in which many of the more glaring defects of the Report will be examined in detail. NICAP members here, and throughout the country, ought to be apprised of the highly adverse impact of the Condon Report in those chambers most crucially related to initiation of any new and more adequate program of UFO studies; the longer-term objectives of NICAP must not be put aside in favour of secondary goals at this critical stage of the curious history of the UFO puzzle. Rather than hearing less about the Condon Report, I submit that NICAP members should hear very much more about it. The Condon Report is now the crucial factor, the pivotal point, in the immediate future evolution of insight into the profoundly mysterious nature of the UFO phenomena. I say that because I feel sure that neither individual scientists nor private groups like NICAP can mount an effort capable of solving this mid-twentieth century mystery that has puzzled us for over 20 years. It will demand the kind of organised scientific effort that will come only when those who guide policy in our national science-related agencies recognise the nature and scope of the problem. So long as they remain under the misimpression that the Condon Report is the last word on UFOs, nothing useful will be done.

(to be concluded next month)

++++
+ L E T T E R S +
+
++++

From: Mr. Richard Beet, SIGAP Secretary, of 23 Coatham Place, Cranleigh, Surrey:-

"I have noted, with interest, the conclusions reached by Mr. David Simpson and SIUFOP, which have been printed in the Evening News. The claim made by SIUFOP is that nearly all witnesses have two similar characteristics - a large science-fiction library and a vivid imagination. However, these findings bear no relationship to the extensive investigations carried out by SIGAP over the past three 2½ years. In fact, the majority of sightings that I have investigated on behalf of SIGAP, were made by persons with little or no interest in stories of flying-saucers. Most witnesses have been prepared to accept a terrestrial explanation. Mr. Simpson's hypothesis appears to crumble when the following points are pursued:-

1. His results are probably based on an analysis of too few sightings. It is more desirable to collect and collate a few hundred reports before any reliable trends can be established.
2. Selection of sighting reports. When analysing witness behaviour, it is necessary to include all reported sightings whether or not a suitable subsequent explanation is established. Is it possible that a substantial proportion of the sightings investigated by SIUFOP were made by established flying-saucer fans and their friends?
3. It is possible that SIUFOP has set out to disprove the existence of UFOs and have been side-tracked by their study of psychic phenomena (which may or may not be related to UFO phenomena) and also their preoccupation with dubious photographic evidence.

I do understand, however, that SIUFOP wish to continue UFO investigations despite their public conclusions. I can only assume that little faith is attached to the results.

After years of interest and investigation into the subject, I have never seen a flying-saucer. Yet I have no reason to disbelieve airline pilots, policemen, doctors and astronomers when they fail to find an explanation for their own sightings. Anyway, what purpose would be served by me seeing anything worthwhile? I've a science-fiction library!!!

NEXT MEETING : December 9th. Investigators Training Evening. Pt. 2.
8pm held at Canteen of Elastic Coatings Ltd, By-Pass, Guildford.

From: Mr. Trevor Whitaker, of Elm Dene, 253 Huddersfield Road, Halifax:-

"Twice in your No.3 edition of Pegasus you mention the lack of support by the scientific UFO groups at the convention held at Woburn Abbey. Mike Parry has only himself to blame for this. The original literature sent out by the Interplanetary Space Travel Research Group (U.K.) gave the impression that it would be the circus that it finally turned out to be. The Halifax Branch of the British UFO Research Association decided it would not support any event of this type, since in our opinion they are a waste of effort".

NEW MEMBERS: SIGAP welcomes the following new members:-

P.J. Selfe, 21 St. Helens Gardens, N. Kensington, London W.10.
J.T. Bardsley, 28 Gateways, Epsom Road, Guildford, Surrey.
A. Coutts, 31 Alloa Road, Goodmayes, Ilford, Essex.
J.E. Holmes, 89 Battersea Rise, Clapham, London S.W.11.
F. Woodcock, Alta Vista, 31 Glebe Road, Dorking, Surrey.
Miss Sylvia Aylward, 1 Carlos Street, Godalming, Surrey.
P.J. Reynolds, 14 Parkhouse Cottages, Ewhurst Road, Cranleigh, Surrey.
S.J. Cooper, 4 Sherwin Crescent, Farnborough, Hants.
J.G. Vincent, 74 Selborne Avenue, Tices Meadow, Aldershot, Hants.
N.S. Cox, Chesnut Corner, Pinemount Road, Camberley, Surrey.

PRICE INCREASE: Owing to increasing costs, SIGAP finds it necessary to raise the price of PEGASUS from 1s 6d. to 2s, starting this month.

