

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [1999](#) > Jun

UFO UpDates Mailing List Jun 1999

Jun 1:

- [Re: Roger Sandell Memorial Essay Competition](#) - Larry Hatch [4]
- [Re: An Open Letter To A Friend, Jeff Rense...](#) - Jim Mortellaro [32]
- [Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Jim Deardorff [30]
- [The Millennium Project News - May 31, 1999](#) - Paul Anderson - TMP / CPR-Canada [89]
- [Appeal From CUFORG \[Cornwall UFO Research Group\]](#) - Ian Darlington [18]
- [Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999](#) - Karl Pflock [13]
- [Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999](#) - Greg Sandow [47]
- [Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999](#) - Mark Cashman [15]
- [Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999](#) - John Velez [25]
- [Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999](#) - Dennis Stacy [33]
- [Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Tony Spurrier [34]
- [Dr. Leir's Recovery](#) - Derrel Sims [85]
- [Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999](#) - Greg Sandow [3]

Jun 2:

- [Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?](#) - Kim Burrafato [0]
- [Re: Steve Neill Walks](#) - Steve Neill [10]
- [Note To UK Readers](#) - John Rimmer [9]
- [\(Skyopen\) Lecture in Hong Kong](#) - Jean-Michel Mariojouis [17]
- ['Stein Online' - Constance Clear](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [11]
- [Re: \(Skyopen\) Lecture in Hong Kong](#) - Brian Cuthbertson [6]
- [Australian UFO Research Network/OZ File Report](#) - Diane Harrison [21]
- [Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Jenny Randles [17]
- [Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?](#) - Judith Dale [20]
- [UFO Centre To Be Launched In Window Area, UK](#) - Jenny Randles [23]
- [Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Jim Deardorff [57]
- [Recent Scotland UFO Activity - Case Feedback](#) - Dave Ledger [729]
- [Nick Popes Weird World - June '99](#) - Georgina Bruni [142]

Jun 3:

- [Re: *U* Map: North America 1947](#) - Bob Young [79]
- [Re: Nick Pope On 'The Sheffield Incident'](#) - Max Burns [71]
- [Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [32]
- [Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [21]

[Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?](#) - Henny van der Pluijm [28]
[Re: \(Skyopen\) Lecture in Hong Kong](#) - Brian Cuthbertson [9]
[Re: 'Topographic Brain Mapping of UFO Experiencers'](#) - Tim D. Brigham [16]
[Re: Dr. Leir's Recovery](#) - Derrel Sims [23]
[UFOINFO Progress Report](#) - John Hayes [19]

Jun 4:

[Intruders Foundation Website](#) - John Velez [33]
[Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Tony Spurrier [38]
[Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Tony Spurrier [26]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Jerome Clark [20]
[Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?](#) - Jim Mortellaro [60]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Steven Kaeser [11]
[The Prophets Conference - Port Townsend](#) - prophets@maui.net [132]
[Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Dennis Stacy [77]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - James Easton [298]
[Filer's Files #22 --1999](#) - George A. Filer [410]
[UK UFO Weekend](#) - Sue Lawrence [36]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [54]
[UFOs in Piracicaba and Sao Pedro, Brazil](#) - Thiago Ticchetti [25]
[Re: Intruders Foundation Website](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [38]
[Ted Roach?](#) - Roy Hale [10]
[Re: *U* Map: North America 1947](#) - Bob Young [17]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [54]

Jun 5:

[Re: Intruders Foundation Website](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [46]
[Re: UK UFO Weekend](#) - Tom Carey [6]
[Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Jim Deardorff [43]
[Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99](#) - Rense E-News [241]
[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman](#) - Jerry Black [142]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - James Easton [151]
[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman](#) - Jerry Black [120]
[Larry Hatch Away For A Week](#) - Larry Hatch [10]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [66]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [20]
[Resignation](#) - Jim Mortellaro [13]
[Alfred's Odd Ode #306](#) - Alfred Lehmborg [100]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Jerome Clark [16]

Jun 6:

[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [17]
[Re: Resignation](#) - John Velez [28]
[Re: 'Topographic Brain Mapping of UFO Experiencers'](#) - Julie Bedford [5]
[Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99](#) - Dan Geib [14]
[What's New at Magonia](#) - Mark Pilkington [13]
[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman](#) - Joe Murgia [23]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Ron Decker [26]

Jun 7:

[UpDates Server Problem](#) - Moderator UFO UpDates - Toronto [13]
[Re: The Enigma Channel](#) - John Hayes [76]
[BWW Media Alert 19990606](#) - BufoCalvin@aol.com [217]
[List Subscribers](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [9]
[Re: Protocol Bookburning Conspiracy](#) - Stan Friedman [35]
[Nasa Programming Computer To Seek Alien Life](#) - Stig Agermose [44]
[He's Keeping Eye On Close Encounters](#) - Stig Agermose [50]
[Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Joachim Koch [134]
[Students On A Mission To Find Life In Space](#) - Stig Agermose [25]

Jun 8:

[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - James Easton [133]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - David Rudiak [111]

Jun 7:

[Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999](#) - Martin Phillips [8]

Jun 8:

[UFO History Workshop](#) - Jan Aldrich [90]
[Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999](#) - Martin Phillips [8]
[An Educational Discourse](#) - Josh Goldstein [41]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - David Rudiak [79]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold](#) - David Rudiak [352]
[An Apology](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [13]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Brian Cuthbertson [6]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Donald Ledger [8]
[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman](#) - Bruce Maccabee [62]
[UFO Report By Ex-RAF Radar Personnel](#) - Dave Ledger [110]
[US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon](#) - Stig Agermose [51]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [48]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [115]
[The Books Of Charles Fort Now Online](#) - Stig Agermose [47]
[The Millennium Project News - June 7, 1999](#) - Paul Anderson - TMP/CPR-Canada [86]
[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman](#) - Bruce Maccabee [9]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - GT McCoy [25]
[Re: UFO History Workshop](#) - Jan Aldrich [29]
[Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much For](#) - Nick Balaskas [32]
[Crop Circle Message](#) - Maurizio Baiata [46]
[Re: Intruders Foundation Website](#) - Sue Kovios [23]
[Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99](#) - Richard G Brown [8]

Jun 9:

[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [34]
[What Have We Really Learned](#) - Jerry Black [166]
[Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?](#) - Steven J. Dunn [10]
[Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999](#) - Jenny Randles [13]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - John Velez [8]

[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [23]
['Parchment Parachutes' - Prof. Moore Explains](#) - James Easton [98]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold](#) - David Rudiak [191]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Donald Ledger [82]
[Info About Mr. Haktan Akdogan?](#) - Thiago Ticchetti [9]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [160]
[NIDS Roper Poll Results](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [78]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [43]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - James Easton [41]
[Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon](#) - Josh Goldstein [18]
[Re: UFO Report By Ex-RAF Radar Personnel](#) - Jenny Randles [57]
[Re: Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much For](#) - Kim Burrafato [8]
[Re: - Jerome Clark](#) [123]
[Re: Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?](#) - Georgina Bruni [17]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - David Rudiak [91]
[Re: Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?](#) - David Rudiak [93]
[Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99](#) - Nick Balaskas [19]
[Forgione's Balducci Interview](#) - Adriano Forgione [203]

Jun 10:

[Re: Info About Mr. Haktan Akdogan?](#) - Stan Friedman [7]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - James Easton [265]
[Re: Guide To U.S. Sightings](#) - Stig Agermose [17]
[DA Investigating Mysterious Cow Deaths In New](#) - Stig Agermose [89]
[Re: OZ: Search Fails To Find Clues To UFO](#) - Stig Agermose [19]
[Australia Searches For ET](#) - Stig Agermose [64]
[Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon](#) - Wendy Christensen [6]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [99]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Jerome Clark [44]
[W.W.W Australia Now On Web](#) - Diane Harrison [18]
[Re: What Have We Really Learned](#) - Rob Irving [7]
[New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell Story](#) - Kal K. Korff [315]
[BUFORA WATCH: BUFORA Sacks Editor for Silence](#) - Mike Wootten [195]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Joel Carpenter [11]
[Greer Joins The Prophets Conference Visiting](#) - prophets@maui.net [73]
[Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell](#) - Kevin Randle [48]
[Re: What Have We Really Learned?](#) - Jenny Randles [147]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [37]
[Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon](#) - Henny van der Pluijm [11]
[Max Burns BUFORA Lecture](#) - Roy Hale [6]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [105]
[Re: What Have We Really Learned?](#) - Jim Mortellaro [14]
[Spat With Talk Show Host - \\$60 Million Lawsuit](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [164]

Jun 11:

[Re: What Have We Really Learned?](#) - Alan Loper [27]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [48]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [68]
[Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture](#) - Mike Wootten [4]
[SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same Packets](#) - Stig Agermose [101]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold's Sighting \[was: Re: Voyager](#) - James Easton [214]

[Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture](#) - Mike Wootten [4]
[Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell](#) - Tom Carey [20]
[Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Jim Deardorff [98]
[Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon](#) - Josh Goldstein [65]
[Earth Changes TV/Breaking News - Did NASA Erase](#) - Mitch Battros [30]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [64]
[DISPATCH # 110 -- the weekly newsletter of](#) - ParaScope@AOL.COM [167]
[The Max Burns BUFORA Lecture - A Review](#) - David Clarke [288]
[Filer's Files #23 1999](#) - George A. Filer [398]

Jun 12:

[Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture](#) - Joe Murgia [7]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Jerome Clark [55]
[Re: High Flying Pelicans](#) - Bruce Maccabee [6]

Jun 10:

[Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake](#) - Tony Spurrier [25]
[Re: UK UFO Weekend](#) - Tony Spurrier [20]
[MAGONIA Monthly Supplement No. 16 June 1999](#) - Mark Pilkington [316]

Jun 12:

[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [19]

Jun 13:

[Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same](#) - Don Allen [6]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting](#) - Jerome Clark [31]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold](#) - David Rudiak [278]
[MUFON '99 International Symposium](#) - Sue Kovios [168]
[Re: Greer Joins The Prophets Conference Visiting](#) - Josh Goldstein [2]
['Angel Hair' Again Falls From The Sky In OZ](#) - Diane Harrison [28]
[Return of Orange UFOs To OZ East Coast](#) - Diane Harrison [40]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [20]
[New CD-ROM Publication From CUFOS](#) - Steven W. Kaeser [23]
[Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Jenny Randles [85]
[Van Den Broeck's Paper On 'Warp' Drive](#) - Stig Agermose [31]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Tim Matthews [57]
[European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies](#) - John Hayes [29]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [10]
[Re: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Mendoza [128]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Dennis Stacy [47]
[Larry Hatch Is Back](#) - Larry Hatch [6]
[Re: Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much](#) - Larry Hatch [14]
[Seti@home 'Failure'?](#) - John Tenney [44]
[Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99](#) - Larry Hatch [14]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Larry Hatch [14]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Larry Hatch [50]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold's Sighting \[was: Re: Voyager](#) - David Rudiak [170]
[Fwd: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90](#) - Philip Mantle - QUEST [73]
[BWW Media Alert 19990613](#) - Bufo Calvin [212]

[Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same](#) - Donnie Shevlin [28]
[Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Crosses Atlantic](#) - David Clarke [50]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Jim Mortellaro [55]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - John Heptonstall [66]
['Strange Days...Indeed' - Tonight: Dennis Stacy](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [20]
[Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture](#) - Roy Hale [5]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting](#) - Dennis Stacy [58]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Rose Hargrove [41]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold](#) - Dennis Stacy [39]
[Re: Fwd: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90](#) - Henny van der Pluijm [13]

Jun 14:

[Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan, 7 July 1989?](#) - Roy Hale [12]
[24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?](#) - Roy Hale [12]
[Humanoid Allegedly Found In Mason, MI, In Spring](#) - Stig Agermose [44]

Jun 15:

[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Nathan Ranger [55]
[Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same](#) - Christine Fernandes [4]
[Housekeeping](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [13]
[FYI: Possible UFO Mis-Reports](#) - Leanne Martin [9]
[Re: Seti@home 'Failure'?](#) - Michel M. Deschamps [12]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Dennis Stacy [17]
[UFO, Paranormal, New Age Etc. Address List?](#) - Philip Mantle - QUEST [14]
[Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same](#) - Jacques Poulet [18]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Jsmortell@aol.com [16]
[Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture](#) - Mike Wootten [6]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Jenny Randles [107]
[Re: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90](#) - Nick Balaskas [32]
[Research Institute on Anomalous Phenomena](#), - Alexander Beletsky [107]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - John Rimmer [34]

Jun 16:

[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [12]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold](#) - Bruce Maccabee [52]
[Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99](#) - Bruce Maccabee [3]
[Re: Humanoid Allegedly Found In Mason, MI, In](#) - Jeff Westover [3]
[Re: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting](#) - James Easton [115]
[The Millennium Project News - June 14, 1999](#) - Paul Anderson - TMP/CPR-Canada [98]
[Possibilities](#) - Judith Dale [26]
[Re: Survey: 'UFO Technology' Among Top](#) - Stig Agermose [152]
[Re: Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan, 7 July](#) - Larry Hatch [12]
[Re: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?](#) - Larry Hatch [18]
[Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture](#) - David Clarke [58]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Jenny Randles [24]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting](#) - Jerome Clark [65]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Martin Phillips [16]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Jerome Clark [6]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Larry Hatch [12]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - John Velez [49]

[Re: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Jerome Clark [11]
['UFO Research: Cincinnati' Site Revision/update](#) - Kenny Young [11]
[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman](#) - Mark Cashman [13]
[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedma](#) - Mark Cashman [33]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Jim Mortellaro [10]
[RUFOS, JFK, and Richard Belzer](#) - Stig Agermose [125]
[U.S. Military Designation System \[AN\---\]](#) - Stig Agermose [105]
[The Stonedisks of Baian-Kara-Ula](#) - Stig Agermose [38]
[Re: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90](#) - Henny van der Pluijm [10]
[US Feds: No Implant In 'Mobster's' Butt](#) - Stig Agermose [44]
[Re: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting](#) - Mark Cashman [31]
[John Mack, M.D. Joins The Prophets Conference](#) - prophets@maui.net [46]
[Physics Of UFO Data](#) - Stig Agermose [23]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting](#) - Josh Goldstein [21]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Perry Mick [8]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting](#) - Donald Ledger [52]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting](#) - Asgeir W. Skavhaug [87]
[Re: Possibilities](#) - Stephen Bassett [37]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Jim Mortellaro [19]
[Re: Irwin Weider Query](#) - Andy Roberts [6]
[Re: Budd Hopkins \[was: Mad Maxad Max: Beyond the](#) - Jerome Clark [19]
[Re: US Feds: No Implant In 'Mobster's' Butt](#) - Jsmortell@aol.com [22]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Jim Mortellaro [3]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting](#) - Dennis Stacy [18]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Dennis Stacy [66]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Dennis Stacy [40]

Jun 17:

[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Jerome Clark [4]
[UFOs Around The World...A Lot Of Them](#) - Thiago Ticchetti [48]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [4]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting](#) - Bruce Maccabee [215]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting](#) - Bruce Maccabee [3]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - John Velez [64]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Jenny Randles [109]

Jun 18:

[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Mark Cashman [40]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting](#) - Mark Cashman [58]
[Re: Moving Home](#) - Sean Jones [11]
[Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'](#) - Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo [227]
[Timothy Cooper's MJ-12 REPORT](#) - Stig Agermose [451]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Jenny Randles [46]
[Re: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Peter Brookesmith-Mendoza [45]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Dennis Stacy [35]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Judith Jaafar [105]
[Firmage Returns To Lead New USWeb/CKS Venture](#) - Stig Agermose [45]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Dennis Stacy [26]
[Einstein'S Brain Found To Be Anatomically Distinct](#) - Stig Agermose [83]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting](#) - Donald . Ledger [16]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Jerome Clark [51]

[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman](#) - Kevin Randle [7]
[Ray Gun Freezes Victims Without Causing Injury](#) - Stig Agermose [97]
[Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie](#) - Jerome Clark [21]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Greg Sandow [11]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting](#) - David Rudiak [172]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - John Heptonstall [31]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Lynda Matthews [36]
[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Andy Roberts [146]

Jun 19:

[Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome](#) - Jim Mortellaro [10]
['The Roots Of Complacency'](#) - Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo [227]
[Filer's Files #24 --1999](#) - George A. Filer [407]
[Cashman & IUR](#) - Bill Weber [21]
[Re: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?](#) - Nick Balaskas [30]
[Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell](#) - Bob Young [6]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - David Rudiak [41]
[Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie](#) - Greg Sandow [18]
[NASA Demonstrates A More Open Forum](#) - Mitch Battros [69]
[Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie](#) - Jenny Randles [26]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Jenny Randles [97]
[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman](#) - Stan Friedman [7]
[Blather: On The Ghost Bus](#) - Daev Walsh - Blather [358]
[UFO Over Pakistan](#) - Stig Agermose [16]
[Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie](#) - Thiago Ticchetti [15]
[Gigantic 'Heart' formation on Mars](#) - Stig Agermose [43]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Dennis Stacy [9]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Dennis Stacy [8]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Roger Evans [27]
[Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes](#) - Bruce Maccabee [6]
[Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting](#) - Michel M. Deschamps [18]
[Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie](#) - Jean-Luc Rivera [16]
[Re: Cashman & IUR](#) - Larry Hatch [36]
[British Columbia UFO Radio Show](#) - UFO*BC [25]
[Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman](#) - Kevin Randle [15]
[Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell](#) - KRandle993@aol.com [117]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Kevin Randle [14]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Larry Hatch [37]
[Re: Gigantic 'Heart' formation on Mars](#) - Jim Mortellaro [10]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Jenny Randles [13]
[J. Allen Hynek Quote](#) - Francisco Lopez [162]

Jun 20:

[Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Confusion](#) - Jenny Randles [143]
[Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'](#) - Jim Mortellaro [76]
[Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie](#) - Peter Brookesmith - Mendoza [112]
[Night Sky Mystery - Is It A Bird, Is It A Plane..?](#) - Diane Harrison [43]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Greg Sandow [7]
[Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'](#) - Bruce Maccabee [3]
[Re: Cashman & IUR](#) - Tim D. Brigham [20]
[Satanic Abuse \[was: Re: Budd Hopkins\]](#) - Josh Goldstein [23]

[BWW Media Alert 19990620](#) - BufoCalvin@aol.com [201]
[Time Travel](#) - Jenny Randles [19]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Bluehare Dark Peak [538]
[RIPT & MJ-12](#) - Asgeir W. Skavhaug [34]
['Strange Days...Indeed' - Tonight: Stanton T.](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [20]

Jun 21:

[Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'](#) - Brian Cuthbertson [25]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Dennis Stacy [35]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Brian Cuthbertson [10]
[Re: Hypnotic Abuse \[was: Re: Budd Hopkins\]](#) - Tim Matthews [10]
[Re: Satanic Abuse \[was: Re: Budd Hopkins\]](#) - John Rimmer [13]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Roy Hale [40]
[Re: Time Travel \[Caution: 'umour\]](#) - From: Jim Mortellaro [28]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Roger Evans [38]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Jenny Randles [33]
['The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Phillip S. Duke [45]
[Re: Budd Hopkins](#) - Jerome Clark [8]
[Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie](#) - Jerome Clark" [27]
[Re: RIPT & MJ-12](#) - Kevin Randle [26]
[Re: Hypnotic Abuse](#) - Steven Kaeser [18]

Jun 22:

[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Greg Sandow [9]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Andy Roberts [64]
[Big Grey Man of Ben McDhui](#) - Allen Loper [8]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - "Matthew Williams" [108]
[Kind Words](#) - Kevin Randle [6]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Peter Brookesmith Mendoza [22]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Kathleen Andersen [22]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Thiago Ticchetti [8]
[GOES and METEOSAT pictures of UFOS?](#) - Luis Eduardo Pacheco [15]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - GT McCoy [30]
[Re: Hypnotic Abuse](#) - Roy Hale [7]
[Re: RIPT & MJ-12](#) - Neil Morris [82]
[Re: Hypnotic Abuse](#) - Kevin Randle [27]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Kevin Randle [16]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - David Clarke [16]
[Truth In Numbers](#) - Bob Kathman [12]
[S4 Database - New Address](#) - Olav Phillips [19]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Royce J.Myers III [16]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Judith Dale [43]
[Aurora 1897 - Again](#) - Richard D. Nolane [18]

Jun 23:

[Re: New Images Placed On RPIT Site - "The Bird"](#) - Asgeir W. Skavhaug [33]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Jenny Randles [26]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Teri Edgar [15]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Larry Hatch [8]
[Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie](#) - Peter Brookesmith Mendoza [32]