SURREY ROUNDUP: The following is a summary of some of the recent sighting reports received by SIGAP:-

1. Fifteen-year old John Miller, of "Westfield", Munstead, Godalming, Surrey, and his 16-year old sister Chris, claim they saw a cigar-shaped UFO from their attic window on the night of July 23. Says Chris in her report: "At about 11.30 p.m. my brother and I were in our attic when through the window, facing south, we saw some bright flashes lighting up the sky behind the trees opposite. I thought it might be lightning, but my brother pointed out that the lights were too low and there was no sound which there would have been if it had been lightning (?) The flashes came every few seconds. Sometimes though the gaps between them were five minutes. From time to time the flashes lit up a sort of cigar-shaped object which seemed to move from side to side. During one flash, a longer one, I thought I saw two of these cigar-shaped objects. It was quite eerie and scaring watching and waiting for the flashes. As the night progressed, the flashes became more frequent and were fairly regular after midnight. After about 1 a.m. they flashed less often. At 1.30 a.m. we phoned the police who said they did not know what the lights were

and that they would look into it. There were only one or two flashes between 1.45 a.m. and 2 a.m., and we saw no more after 2 a.m. In his report, John said: "The whole sky was lit up. The flashes were irregular. They were at their peak at midnight, sometimes occurring every second. What we saw was rather like a huge airship with lights at the end and sides - these could have been causing the flashes".

2. "A bright white light" was seen at 10 p.m. on August 21 by typist Mrs. M. G. Perkins, while walking along Walnut Tree Close to the Plastic Coatings Factory, off the Woodbridge Meadows By-Pass, Guildford, Surrey. Said Mrs. Perkins, of Flat 1, 3 Hunter Road, Guildford: "It was moving very fast. It then stopped, vanished, then reappeared circling on the spot". After continuing its circling and stop/go movements for a short while, it stopped and vanished completely.

3: Six people saw what looked like a "very bright star" perform erratic noiseless movements in the sky, in the early hours of August 22 at Shalford, near Guildford, Surrey.



+++++
+
+ F A C T O R F O L K L O R E ? +
+
+ B y D a n B u t c h e r +
+
+++++

There is something about the form of George Adamski's flying-saucer which puts us in mind of a bell: it might be described as being of a squat bell-shape. Other UFOs are of globular form - and so too are certain types of bells such as those which used to be tied round the necks of domestic animals. If the term "bell" be stretched to include discoidal and tubular gongs, then we have two more of the main UFO forms. If it be further stretched to include the rattle (a primitive form of the bell) then we can account for the mushroom-type UFO. George Hunt Williamson, in his book "The Saucers Speak", refers to the saucers as "crystal-bells". The folklore of the bell is extensive, and on occasion, seems to hint at the UFO. The practice of putting bells on domestic animals, and wearing them on the person, is world-wide, and originally had the same purpose everywhere - protection from evil spirits and from bodily harm. The UFO researcher might debate whether the "evil-spirits" refers to the malignant type of UFO entity, and the "bodily-harm" to UFO burns. He might also wonder if the practice of putting bells on animals might not have been some magical measure to guard against the abduction of the beasts. Bells, according to legend, frighten away dwarfs, trolls and giants. They were also used to overcome witches and sorcerers.

Furthermore, there are numerous tales of bells plunging into lakes, and lying sunken under the water - as there are, of course, of UFOs. There are stories of bells speaking with a human voice. Finally, like the UFO, they could fly through the air. All church bells were believed in medieval Europe to make a pilgrimage to Rome to keep Good Friday. People used to stay indoors so as not to see their flight. Was this particular item of folklore based on an actual sighting of Adamski-type UFOs heading in the direction of Rome? It looks like it.

++++
+ SAUCER LANDING IN NEW ZEALAND ? +
+
++++

"A flying-saucer may have landed in the North Island of New Zealand recently. A 44-year old farmer has found evidence on his property which supports such a theory and so far no alternative explanation has been given. Last Thursday (September 4), Mr. Bert O'Neil of Ngatea, 70 miles south-east of Auckland, found what he thinks may be the saucer's landing spot, hidden in dense scrub on his run-off farm. More than a mile from the nearest road and two miles from the nearest farm house, the farmer found a circular patch of scrub that had withered and died. In the centre of the 42 ft. circle of dead growth were three deep impressions where some heavy object had rested on a tripod. The impressions were in a perfect triangle and were exactly nine feet apart. The surrounding area was covered with perfectly healthy growing scrub and there were no tracks or wheel-marks leading to or from the circle. "There has been no stock in here since last year and I haven't been in here myself for at least six months", said Mr. O'Neil. "There could be a logical explanation for the whole thing, but I'm not too sure now that flying-saucers don't exist. "No-one has done any weed spraying for miles and there is no sign of scrub blight anywhere in the area". Although the scrub was not scorched, it had withered and died completely. Even thick branches were completely dry of sap. The undergrowth of moss and rushes was unaffected. "It looks as though something has hovered over the patch and has put down hydraulic rams and dug them into the ground", said Mr. O'Neil. "On each of the corners of the triangle there is a deep gouge in the ground. Then when the thing has taken off again it has torn up the earth where the legs were and has gone out over a line of higher scrub, killing a section of that too". Mr. O'Neil, who has had the 50-acre scrub-covered farm for 7 years, says he has never seen anything like the weird markings on his property. "If the dead section had been sprayed the plant stems would all be twisted, but they are not", he said. "I've done a lot of pig-hunting in this sort of country and can read signs pretty well, but I saw no markings here at all". Mr. O'Neil said he had read of a similar find in Sydney last year, where some children had discovered a flattened circle of reeds in a