[Re: Hypnotic Abuse](#) - Jerome Clark [38]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - James Easton [28]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Phillip S Duke [100]
[Re: RIPT & MJ-12](#) - Roger Evans [29]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Greg Sandow [22]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Greg Sandow [36]
[Re: Hypnotic Abuse](#) - John Velez [63]
[Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952](#) - Stig Agermose [28]
[Re: Hypnotic Abuse](#) - Tim Matthews [0]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Roy Hale [7]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Peter Brookesmith Mendoza [152]
[On Firmage's UFO Theories](#) - Stig Agermose [87]

Jun 24:

[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Jenny Randles [26]
[Re: Hypnotic Abuse](#) - Jenny Randles [111]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - KAnder6444@aol.com [12]
[Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie](#) - Jerome Clark [45]
[Re: Hypnotic Abuse](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [10]
[Paradigm Research Group Update - 6/22/99](#) - Stephen G. Bassett [379]
[Firmage's ISSO Update](#) - Joe Firmage Automessenger <> [56]
[Cattle Mutilation in Chino Valley, Arizona](#) - Desiree Holloway [21]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Henny van der Pluijm [10]
[Alien Life May Be Hard To Find](#) - Stig Agermose [58]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Henny van der Pluijm [12]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - judithdale [47]
[Re: New Images Placed On RPIT Site - "The Bird"](#) - Neil Morris [29]
[Re: RIPT & MJ-12](#) - Neil Morris [120]
[Re: Hypnotic Abuse](#) - Tim D. Brigham [28]
[P-47: Astronaut Cooper and UFOs](#) - Loy Pressley [24]
[Re: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952](#) - Donald Ledger [9]
[Re: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952](#) - Jim Ball [19]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Tim D. Brigham [48]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Greg Sandow [14]
[Re: RIPT & MJ-12](#) - David Rudiak [67]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Bruce Maccabee [2]
[Re: Crisis..... What Crisis](#) - Jerry Anderson [43]

Jun 25:

[Re: Crisis..... What Crisis?](#) - Jim Mortellaro [62]
[Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'](#) - Sharon Kardol [42]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Mark Cashman [10]
[Re: Crisis..... What Crisis?](#) - Michel M. Deschamps [9]
[Re: Otherworld Reality Conference - Review PT. 2](#) - Stephen Miles Lewis - ELFIS [616]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Mike Wootten [16]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Mike Wootten [16]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Mike Wootten [16]

Jun 26:

[Filer's Files #25 - 99](#) - George A. Filer [408]

[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Roger Evans [48]
[Month-Long Sightings In Iran?](#) - Stig Agermose [11]
[Doug & Dave?](#) - John Gilbert [7]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - John Gilbert [7]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - Teri Edgar [18]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - John Rimmer [12]

Jun 27:

[UFO Sighting & Mag Detector Activity?](#) - Stan Gordon [102]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Kevin Randle [13]
[Re: Month-Long Sightings In Iran?](#) - Larry Hatch [5]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Larry Hatch [12]
[UFO Shows on TLC Tonight](#) - Dave Pengilly - UFO*BC [10]
[Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed](#) - KAnder6444@aol.com [35]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - neil morris [16]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - dave bowden [19]
[New Project 1947 Web Site](#) - UFO UpDates - Toronto [9]
[Joseph Trainor and UFO ROUNDUP - Mystery Solved!](#) - John Hayes [81]
[Re: Theorist Predicts Life in Universe is Common](#) - Stig Agermose [56]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Greg Sandow [18]
[Re: WBAI RADIO](#) - Paul Williams [23]
[Re: BWW Media Alert 19990627](#) - BufoCalvin@aol.com [268]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - John Rimmer [7]
[Re: Filer's Files #25 - 99](#) - Phillip S Duke [52]

Jun 28:

[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Greg Sandow [7]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - John Hayes [15]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Larry Hatch [6]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Larry Hatch [13]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Sean Jones [17]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - John Rimmer [6]

Jun 29:

[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Tim D. Brigham [16]
[BBC: 'Fying Saucer' Grounded](#) - Steven J. Dunn [24]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Bruce Maccabee [4]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Jerome Clark [8]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Neil Morris [30]
[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Greg Sandow [14]
[Re: New Project 1947 Web Site](#) - Jim Mortellaro [35]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - dave bowden [11]
[Re: Max Burns UFO Hoax Exposed](#) - Matthew Williams [89]
[Re: Doug & Dave? \[Caution: 'umour\]](#) - Jim Mortellaro [13]
[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Jilain [11]
[Western Australia To Help In Alien Search](#) - Stig Agermose [23]
[Mars Lander And Possibly Life Sites Eyed](#) - Stig Agermose [50]
[The Millennium Project News - June 28, 1999](#) - Paul Anderson - TMP / CPR-Canada [81]
[PRG - Program Announcement](#) - Stephen G. Bassett [13]
[Satanic Abuse](#) - Bob Young [6]

[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Bob Young [10]

[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Neil Morris [24]

Jun 30:

[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Jerome Clark [8]

[Re: Doug & Dave? \[Caution: 'umour\]](#) - John Rimmer [4]

[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Henny van der Pluijm [13]

[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Sean Jones [6]

[Re: Satanic Abuse](#) - Leanne Martin [6]

[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Greg Sandow [2]

[British Aerospace Sponsors Research Into](#) - Stig Agermose [84]

[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Ron Decker [19]

[Re: Doug & Dave?](#) - Tim D. Brigham [19]

The number enclosed in brackets is the number of lines of new text in the message, excluding the header, blank lines and quotes from previous messages.

[Previous Month](#)

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: Roger Sandell Memorial Essay Competition

From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
Date: Mon, 31 May 1999 11:33:29 -0700
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:16:16 -0400
Subject: Re: Roger Sandell Memorial Essay Competition

>Date: Mon, 31 May 1999 14:22:47 +0100
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>From: John Rimmer <magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Roger Sandell Memorial Essay Competition

>In memory of the life and work of Roger Sandell, who died in
>January 1996, Magonia has instituted a regular essay competition
>with a prize of GBP 100 (USD 160) for an essay in a field
>related to Roger's interests.

>Enties are now invited for the second competition, which has the
>broad theme of:

>The Media, Vision and Belief.

>This can be interpreted in the widest sense, and could include
>media coverage of specific phenomena or beliefs; how the media
>shapes contemporary beliefs; how the media contributes to public
>understanding (or misunderstanding) of anomalous events or
>beliefs; or any other aspect of media interaction with the
>topics covered in Magonia magazine. This list is not intended to
>be comprehensive, and potential entrants are invited to contact
>the editor of Magonia to discuss if a proposed topic would be
>suitable.

>Entry is open to all, except those listed as editors of Magonia
>in the current issue.

>Each entry must be the original and unpublished work of the
>entrant, and must not be submitted elsewhere for award or
>publication before 31st October 1999.

>Entries must be between 4000 and 5000 words, not including notes
>and references, but lengthy footnotes should be avoided. Entries
>must be typed, double spaced, on one side of A4 paper, with a
>separate sheet giving the title and the entrant's name and
>address.

>Entries must be posted to John Rimmer, John Dee Cottage, 5 James
>Terrace, London SW14 8HB, UK, in time to be received by 31st
>September 1999. Entries sent on disc, by fax or e-mail are not
>acceptable.

>Entries will be judged by John Rimmer, John Harney and Peter
>Rogerson, and the winner will receive a prize of 100 pounds
>(\$160). No correspondence will be entered into. The judges
>reserve the right to withhold the prize if they consider that no
>entry reaches a sufficiently high standard.

>The winning entry will be published in Magonia. The editors may
>wish to publish other entries by agreement with the authors.

Dear John:

I hope you do not get TOO many entries.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: An Open Letter To A Friend, Jeff Rense...

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 31 May 1999 15:00:13 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:17:24 -0400
Subject: Re: An Open Letter To A Friend, Jeff Rense...

>Date: Mon, 31 May 1999 10:03:59 -0700
>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalseve.net>
>Subject: Re: An Open Letter To A Friend, Jeff Rense... Journalist

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 12:20:10 EDT
>>Subject: Re: An Open Letter To A Friend, Jeff Rense... Journalist
>>To: updates@globalseve.net

>>I am reduced to a quivering mass of inert protoplasm. My
>>reputations as Cheeser, Vintner, UFO publisher and inebriant are
>>finished. My fresh wines are not selling well. People think I
>>have come out of my security closet, the one I hide in and pass
>>notes to my employees ... whenever the rest of the world goes
>>mad. The one in which my non compos mentis ravings are well
>>met. That place I go in order to receive messages from the tin
>>foil hat I wear in there.

>>I promise to answer all the private mail I've received, just
>>give me some time... and please, stop sending the original to
>>your friends... It's ruining my reputation as a ditsy dirt-bag.

>>Jim

>Dear Monsignor Mortadella, provider of salami, bologna and fresh
>vintage wines:

>Please stoppa disturbando mia Burpa.

>You'a knocka dem suds off.

>With the very best regards

>- Larry

>

>PS:

>

>Further findings!

><http://www.jps.net/larryhat/48yrs.html>

>If that doesn't work, navigate thru the Statistics Menu.

>Otherwise, try Larry Hatches Burpa! It ain't exactly Grippa,
>but it don't dye a guys stools Purpa.

>[sorry]

Never be sorry for Purple Stools... but you need to know
something about Morte.... as in "Morte-llaro" and "Marte-della!"

Oh my gawd! Everybody is gonna be sorry you said that....
Except me. I am now going into the Italian Deli meat
business... say, what's an old sudzer like you with a name like
Hatch know about Mortadella? Woof... will wonders never cease.
I am driven to bedlam!

And now for the rest of the story (with special thanks to Paul Harvey). Mortellaro... mortadella... "Morte" meaning death, is a part of both words. Mortadella is an Italian cold cut made (in original form) from blood. It's a little like German Blutvurst. It's got fat, blood, peppercorns, garlic and the "death or morte" part comes from the blood. Without blood.... you is dead!

Anyway, about 28 years ago, my wife who is an artist, had a bad case of contact dermititis from some of the chemicals she was using. So off we went to the Grand Concourse (in the Bronx) to a dermatologist... this man is very Jewish... conservative. We get thru with the exam when he tells us how much he loves Italian culture. He turns out to be a student of Italian culture.

He whips it out... (Sorry, Cleavon Little is dead too) anyway, he whips out a huge, leather bound volume of names, all Italian. He aks (this is the Bronx, remember?) us if we know what Mortellaro means...? We say no, but it must have something to do with death, as that is the first word in the name.

He looks it up and says, "Mortellaro is a bastardization of a word (which escapes me right now) which means "lives forever or Lack of death." It is the name of an evergreen tree indigeonous to the island if Sicily. And aks us for \$50 and sends us on our way. So, just call me "Tree" or "everygreen". But ya dasn't hafta call me Johnson!

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
Date: Mon, 31 May 1999 23:21:17 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:18:40 -0400
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 16:01:49 -0400
>From: Tony Spurrier <TSpurrier@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>The handful of reports which relate to first hand witnesses
>seeing formations appear before their eyes are sketchy to
>say the least. Following are some eyewitness reports:

>Arthur Shuttlewood - 1970's, a fan opening spiral in grass
>on Starr Hill in Bishopstrow parish, Wiltshire

>Melvyn Bell - 1983 in wheat, on the slopes of Great Cheverell
>Hill, Wiltshire

>Ray Barnes - 3rd July 1982, a fan opening spiral in a cereal
>crop on the slopes of Westbury Hill

>Sandy Reid - late August 1989, near Duntoon Hill, north of
>Dundee

>These are the eyewitness accounts in 'The Crop Circle
>Enigma',

Thanks for listing them, Tony. I suppose if there were as many as 500 such reports, they would still be dismissed as anecdotal, for the same reason that several hundred thousand screened UFO reports are treated the same way by negative skeptics. But it would be interesting to interview these four persons and form one's own opinion as to their sincerity and character. But at least Terence Meaden thought these witnesses' reports were worth noting, which is more than most anti-UFO advocates would do.

>what surprises me is the lack of detail regarding
>the 'sightings' plus the lack of supporting evidence that
>the formations allegedly seen created were anything more
>than wind damage.

Anyone who has seen crop blow-down due to wind knows that that doesn't leave a formation with the distinct geometry of a crop-circle formation or with regular, crisp edges.

>For some reason it appears that dowsing
>rods are to be taken more seriously than these eyewitnesses,
>why?

If I heard someone make that suggestion, I wouldn't take them seriously.

>Why do formations in oil-seed rape offer more proof to
>a non-terrestrial origin for crop circles?

For the same reason that hoaxed crop circles in oil-seed rape are extremely rare. That thick-stemmed crop consists of quite bushy plants that are rather unmanageable when you get in there with your boards and all. I suppose someone has tried to make a crop circle in it, but if so, they must have left quite a mess of broken and irregularly tangled stems.

>If the subject of crop circles was or is to
>be taken seriously why weren't the latest revelations
>highlighted back in the late 70's, early 80's? Especially as
>there were less formations created back then, is it that today's
>formation are genuine and those weren't, or is there another
>explanation?

Do you mean, Why did the formations evolve from circles and
formations of circles to much more complex patterns? That could
be due to the "I" in ETI. If the aliens have enough intelligence
not to have forced themselves upon us after some 52 years of a
campaign of a stepped-up sightings rate, and to allow the
coverup to continue until we can expose it ourselves, their
strategy could be similar relative to crop circles -- to give
the skeptics the option of not being forced to believe in the
reality of what they would prefer to ignore. Of course, it
didn't help Terence Meaden, who has to assume that descending
vortices from on high have given way to all hoaxes.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO Updates Main Index](#)

UFO Updates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

The Millennium Project News - May 31, 1999

From: Paul Anderson - TMP / CPR-Canada <psa@direct.ca>
Date: Mon, 31 May 1999 13:52:48 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:17:58 -0400
Subject: The Millennium Project News - May 31, 1999

The Millennium Project News
News and Updates from The Millennium Project

May 31, 1999

WEEKLY BRIEFING:

More updates on the mystery contrails (or "chemtrails"), with new reports from myself and others here in Vancouver, BC and the US. Many very large contrails, including bold "Xs" and "cross-hatch patterns" and other "geometric" shapes were seen over Vancouver and in surrounding municipalities on May 26, as well as other days in the past couple weeks, with the 21st and 26th being the "heaviest" days of activity (so far). Some photos have been added to the web site, along with the reports. More will added as soon as they can be scanned. When we first started seeing the unusual contrail patterns here in mid-April (similar to reports from all across the US and Canada), they were all parallel, but an unusually high number of them, and very large. Now, we have started seeing the (increasingly blatant) characteristic Xs and cross-hatch patterns here, just in the last couple weeks or so. Also, in cooperation with William Thomas (who resides on Vancouver Island here in Canada), we are now looking for a private pilot who may be able to assist in close-up photography /video of some of these bizarre contrails and the aircraft involved, as well as gathering of air samples for analysis. If you are a pilot or know of any pilots in the western Canada or US areas who may be able to help, please notify myself or William Thomas immediately. And to all who read this - for heaven's sake *look up* and see what may be happening in your skies... (as if increasing waves of UFO sightings weren't enough). More background info on this phenomenon is on the web site.

Also, the latest crop circle reports from England and Germany as the season kicks into high gear, plus the latest UFO, space and science news, the next Fields of Dreams crop circle lecture for The Millennium Forum and new web site links.

Wishing a good week to all of you.

Paul Anderson
Director
The Millennium Project

See the TMP web site for links to the following news stories and updates, an archive of previous news and information on other TMP resources:

<http://persweb.direct.ca/psa>

NEWS AND REPORTS

- * Latest Crop Circle Updates from England and Germany
- * "Airport for UFOs" Looks For Signals From Hidden Universe
- * Filer's Files #21 - May 28, 1999
- * Australia Confirms Existence of UKUSA, Echelon
- * New "Suncruiser" Images from I Wonder Productions
- * Popular Science: NASA Interstellar Propulsion Schemes
- * "Dark Energy"
- * Scientists: Cloned Sheep Dolly has "Old" DNA

SPECIAL RESEARCH PROJECTS

- * Mystery Contrails: New Reports and Photos from BC, Washington, Ohio, Michigan and North Dakota

THE MILLENNIUM FORUM

- * Next Fields of Dreams Crop Circle Presentation
June 21 in Vancouver, BC

RELATED WEB SITE LINKS

- * Link for New Earth Files web site by Linda Moulton Howe

The Millennium Project News is the e-mail update service of The Millennium Project, an independent research organization initiated in January 1999 as an alternative source of news and information to the mainstream media. TMP was founded by future studies researcher Paul Anderson, also director of Circles Phenomenon Research Canada.

TMP News is published weekly or as breaking news develops, with the latest news and reports, information on TMP events and web site updates and is available free by subscription; to be added to or removed from the mailing list, send your request, including either "subscribe TMP News" or "unsubscribe TMP News" and e-mail address to: psa@direct.ca

TMP welcomes your news leads and submissions.
Forward all correspondence to:

E-Mail:
psa@direct.ca

Tel / Fax:
604.731.8522

Mail:
Suite 202 - 2086 West 2nd Avenue
Vancouver, BC
V6J 1J4
Canada

=A9 The Millennium Project, 1999

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Appeal From CUFORG [Cornwall UFO Research Group]

From: **Ian Darlington** <cuforg@interweb-design.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 10:30:34 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:19:09 -0400
Subject: Appeal From CUFORG [Cornwall UFO Research Group]

Dear All,

I am writing to ask if anyone has an article, research report or similar piece of work that they would be willing to allow me to publish in our small circulation printed newsletter 'Skywatchers'.

The newsletter starts life as a 36 page photocopied edition with a print run of about 80 copies. We then provide an email edition to researchers and members of the public who subscribe. Eventually, some of the articles are published on our Web site.

Each article will naturally be credited & linked (where applicable) to the author - please let me know where you are willing to have your work published: printed edn., email, Web site or all three.

Please email any articles or enquiries to:
<mailto:cuforg@interweb-design.co.uk>

Many thanks in advance,

Ian Darlington.
Editor/Webmaster 'Skywatchers'.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [cuforg](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

From: Karl Pflock <Ktperehwon@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 11:50:01 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:19:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

Dennis & Fellow List Fiends--

>In Friedman's defense, abductions have never been a part of his
>portfolio.

You, Harney et al. seem to forget Stan was a not insignificant player in the Barney and Betty Hill case, albeit with respect to an almost nutsy-boltsy matter: the star map and Marjorie Fish's work re same. This certainly doesn't make him an abductologist, but it suggests why he might be a good choice as an abduction conference presenter.

I don't know what Stan spoke of at the conference, but if he addressed the star map and its implications, then he just may have contributed in some small degree to bringing abductology back down to earth, so to speak, and to re-linking the subject in some substantial way to ufology.

-- Cheers, KARL

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

From: Greg Sandow <gsandow@prodigy.net>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 11:48:56 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:20:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 19:28:55 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>Greg,

>Not to choose sides in an already complicated issue, but I
>think Harney's point was this (or something similar): A one day
>symposium on the abduction phenomenon is being held; So why is
>Friedman, an historically nuts and bolts man, invited to speak
>at same, say, in lieu of someone else, such as Kevin Randle?
>Remember that discussion?

>A quick glance at the index of my copy of Alien Discussions, for
>example, reveals not a single entry under Friedman, Stan or
>Stanton. Friedman has never been regarded as an abduction man
>(pardon the phrase), so the curious among us simply want to know
>why he is now presumed to have any meaningful input on the
>matter?

Stan was invited to speak about one very specific issue -- can alien beings travel to earth from other solar systems? This is something he's well qualified to discuss, because of his background in nuclear engineering, and especially because of his work on the attempted development of nuclear rockets. This was a part of his history I hadn't been aware of, and I was intrigued by his thoughts on how scientists, when they declare that something is impossible, may not have considered engineering approaches to the problems they think can't be solved.

Since Stan was speaking at the conference, it seemed reasonable to ask him what he thinks about abductions, and, as moderator, I did that during the final discussion panel. As I said here earlier, I'd already asked him to write a position statement for the conference press kit. Speaking only for myself, I found it interesting to have a participant who hadn't been closely identified with the subject, as something of a wild card in the mix. Any more than this should come from Stan himself, which is not to say that there are any great secrets here. It's just that I don't have any business speaking for him. (I should note that speakers had their expenses reimbursed, but weren't paid any fee.)

>Harney is perfectly right and free as an editorial commentator
>to speak his mind, concluding with the plea: "Could someone sort
>it out for me?" Does Greg seriously believe that NY Times
>editorial writers are obligated to do original reporting
>themselves (ie, man the phones) when commenting upon already
>extant news items? Of course not.

Of course they aren't. But the Times will already have printed news stories on the issues discussed in editorials, and there presumably won't be gaping holes in the coverage. If the Times wants to campaign, let's say, against Clinton's policy toward Yugoslavia, they'll have asked him any relevant questions in the course of their news reporting.

The Magonia editorial appeared on its own, without any context of news about the conference. So Harney's plea for information -- about something he could easily have found out for himself -- made his newsletter seem like a rather hapless amateur operation, at least to me.

If you want comparisons, Dennis, I'll offer two, which at least to me make more sense than a comparison to a NY Times editorial.

Comparison 1: If I write one of my music reviews for the Wall Street Journal, I'll never let any major question sit unanswered. I can't just sit back and write, "Will someone tell me why Gerard Schwarz is still music director of the Mostly Mozart festival?" I have to call the festival (or other sources in the business) in an attempt to find out.

Comparison 2: You'd left the MUFON Journal, Dennis, when I published my review there of David Jacobs's book "The Threat." But I had a question for Dave when I wrote the book -- "How many abductees reported the things the book talked about?" So I called him to ask, and spent much of the review discussing his answers.

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

From: Mark Cashman <mcashman@ix.netcom.com>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 10:28:26 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:21:09 -0400
Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 10:00:42 +0100
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>From: John Rimmer <magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>Editor: JOHN HARNEY

>EDITORIAL

>Let us take multi-witness cases first. There are, so far
>as I am aware, no cases with multiple, independent witnesses
>which cannot be explained with reference to sightings of
>aircraft or natural phenomena. Those cases which appear to
>satisfy these criteria do not stand up to critical examination.

There must be short memories at Magonia -

- 1) Lubbock, TX 1951 (Photos also)
- 2) Paul Hill, Hampton, VA, 1952
- 3) Vins, France, 1957
- 4) Levelland, TX 1957
- 5) Sherman TX, 1965 (Photos, also)

There are, of course, more. And there are many where multiple witnesses are in the same location but otherwise have no association.

It's not as if the above are obscure incidents, either.

Mark Cashman (TeamB - C++ Builder), creator of The Temporal Doorway at
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com>
- Original digital art, writing, music and more -
C++ Builder / JBuilder Tips and The C++ Builder Programmer's Webring (Join us!)
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com/programming/index.htm>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 15:53:50 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:24:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>From: Karl Pflock <Ktperehwon@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 11:50:01 EDT
>Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999
>To: updates@globalserve.net

>Dennis & Fellow List Fiends--

>>In Friedman's defense, abductions have never been a part of his
>>portfolio.

>You, Harney et al. seem to forget Stan was a not insignificant
>player in the Barney and Betty Hill case, albeit with respect to
>an almost nutsy-boltsy matter: the star map and Marjorie Fish's
>work re same. This certainly doesn't make him an abductologist,
>but it suggests why he might be a good choice as an abduction
>conference presenter.

>I don't know what Stan spoke of at the conference, but if he
>addressed the star map and its implications, then he just may
>have contributed in some small degree to bringing abductology
>back down to earth, so to speak, and to re-linking the subject
>in some substantial way to ufology.

>-- Cheers, KARL

Hello Karl, hi All,

Stan did spend time talking about the star map and Marjorie
Fish's work. Both he and Jerry Clark made contributions which
'grounded' the proceedings in good old fashioned 3D reality.
Budd and Dave Jacobs made equal contributions on that score.

Stan & Jerry were there to to bring their unique 'nuts & bolts'
approach to the proceedings which they both did admirably and
with much aplomb. And, contrary to popular belief, so did Budd
and David Jacobs. There are so many false and unjustified
accusations thrown at Budd and David that I just thought I'd
mention the fact that they both happen to be two of the more
'grounded' people investigating this subject.

The lineup that was selected for the conference was
deliberate and well thought out. It was one of the more
"intelligent/thoughtful" conferences I have ever attended. No
'crystals and ballyhoo', just straight information that the
attendees could use to formulate their own oppinions.

Peace,

John Velez, Webmaster IF-AIC

jvif@spacelab.net
INTRUDERS FOUNDATION/ABDUCTION INFORMATION CENTER
<http://www.if-aic.com/>

"Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 15:32:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:24:45 -0400
Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>From: Greg Sandow <gsandow@prodigy.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999
>Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 11:48:56 -0400

<snip>

>If you want comparisons, Dennis, I'll offer two, which at least
>to me make more sense than a comparison to a NY Times editorial.

>Comparison 1: If I write one of my music reviews for the Wall
>Street Journal, I'll never let any major question sit
>unanswered. I can't just sit back and write, "Will someone tell
>me why Gerard Schwarz is still music director of the Mostly
>Mozart festival?" I have to call the festival (or other sources
>in the business) in an attempt to find out.

>Comparison 2: You'd left the MUFON Journal, Dennis, when I
>published my review there of David Jacobs's book "The Threat."
>But I had a question for Dave when I wrote the book -- "How many
>abductees reported the things the book talked about?" So I
>called him to ask, and spent much of the review discussing his
>answers.

>Greg Sandow

Greg,

As I said, I don't have a dog in this hunt. I accept that your comments and reasoning are imminently rational, just as I accept that Harney might have rational reasons for his comments, too, if he cares to make them public.

But since you brought up the book review example, let me comment. Surely it is not standard practice for a book reviewer to call up an author for further clarification of a particular point?

Admittedly, there's no law that says you can't or shouldn't, but neither is there any obligation to do so under the circumstances. The book review is your opinion and you stand or fall on it. If I wonder aloud, "What the hell was Tom Wolfe thinking when he ended his latest novel the way he did?" should I give him a quick call to find out?

Similarly, the organizers of a conference are perfectly free to invite anyone they want, just as Friedman is perfectly free to show up and speak at same. That's not at dispute, either. No one is obligated to invite a skunk to their garden party if they aren't so inclined.

If I were going to hold a one-day seminar devoted to the abduction problem, however, I can think of a long list of names that would precede Friedman's. But that would depend on whether the organizers were interested in educating the public as to all the pros and cons of the subject under discussion, bolstering their own case, preaching to the choir, keeping expenses to a minimum...any number of factors.

It would behoove us all -- without increasing our cynicism or pessimism quotients -- to remember that life is a series of compromises. Sometimes you pick up the phone, and sometimes you don't. And just because you get a quote doesn't necessarily mean you got the answer.

"Slobodan, Dennis here. _Why_ are you terrorizing all those ethnic Albanians in Kosovar, anyway?"

I guess what I'm saying is this: news journalism requires that you pick up the phone. Editorial commentary, reviews, and opinion pieces don't, unless one is so inclined.

Dennis

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Tony Spurrier <TSpurrier@compuserve.com>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 17:03:18 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:25:27 -0400
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Date: Mon, 31 May 1999 23:21:17 -0700 (PDT)
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>,
>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Thanks for listing them, Tony. I suppose if there were as many
>as 500 such reports, they would still be dismissed as anecdotal,
>for the same reason that several hundred thousand screened UFO
>reports are treated the same way by negative skeptics. But it
>would be interesting to interview these four persons and form
>one's own opinion as to their sincerity and character.

Do you have the full details of what these eyewitnesses actually claim to have seen? If so, I'd like to view their accounts and details of the alleged formations that were created.

>But at least Terence Meaden thought these witnesses' reports were
>worth noting, which is more than most anti-UFO advocates would do.

I have noted it also but a few names, dates and vague areas doesn't constitute worthwhile testimony. Where are the full accounts of what these people saw?

>For the same reason that hoaxed crop circles in oil-seed rape
>are extremely rare. That thick-stemmed crop consists of quite
>bushy plants that are rather unmanageable when you get in there
>with your boards and all. I suppose someone has tried to make a
>crop circle in it, but if so, they must have left quite a mess
>of broken and irregularly tangled stems.

Firstly, you seem to be implying here that I have a set of boards, just because I believe that circles are man made doesn't make me a circle maker. You believe some formations are UFO created, that doesn't make you an alien <g>

Secondly, have you actually tried to create a circle in oil-seed to test your theory? From what I've learned, crop is cushioned by other crop when flattening, which shelters an extremely large percentage of stems from being broken. Some apparently are broken, but barring checking every single stem a cerealogist wouldn't obviously see them. You mentioned 'Circular Evidence' before, Colin Andrews explained how crop can not be flattened using string across the radius as the pressure is too great, so we have evidence that what the circle makers say is likely to be correct.

Thirdly, what of the alleged tell tale signs that a circle is genuine can be found in the oil-seed formations, i.e. exploded nodes, etc. ?

>Do you mean, Why did the formations evolve from circles and
>formations of circles to much more complex patterns?

I didn't actually, I meant why the vortex theory, ley line theory, eti theory, none can be hoaxed, some can be hoaxed, most can be hoaxed, only the true geometric formations are genuine, those which aren't are significant etc. etc. It seems that each time the cerealogists are caught out they come back with an alternative theory which claims a mystery. Doesn't it seem that they are literally clutching at straws to make a mystery out of

something that is purely man made?

>their strategy could be similar relative to crop circles -- to give
>the skeptics the option of not being forced to believe in the
>reality of what they would prefer to ignore.

The circle makers have disclosed for years how they make crop circles, perhaps it's the believers that UFOs are connected are the ones who prefer to ignore the reality of the circles?

Tony

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Dr. Leir's Recovery

From: Derrel Sims <derrel@holman.net>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 18:00:03 -0500
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:45:38 -0400
Subject: Dr. Leir's Recovery

Dear friends, investigators and fellows in the UFO field:

Dr. Roger Leir is in dire straights medically. There is a new procedure (we are told) that may help him with his heart condition. We ask for your prayers for him and his wife Sharon, and daughter Shaina. The medical people will do what they can. We must do what we do best, so please do what you do best.

There is another issue... his family is in dire straights financially. The hospital bills are only one problem he has. His personal bills are still there as well. If his podiatry practice is not maintained (office help and other services) he will lose this as well. Since this is his practice and his primary income, please send what you can. You may be in financial difficulties (as many are), but please send something. This is very important. If you cannot send any financial support now or later, please do the one above. Pray for Roger and his family.

May God give us the wisdom and the grace to accept healing and to give it as well. This is a time for healing.

Derrel and Doris Sims

Dear Friends,

I talked with Sharon Leir this morning and she told me that Roger was re-admitted to the hospital last night. Now I have received the following from Whitley Strieber. We must really do some serious praying for Roger.

Thank you for redoubling your prayers.

Please pass this on to as many as possible.

I did just get an update from Mike Portanova, who said that Roger was suffering angina pains last night and re-entered the hospital. But he said he is doing fine and that the doctors feel he will recover. There are several arteries that have problems, and can't be operated on at this time. But other therapies can be used, along with diet and exercise, and medication. This is good news, but we still need a lot more prayer!!

Thank you,

Don Robertson
Ventura/SB MUFON:

=====
Dear Don, and friends,

Roger will, must recover. Don, our prayers are with him, as they were with you and your wife in your times of distress. I know Sharon and Shaina are with him every moment, as are all there in the area. This is healing too. I have seen Roger in

sickness, in T.O., in Japan, and other places on our trips together. Where his friends were near him, he always recovered. It is what he does.

In Japan his illness was so severe the Japanese were so worried I think they thought he might expire. I was a day late in getting to Japan. By the time I got there the Japanese were waiting for me at the train station. They all looked like they were about to go to a funeral. When I asked what the problem was, they mentioned that "Dr. Leir is very sick". When I got to the Hotel, I came in to see him immediately. After checking in on Roger, I went to put my bags in my room. While doing this, Roger called me. He was in great agony. He asked me to "use my magic of hypnotic anesthesia on him". I had never seen him in such pain. This pain was due to chronic "gut condition" (as Rog refers to it). The benefits seemed to be effective and he was in deep trance in a few moments. By morning he was up and jumping around (literally) like a boy. The Japanese were very excited and relieved. Dr. Jesse Marcel Jr. was in some sickness as well that morning. Later Dr. Haines had some difficulty as well. That may have been the difference in foods of one nation from another? Roger's condition has been with him for a while. If Rog can recover from that, then he will recover from this, we all pray to that effect.

He should be up and at them soon. On our travels, I would often carry most of our bags. This was to conserve his strength. Roger has had a heart condition for some time. All his friends know this. He must be encouraged (by all those who are with him when he eats and is at work), to follow the advice of the doctors at this time. Most of us do not do that (as we should) in these situations. This advice is for his continued recovery and best of health for the rest of his life. Please insist that Roger stay on proper diet, and exercise in a way that is consistent with the best medical advice he is being given.

Roger is sometimes hardheaded. Many people in the medical profession are. They have to be. Rog often mentions that he is not afraid of death. That I admire. Following his own Dr.'s advice is what I admire more. Please insist on Roger to follow the heart specialists advice. Those of us who have been around him most know this is essential for him to do so, especially now.

Don I totally agree with you. Doubling up on our prayers is the best thing we can all do. Thank you for the updates and your continued word on Roger's condition.

Derrel/Doris Sims

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 1](#)

Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

From: Greg Sandow <gsandow@prodigy.net>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 19:43:58 -0400
Fwd Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 22:54:24 -0400
Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>From: Karl Pflock <Ktperehwon@aol.com>
>Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 11:50:01 EDT
>Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999
>To: updates@globalserve.net

>I don't know what Stan spoke of at the conference, but if he
>addressed the star map and its implications, then he just may
>have contributed in some small degree to bringing abductology
>back down to earth, so to speak, and to re-linking the subject
>in some substantial way to ufology.

Yes, Karl, Stan did talk about the star map. Thanks for reminding me, and reminding all of us of Stan's long-time interest in it.

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

From: Kim Burrafato <lensman@stardrive.org>
Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 21:05:52 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 08:08:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

>To: updates@globalserve.net
>From: Bill Chalker <bill_c@bigpond.com>
>Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?
>Date: Sun, 30 May 99 22:40:31 PDT

>>Date: Sat, 29 May 1999 22:22:32 -0400
>>From: Paul Badger <pbadger@compuserve.com>
>>Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

><snip>

>>I haven't read the article, but from the brief reference made to
>>it on the CUFOS website, I get the impression that the point of
>>the story is that the hair alleged to have been left behind by
>>the entity has human DNA, albeit very rare, and not a DNA that
>>is unrecognisable and thus "alien". Am I right?

>I expected my IUR article to create some controversy, but
>probably not before people have had a chance to read it (eg.
>Paul Badger). Yes Paul there is a lot more to this than the few
>lines you have made some premature conclusions from.

>I urge you to read the IUR piece first. It is a complex and
>detailed piece (15 pages) and then perhaps comment further.

>Yes the DNA profile found is "human" but it is "from one of the
>rarest human lineages known ... that lies further from the
>(human) mainstream than any other except for African Pygmies and
>aboriginals". The DNA sequencing fits only "a Chinese
>mongoloid" however the hair is blonde, rather than black, as you
>>would expect from a Chinese donor. Also the source of the hair
>was an alleged tall blonde haired female, who apart from very
>unusual "blue" eyes" a few times larger than standard human, and
>a long narrow face with pinty chin, unusual strength &
>behaviour, one might type as Scandanavian or dare I say "Nordic"
>with long exotic blonde hair and fair skin, certainly no Asian
>like feature. There were 2 "women" present. The other looked
>somewhat Asian in appearance, but had black hair, so she was not
>an obvious source of the blonde hair which we subjected to PCR
>DNA testing.

>As for "human" DNA, we need to consider the widespread reports
>of "human" like beings in abduction literature - Villas Boas,
>Travis Walton, there are many more.

>Then we need to consider are these exotic "human" similar to us
>in more ways than just appearance. Is their biological
>structure also based on a DNA structure. There are endless
>questions & speculations here.

>Also consider "human" type panspermia theories. Check out
>Appendix 2 "The Argument for Duplicate Beings" in Paul Davies
>book "Are We Alone?" (1995) and also the closing paragraphs of
>Davies book "The Fifth Miracle" (1998).

>Finally, I once again urge you to read the IUR article. It is
>much too detailed and complex to attempt a summary here and
>beside you will be supporting a very worth while publication -

>IUR. You need to have all the data to make an informed
>response.

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Re: Steve Neill Walks

From: Steve Neill <neill@gte.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 01:12:55 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 08:17:56 -0400
Subject: Re: Steve Neill Walks

>From: Sharon Kardol <sharon@hotmix.com.au>
>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Steve Neill Walks
>Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 08:54:00 +0800

>>From: Jeff Rense <eotl@west.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Steve Neill Walks
>>Date: Sat, 22 May 1999 01:40:25 -0700 (PDT)

>>Steve Neill, Renowned UFO Researcher and Artist, Quits Ufology

>>>From Steve Neill <neill@gte.net>

>>5-15-99

>>After being involved in the most serious UFO research and direct
>>experiences with ET all my life, the behavior of most of the UFO
>>community has become such a disgrace, so vile and demented, that
>>I have decided to withdraw from the field permanently.

>>All the petty, infantile mudslinging and politics, the
>>backstabbing and throat-slitting, the egos and the liars, the
>>radio cult figures, the betrayal of 'friendships' have all
>>overshadowed the critical issues at hand...and have often made a
>>virtual laughing stock of anyone who innocently tries to tell
>>the truth.

>>The UFO 'community' is its own worst enemy. Any respect this
>>field might have had or been due to receive has been destroyed
>>by the actions of many, if not most, of the key players
>>involved. I say *most* involved because there are some very good
>>professional people in the field...but they are a relative few
>>and maintain low profiles for the most part.

>><snip>

>Dear Steve,

>I don't want to start an inter-continental war here, but I was
>curious as to whether you were referring to your experiences
>with the American UFO community.

>Being an Australian, I have to say there is very little if not
>none at all, of this destroying of characters and bitter in
>fighting here. Sure personalities do clash, but we have tried
>to unite to research as a productive unit. I wasn't aware of
>this mud-slinging in Ufology until I joined a few US mail lists
>and corresponded with American reseachers.

>I'm not trying to bag you 'murikans' :), just offering sympathy
>because it's hard enough here fighting the prejudices of
>the general public and govt departments, let alone fighting
>with those with whom you should get the most support.
>Hey, perhaps you should move down under? :)

>Good Luck where your life takes you now, and we hope you find
>some peace in your adventures

>Cheers
>Sharon K

Thanks for your message Sharon. I've had so much support on this. But UFOs in America, well you know how Americans can be.

It's clear that there are many more serious researchers than I first thought, but these people stay away from the carnival aspects and are usually accused of being with the intelligence community. That has already happened to me with the types that live for the Art Bell show. Thanks again for writing and best of luck to you too!

Sincerely,

Steve Neill

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Note To UK Readers

From: John Rimmer <magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 11:54:24 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 08:20:55 -0400
Subject: Note To UK Readers

Just a note to readers in London and region that the next informal Magonia meeting takes place in the Railway pub, Putney High Street, SW14 this Sunday, June 6th, from about 7.15 pm onwards.

All welcome if you're in the neighbourhood (it's a Wetherspoon's pub so we can talk without a background of deafening music!).

--
John Rimmer
www.magonia.demon.co.uk
Abandon hope all ye who press Enter here

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

(Skyopen) Lecture in Hong Kong

From: **Jean-Michel Mariojouis** <jmexit@macau.ctm.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 08:38:13 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 08:38:13 -0400
Subject: (Skyopen) Lecture in Hong Kong

Hi everybody!

This is to inform you that I will participate to a lecture organized by the Hong Kong UFO Club at the Hong Kong Space Museum on Saturday 5th of June, between 6:00PM and 9:00PM.

The global theme will be asian UFO cases and footages from Japan, China, Taiwan, Korea, and Hong Kong and Macau. I will introduce Skywatch International and present some cases and footages from Macau, included the strange phenomenon occuring here since 1996.

Jean-Michel Mariojouis
China Director

SKYWATCH INTERNATIONAL INC.
(A Non-Profit Organization)

Administrative:
PO Box 900393
Palmdale, CA 93590-0393
USA

Membership:
PO Box 801
Leander, TX 78646-0801
USA

Postings/Mailing
PO Box 2154
Elk City, OK 73648
USA

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

'Stein Online' - Constance Clear

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <updates@globalserve.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 21:53:31 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 21:53:31 -0400
Subject: 'Stein Online' - Constance Clear

Source: <http://broadcast.com/shows/stein/>

CompuServe Interactive Radio and broadcast.com
Presents: "STEIN ONLINE" with Eliot Stein

Thursday, June 3, 1999

7:00-8:00 p.m. ET
GUEST: Constance Clear
TOPIC: Alien Abductions

Psychotherapist Constance Clear will relate first-hand accounts of individuals that came to her with claims of alien abductions. She is the author of "Reaching For Reality: Seven Incredible True Stories of Alien Abduction."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Re: (Skyopen) Lecture in Hong Kong

From: **Brian Cuthbertson** <brianc@freeside.fc.net>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 08:44:32 -0500 (CDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 21:53:31 -0400
Subject: Re: (Skyopen) Lecture in Hong Kong

>From: Jean-Michel Mariojouis <jmexit@macau.ctm.net>
>To: Skywatch International list <skywatch@ltlb.com>
>Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 1999 11:32 AM
>Subject: Lecture in Hong Kong

>This is to inform you that I will participate to a lecture
>organized by the Hong Kong UFO Club at the Hong Kong Space
>Museum on Saturday 5th of June, between 6:00PM and 9:00PM.