swamp. "From what I can remember of that, this spot on my farm is almost identical. I didn't used to believe in flying-saucers, but now I'm not so sure". Earlier this year, and less than 20 miles from Mr. O'Neil's farm, a young man driving at night on a lonely country road was almost paralysed with fear when a bright hovering object began following his car. He described the object as giving off an intense white light and being oval-shaped. It followed his car closely for several miles before disappearing at high speed over a range of nearby hills. The man was later treated for intense shock by a doctor. Several months later two hunters returning home at night in the same area were badly frightened when a huge shining object approached their truck. Their vehicle stalled and they were unable to start it again. The truck's lighting system failed also. The object hovered nearby for several minutes before vanishing. As soon as it disappeared the truck lights came on and they were able to start the motor. A PA message from Auckland says that no positive identification has been made of what - or who - caused the circle. The Auckland University Unidentified Flying Objects Research Group has inspected the spot, considers there is no hoax, and that the marks were made about a week ago".

SIGAP is extremely grateful to Camberley Member Mrs. B. S. Blundell for sending in the above report, which appeared in the "New Zealand Post", on September 9 or 10. She also sent in the following report, which appeared in the "Western Mail" (Cardiff) on October 1:-

"Mysterious circles of bleached scrub started rumours that flying-saucers had landed near Hamilton, New Zealand, and burned the grass with their radioactivity. Sightseers flocked to the area and found more patches of withered grass. University students planned to keep a weekend watch for UFOs. Then the Government called in nuclear scientists. They came up with the answer.....the 42 ft. circles were caused by root rot and blight".

(This official explanation is all very well, but are the scientists seriously suggesting that root rot and blight make the impressions in the ground too? - Editor).

FALSE ALARM: Don't get too excited if you see a brilliant star in the sky on the evening of Friday, November 14. It won't be a UFO, and you will not have made a startling astronomical discovery, but it will be worth looking at all the same, especially through binoculars or a telescope. For the star, which will later appear as a mushroom-shaped cloud, will be the waste fuel being jettisoned from the spent third stage of a mighty Saturn 5 rocket - after it has blasted three American astronauts, the crew of Apollo 12, moonward. Apollo 12 is America's second lunar-landing mission. The third stage boosts the command and service modules of Apollo 12 from earth orbit into a lunar trajectory. When about 25,000 miles from earth, the third stage will separate from the spacecraft proper, and the fuel ejected. It is this fuel, liquid hydrogen and oxygen, which will be visible. The star, and cloud, should be visible, weather permitting, at 9.40 p.m., 30 degrees alt. WSW.

+-----+
 +
 + P E G A S U S +
 +
 + Monthly Journal +
 +
 + of the +
 +
 + Surrey Investigation Group On Aerial Phenomena +
 +
 +
 +EDITOR: Ron Toft, 14 Buckhurst Rd., Frimley Green, Camberley, +
 + Surrey. +
 +
 +Articles for publication in "Pegasus", be they long or short, +
 +are extremely welcome. They should be sent to the Editor. +
 +Views expressed in "Pegasus" are not necessarily those of the +
 +S.I.G.A.P. Executive Committee. Extracts may be taken from the +
 +magazine, provided they are in context and full credits given. +
 +Individual copies of "Pegasus" are obtainable from the Secretary +
 +at 2s each. (By post 6d. extra). +
 +
 +Exchange publications and advertisements should be sent to the +
 +Editor too. The advertising rates are as follows: +
 +
 + Classified - Members 2d. per word. Non-members 4d. +
 + Display - Quarter-page 15s. Half-page 30s. Full-page 55s. +
 + -----
 +
 +S.I.G.A.P. CHAIRMAN: Omar Fowler, 149 Mytchett Road, Mytchett, +
 + Camberley, Surrey. Tel. Farnborough 41012. +
 + " " SECRETARY: Dick Beet, 23 Coatham Place, Cranleigh, +
 + Surrey. Tel. Cranleigh 4420. +
 + " " TREASURER: Mrs. Jean Fowler, 149 Mytchett Road, +
 + Mytchett, Camberley, Surrey. +
 +
 +Committee members: Omar Fowler, Dick Beet, Mrs. Jean Fowler, +
 +Ron Toft, Dan Butcher, Graham Raine, Richard Munford, +
 +Miss Marjorie Dalley and Philip Parkinson. +
 +
 +All membership and other general inquiries to the Secretary. +
 +U.F.O. reports to the Chairman. Ordinary membership: 15s. per +
 +year. Junior membership (14-16 years): 12s. +
 +
 +S.I.G.A.P. Board of Consultants: +
 +
 + John Adams (OPTICAL PHYSICS) +
 + Tim Childerhouse (SPACE & SATELLITE RESEARCH) +
 + Rev. Norman T. Cockburn (THEOLOGY) +
 + Stuart Miller (PYSCHOLOGY) +
 + Ronald Pilkington (METEOROLOGY) +
 + Professor Frank B. Salisbury (EXO BIOLOGY) +
 + -----
 +PEGASUS is printed and published by the Surrey Investigation +
 + Group On Aerial Phenomena. +
 + -----
 +
 +-----+