>The global theme will be asian UFO cases and footages from
>Japan, China, Taiwan, Korea, and Hong Kong and Macau. I will
>introduce Skywatch International and present some cases and
>footages from Macau, included the strange phenomenon occuring
>here since 1996.

Perhaps you could summarize some of the cases you mention above
and post them to the UFO UpDates mailing list for the benefit of
worldwide subscribers outside of Hong Kong? I'm sure reports
from that area would be of interest. Alternately, a web page
that discusses such cases would be of interest.

Thanks,

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Australian UFO Research Network/OZ File Report

From: Diane Harrison <tkbnetw@fan.net.au>
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 00:45:59 +1000
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 21:53:31 -0400
Subject: Australian UFO Research Network/OZ File Report

The Keith Basterfield Network Australasia
E-Mail tkbnetw@fan.net.au
<http://www.fan.net.au/~tkbnetw>

UFO Australian Research Network Hot Line Number
1800 77 22 88 Free Call

Hi everyone

It would appear Keith Douglass has been very busy investigating & collecting sighting reports in outback Alice Springs.

Keith called me last night to say a farmer 150 klm from Alice Springs out near Aritunga, called him to report the death of one of his horses. Keith said the farmer has lived in the area for many years and has never had an animal die in such a strange way. The farmer said there was no sign of the horse stumbling before its death as there should have been.

The farmer thought it was a little strange the horse was legs up and there was no sign of the horse having struggled because the ground was not disturbed at all.

The farmer said he thought he would report it because of the UFO sighting which occurred near his farm on April 18th 1999 when a photo was taken of an alleged UFO.

More details to come - still under investigation

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 14:28:46 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 22:00:47 -0400
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 17:03:18 -0400
>From: Tony Spurrier <TSpurrier@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>>Date: Mon, 31 May 1999 23:21:17 -0700 (PDT)
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>,
>>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>>Thanks for listing them, Tony. I suppose if there were as many
>>as 500 such reports, they would still be dismissed as anecdotal,
>>for the same reason that several hundred thousand screened UFO
>>reports are treated the same way by negative skeptics. But it
>>would be interesting to interview these four persons and form
>>one's own opinion as to their sincerity and character.

>Do you have the full details of what these eyewitnesses actually
>claim to have seen? If so, I'd like to view their accounts and
>details of the alleged formations that were created.

>>But at least Terence Meaden thought these witnesses' reports were
>>worth noting, which is more than most anti-UFO advocates would do.

>I have noted it also but a few names, dates and vague areas
>doesn't constitute worthwhile testimony. Where are the full
>accounts of what these people saw?

>>For the same reason that hoaxed crop circles in oil-seed rape
>>are extremely rare. That thick-stemmed crop consists of quite
>>bushy plants that are rather unmanageable when you get in there
>>with your boards and all. I suppose someone has tried to make a
>>crop circle in it, but if so, they must have left quite a mess
>>of broken and irregularly tangled stems.

>Firstly, you seem to be implying here that I have a set of
>boards, just because I believe that circles are man made doesn't
>make me a circle maker. You believe some formations are UFO
>created, that doesn't make you an alien <g>

>Secondly, have you actually tried to create a circle in oil-seed
>to test your theory? From what I've learned, crop is cushioned by
>other crop when flattening, which shelters an extremely large
>percentage of stems from being broken. Some apparently are
>broken, but barring checking every single stem a cerealogist
>wouldn't obviously see them. You mentioned 'Circular Evidence'
>before, Colin Andrews explained how crop can not be flattened
>using string across the radius as the pressure is too great, so
>we have evidence that what the circle makers say is likely to be
>correct.

>Thirdly, what of the alleged tell tale signs that a circle is genuine
>can be found in the oil-seed formations, i.e. exploded nodes, etc. ?

>>Do you mean, Why did the formations evolve from circles and
>>formations of circles to much more complex patterns?

>I didn't actually, I meant why the vortex theory, ley line
>theory, eti theory, none can be hoaxed, some can be hoaxed, most

>can be hoaxed, only the true geometric formations are genuine,
>those which aren't are significant etc. etc. It seems that each
>time the cerealogists are caught out they come back with an
>alternative theory which claims a mystery. Doesn't it seem that
>they are literally clutching at straws to make a mystery out of
>something that is purely man made?

>>their strategy could be similar relative to crop circles -- to give
>>the skeptics the option of not being forced to believe in the
>>reality of what they would prefer to ignore.

>The circle makers have disclosed for years how they make crop
>circles, perhaps it's the believers that UFOs are connected are
>the ones who prefer to ignore the reality of the circles?

Hi,

I have been following this debate with interest, as I trust has Paul Fuller. Paul and I have written three books on circles and been involved since before Colin Andrews and Pat Delgado even. We have spent a lot of time collating eyewitness accounts and both of us have interviewed some. Dozens of cases exist and you will find plenty in the 1993 updated edition of our book 'Crop Circles: A Mystery Solved?' (Robert Hale).

In essence eyewitnesses describe glowing rotating dome shaped lights at night (often with electrical effects) and dark, grey, misty lens shapes in daytime (often generating electroststic fields).

One vital key is that we never found a single case where a witness saw a complex formation created. Nearly all eyewitnesses are to simple, single circles. Eyewitness cases date back a long time and we have examples from pre 20th century.

Hope this helps.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

From: Judith Dale <judithdale@earthlink.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 09:11:50 -0700
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 22:03:26 -0400
Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

>Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 21:05:52 -0700
>From: Kim Burrafato <lensman@stardrive.org>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

>>To: updates@globalserve.net
>>From: Bill Chalker <bill_c@bigpond.com>
>>Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?
>>Date: Sun, 30 May 99 22:40:31 PDT

>>>Date: Sat, 29 May 1999 22:22:32 -0400
>>>From: Paul Badger <pbadger@compuserve.com>
>>>Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>><snip>

>>>I haven't read the article, but from the brief reference made to
>>>it on the CUFOS website, I get the impression that the point of
>>>the story is that the hair alleged to have been left behind by
>>>the entity has human DNA, albeit very rare, and not a DNA that
>>>is unrecognisable and thus "alien". Am I right?

>><snip>

>>Yes the DNA profile found is "human" but it is "from one of the
>>rarest human lineages known ... that lies further from the
>>(human) mainstream than any other except for African Pygmies and
>>aboriginals". The DNA sequencing fits only "a Chinese
>>mongoloid" however the hair is blonde, rather than black, as you
>>>would expect from a Chinese donor. Also the source of the hair
>>was an alleged tall blonde haired female, who apart from very
>>unusual "blue" eyes" a few times larger than standard human, and
>>a long narrow face with pinty chin, unusual strength &
>>behaviour, one might type as Scandanavian or dare I say "Nordic"
>>with long exotic blonde hair and fair skin, certainly no Asian
>>like feature. There were 2 "women" present. The other looked
>>somewhat Asian in appearance, but had black hair, so she was not
>>an obvious source of the blonde hair which we subjected to PCR
>>DNA testing.

>>As for "human" DNA, we need to consider the widespread reports
>>of "human" like beings in abduction literature - Villas Boas,
>>Travis Walton, there are many more.

>>Then we need to consider are these exotic "human" similar to us
>>in more ways than just appearance. Is their biological
>>structure also based on a DNA structure. There are endless
>>questions & speculations here.

>>Also consider "human" type panspermia theories. Check out
>>Appendix 2 "The Argument for Duplicate Beings" in Paul Davies
>>book "Are We Alone?" (1995) and also the closing paragraphs of
>>Davies book "The Fifth Miracle" (1998).

>>Finally, I once again urge you to read the IUR article. It is
>>much too detailed and complex to attempt a summary here and
>>beside you will be supporting a very worth while publication -
>>IUR. You need to have all the data to make an informed

>>response.

>I've been wondering how long it would take for biological trace
>evidence like this to show up. The fact that the hair is of an
>extremely rare human line -- Chinese mongoloid -- and blonde to
>boot -- is intriguing. But it's not definitive proof of
>extraterrestrial origin. My question to those well versed in
>molecular genetics, is what would constitute DNA that could be
>generally regarded as being of non-terrestrial origin? How
>different would it have to be from the DNA of the simplest
>terrestrial organism in order to be defined as "ET DNA"? And
>let's not forget, there may be biological entities out there
>that reproduce via an entirely different molecular biochemistry,
>not dependent on DNA/RNA synthesis.

There has been much written regarding the interfacing of humans and 'aliens', from ancient times to present day. Indeed, thanks to the hard work of several researchers, much information has been brought forth from the depths of ancient writings found on tablets, walls of buildings, walls of caves, rock faces, and various scrolls or books. Information that seems to indicate a long history of human and 'alien' involvement. Some of this information seems to demonstrate that humans, in fact, are the result of ancient genetic manipulations. Despite Darwin's 'Theory of Evolution', and all of the evidence coming forth from the work of archeologists and anthropologists, we still seem to be missing 'the link' between humanity and other similar life forms on this planet.

I find this new evidence to be intriguing. I do not find it strange that it appears to be of a rare 'human lineage'. I am interested, however, to see how the DNA compares with our human DNA now being mapped in the 'Genome Project'. Perhaps we shall find that these so called 'aliens' are not so 'alien' after all, and so merely human types from elsewhere.

Blessings to All,

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

UFO Centre To Be Launched In Window Area, UK

From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 17:02:04 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 22:06:41 -0400
Subject: UFO Centre To Be Launched In Window Area, UK

>Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 11:54:24 +0100
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>From: John Rimmer <magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Note To UK Readers

>Just a note to readers in London and region that the next
>informal Magonia meeting takes place in the Railway pub, Putney
>High Street, SW14 this Sunday, June 6th, from about 7.15 pm
>onwards.

>John Rimmer
>www.magonia.demon.co.uk

Hi,

I did not think it was proper to plug events on UpDates, but I will follow John's lead.

On Monday 7 June at 7 for 7.30 pm I am giving a lecture on the development of UFO activity in the very active window area of the Rossendale Valley, Lancashire. The venue is the Leisure Hall on Burnley Road, Bacup. For details phone: 01706 - 879 338

This is tied to an exciting venture. Some local businessmen and the council are working to set up the first permanent UFO centre - certainly in the UK and possibly the world. This would comprise an exhibition, lecture and conference site, archive and library and a sky watch site within this hyper active UFO region. Links with Jodrell Bank to help scientific credibility and provide things like an astronomy tuition component to ground the sky watchers are being sought. The scheme is apparently well advanced and local MPs and the like plan to be there on Monday, I am told. So it is a chance for ufologists to ensure that if this idea is done it is done well and does not turn out to be some tacky tourist set up but of genuine educational benefit.

The reason I am giving the lecture, by the way, is simple. I was born in Rossendale and lived in Bacup during my childhood. So I am supporting my home town!

Jenny Randles

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 09:51:19 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 22:09:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 17:03:18 -0400
>From: Tony Spurrier <TSpurrier@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>>Date: Mon, 31 May 1999 23:21:17 -0700 (PDT)
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>,
>>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>>Thanks for listing them, Tony. I suppose if there were as many
>>as 500 such reports, they would still be dismissed as anecdotal,
>>for the same reason that several hundred thousand screened UFO
>>reports are treated the same way by negative skeptics. But it
>>would be interesting to interview these four persons and form
>>one's own opinion as to their sincerity and character.

>>But at least Terence Meaden thought these witnesses' reports were
>>worth noting, which is more than most anti-UFO advocates would do.

>Do you have the full details of what these eyewitnesses actually
>claim to have seen? If so, I'd like to view their accounts and
>details of the alleged formations that were created.

>I have noted it also but a few names, dates and vague areas
>doesn't constitute worthwhile testimony. Where are the full
>accounts of what these people saw?

Tony,

I don't know who, if anyone, has any written reports, full or
partial, from these four. I suppose Colin Andrews or other
British crop-formation investigators would be the ones to
contact on that.

>...
>Secondly, have you actually tried to create a circle in oil-seed
>to test your theory?

No, I leave that up to the crop-circle experts. But my own
opinion, after examining a stand of it that I didn't want to
trample, was that it would be a hopeless task to do an
impressive hoax job on it.

>You mentioned 'Circular Evidence'
>before, Colin Andrews explained how crop can not be flattened
>using string across the radius as the pressure is too great, so
>we have evidence that what the circle makers say is likely to be
>correct.

The supposed "string" technique was first offered up by negative
skeptics as a hoaxing technique because of the circular shapes
of many of the earlier ones, before Colin dispelled that one.

Here's one for you to ponder, since you have Noyes' (editor)
The Crop Circle Enigma. Go to p. 22 of that book and you'll
see diagrams made by Terence Meaden and Colin Andrews of the
crop circle of 1 Aug. '86 at Headbourne Worthy, Hampshire. It
was a two-layer system, with an underlayer swirled one way and

an upper layer above it, covering it, swirled such that the lay of the stems was at right angles to that of the layer just underneath. The diagrams depict the direction of the respective swirls. The photograph of it is shown on p. 36 of Circular Evidence by Delgado & Andrews.

You won't find any crop-circle naysayer talking about this one, or speculating on how it could have been hoaxed, or trying to demonstrate how it might be hoaxed. That's because it's pretty mind-boggling just to wonder about. You have to imagine that somehow every other crop stem out of the many thousands was first bent over (without breaking the stems) in one direction of swirl while the remaining stems all around stood intact. Then, these intact stems were bent over with a swirl at right angles to the swirl given to the other stems.

>Thirdly, what of the alleged tell tale signs that a circle is genuine
>can be found in the oil-seed formations, i.e. exploded nodes, etc. ?

Such tell-tale signs have been found most notably in other crops, with wheat receiving the most attention, I believe. You could write the BLT research team for more details on that. Recall that posting from Nancy Talbott I originally was trying to bring to your attention, with excerpt below:

>Yes, control studies have been conducted; BLT has made circles
>with feet, planks & rope, and cement rollers, then sampled the
>crop as we normally do to look for the regularly-found plant
>anomalies.

>We did not find (1) node elongation of the plant stems, (2)
>expulsion cavities at the nodes of plant stems, (3) altered
>redox ratios (measurements of mitochondrial respiration rates),
>or (4) altered germination characteristics in the downed plants
>when compared with controls taken elsewhere in the test fields.

> Nancy Talbott
> BLT Research,
> Box 400127,
> Cambridge, MA
> 02140, USA.

The "B" stands for John Burke, the "T" stands for Talbott, and the L for Dr. Wm. C. Levingood, who did manage to get a paper or two (or more since 1994?) into the peer-reviewed literature on it, and in it he does describe some of the anomalies in detail. His paper is "Anatomical anomalies in crop formation plants," Physiologia Plantarum 92 (1994), pp. 356-363.

>>Do you mean, Why did the formations evolve from circles and
>>formations of circles to much more complex patterns?

>I didn't actually, I meant why the vortex theory, ley line
>theory, eti theory, none can be hoaxed, some can be hoaxed, most
>can be hoaxed, only the true geometric formations are genuine,
>those which aren't are significant etc. etc. It seems that each
>time the cerealogists are caught out they come back with an
>alternative theory which claims a mystery. Doesn't it seem that
>they are literally clutching at straws to make a mystery out of
>something that is purely man made?

It's the other way around. There is a lot of conclusive evidence that the real crop-circle formations can't be hoaxed, because hoaxers can't reproduce any of the extremely important details. All they can do is make a pattern that, if they do it carefully, may look OK when photographed from an airplane. But that's good enough to satisfy those who don't want to admit that beyond-human intelligence is at work. They're the ones who don't want to mention or discuss Levingood's work, or that two-layer crop-circle system I mentioned above, or the braided systems, or the several cases where the stems were all bent over from one to several inches above the ground, or why, in thousands of cases of "genuine" crop formations, no hoaxers have been caught making them, etc.

Jim Deardorff
<http://www.proaxis.com/~deardorj>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Recent Scotland UFO Activity - Case Feedback

From: Dave Ledger <dledger@cableinet.co.uk>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 17:56:43 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 22:24:22 -0400
Subject: Recent Scotland UFO Activity - Case Feedback

Dear listmembers,

Here a few recent sighting reports FYI that have been received via the UFO Scotland website over the past month or so.

We feel that it is important to share with other researchers and organisations from around the world, any findings or patterns etc that emerge from our data-base.

Many of the reports are still under investigation but we felt that it was important to post these reports for the benefit of the ufo community at large as well as other researchers with an interest in Scotland's ongoing ufo phenomena.

Secondly, I would like to take this opportunity to ask for some help or assistance from any of our colleagues that are familiar with unusual writings, symbols or channelling type experiences. I do remember a few posts going through the lists over the last few years that have mentioned such writings and symbols etc.

We were recently approached at UFO Scotland, by a man from Fife in Scotland who has logged and documented a series of unusual scripts and symbols that he received during the years of 1991-1994. The subject himself is a very sincere and down to earth type person, although he accepts that the whole episode of the channelled writings etc was bizarre and remains a mystery to him to this day. He has requested help so that he may learn more about these unusual experiences, and for that reason I would like to appeal to anyone who has either researched or experienced such events in the past, to please get in touch with us at UFO Scotland so that we may try to research this phenomena a little further and also to get some answers for our client.

We have added a small portion of the strange writings and symbols to our website in the hope that other folks who have experienced similar experiences can come forward and exchange notes etc. Our client is most keen to meet and talk with others who may identify with his writings and channelling experiences. The page containing the script and writings can be found at:

<http://wkweb5.cableinet.co.uk/dledger/writings.htm>

We ask that the readers will visit this page and please reply to us if they feel that they may be able to further add to this incident. I sincerely thank you all in advance and look forward to any positive feedback concerning this unusual case.

Thanks for your time and good luck to all on the lists.

>From your friend,

Dave Ledger (UFO Scotland)

Sighting reports follow below:

Subject: East Kilbride UFO's Date: Sat, 15 May 1999 10:58:16
+0100 Source: Robert G Henderson <Robert@bowmontpl.demon.co.uk>

About a year or so ago around midnight, a light was visible in the sky. As one who has an interest in aviation it struck me that the pattern of movement of this light was not like that of a fixed wing aircraft or indeed a helicopter. It moved at high speed and then came to a sudden stop a few times in the sky. As it was night it was hard to judge the height of the object. I could see no detail due to the distance involved, but it certainly would not have been the local police helicopter which has a distinctive engine sound. There have been many sightings over East Kilbride in the last year all of which have been "officially explained". I remain unconvinced.

Name : Candice Powers
date: : April 1997
location: : Brora, Sutherland, Scotland
time : late evening
PM : on

Eye-witness Report : I was with my friend,who, incidentally is a prominent figure in Britain, in his car outside of the house where I was staying. As near as I can accurately remember, We were looking at what we thought was Venus or Mars in the sky when we both saw a big, bright flash of light just beneath the star we were looking at. We both exclaimed, "Did you see that?!" and then it happened again. There was a 'star' that then began moving around in the sky in a zig zag sort of motion, not at all straight like a plane or anything else you might recognize, and went behind some clouds. We thought that was the last of it when it suddenly appeared on the other side of the cloud. It moved about a bit more then disappeared again in the next cloud. We felt priveleged to have seen it!

Name : Gareth Morgan
date: : 23/4/99
location: : Downpatrick
time : 8.30 PM

Eye-witness Report : I was looking out my skylight window when I noticed an unusually bright light over my neighbours house. It the shot straight up in the air and just disappeared. Then half an hour later it appeared again, so I told my whole family to look. It sat there for ten minutes while we looked at it then it went out in a similar fashion to a dimmer switch. It then appeared again, a minute later higher still, and to the left of the house. It flashed and then never appeared again.

Subject: Unusual object spotted near Falkland Hill in Fife.
Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1999
Source: Thanks to UFO Scotland team member Lewis Burt.

Eye-witness Report: I was driving home into Star of Markinch at around 9pm when I looked to the NE and high in the sky was a very bright orange light hovering, slightly moving downwards. I stopped the car and watched it for about twenty seconds. Gradually it burned out. It looked like the colour of fire and it was very bright. First I thought it to be a planet however. I stopped the car and opened the window but I could not hear any sound.

It was seen roughly high above the same location as that September sighting in Drummy Woods. The conditions at the time were clear sky, almost full moon and fairly warm for this time of year. No clouds in sight.

Perhaps it could have been a plane falling, burning out of the sky but theres been nothing on the news that I've heard.

Subject: Strange anomaly observed near Crail on Scotland's East coast.
Name : Witness names withheld by request.
Date: : November 3, 1997
location: Crail, Fife, Scotland
time : Evening PM

Eye-witness sighting report: On the evening of November 3, 1997, I was sitting on the back porch reading an article in the daily newspaper and talking with my wife. Just as we were preparing to go inside, a distinct feature in the sky caught our eyes. It appeared to be an oval shaped object moving parallel to the ground. The object had a bright blueish coloured lining around the outside of it. The core, if you will, was a redish orange colored. As it moved, we observed a second smaller object depart from the larger one. This was a small circular shaped aircraft and it was a solid blue. I can also remember a very discrete high pitched ringing, if you will. After about ten to fifteen minutes of observation, the smaller object, which had been circling the larger this whole time, seemed to connect or enter back into the larger object. As soon as this happened the oval shaped object proceeded to shoot straight up. It didn't shoot up so fast that it disappeared instantly though. It seemed to gradually disappear, as if it were exiting the atmosphere. This whole sighting lasted around twenty minutes and left us in awe.

Subject: Alien Abduction in Grangemouth?
Date: 6th January 1996
Name : Eye-witness name withheld by request.
Location: : Grangemouth, Falkirk, Scotland
time : 1-30am till 2-20am

Eye-witness report: From the back door of my home, my family have a clear view of the skies over Grangemouth. On the night of 6th Jan 1996, I retired to my bed (downstairs) with my 10yr old daughter at around 12-45am.

Just as i was dozing off I sensed something, a feeling, did I hear something? I was'nt sure. I sat bolt upright, my daughter still asleep as my dog was trying to get comfortable at the bottom of the bed.

As I lay there thinking it was my dog I became quite scared, almost like the feeling you get on waking from a nightmare all jelly like. However I snuggled up next to my daughter and I am sure I went to sleep.

I awoke with the feeling my daughter was sliding out of the bed and I reached over to pull her back into bed. A few seconds later I felt it again, I spoke this time to her. I told her to stay in bed and as I spoke I felt scared again and I felt panicky. My dog was crying over at the window, "lie down i said".

Again I lay down just as I heard my son running downstairs and shouting "look!", pointing to the window with a pair of binoculars.

"It is just a plane light" I said, "No! i have been watching it for ages with my cousin" "Look again!" which I did and I saw a single light in the sky pulsating. It seemed to be moving ever so slightly towards the east and back to where it originated from.

As I was staring at it through the glasses, three lights shot out from the top and two from the bottom of the anomaly. The small lights jaggedly danced through the air but were always returning to the slightly brighter light.

Myself, my daughter, my son and his cousin all ran up the stairs to the bedroom above and opened the window (the whole window opens inward). We stood and watched while all the lights became one. Again it moved towards the east and back, then it was as if it saw us and came towards us!

It was going to go directly over the house. I stepped onto the window ledge and when I was looking up, I noticed it was not a sphere shape. As the lights flashed it left the outline of a "V", the same effect you would get if you stood in a dark room and switched the light off and on, you are left with a shadow of a shape.

We all ran into the front bedroom, opened the window and waited on it appearing above the house and it did.

My daughter at this time was begining to hyperventilate, so we were trying to keep her calm and watch the anomaly at the same-time.

It began to move towards the South,or South East and kept going for what I would estimate to be about a mile.

Someone shouted "there was another one straight ahead", but this instance was indeed a plane using it`s usual flightpath towards the West.

I glanced back at the light and it had changed directions, towards the plane. As the plane reached S,SW, the light seemed to be directly ready to hit the plane. There was a dark grey mist which had mysteriously appeared and then the light was gone and of course the plane was fine.

When we looked at the time it was 2,20am. My son said it was about 2,00am when he and his cousin came downstairs.

I did tell others the following day, but what proof had we got? My daughter did not want anyone to know incase they all thought she was weird.

My son did some sketches of that night, he said he and his cousin had been watching the unusual light for 15minutes before he came downstairs that night.

I have heard of abductees becoming ill, headaches, memory loss, painful joints and muscular aches, is there any truth to this? and if so what can a person do?

I am a or was a sceptic until this happened. I believed in god and god only but now I am not so sure, it is as if nothing makes sense any more!

Subject: More UFOs sighted over Kirkcaldy in Fife.

Name : Bill Robertson

date: : 11th April 1999

location: : Kirkcaldy, Fife, Scotland.

time : Between 22:40 and 23:30 PM

Eye-witness Report : Whilst looking out of our front window, Myself, my wife and my 16yr old daughter all observed an extremely bright light low in the sky(positioned between two houses at a level well below the roof apex of a small nearby house). This was stationary and remained there for approx 30min (the duration we observed.)

Its disappearance was noted by all three of us again and further confirmed by myself going outside and walking to the top of our street to see if I could locate its current position.

Whilst returning to the house after approx 10 mins, I saw it disappearing over the top of some trees to the south of our housing estate. This light was now much more intense and I can only assume that this was due to the object being closer to our location.

I quickly ran to the house in order to get a camera and possibly follow the object in my car, however, it had gone from view. I immediately proceeded to the location where i last saw the light but there was no sign of the same anomaly in the surrounding skies.

RED DISC HOVERS OVER CARNOUSTIE, SCOTLAND

Source: UFO ROUNDUP Volume 4, Number 11, originally from Dundee Evening Telegram.

Date: March 15, 1999

Editor: Joseph Trainor

"An unidentified flying object spotted in Angus skies near Carnoustie this morning has left a number of people mystified."

"One Carnoustie resident, who sought to remain anonymous, said he had been fairly sceptical about such things but wanted an

explanation for what he had seen."

"He and several members of his family, along with a Forfar couple, saw a strange red disc moving about in the sky between 6:30 and 6:55 a.m. this morning."

"Neither the Coastguard or members of staff at RAF Leuchars could shed any light on the sighting."

"I was out walking the dog with my wife and children at the Black Slab car park this morning," (Friday, March 12, 1999) he said, "We saw this red oblong shape in the sky and it couldn't have been the moon or a star because of the way it was moving. It then just disappeared."

A car pulled up beside the family, and the driver stuck his head out the window. "The man in the car said he was from Forfar and had seen the light earlier, and we could see that he was distressed."

The family continued walking along the beach, and, at 6:55 a.m., the UFO appeared again.

"I'm neither a believer nor a non-believer in UFOs. But this time it changed from red to bright orange and it was much bigger," he continued, "Anybody looking at the sky could have seen it. It was that big. You couldn't miss it."

"A member of the Fife Coastguard said there had been no reports of flares or other lights."

"A spokesman at RAF Leuchars discounted any official aerial activity from the Fife airbase. 'I know of no operations in the area by any of our flights,' he said.

Carnoustie is a port city on Scotland's east coast about 60 miles (100 kilometers) northeast of Edinburgh, the capital. (See the Dundee Evening Telegram for March 12, 1999, "Carnoustie disc remains a mystery." Many thanks to Gerry Lovell for forwarding the newspaper article.)

Bizarre sightings in Dundee leave witnesses baffled!

Name :Eye-witness names withheld by request.

date: : 27th and 28th January 1999

location: : Dundee

time : 18:20hrs GMT (27th) and 08:40hrs GMT (28th)

Case Researchers: Thanks to Mr Allan Robertson for bringing this case to our attention and also to UFO Scotland researcher Jeannie McKay for the follow up work.

Sighting Submission:

Dear Sirs, I have been asked to forward this UFO sighting report to you by someone who knows of my interest in the subject, but who wishes, at present, to remain anonymous. I have typed up this report from hand-written notes that the person has given to me. The reason he wishes anonymity stems mostly from the fact that when it was reported locally, (to a local newspaper and our local observatory) it was dismissed as a "star or maybe Venus" that was seen, and this has caused some concern that only more ridicule will result from further reporting of the sighting.

The person in question is an A.D.I. approved driving instructor, and the incident has had a great effect on him. From listening to his verbal account of this sighting it is apparent that he would like to pass on this information to someone who will take it seriously. With this in mind, I believe that should someone wish to investigate this further, I think he would be more than willing to discuss it more fully provided that any contact was made via myself in the first instance. He does not even want his family to know he has made this report as they are so fearful of ridicule.

To perhaps assist with the 'geography' of the place names given in the report, a few distances/ directions might help. The Fairmuir Park mentioned is about 2 miles north of the Tay and

the Thomson Street mentioned later is about half a mile north of the Tay. Dundee's small airport's traffic consists mostly of small private aircraft which are very familiar to locals. Also, a few miles away in Fife, is the R.A.F. base at Leuchars, so that military aircraft are also a common sight crossing Dundee. This fact makes the observers reaction to being unable to identify what he saw all the more strange.

----- (report follows)-----

Dundee Report:

(Witness name withheld by request)

"Dear Sirs,

On Wednesday evening, 27th January 1999, during a driving lesson with a 17 year old pupil, at approx. 6:20pm, I saw a black diamond shaped UFO flying through the sky. It had no flashing lights which you would see on any normal aircraft. The driving lesson continued when approx. 20 - 25 minutes later we stopped to do a Reverse Exercise at a local park known as Fairmuir Park. I looked up in the sky to see if I could still see the UFO I had seen earlier on. It was hovering high in the sky glowing like a star. I recognised it as the UFO I had seen earlier because of the shape. I got out of my car to look at it and after about 1 minute it rotated anti-clockwise and directly underneath there was an orange coloured beam which came down from the UFO and went back up again. At this point I shouted to my pupil to come out of the car.

I could not see any lights nor could I here any sound. We were both standing in the park trying to find out what we were looking at. We had never seen anything like it. About 2 - 3 minutes later it started moving off. We jumped into the car and followed it for approx. 10 minutes. It was glowing a brilliant white/very light yellowish colour.

It was almost round in shape but a little oval in the centre now. We could not believe what we were looking at, it was definitely not from this world it was extra-terrestrial. We watched it travelling through the sky getting smaller and smaller as it got further away. At this time it was bright white just like a star. I watched it till it disappeared over the River Tay and into the hills of Fife. The time was now approx 7pm.

I found out on the Friday (29th January), that without knowledge of my sighting, that on the next day, Thursday 28th January, at approx. 8:40am, a relative of mine with her 2 daughters were travelling down Thomson Street, which overlooks the River Tay and one of her children said there was a shooting star over the Tay. It was hovering over the water with two yellow beams coming from underneath. Then it started to rise vertically into the sky. They lost sight of it because of a building obstructing their view. They described it as shining like a star, very bright white/ yellowish colour. After they could see the Tay again the object had completely vanished. They had obviously seen the same UFO as me. The two girls (13 yrs. and 9 yrs.) & their mother all saw this as well as me and my pupil the night before."

----- (report end)-----

P.S.

There are, unfortunately, no photographs of this sighting, but there are some rough drawings available. I reported this sighting to a UFO magazine several weeks ago, but they have not acknowledged it to date. This has made the person even more anxious that nobody is taking it seriously. With this in mind, I hope that even if no follow up is required with this incident, you will be able to at least e-mail me with some sort of 'note' that I can pass on to the person concerned. I'm sure that even this would go some way to easing his anxiety.

(Follow up E-mail interview by UFO Scotland Researcher Jeannie McKay):

The incident took place 6.20pm on Jan 27th. The subject then saw a black diamond UFO fly thru the sky.

1. At that time of the year it is dark at that time. How low was

the UFO at that time? At what approx. speed was it moving and in what direction? How large was the craft? What shape does the subject deem to be "diamond"?

Answer:

In the direction he first seen it he could probably have observed the craft silhouetted against any remaining 'glow' in the western sky.

At that time he and his pupil (who was driving) were travelling west along a road about 2.5 miles north of the River Tay. The instructor saw the object in the general south/westerly direction. He estimates it was about 40 - 45 deg. above the local horizon and travelling in the general direction of the Sidlaw Hills ie. north. Although I tried to get him to estimate the craft's

speed/
size/ altitude, he was not prepared to guess. All he would say was he reckoned the craft was probably about the same size as his thumb-nail at arms length. As this part of the sighting only lasted 5 - 8 seconds and was from a moving car, during a driving lesson, I don't think he can say much more on this. As for the diamond shape, I cut out a piece of paper in the shape of the diamond he had drawn when he first told me about the incident (see attachment Fig. 1 from the first e-mail I sent) and he agreed this was the shape when he first saw it. He also said the craft was moving in the direction of it's shorter axis.

20- 25 minutes later Instructor and pupil see object again. He recognises that it is the same one seen earlier because of the shape.

2. How low is the craft now and in what direction?

Answer:

This part of the sighting was from the park which is about 2 miles north of the Tay and about 1 mile east of the 1st sighting. He estimated that the craft was about 70 - 80 deg. above the local horizon in a west of south/west direction. At this time he estimated it was the same size as a pen, end on, held at arms length. Again he couldn't estimate size/altitude.

The craft was "glowing like a star".

3. What colour was it glowing and how brightly? Was the outline of craft clearly visible?

Answer:

The outline of the craft was clearly visible. This was the reason he was able to recognise it when the car first stopped at the park and he looked around, from inside the car, to see if he could spot what he had seen earlier. When I asked him what colour it was and if it was very bright, he just said again that it was "like a star" but recognizable as the diamond and just hovering.

The craft rotated anti-clockwise.

4. How many degrees did it rotate? How fast did it rotate?

Answer:

I'll try to find out about this.

Orange beam came down from UFO and went up again.

5. How far down did orange beam come? Was the craft hovering at the time? What would have been underneath craft at time beam came down (approx.)? Did craft appear to be searching for something? How fast did the beam go down and up? Was the beam a single shaft of light?

Answer:

(Again, see the e-mail attachment mentioned above, Fig. 3 for relative sizes).

The craft was hovering at the time the "beam" was seen. As with size estimates etc., he compared the "beam" to being like the tail of a kite in length. The "beam" was described as "being like a row of Christmas lights coming on one after the other in sequence, first down from the craft, then back up towards it. The craft was hovering at this time, he estimates it was above the general area of the Dryburgh Estate in Dundee. He didn't recognise it as anything like a helicopter or even a "blimp" type airship. From his (animated!) description of the "beam" event, it seems to have lasted only a couple of seconds. I'll check on this.

Instructor followed the craft for ten minutes.

6. Did he follow it in his car? Or did he stand observing for 10 minutes?

Answer:

The instructor and the pupil followed the object in the car for about 10 minutes. They drove in a generally westerly direction along several roads until they ended up about 1.5 miles west of the park at which point they stopped as the object had, they estimated, passed over Invergowrie Bay and went into the distance over the hills of Fife.

It was then glowing a white/very light yellow

7. Is the glow coming from the craft itself or is it a glowing field around the craft? Was the glowing light pulsating?

Answer:

His description was of the craft glowing but I'll check again on this and on the pulsating.

The UFO is almost round in shape - but a little oval in the centre now.

8. Would the Instructor say that the craft changed shape? Or was he viewing from a different angle?

Answer:

When questioned, he agreed that he could have been looking at the craft from a different angle.

9. When the craft was last seen at what speed was it travelling? Was the UFO seen at the same height during the sighting?

Answer:

Since the craft appears to have travelled from approx. above Dryburgh to the hills of Fife in a general south west direction which is about 10 - 11 miles in about 10 mins. the speed may have been 60 - 66 mph. As to height, it appears to have been relatively smaller above the park than it was when it was first seen. I'll have to check to see if it appeared to change altitude as it was flying away into the distance.

10. Not personally knowing the area, was the craft always travelling in the same direction (e.g when it rotated)?

Answer:

When first seen, it appeared to be travelling in a northerly direction. After the park part of the sighting, it appeared to move off in a general south/westerly direction. To clarify the park part of the sighting, it was observed hovering for about 1 minute before the "beam" was seen, then the craft rotated and again remained hovering for about 2 - 3 minutes before it moved off in the south/westerly direction.

Also, further to your mention of similar sightings, I noticed in the current issue of UFO Magazine (May/June '99), that at the end of February in the Hull/Flamborough area, sightings of diamond shaped craft were reported. I particularly note that close up observers reported structured diamond shaped craft, and observers probably too far away, reported balls of light.

I also noted from the copy of the report you sent me which you had forwarded to Skywatch was headed "Fife" rather than Dundee. Will this matter too much?

Again I'll try to get more info on the childrens sighting the following morning, but this appears to have been of short duration. I don't know the children personally and will see if the Instructor, who is their uncle, is willing to ask a few more questions of them.

(Further E-mail Follow-up):

The craft rotated anti-clockwise.

How many degrees did it rotate? How fast did it rotate?

Answer:

It rotated a full 360 deg. and this took about 5 -6 seconds.

Orange beam came down from UFO and went up again.

How far did orange beam come? What would have been underneath craft at time beam came down? How fast did the beam go down and up?

Answer:

It did not come down to the ground, it only came down about a hand length on an outstretched arm. The instructor was also a little unhappy about saying that it seemed to be hovering above Dryburgh Estate as he said that not knowing it's altitude or size, this made it difficult to say where it was hovering. The beam took about 2 - 3 secs to come down, paused for about 2 - 3 secs and then again, 2 - 3 secs to go back up.

It was glowing a white/very light yellow.

Is the glow coming from the craft itself or is it a glowing field around the craft? Was the glowing light pulsating?

Answer:

It was the craft itself that was glowing, and the glowing light was not pulsating.

Was the UFO seen at the same height during the sighting?

Answer:

As it moved across Invergowrie Bay towards Fife, it may have started to gain altitude.

I hope that helps to clarify these points. The instructor also has some more details now from the childrens sighting.

(Further E-mail follow-up):

I'll try to give you the best information I can about the children's sighting that I've been able to gather from the Instructor during three or four visits from him.

I'll include with this e-mail a couple of scans I've made from drawings the children made within a short time of their sighting. The scans (Figs 5 & 6) on the original report I sent you were the instructors interpretation of the drawings that the children had shown him. (You will note that the 9 year old refused to colour in her 'object' as she insisted that she didn't have a colouring pen of exactly the right colour so she would rather leave it blank!)

I think that I should also mention a little about Thomson Street where the sighting took place. As mentioned, the top of this street is very approx. half a mile from the Tay and exits at the bottom onto Magdalen Yard Road almost directly opposite the northern end of the Tay Rail Bridge. Thomson Street is very narrow with quite a steep slope down towards the river. There are usually cars parked half on the pavement, half on the road, leaving hardly enough room for a car to pass. There are buildings on either side of the street making the view of the river quite restricted to the sides.

The report...

At approx. 08:40 am on Thursday 28th January, the two girls and their mother, after having collected their car from a lock up near the top of Thomson Street, were driving down this street when the the youngest child said that there was "a shooting star" in the sky above the river. When her older sister looked at it she said it wasn't a shooting star but a comet, "because it had a tail". It had two yellow beams coming from underneath it. It started to rise vertically into the sky. Their view was retracted because buildings were obscuring their view. They said it was shining like a star, a very bright white/yellowish colour.

The mother saw the object as well.
After they turned into Magdalen Yard Road and had a clear view of the river, the object had vanished. (One of the children later said to her father that they had seen a UFO because it was going up vertically and she knew that "aeroplanes couldn't do that!")

I got the Instructor to ask the girls and their mother some questions.....

1..... How long did the sighting last?

Answer: About 5 minutes.

2..... Who saw it first?

Answer: The younger girl.

(My comment: I note that she was the one who drew the craft as an almost round object, whereas her sister drew a shaped object.)

3..... Were you in the back of the car?

Answer: Yes.

4..... Which window did you see it through (ie in which direction)?

Answer: Front and side.

(My comment: This would have them looking in the general direction of the railway bridge.)

5..... How high was it (ie if you were pointing at it, how high would your arm be)?

Answer: Shoulder level.

(My comment: This would put the object probably at a fairly low height ie. straight ahead)

6..... What size was it (like a penny, 10 pence, 50 pence or whatever held at arms length)?

Answer: A football.

7..... Did you all see it hovering?

Answer: No.

(My comment: This again may explain why the youngest girl drew an almost round object. She did see it hovering.)

8..... Did the air around the object glow or was it just the object which glowed? Did the light pulse?

Answer: The bottom of the object glowed.

(My comment: There was no answer to the pulsing question.)

9..... When it moved off vertically, did it shoot off very fast or did it move slowly.

Answer: Slowly at first, then vanished quickly.

10.... Did you hear any sound?

Answer: No.

11.... Do you think it was directly above the river?

Answer: Yes.

12.... Could you see the river at the same time as you seen the object.

Answer: Yes.

13.... Anything else you remember?

Answer: No.

End of report.

I hope that this helps with this sighting. I don't know if I'll be able to get any more from the children. At the time this sighting took place, the road along the north shore of the river

past the railway bridge is very busy. It would be very strange if nobody else seen this thing..... Anyhow I look forward to seeing the report on your web site. I'll show it to the instructor, he'll be very satisfied.

Many thanks to Allan Robertson and Jeannie McKay for their work and excellent research into this delicate case.

Bizarre Flying Disc Over Scotland Shakes Witnesses

Source: The Dundee Evening Telegraph - Scotland
Thanks to: Gerry Lovell <ed@farshore.force9.co.uk>
Date: March 13th 1999

An unidentified flying object sighted in the Angus skies near Carnoustie this morning has left a number of people mystified.

One Carnoustie resident, who wishes to remain anonymous, said he had been fairly sceptical about such things, but wanted an explanation for what he saw.

He and several members of his family, along with a Forfar couple, saw a strange red disc moving about the sky between 6.30am and 6.55am this morning.

Neither the Coastguard nor members of staff at RAF Leuchars could shed any light on the sighting.

The man said that the object, which moved about the sky, was "like nothing I've ever seen before except on the film Armageddon".

"I was out walking the dog with my wife and child near the black slab car park this morning," he said.

"We saw this red oblong shape in the sky, and it couldn't have been the moon or the sun because of the way it was moving. It then just disappeared.

"A car drew up and the man inside asked us if we'd seen it and we said yes.

"Distressed"

"The man in the car said he was from Forfar and had seen the light earlier, and we could see he was visibly distressed."

The family continued their walk along the beach and the object reappeared at about 6.55am.

"I'm neither a believer nor a non-believer in UFOs, but this time it had changed from bright red to orange, and it was much bigger," he continued.

"Anybody looking at the sky would have seen it - it was that big you couldn't miss it."

A member of the Fife Coastguard said there had been no reports of flares or other lights.

"It's been fairly misty this morning, and there is no meteorite activity as far as I know," he said.

A spokesman at RAF Leuchars discounted any official aerial activity by personnel from the Fife airbase.

"I know of no operations in the area by any of our flights," he said.

So it seems the strange red object will have to remain a mystery for the time being.

UFOs sighted in Morayshire in Scotland (North East)

Name : Heidi and Iain Sands <SAMBO@SANDSI.FREESERVE.CO.UK>
Date : 18th May 1999
Location: : Braehead, Elchies, Craigellachie, Aberlour, MORAY
Time : between 12.20am and 1.04am

Eye-witness sighting report : Together myself and my husband watched two UFO's, hanging in the night sky. One was much further away than the other. The sky was very clear and we heard no noise.

They were in the direction of Burghead/Kinloss from our home. They were moving from side to side and up and down, and appeared to be saucer shape, sometimes tipping to show the top or the bottom at other times, elliptical, very bright light at one end and something akin to a power source or surge at the other end.

In total we watched them with binoculars and the naked eye for over half an hour. When they moved to go they went very quickly away from us.

I would be interested to hear if anyone else sighted what we did. For the record this is my (Heidi Sands) second sighting. On New Years eve twenty years ago, I saw exactly the same thing, albeit only one UFO, in Lancashire outside Salwick Atomic Energy plant. I was not alone at the time, and there were many reports the following day in the press about similar! sightings.

Please let me know if anyone else saw the same UFO over Burghead/Kinloss as we did.

Thank you.

Subject: More unusual sightings near Aberdeen area on East Coast of Scotland.

Date: Sat, 22nd May 1999

Time: 23:30 approx

Source: Thanks to UFO Scotland researcher "Richard Gall"

<MIB@cyborg.force9.co.uk>

Tonight, while I was out walking my dog I witnessed the best 'unknown' in the sky that I have ever seen. Every night when I walk the dog I usually spend more time looking up than where I'm going when the sky is clear. Tonight the sky was relatively clear with scattered clouds.

Just as I finished the walk and was in my garden I noticed a very bright object in the sky. I assumed it to be a star until I realised it was moving. Secondly, I thought it was a perception error, considering the clouds were moving, I wondered whether or not the movement was 'illusional' as is often the case.

However this was not the case, this very intense white object, larger(brighter) than any star in the sky was obviously very high up, absolutely silent, yet moved across the sky at a good rate. I estimate the sighting lasted about 3 - 4 minutes.

When I first noticed the object it was about 30 degrees above the horizon directly to the south. As the sighting proceeded, the object moved north then gradually turned and headed out to the north east where I eventually lost it behind a thick cloud layer. I did proceed to walk down the hill where there are less lights to see if I could relocate it however this was not the case.

There were no indications of any anticollision beacons or noise to indicate that this was a conventional aircraft. Besides, even if it was a conventional aircraft, if it was high enough that no engine noise could be heard, there is no way it could travel the distance it did in the time it did. I must also emphasise how 'intense' the light appeared.

I would be interested in hearing about any other such cases in Scotland right now. Chances are if I seen it, many people from a wide radius around did too. Since it came up from the south, perhaps some of you down near Fife seen similar object(s) tonight?

=====

If you see someone without a smile.....give them one of yours :)

Posted by: Dave Ledger (mailto:UFOSCOT@cableinet.co.uk)

VISIT "UFO SCOTLAND" AT:

<http://wkweb5.cableinet.co.uk/dledger/index.htm>

ICQ pager <http://www.mirabilis.com/4851425>

THE TRUTH IS JUST AROUND THE CORNER!.....BUT HOW FAR?

=====

"The sands of time are trickling away from our dear mother Earth
and yet we continue to fight amongst ourselves and destroy our
natural enviroment, leaving all the mess for our children and their
children's children to inherit when we're gone."

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 2](#)

Nick Popes Weird World - June '99

From: Georgina Bruni <georgina@easynet.co.uk>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 18:20:20 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 22:40:23 -0400
Subject: Nick Popes Weird World - June '99

Hot Gossip UK June '99

Nick Pope's Weird World

Welcome to the June column, and the latest news and gossip from the weird and wacky world of UFOs, alien abductions and the paranormal.

Alien Big Cat Sightings

The Beast of Bodmin, the Beast of Exmoor, the Surrey Puma. There have been a steady stream of big cat sightings over the years, and some new ones have just come to light from Devon. The term "Alien Big Cat", by the way, doesn't mean they're supposed to be extraterrestrial, and is simply a reference to the fact that if they're seen in the UK, this is "alien" to what's judged to be their usual habitats. These sightings are of interest to ufologists because it may have a bearing on animal mutilations. I kept an eye on these stories while investigating UFOs for the Government, and made some low key enquiries with the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. These new sightings occurred on 5th May, one in Harford and one in Wrangaton. As it happens, my brother lives in Wrangaton, so I telephoned him, to see if he could put me in touch with the witness. Well, Fortean among you can guess the rest; he was the witness! He told me that he was just putting the chickens away, when he saw a large, tan-coloured animal standing in the road. He described it to me as being "around three or four feet high, and five or six feet long". He told me that "I looked at it, and it looked at me, and then it turned and went". He admitted that he didn't know enough about big cats to say whether he thought it was a lioness, a panther, a puma or a lynx, but I'll be getting a more detailed account from him, and will keep you posted.

Crop Circle Study

Many of the national newspapers carried the story of how the American millionaire Laurance Rockefeller is to fund an in-depth research project into the crop circle phenomenon. The study will be co-ordinated by Colin Andrews, who already has a computer database of over 10,000 formations from all around the world. Much of the money is likely to be spent on hiring aircraft so that more aerial photographs of formations can be taken. It certainly looks like being an interesting summer, down Wiltshire way.

New UFO Videos

UFO Magazine have an exclusive deal to market videos of five intriguing programmes made by Transmedia Productions, and shown recently on Discovery channel. The programmes include one on animal mutilations, one on alien abductions and one on mind control. Details can be found on page 41 of the current (May/June) edition of UFO Magazine. These videos won't be available in the shops until later this year.

Global Abductions

I've often tried to highlight the fact that reports of alien abductions come from a wider range of countries than Britain and America. To prove my point, I have four new cases that have come my way in the last couple of weeks. Two were from Britain, but one was from Australia and the other from Norway.

Traitors On The Net

In the aftermath of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry, and the recent nail bomb attacks in London, the extreme right have been subjected to more scrutiny than usual. Coincidentally, British ufology's resident Nazi has been keeping a low profile. However, he's now resurfaced, and in a move of breathtaking stupidity decided it would be clever to circulate the list of alleged MI6 agents that appeared on the Internet recently. Sorry, but there's nothing clever about treason, or about putting people's lives at stake to satisfy your own ego.

Space Debate

On 4th May the House of Commons was the scene of a rare parliamentary debate on space issues. Billed as a debate on satellite communications, it widened out into a more general discussion. Topics raised included concerns over the militarisation of space, and the potential for "cyberwar", including vulnerability of military satellites to hacking. It's not often that such issues are aired, and it's an intriguing sign of the times when they are. There has already been a debate on the threat from comets and asteroids.

World Wide Whinge

I received a highly entertaining e-whinge from Andy Roberts recently, after I dared to question his commitment to witness confidentiality, and indeed to ufology. And yet, he makes my own case for me when he haughtily advises me "Don't listen to what ufologists say - they know squat!". He goes on to freely admit that he and Tim Matthews/Heppele laughed at an abductee while at a TV show. Andy told me "&Mac183; we both openly jeered at an abductee. So what? Both their stories (sic) were funny and without any foundation in reality". Giving me his perspective on the Independent UFO Network (IUN), he promises " a surrealist, chaotic, non-organisation &Mac183;". As it happened, we didn't have long to wait before we were treated to an example of Andy's radical, new approach to ufology: he was due to write an article for UFO Magazine about the Berwyn Mountain case, but has decided he can't talk about the case for now, as he's got a book coming out: It's all in the book! Read my book! Radical stuff, Andy! We've never heard that sort of thing before in ufology! He's not a bad chap, but it seems to me that he's far more interested in point-scoring than in ufology. Still, if all his e-rants are as hilarious as his last one &Mac183; keep 'em coming!

Positive UFO Encounters

In my last column in featured a company that specialised in material relating to positive alien encounters, and gave details of the website. Unfortunately, I'm not sure that the site was up and running at the time. Anyone interested in a more New Age interpretation of alien contact should now be able to access this site, at www.pleiadianlight.net. Alternatively, write to them at Dolphin Ray Productions, PO Box 32, Launceston, Cornwall, PL16 0YF.

The Unopened Files

The new edition of The Unopened Files is out now, and available from all good newsagents. This fascinating magazine started off as a spin-off from UFO Magazine - it's edited by Mark Birdsall - but is now well-established in its own right, and is published Quarterly. As well as material on UFOs, it features articles on the Millennium Bug, BSE, biological warfare, cults, cover-ups, conspiracies and lots more. It's well worth checking out.

Peer Pressure

Dr John Mack, Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, is well-known for his view that the alien abduction phenomenon is worthy of serious study. This was a central theme in his book, Abduction, and it is a message that he continues to press home through the group that he set up to study abduction reports. The Program for Extraordinary Experience Research (PEER) produces a regular newsletter, PEER Perspectives, and has a website at www.peer-mack.org. Alternatively, snail mail them at PEER, PO Box 398080, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA. There is essential information here for all serious researchers into alien abductions.

Ed's Note:

Nick Pope's books, The Uninvited and Open Skies, Closed Minds, are

available from all good bookshops, in paperback. His publishers in Britain are Simon & Schuster. The Uninvited is available in the US, published by The Overlook Press, who plan to publish Open Skies, Closed Minds later this year. Nick's debut novel, Operation Thunder Child, will be published in October by Simon & Schuster Ltd.

Posted by Georgina Bruni
Georgina Bruni - Editor in Chief Hot Gossip UK
& check out Bruni's Column ufocity.com

* * * * *

E-mail: georgina@easynet.co.uk

E-mail: 104707.336@compuserve.com

* * * * *

HOT GOSSIP UK

www.hotgossip.co.uk

Celebrating three years on the World Wide Web

Britain's first on-line Gossip Magazine

* * * * *

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

Re: *U* Map: North America 1947

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 15:01:45 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 06:37:38 -0400
Subject: Re: *U* Map: North America 1947

>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>Date: Thu, 20 May 1999 02:18:54 -0700
>Fwd Date: Thu, 20 May 1999 11:35:07 -0400
>Subject: *U* Map: North America 1947

<snip>

><http://www.jps.net/larryhat/NAM47.html>

<snip>

>I hope you all have some time to look around the website. It
>took 15 years to gather the data.

Larry and Everyone:

You should really be commended for this effort, which provides a continuing, public record of this information. Your site provides a lot of food for thought. For a number of pages that I looked at some thoughts come to mind relative to your analyses:

Venus-Earth Sidereal Proximity.

For some 16,800 UFO sightings with known dates, the Heliocentric Longitude of Earth and Venus are compared.

The DIFFERENCE between these longitudes is divided into 24 "zones" of 15 degrees each. Earth and Venus are closest in zone 12 (yellow bar). Sightings >that occur at these times increment the height of the bar. "Zone zero" sightings >occur when they are on opposite sides of the sun.

The influence of Venus is diminished in zone 12, probably lost in the Sun's glare.

Mars - Earth Sidereal Proximity.

For some 16,800 UFO sightings with known dates, the Heliocentric Longitude of Earth and Mars are compared.

The DIFFERENCE between these longitudes is divided into 24 "zones" of 15 degrees each. In "zone 12" Earth and Mars are on the same side of the Sun, as close as they get for any given orbit. Zone zero sightings occur when Mars and Earth are on opposite sides of the sun.

While Venus is often blamed for low quality sightings, It would seem that Mars correlates much better using a filtered database.

I agree, but the the reason for the closer correlation of Mars probably has to do with its longer visibility to an Earth observer. Mars, an outer planet, is best seen which it is at opposition, or opposite to the Sun, when it is closest to Earth, and hence brightest. Since it is 180 degrees away from the Sun it rises in the East when the Sun sets, is highest due South at midnight, and sets at dawn. In other words, it is up all night and can be observed by all observers who are outside.

Venus, on the other hand, is visible either in the evening or morning, but never all night. Also, Venus, an inner planet, is closest to Earth when in Conjunction, or nearest to the Sun, but this is not, as you point out, its best visibility. This occurs from the time that Venus is at Greatest Elongation (about 45 degrees away) East of the Sun in the evening, or Greatest Elongations West, in the morning, until the time of greatest brilliance some weeks later, when it is closer to us and the Sun, and presents a large, thin, but brilliantly illuminated crescent. Greatest elongations occur about 10 weeks on either side of close approach to the Earth, and greatest brilliancy is about five weeks on either side. For example, this coming week, on June 10, Venus will be at Greatest Eastern Elongation, easily noticed 30 degrees above the horizon at sunset and will set 3 hours after the Sun, at about 11:30 P.M., Daylight Saving Time.

The giveaway for this Observers Effect is that more UFO reports occur at the evening Eastern Elongations, not at the less well noticed morning Western Elongations, on the right of your 12-hour band.

Sidereal Sightings Histogram.

For any given date, time and place, some part of the zodiac is directly overhead.

Astronomers divide the sky into hours of Right Ascension (R.A.). By convention, the >Vernal Equinox in Pisces is considered "zero hours" R.A. This display divides the sky into 24 hours (R.A.) with UFO sightings counts for each hour.

There is a notable rise between 20 and 21 hours R.A., when Capricorn is overhead. Oddly, this points toward the galactic center.

I have no ready explanation for this surprising effect

The galactic center is not in Capricorn, it is at 17H 45.7m Right Ascension, -29 deg Declination, two Zodiacal signs to the west, in Scorpio. Also, Capricorn is never overhead but is actually more than 100 degrees away from the zenith. I think that you meant that it appears highest in the sky, or due south at midnight.

But, again, for this peak of reports I suggest an Observer Effect. The jump in sightings you point to undoubtedly comes from reports in early August, during the summer months when folks are outdoors and when it gets dark by 9 P.M.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

Re: Nick Pope On 'The Sheffield Incident'

From: Max Burns <AlienHype@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 18:11:35 EDT
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 06:42:47 -0400
Subject: Re: Nick Pope On 'The Sheffield Incident'

In a message dated 5/31/99 6:43:32 PM GMT Daylight Time, updates@globalserve.net writes:

Subj: UFO UpDate: Nick Pope On 'The Sheffield Incident'
Date: 5/31/99 6:43:32 PM GMT Daylight Time
From: updates@globalserve.net (UFO UpDates - Toronto)

Snipped it all,

Phew thanks Nick for offering support for something you all ready acknowledged that you knew nothing about.

Strange comment from a man who is in no position to make any comment by his own statements.=E2=80=A6

Phew me wonders how The pope sleeps at night

"In the name of the father, the son and the holy ghost amen".

(((((Hey Folks)))))

This Saturday June 5th The Bufora summer lectures

Be there, here the facts that others wish you not to hear. Hey Popey turn up and here some facts, then you would be in a position to make a comment from a more informed position..

Instead of propaganda.....Phew

I forgive you in the nane of the father the son and the holy POPE

Max Burns Lecture
The Sheffield Incident

Banner Slide: The Sheffield Incident

Ladies & gentlemen, good afternoon and welcome to the Bufora London Summer '99 lectures. My Name is Max Burns, and today I am going to talk to you about my investigation into the Sheffield Flying triangle incident which occurred on the night of March 24th 1997, over the peak district to the west of Sheffield.

Today's lecture is the culmination of my own twenty-seven month investigation into the incident. My presentation today will be in three parts:

PART I:
A presentation of my investigation into case

PART II:
A comparative look at some of the claims and counter claims that have been made wherein I will show the irregularities of the claims of other researchers.

PART III:

A questions and answer period during which I will be pleased to answer all your questions about the incident. I do request that you hold all of your questions until the question and answer section, so that the presentation will flow smoothly as there is a lot of information to digest today

My research has been the topic of some very heated debate and argument on both the Internet and in various other forms of media publication with claim and counter claim, allegations of fabricating of evidence, and counter allegations of complicity in a conspiracy to conceal evidence. I ask you to put aside what you have been told or have heard through the rumor and whisper channels of ufology and listen and review my material with an open mind.

I would like to thank Malcolm Robinson & the Council of Bufora for allowing me to be here today, and I would like to thank you all for taking the time to come and listen to what I have to say. I hope that you enjoy my presentation.

And on that note, welcome.

Please attend if not make comment like The pope he allready said he knows not much about the case.

On that level, my granny said im right, she is blind and deaf.

Perhaps the pope could help her regain her vision?

Max Burns

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 06:55:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes
>To: updates@globalserve.net

>The Eastonian Times-Picayune is back, starting off with the
>usual bird-brained theories about the original Kenneth Arnold
>sighting. Bruce Maccabee, myself, and others argued ourselves
>blue in the face with all sorts of mathematical and other
>arguments why birds couldn't possibly work (can birds outfly a
>plane?). A lot of good it did. Don't get me started.

Why don't we get you started? Did it ever occur to you (and Maccabee) that your mathematical arguments and analysis of the Arnold case are only right if you assume Arnold was absolutely incapable of human error? But what if he was wrong? What if, for example, he saw another flight of some 20-25 objects not too long after his original sighting which certainly sound like birds to most of us? What if he went on to report seven UFO sightings total? What if he eventually concluded that UFOs are space animals -- "living organisms...in the atmosphere"?

See Clark's "The UFO Book," p. 62.

Would this lead you to conclude that you had something approaching a fruitcake on your hands, or would you prefer to conclude that a living organism crashed at Roswell?

You treat the Roswell case and its witnesses in the same fashion. When they support your argument, such witnesses as Proctor et al are absolutely accurate and inviolable in their recall, never mind interviewed 30 and 40 years after the fact. When they don't -- as in the case of Kent Lorenzo, first interviewed by Friedman in 1992, but never conveniently mentioned since -- they must be, what, part of the ongoing cover up?

Don't get me started.

You, Maccabee and others can mathematically analyze Arnold's original statements all you want, or until Hell freezes over, whichever comes first. And it doesn't mean a goddam thing unless you think he was absolutely dead on and incapable of any error in perception whatever.

Now explain how Miracle Man, i.e., Arnold, came to believe that UFOs were living organisms.

Troubling, isn't it?

Unless you're the editor of the Rudiak Real Times-Picayune.

Dennis Stacy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: **Dennis Stacy** <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 20:46:23 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 06:58:11 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes
>To: updates@globalserve.net

<snip>

> Don't get me started.

<snip>

>David Rudiak

Getting you started isn't the problem, believe me.

Now that you are, however, perhaps you would be so kind as to answer the following questions, based on your own mathematical analysis of same (And please feel free to call on Maccabee or others as required. Hell, if you want, you can even refer to Arnold.):

- 1) How many non-Mogul alien UFOs crashed at or near Roswell in the summer of 1947?
- 2) Where and when?
- 3) How many bodies were recovered?
- 4) Where were they sent? Did they pass through Roswell?
- 5) What cover up and investigative organization resulted as a consequence?
- 6) If MJ-12, please supply proof. If not MJ-12, please supply proof.
- 7) Does that mean that you support those MJ-12 documents that have surfaced or not?
- 8) How much of the Corso/Birnes book is true?

Sorry to have got you started. But trust you can finish.

Dennis Stacy

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

From: Henny van der Pluijm <hvdp@worldonline.nl>
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 02:12:07 +0200 (MET DST)
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 06:45:06 -0400
Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

>Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 21:05:52 -0700
>From: Kim Burrafato <lensman@stardrive.org>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

>I've been wondering how long it would take for biological trace
>evidence like this to show up. The fact that the hair is of an
>extremely rare human line -- Chinese mongoloid -- and blonde to
>boot -- is intriguing. But it's not definitive proof of
>extraterrestrial origin. My question to those well versed in
>molecular genetics, is what would constitute DNA that could be
>generally regarded as being of non-terrestrial origin? How
>different would it have to be from the DNA of the simplest
>terrestrial organism in order to be defined as "ET DNA"?

This is an interesting question. For the annoying reason that it cannot be answered, since nobody knows what ET DNA looks like. I guess this is a catch-22 situation. If the DNA resembles human DNA too much, it is human DNA. If the DNA differs too much from human DNA, it might be the DNA of an unknown animal. So either way it is not proof of ET.

Organized science will treat the DNA as it treats other sorts of evidence. If people see a UFO it isn't proof of anything. If a UFO is photographed it can be anything but an extraterrestrial object. When thousands of people report visiting entities it isn't proof of anything. When UFO's leave 4,000 traces on the ground the data are ignored. When you have a radar-visual case it is still anything but an extraterrestrial object. When fragments of a crashed UFO are found and analyzed the scientific community ignores it. It will be the same with DNA.

The crux of the matter is what John Velez said on this forum a few weeks ago. Humanity is simply not ready for accepting the presence of intelligent non-human beings on earth, whether on foot or in flying craft. Until that situation changes, and this will be a slow process, the scientific establishment will not take UFO's seriously, at least in public.

/ Met vriendelijke groet/Best wishes \
Henny van der Pluijm
hvdp@worldonline.nl

Technology Pages
<http://home.worldonline.nl/~hvdp>
\ _____ /

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

Re: (Skyopen) Lecture in Hong Kong

From: **Brian Cuthbertson** <brianc@freeside.fc.net>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 21:12:48 -0500 (CDT)
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 07:20:48 -0400
Subject: Re: (Skyopen) Lecture in Hong Kong

Folks,

FYI, I received the following reply from Jean-Michel Mariojouis after I sent a direct email requesting additional info about the Hong Kong cases as mentioned in a previous message posted to UFO Updates. If anyone on the list is familiar with a "flashing dots phenomenon" as related to any UFO incident, crop circle event, etc, you might want to contact Jean-Michel and compare notes.

-Brian Cuthbertson

>>>>From: Jean-Michel Mariojouis <jmexit@macau.ctm.net>
>>>>To: Skywatch International list <skywatch@ltlb.com>
>>>>Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 1999 11:32 AM
>>>>Subject: Lecture in Hong Kong

>>>>This is to inform you that I will participate to a lecture
>>>>organized by the Hong Kong UFO Club at the Hong Kong Space
>>>>Museum on Saturday 5th of June, between 6:00PM and 9:00PM.

>>>>The global theme will be asian UFO cases and footages from
>>>>Japan, China, Taiwan, Korea, and Hong Kong and Macau. I will
>>>>introduce Skywatch International and present some cases and
>>>>footages from Macau, included the strange phenomenon occuring
>>>>here since 1996.

>>>>Perhaps you could summarize some of the cases you mention above
>>>>and post them to the UFO Updates mailing list for the benefit
>>>>of worldwide subscribers outside of Hong Kong? I'm sure reports
>>>>from that area would be of interest. Alternately, a web page
>>>>that discusses such cases would be of interest.

>>>>Thanks,

>>>>-Brian Cuthbertson

>>> Who are you?
>>> What is the UFO Updates mailing list?
>>> What is updates@globalserve.net?

>>> Thanks

>>> Jean-Michel Mariojouis
>>> Skywatch International China Director

>Brian Cuthbertson wrote:

>>I'm one of the subscribers to the UFO UpDates moderated
>>by Errol Bruce-Knapp of Toronto, Canada. Personally, I'm
>>a software engineer and advanced amateur astronomer living
>>in Austin, Texas.

>>For more info on the UFO Updates email list, see the
>>following web page:

>> <http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/>

>>Click on the "Rules & Policies" link there if you
>>are interested in subscribing.

>>Quite a number of UFO researchers subscribe to this
>>list, including such folks as Stanton Friedman,
>>Greg Sandow, Jenny Randles (UK), and others.
>>Likewise numbers of normal folk, like myself,
>>subscribe.

>>Hope this helps,
>> -Brian

>From: JM <jmexit@macau.ctm.net>
>To: Brian Cuthbertson <brianc@freeside.fc.net>, skywatch@ltlb.com
>Subject: Re: (Skyopen) Lecture in Hong Kong

>Nice to meet you Brian!

>I always give new informations I have to the Skywatch mailing
>list, if not why the hell I would be China Director?!

>The Macau cases are already known to the long time Skywatch
>subscribers and others (as they have been reproduced in other
>Web sites at the time).

>The problem is that the most important case, the one I'm
>studying since 1996, is quite unusual and difficult to document.
>I recently started a collaboration with the Hong Kong UFO Club.
>Some new cases have been reported from some asian countries and
>they will be presented at the lecture. I will publicly present for
>the first time what I 'm calling: "the unidentified flashing dots
>phenomenon". A strange phenomenon on wich I can't find any
>reference in the UFO literature.

>I will surely report the result of the lecture to the Skywatch
>list. There is a Web page dedicated to my work but is waiting to
>be completed for a long time now. It will be done in two to three
>weeks time, including footages, photos, the Hong Kong lecture and
>much more.

>This is where:
><http://www.geocities.com/SoHo/Cafe/6289/ufo.html>
><http://www.geocities.com/SoHo/Cafe/6289/sichina.html>

>I will check UFO UpDates.

>Thanks

>Jean-Michel Mariojouis
>Skywatch International China Director and Field Investigator

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [skywatch](#)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

Re: 'Topographic Brain Mapping of UFO Experiencers'

From: **Tim D. Brigham** <TBrigham@ksinc.net>
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 23:19:15 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 08:03:11 -0400
Subject: Re: 'Topographic Brain Mapping of UFO Experiencers'

'ello all,

After my recent request for info regarding electrophysiology/neurophysiology of experiencers, I 'coincidentally' recieved the Rhine Institute's latest issue of The Journal of Parapsychology, which lists in its yearly bibliography an article titled "Topographic Brain Mapping of UFO Experiencers."

Authors are listed as Don and Moura (1997). Published in Journal of Scientific Exploration, 11, pg 435-454. Although

I am now a member of the SSE, I don't have this issue onhand, and wondered if anyone on this list might who would be willing to send me a copy to aid in the literature review that I am engaged in while I consider exploring this area further in an experimental manner. If so, please contact me directly.

Many thanks,

Tim Brigham

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

Re: Dr. Leir's Recovery

From: Derrel Sims <derrel@holman.net>
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 00:32:11 -0500
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 08:03:27 -0400
Subject: Re: Dr. Leir's Recovery

Dear friends, investigators and fellows in the UFO field:

A public plea is up on my site for Roger's financial and medical help.

Thank you all for you attention and the help that has already been directed to him from those of you who contacted me. I forwarded some of the information to MR. Avery and the rest I ask you to send directly to Roger's office.

Additional info is at:

<http://www.firstevidence.org/>

The data is up on the site. I am exhausted from all of this. god bless everyone for helping Roger...please, please dont forget to pray. Money can never take the place of prayer. Got to run. I have 4 presentations this weekend I have got to get ready for some of the best work I have ever presented.

God bless you all,

Derrel Sims, CM.Ht., R.H.A.
Chief of Investigations, Saber Enterprises
F.I.R.S.T., & H.U.F.O.N.
19934 Rising Star, Humble, Texas 77338
Resource Phone # 281 446 3005
Email: derrel@holman.net
Web Sites: www.FIRSTevidence.org & www.ALIENHUNTER.org &
www.AlienImplants.com

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 3](#)

UFOINFO Progress Report

From: John Hayes <jhayes@cableinet.co.uk>
Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 12:00:34 +0100
Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 08:03:43 -0400
Subject: UFOINFO Progress Report

Dear Errol and List Members,

The server the UFOINFO site is on is now back online but I have to wait until my new password has been installed for security reasons.

The latest report suggests that all or most of the files have been lost so a complete upload of the site will be necessary. As there are around 800 pages and many images in use it will probably take a few hours to complete.

Due to the cost of phone calls in the UK it means I will have to wait until the weekend before this can be done.

My apology for the inconvenience.

John Hayes

jhayes@cableinet.co.uk
webmaster@ufoinfo.com

UFOINFO:- <http://ufoinfo.com>
UFO Roundup:- <http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>
Filer's Files:- <http://ufoinfo.com/filer/>
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences:-
<http://ufoinfo.com/ufoicg/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Intruders Foundation Website

From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 15:58:02 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 10:56:44 -0400
Subject: Intruders Foundation Website

Hi All,

For almost five years I have maintained the IF website and attended to all of the contacts and correspondence that it generated. It was a voluntary effort that required hours of my time each day. I can no longer afford to dedicate so much of my time without compensation. In short, I need to concentrate on earning some \$ so that my family does not have to pay the price for my work with the public and on behalf of the experiencers.

Until further notice, the Intruders Foundation website will be offline. Any correspondence for Budd or for IF should be sent to:

IFCENTRAL@aol.com

I will not handle or forward any correspondence that is sent to my e-mail address intended for either Budd Hopkins or the Intruders Foundation.

I will continue to moderate and maintain the Abduction Information Center. Members can simply continue to access the website and interactive e-mail list the same as always. However, AIC will no longer be affiliated with Budd or the Intruders Foundation.

I have no idea who will pick up the work. For now, I am no longer the webmaster for IF and I will no longer represent either Budd or the Intruders Foundation in any way.

I hope this doesn't create an inconvenience for anyone. It's just something I have to do for myself.

Regards,

John Velez, Webmaster AIC

jvif@spacelab.net
INTRUDERS FOUNDATION/ABDUCTION INFORMATION CENTER
<http://www.if-aic.com/>

"Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind."

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Tony Spurrier <TSpurrier@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 09:29:21 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 10:56:24 -0400
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>From: Jenny Randles <nufon@currantbun.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake
>Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 14:28:46 +0100

>I have been following this debate with interest, as I trust has
>Paul Fuller.

Hi Jenny

At this point I should explain why we're particularly looking for physical evidence found in crop formations. Myself and Sue Addison run a UFO group in Hertfordshire, and in addition to our own research we aim to replicate others research findings. For example we have soil samples for the alleged landing site at Capel Green, Rendlesham Forest which are currently undergoing a full chemical analysis. We'll be comparing these to the findings that Larry Warren and peter Robbins unearthed (pardon the pun <g>).

Due to varying standards to the acceptance of evidence we feel there is a gap in research which will either help prove physical traces or disprove them as being bias. The group we run is split over the possibilities of the

origin of crop circles, although you've probably guessed what my view is <g>. Despite each individuals viewpoint we are all in agreement to look objectively at any evidence without bias and sieve out the relevant data from the irrelevant. For example, we've seen photo's of exploded nodes, but these have all been laid out on tables, and not whilst the crop is still in the ground. Those that believe in the possibility of crop circles being made by unknown forces agree that we can't rule out that the crop may have been tampered with after it was taken from the formations.

So far we have found that we step on the sceptics toes because we are open minded, and we are just sceptics to those who have a lower standard and accept anecdotal evidence. Anyway, I thought it was time to clarify the need for the information.

>Paul and I have written three books on circles and
>been involved since before Colin Andrews and Pat Delgado even.
>We have spent a lot of time collating eyewitness accounts and
>both of us have interviewed some. Dozens of cases exist and you
>will find plenty in the 1993 updated edition of our book 'Crop
>Circles: A Mystery Solved?' (Robert Hale).

Strangely enough I have a just received copy of your book which was our next port of call to extract physical evidence and eyewitness accounts.

>In essence eyewitnesses describe glowing rotating dome shaped
>lights at night (often with electrical effects) and dark, grey,
>misty lens shapes in daytime (often generating electroststic
>fields).

Sounds interesting.

>One vital key is that we never found a single case where a
>witness saw a complex formation created. Nearly all eyewitnesses
>are to simple, single circles. Eyewitness cases date back a long
>time and we have examples from pre 20th century.

Well, I'll certainly have a read of the book and check out the information on the eye witness formations.

If the only formations made by natural forces, or 'other' forces are single circles, then this seems to negate the more complex formations as mysterious messages from the aliens <g>

Tony

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Tony Spurrier <TSpurrier@compuserve.com>
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 09:30:14 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 10:58:28 -0400
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 09:51:19 -0700 (PDT)
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>I don't know who, if anyone, has any written reports, full or
>partial, from these four. I suppose Colin Andrews or other
>British crop-formation investigators would be the ones to
>contact on that.

Noye's book claimed that Andrews and Delgado ignored these reports as they were daytime sightings, and they were trying to prove that formations only appeared at night. So much for objective research!

>No, I leave that up to the crop-circle experts. But my own
>opinion, after examining a stand of it that I didn't want to
>tromple, was that it would be a hopeless task to do an
>impressive hoax job on it.

Unfortunately research into crop circles and ufology in general requires more than just opinion to establish the facts.

Given that a few of the oil-seed rape formations this year seem to refer to the solar eclipse in August, do you think the aliens are going to present themselves? Or what other meaning do you think the formations have?

>The supposed "string" technique was first offered up by negative
>skeptics as a hoaxing technique because of the circular shapes
>of many of the earlier ones, before Colin dispelled that one.

I would assume that Colin took the fact that circle makers used string too literally. He tried to flatten the crop with it, rather than use it to gauge the radius of the formation.

>Here's one for you to ponder, since you have Noyes' (editor)
>_The Crop Circle Enigma_. Go to p. 22 of that book and you'll
>see diagrams made by Terence Meaden and Colin Andrews of the
>crop circle of 1 Aug. '86 at Headbourne Worthy, Hampshire. It
>was a two-layer system, with an underlayer swirled one way and
>an upper layer above it, covering it, swirled such that the lay
>of the stems was at right angles to that of the layer just
>underneath. The diagrams depict the direction of the respective
>swirls. The photograph of it is shown on p. 36 of _Circular
>Evidence_ by Delgado & Andrews.

Thanks, I'll definitely check that out.

>You won't find any crop-circle naysayer talking about this one,
>or speculating on how it could have been hoaxed, or trying to
>demonstrate how it might be hoaxed. That's because it's pretty
>mind-boggling just to wonder about. You have to imagine that
>somehow every other crop stem out of the many thousands was
>first bent over (without breaking the stems) in one direction of
>swirl while the remaining stems all around stood intact. Then,
>these intact stems were bent over with a swirl at right angles
>to the swirl given to the other stems.

Have you asked any circle makers how this could be done?

>Such tell-tale signs have been found most notably in other
>crops, with wheat receiving the most attention, I believe.

If those signs are to be taken seriously surely they should
appear in oil-seed rape as you claim they are alien made?

>They're the ones who don't
>want to mention or discuss Levingood's work, or that two-layer
>crop-circle system I mentioned above, or the braided systems, or
>the several cases where the stems were all bent over from one to
>several inches above the ground, or why, in thousands of cases
>of "genuine" crop formations, no hoaxers have been caught making
>them, etc.

I have seen Levingood's work being discussed on many occasions.

I'll look into the lay of the crop, but I doubt there's anything
there that

couldn't be hoaxed.

You'll find that crop bent at different heights is just a
natural effect, I gather you saw the program 'Secrets of Crop
Circles'.

Can you name any crop circle maker that has been caught at all?

Tony

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Thu, 03 Jun 99 08:26:28 PDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:01:32 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes
>>To: updates@globalserve.net

>Why don't we get you started? Did it ever occur to you (and
>Maccabee) that your mathematical arguments and analysis of the
>Arnold case are only right if you assume Arnold was absolutely
>incapable of human error? But what if he was wrong? What if, for
>example, he saw another flight of some 20-25 objects not too
>long after his original sighting which certainly sound like
>birds to most of us? What if he went on to report seven UFO
>sightings total? What if he eventually concluded that UFOs are
>space animals -- "living organisms...in the atmosphere"?

>See Clark's "The UFO Book," p. 62.

>Would this lead you to conclude that you had something
>approaching a fruitcake on your hands, or would you prefer to
>conclude that a living organism crashed at Roswell?

I'm at a loss to understand what Dennis is trying to say here. The notion that UFOs may be living organisms -- "space animals" -- long ago went out of fashion, but it was a view held (however naively in retrospect) by a number of Ken Arnold's prominent contemporaries. Even Project Sign personnel characterized it as "one of the most intelligent theories we have received." The eminently respectable Civilian Saucer Intelligence of New York (Bloecher, Davis, Mebane) took the idea seriously, and it was discussed in writings by a variety of other early UFO writers, including Charles Fort, Desmond Leslie, M. K. Jessup, John Philip Bessor, Curtis Fuller, Trevor James Constable, and Ivan T. Sanderson. Arnold picked up his ideas from notions current in the late 1940s and 1950s.

For a full discussion of the theory and its history, see my The UFO Encyclopedia, 2nd Ed., pp. 872-77.

Arnold was anything but a fruitcake, and I am startled and depressed that Dennis would suggest as much on such flimsy -- well, actually, nonexistent -- evidence. This is revisionist ufology at its worst. I would have expected better of Dennis.

Jerry Clark

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 13:59:03 EDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:08:17 -0400
Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

>From: Henny van der Pluijm <hvdp@worldonline.nl>
>Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 02:12:07 +0200 (MET DST)
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

>>Date: Tue, 01 Jun 1999 21:05:52 -0700
>>From: Kim Burrafato <lensman@stardrive.org>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Biological Evidence Of An Alien Entity?

>>I've been wondering how long it would take for biological trace
>>evidence like this to show up. The fact that the hair is of an
>>extremely rare human line -- Chinese mongoloid -- and blonde to
>>boot -- is intriguing. But it's not definitive proof of
>>extraterrestrial origin. My question to those well versed in
>>molecular genetics, is what would constitute DNA that could be
>>generally regarded as being of non-terrestrial origin? How
>>different would it have to be from the DNA of the simplest
>>terrestrial organism in order to be defined as "ET DNA"?

>This is an interesting question. For the annoying reason that it
>cannot be answered, since nobody knows what ET DNA looks like.
>I guess this is a catch-22 situation. If the DNA resembles human
>DNA too much, it is human DNA. If the DNA differs too much from
>human DNA, it might be the DNA of an unknown animal. So either
>way it is not proof of ET.

>Organized science will treat the DNA as it treats other sorts of
>evidence. If people see a UFO it isn't proof of anything. If a
>UFO is photographed it can be anything but an extraterrestrial
>object. When thousands of people report visiting entities it
>isn't proof of anything. When UFO's leave 4,000 traces on the
>ground the data are ignored. When you have a radar- visual case
>it is still anything but a extraterrestrial object. When
>fragments of a crashed UFO are found and analyzed the scientific
>community ignores it. It will be the same with DNA.

>The crux of the matter is what John Velez said on this forum a
>few weeks ago. Humanity is simply not ready for accepting the
>presence of intelligent non-human beings on earth, whether on
>foot or in flying craft. Until that situation changes, and this
>will be a slow process, the scientific establishment will not
>take UFO's seriously, at least in public.

This is the best, most succinct and honest revelation of the
facts of life regarding UFOs and the actions of their occupants
I've ever read. Thank you, Sir.

However, and not wishing to speak for anyone else, some of the
fear expressed on this list related to when the time came for
the proof to be undeniable, and people are discovered to be
lizard spawn, or gray spawn ... or perhaps even gray poopspawn.
Sorry, I was unable to restrain myself.

The concern is that when discovery is made that, say I or Velez,
Art Bell or (God Forbid because it would really give the lizard
spawn race a black eye) Fill Class, were discovered to be such
offspring, that we would become the "Strange Fruit" hanging from
the Poplar tree Billy Holiday sang about. Frankly, despite the

fantastic Rimbaudian imagery, I don't like the view from a poplar branch ... much like my brothers and sisters, most likely.

But somehow, I just don't think that will happen. Just my opinion. If it is discovered that some of us are really alien spawn, lizard spawn or otherwise, I tend to believe that we will be preserved by the goobers in gubbamint and analyzed, poked, prodded and sucked for body fluids more than the buggers (uh, bugs) did to us. No, I rather think we will be relatively safe, albeit not free. But then again, who is these days? And please, don't argue with me on this issue. Anyone out there in the ether think you're free? Hee, hee. Right! And the check is in the mail. And, "Don't worry, sweetheart, I'm sterile!" Uh huh. Freedom no longer rings. It tried but no one heard it. Like that Poplar tree falling in the forest ... where no one was around to hear it fall? Therefore it didn't? And where those black bodies with bright spirits hung, in the south of our great nation, and in the camps in Europe.... etc. And continue to hang, as there are better, more insidious ways to hang a man without a rope or a poplar tree.

People have no idea what it is like to be in the position of someone who has (what to that person, are "real") memories of these events. Unless of course, you've been thru it. It creates a level of fear, which evolves over your lifetime, into either terror or some benign "they are our saviors and they love us" tripe. Not only are experiencers saddled with the memories, which are all too real to us, but the ancillary fears, phobias and emotional issues too complex to verbalize here. Some never speak of it. Some, idiots to a man, woman and child, are unafraid to talk about it. Many, like Velez, recommend keeping it quiet. I concur. Because while I do not think the lynch mobs will win, I think the goobers in gubbamint will. And I fear them more than I fear my neighbors with ropes. At least it's over relatively quickly at the end of a rope. But at the end of the corridor, at the camps set up for us, it could be a lifetime of terror, the memories of which will radiate into the universe just like those who've suffered in other camps, at other times thru-out our history. Jerks that we are.

Which is why I continue to believe that to be an inebriant or a nut is so cool. Do you remember that old geezer in "Andromeda Strain" who drank Sterno? Sumbitch didn't die with the rest of 'em. And the baby whose lungs saved it.

See the messages here? No? OK, let me tell you what the messages are:

- 1) Don't drink Sterno, drink Gripple, it tastes better.
- 2) Weep.

Gesundt

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: **Steven Kaeser** <steve@konsulting.com>
Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 10:23:58 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:04:11 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 20:46:23 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes
>>To: updates@globalserve.net

><snip>

>> Don't get me started.

><snip>

>>David Rudiak

>Getting you started isn't the problem, believe me.

>Now that you are, however, perhaps you would be so kind as to
>answer the following questions, based on your own mathematical
>analysis of same (And please feel free to call on Maccabee or
>others as required. Hell, if you want, you can even refer to
>Arnold.):

>1) How many non-Mogul alien UFOs crashed at or near Roswell in
>the summer of 1947?

>2) Where and when?

>3) How many bodies were recovered?

>4) Where were they sent? Did they pass through Roswell?

>5) What cover up and investigative organization resulted as a
>consequence?

>6) If MJ-12, please supply proof. If not MJ-12, please supply proof.

>7) Does that mean that you support those MJ-12 documents that
>have surfaced or not?

>8) How much of the Corso/Birnes book is true?

>Sorry to have got you started. But trust you can finish.

>Dennis Stacy

Dennis-

Have you really become so frustrated with the "genre" that you have to resort to this type of posting? The subjects you raise have all been argued to death on this list (and others) and you throw them out as bait to begin those arguments anew. The worst part of it is that you lump them all together, in spite of the fact that the provenance of each is so vastly different, which is a tactic used by CISCOP.

Personally, I'd rather be reading discussions about the issues at hand, rather than discussions about the discussions.

Steve

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

The Prophets Conference - Port Townsend

From: prophets@maui.net
Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 08:51:36 -1000
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:16:58 -0400
Subject: The Prophets Conference - Port Townsend

The Prophets Conference ~ Port Townsend, taking place the weekend of August 27-29 in the idyllic and picturesque setting of Port Townsend, Washington, is bringing together an extraordinary group of visiting faculty to explore two main themes: =93The UFO: Anomaly, Reality, Implications=94 and =93Evoking the Numinous: A Path of Revelation, Evolution, Awakening.=94

One of the mind opening conference presenters is the =91erudite, witty, and genuinely scary,=92 Robert Anton Wilson, who will be joining Dr. Edgar Mitchell, Joe Firmage, Dr. Jack Sarfatti, Joan Ocean, and Dr. Steven Greer on the UFO panel. Wilson will also be presenting an individual teaching during this historic event entitled, =93There=92s a Seeker Born Every Minute,=94 where he will wax sarcastic (or witty) about both dogmatic Believers and dogmatic Deniers. He will be joined during his presentation by one of America=92s truly great and prophetic novelists, Tom Robbins, a non-dogmatic person reportedly raised by wild dingoes in the Australian outback.

Other presenters at the conference include Gregg Braden, Ilona Selke, and James Twyman.

You will find full information on The Prophets Conference ~ Port Townsend linked at <http://www.greatmystery.org/prophets.html>.

Looking forward to seeing you in August.

Cody

About Robert Anton Wilson

=93Dazzling=85the most thrilling tilt-a-whirls and daring loop-o-planes on the midway of higher consciousness.=94
-Tom Robbins=09

=93We=92ve needed this for a long time=85=94=09
-Henry Miller, author of Tropic of Cancer

=93What great physicist hides behind the mask of Wilson?=94
-New Scientist

=93One Of The Leading Thinkers Of The Modern Age=85=94=09
-Barbara Marx Hubbard

(Excerpt from =93COSMIC TRIGGER III: My Life After Death=94
by Robert Anton Wilson=94)

FROM RUSSIA
WITH LOVE

In Which a Paper Rattlesnake Turns
Around and Bites Us in the Ass

Professor, you've got a bad case of Gogo on the Magogo.
-Spellbound

No ordinary tomato could do this, but-
-Attack of the Killer Tomatoes

On April 24, 1989, when glasnost had already come to bloom but before the final break-up of the Soviet Union, a man named Ivan Vesalova in Cherepovetsk saw or imagined a craft of enormous size, bigger than any airplane, hovering about a thousand feet above the ground. Just another UFO sighting. Nothing special. We all know that Vesalova might have actually seen an airplane distorted by lighting and weather, or a balloon, or a heat inversion. Those of us open-minded enough-or mad enough, as you will-to think he might have seen an alien spaceship do not need to rush in haste to the True Believer position of changing "might have seen" to a dogmatic and fervent "did see." We just don't know, and most of us prefer to remain dubious about such a case, where multiple earthly explanations seem quite likely.

On June 6, in Konantsevo, several children reported the landing of a luminous sphere in a meadow. They saw, or hallucinated--, as you will, a headless person climb out. Then, like a special effect in a sci-fi movie, both the craft and the headless ginkus disappeared. Just faded away...

Well, maybe the kids had smoked some decadent Capitalist weed. Maybe they just wanted to hoax the grown-ups and invented it all. Maybe...maybe...We do not get beyond "maybe" in cases like this, unless we have a Dogma in mind and want to force the data to fit it.

On June 11 in Volagda a woman reported a fiery sphere crossing the sky, visibly for about seventeen minutes.

Maybe she saw a meteor. Maybe she saw a space ship. You decide such maybes definitely only if you made up your mind long, long ago that you would always decide them that way.

For several days in October that year, in the town of Voronezhan industrial center of about one million inhabitants--scores of witnesses reported landings of spherical craft. They also reported gigantic extraterrestrials (twelve to fourteen feet high) who got out of the craft and went walking around the city park.

They even saw or hallucinated several cases of seeming "teleportations"--people who vanished from one place and then re-appeared elsewhere.

The witnesses to all this weirdness did not number two or three, who might have hatched a good hoax between them. In most cases, witnesses consisted of huge crowds.

Kind of makes me wonder. George Lucas, as noted earlier, could fake this on film, but I don't know of any existing technology that would fake it in several parts of a "real," "solid" town.

The alleged extraterrestrial allegedly had three eyes, according to some witnesses. Others denied that and said the Visitors (let's not assume we know what kind of space they came from) had a strange bump in their foreheads that looked only a little bit like a third eye.

Many of the sightings had very large crowds of witnesses. For instance, a woman who saw a red-yellow-green globe maneuvering over her house called all her neighbors. Over 500 people later agreed they had seen it--or 500+ people all starting hallucinating at the same time, if you must dump the data instead of thinking about it.

Several Soviet scientists investigated and failed to convince themselves that all the reports derived from hallucination. They frankly felt stumped, as they told American researcher Dr. Jacques Vallee.

Just before Vallee finished interviewing the Russian investigators--as he prepared to fly back to the United States--one final report came from Voronezh. Another strange craft had flown over a nuclear power plant, and sent a beam toward the ground, which left a burn mark in the asphalt.

Witnesses described the craft, and garb of the giants who walked around the park, as decorated with a curious symbol. Perhaps the reader will recognize that symbol at this stage of our story.

)+(

The sign of UMMO... By now, this group art work, or hoax, or whatever, must have cost its perpetrators about as much as a Spielberg film. What can inspire such spendthrift humor?

The 21st Century Mind: Opening to the Possible is the vision for The Prophets Conference ~ Port Townsend. This special gathering continues the compelling adventure into sacred vision and the realization of meaning. The Prophets Conferences are unparalleled events constantly manifesting the edge of ideas which call for nothing less than the Re-envisioning and Reconfiguration of Reality.

Port Townsend, Washington is a beautiful place on Puget Sound, between Seattle and Vancouver, and is the perfect location for the conference, for a powerful pilgrimage, and for an especially enjoyable vacation. Lodging and camping at the Fort Worden State Park Conference Site are inexpensive, comfortable, and quite nice, and the surrounding scenery is breathtaking.

Full information is available at:
<http://www.greatmystery.org/prophets.html>.

You may request a brochure by calling toll-free 1-888-777-5981.

Thank you for forwarding this information to your various lists. Questions, unsubscribe, subscribe, inquiries, comments, issues? Send mail to Cody@greatmystery.org

explore... <http://www.greatmystery.org>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 17:57:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:21:08 -0400
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 09:51:19 -0700 (PDT)
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

<snip>

>Here's one for you to ponder, since you have Noyes' (editor)
>_The Crop Circle Enigma_. Go to p. 22 of that book and you'll
>see diagrams made by Terence Meaden and Colin Andrews of the
>crop circle of 1 Aug. '86 at Headbourne Worthy, Hampshire. It
>was a two-layer system, with an underlayer swirled one way and
>an upper layer above it, covering it, swirled such that the lay
>of the stems was at right angles to that of the layer just
>underneath. The diagrams depict the direction of the respective
>swirls. The photograph of it is shown on p. 36 of Circular
>Evidence_ by Delgado & Andrews.

Here's one for you to ponder.

In his own crop circle book, The Circles Effect and Its
Mysteries (1989), Meaden indeed viewed the Headbourne Worthy
circle as incapable of having been created by humans. He was
even so bold (or foolish, depending on your point of view) at
the time to state, "We may be sure that none of the 250 circles
personally examined by the author as background material for the
present survey has been man-made."

But only a few years later Meaden was on record as admitting
that, while many of the complex-geometry formations were
undoubtedly hoaxes, some of the simple circles were still the
product of his previously unrecognized "plasma vortex." A year
or two later he was out of the "business" altogether.

One wonders why, doesn't one? But why not contact him and find
out? Ask him what he thinks of the Headbourne Worthy formation
now.

<snip>

>>Such tell-tale signs have been found most notably in other
>>crops, with wheat receiving the most attention, I believe. You
>>could write the BLT research team for more details on that.
>>Recall that posting from Nancy Talbott I originally was trying
>>to bring to your attention, with excerpt below:

>>>Yes, control studies have been conducted; BLT has made circles
>>>with feet, planks & rope, and cement rollers, then sampled the
>>>crop as we normally do to look for the regularly-found plant
>>>anomalies.

>>>We did _not_ find (1) node elongation of the plant stems, (2)
>>>expulsion cavities at the nodes of plant stems, (3) altered
>>>redox ratios (measurements of mitochondrial respiration rates),
>>>or (4) altered germination characteristics in the downed plants
>>>when compared with controls taken elsewhere in the test fields.

>> Nancy Talbott
>> BLT Research,

>> Box 400127,
>> Cambridge, MA
>> 02140, USA.

>The "B" stands for John Burke, the "T" stands for Talbott, and
>the L for Dr. Wm. C. Levingood [sic], who did manage to get a paper or
>two (or more since 1994?) into the peer-reviewed literature on
>it, and in it he does describe some of the anomalies in detail.
>His paper is "Anatomical anomalies in crop formation plants,"
>_Physiologia Plantarum_ 92 (1994), pp. 356-363.

For a balanced overview of the crop circle phenomenon, I can do
no better than to recommend an article by Montague Keen, "Keen
on Crop Circles," which appeared in *The Anomalist* 4 (\$9.95 plus
\$2.50 s/h from, and checks payable to, Dennis Stacy, PO Box
12434, San Antonio, TX 78212). For three years Keen served as
scientific adviser to the Centre for Crop Circle Studies.

Here's an interesting quote from Keen. "In order to use
artificially flattened pants as controls against which
differences in sample crops are measured, it is strictly
necessary not only to have a standard artificial flattening
procedure, using the same implements at the same velocities and
weights to flatten the crop, but to perform this operation at
the same time as the sampled formation is made -- otherwise the
crop may be at a different growth stage and exhibit all manner
of chemical and physiological differences. But this is
impossible. No-one knows where or when crop formations occur;
only when they are noticed. Such an objection may appear to push
methodology over the brink of pedantry, but this is an area
where we can afford to allow no rough edges." (pp. 52-53)

As for Levingood's much ballyhooed measurements in the
diameters of minute pit holes in cell walls, I won't bore you
with the details, but Keen says, in essence, "it is doubtful
whether optical magnification could satisfactorily delineate
diameters to the level of accuracy required for the sort of
statistical calculations made by Levingood. There is a strong
subjective element here. It must cast serious doubt on the
reliability of measurements made and conclusions drawn." (p. 51)

There is much more in this important, intriguing article,
including the to date unanswered challenge made by hoaxer Rob
Irving to Levingood about Levingood's so-called "H-Glaze,"
described by Levingood and Burke as minute particles of iron
contained in the late-summer Perseid meteor shower [that] had
been drawn down from stratospheric heights by a plasma vortex.
"On entering the Earth's atmosphere," according to Keen's
interpretation of Levingood's and Burke's claims, "the heat had
generated microwaves of sufficient intensity to moltenise the
iron particles, some of which were found to be embedded in the
stalk running from the base upwards."

Irving claims he dusted the formation with iron samples obtained
from the chemistry department of one of the Oxford University
colleges -- and still has some, whenever Levingood wants to
compare his samples with his.

As for Levingood's 1994 "Physiologia Plantarum" article, Keen
has this to say: "This journal, the exclusive domain of plant
physiologists, makes no provision for correspondence or
contradiction, otherwise it might have been able to inform its
readers of my failure to find a single piece of supporting
evidence in the several footnoted citations."

Something else to ponder: Like Meaden, Keen was an early student
of the so-called crop circle phenomenon, who has since distanced
himself. I wonder why.

<snip>

>It's the other way around. There is a lot of conclusive evidence
>that the real crop-circle formations can't be hoaxed, because
>hoaxers can't reproduce any of the extremely important details.
>All they can do is make a pattern that, if they do it carefully,
>may look OK when photographed from an airplane. But that's good
>enough to satisfy those who don't want to admit that
>beyond-human intelligence is at work. They're the ones who don't
>>want to mention or discuss Levingood's work, or that two-layer
>crop-circle system I mentioned above, or the braided systems, or

>the several cases where the stems were all bent over from one to
>several inches above the ground, or why, in thousands of cases
>of "genuine" crop formations, no hoaxers have been caught making
>them, etc.

>Jim Deardorff

><http://www.proaxis.com/~deardorj>

Your conclusive evidence is a lot less conclusive than you think, Jim, as are your undervaluations of human ability and ingenuity (and let's don't forget gullibility). You ought to hang out with some hoaxers more and see how it's done. But you probably wouldn't believe it if you saw it with your own eyes.

Dennis Stacy

<http://www.anomalist.com>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: James Easton <voyager@ukonline.co.uk>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 04:33:06 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:24:29 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Regarding:

>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes
>To: updates@globalserve.net

>What's my point here? When everything finally hit the ground,
>the parachutes would again collapse, some parts exposed to the
>sun, but other parts underneath shaded from the sun. If they
>were also composed of something like Brazel's "rather tough
>paper" to the point where they would resemble something like
>parchment, one would also expect only minor or maybe moderate
>shredding. The parachutes should remain relatively intact with
>uneven fading of color. Furthermore, somewhere in the mix of
>debris, there should also have been evidence of the twine lines
>and the structural metal rings.

>But nobody describes anything like that -- no metal rings, no
>twine, just lots of pieces of something parchment-like scattered
>about, described only as "brown" by Marcel and covered with
>purplish writing.

Metal rings and twine/string have been identified, as summarised
in the following:

Date: Sun, 16 Jul 1995 21:31:29 -0400
From: DRudiak <drudiak@AOL.COM>
Subject: Roswell Crash Materials Eyewitness Testimony

DESCRIPTIONS OF ROSWELL CRASH DEBRIS BY CIVILIAN AND MILITARY
WITNESSES

Compiled by David Rudiak

[.]

F&B: Stanton Friedman and Don Berliner, "Crash at Corona", 1991
SKEP July/August 1995 "Skeptical Inquirer"
USAF: United States Air Force Report on Roswell, Sept. 1994.

[.]

3. RIGID METAL, OTHER METAL:

[.]

BESSIE BRAZEL SCHREIBER
(F&B) " ...[There was also] a piece of something made out of the
same metal-like foil that looked like a pipe sleeve. About four
inches across and equally long, with a flange on one end."

CHARLES B. MOORE
(SKEP) Moore says Flight 4 carried several 3-inch-diameter
aluminum rings for assisting with launching the balloon train, as
well as larger rings used to hold sonobuoys. (Moore claims this
is consistent with Schreiber's "pipe sleeve/flange" description
above).

(USAF) The material and a "black box" described by Cavitt, was, in Moore's opinion, most probably from Flight 4, a "service flight" that included a cylindrical metal sonobuoy and portions of a weather instrument housed in a box, which was unlike typical weather radiosondes which were made of cardboard.

[.]

6. FILAMENT-LIKE MATERIAL:

WILLIAM BRAZEL JR.;

(F&B) "[There was] something on the order of heavy-gauge monofilament fishing line...The "string", I couldn't break it."

"[There was also] some threadlike material. It looked like silk, but was not silk, a very strong material [without] strands or fibers like silk would have. This was more like a wire, all one piece or substance."

(B&M) "There was some thread-like material. It looked like silk and there were several pieces of it. It was not large enough to call string, but yet not so small as sewing thread either. To all appearances it was silk, except that it wasn't silk. Whatever it was, it too was a very strong material. You could take it in two hands and try to snap it, but it wouldn't snap at all. Nor did it have strands or fibers like silk thread would have. This was more like a wire--all one piece or substance. In fact, I suppose it could have been a sort of wire--that thought never occurred to me before."

1st-LT. JAMES McANDREW (Speaking for the Air Force Report)
(KPFA) "Other people described a monofilament-type line that was some-kind of fiber optics. Well there was indeed some single nylon line present on this balloon."

CHARLES B. MOORE

(USAF description) [The Mogul radar reflectors were made of] single strand and braided nylon twine, brass eyelets and swivels to form a multi-faced reflector similar in construction to a box kite.

(Pflock description) Moore and his team used very strong (150 and 300 pound test) monofilament nylon line in rigging their Mogul arrays. This could account for the material which has been said to resembled heavy gauge monofilament nylon fishing line. Also used was hand braided lobster twine, composed of many fine nylon threads. Moore told me the twine's individual strands strongly resembled silk threads when the twine unraveled, which it did easily when broken or cut. This could account for the debris described as silk-like threads.
[End]

Also, re the "3-inch-diameter aluminum rings" which Moore references:

"Brazel's daughter, Bessie Brazel Schreiber, in a 1979 interview conducted by author William Moore described some aluminium ring-shaped objects in the debris that looked like pipe intake collars or the necks of balloons. (The mention of the rings appears in William Moore's transcript of the interview, but was not included in his book The Roswell Incident.)"

'The Roswell Incident and Project Mogul'
By Dave Thomas
Skeptical Inquirer, July/August 1995

As with any evidence, some of the most significant is that documented at the time:

'The Wyoming Eagle' - 9 July, 1947
'Kite-Like Device Found in N.M.; Studied by Army'
By WILLIAM F. McMENAMIN

Washington, July 8 --(UP) -- The mystery of the "flying saucers" took a new twist tonight with the disclosure that the army air forces has recovered a strange object in New Mexico and is forwarding it to Wright Field, Dayton, O., for examination.

Announcement of the find came first from the Roswell, N. Mex. army air base, near where a "saucer" was found three weeks ago.

AAF spokesman would say only that the "saucer" was a flimsily-constructed, kite-like object measuring about 25 feet in diameter and covered with a material resembling tin foil.

A telephonic report from Brig. Gen. Roger B. Ramey, commander of the Eighth Air Force at Ft. Worth, Texas, said the purported "saucer" was badly battered when discovered by a rancher at Corona, 75 miles northwest of Roswell, N.M.

Ramey scoffed at the possibility that the object could have attained the supersonic speeds credited to the "flying saucers" allegedly spotted in recent weeks.

He reported that the object was too lightly constructed to have carried anyone and that there was no evidence that it had had a power plant of any sort.

It bore no identification marks and Ramey emphasized that no one had seen it in flight.

Sheriff George Wilcox of Roswell said the disc was found about three weeks ago by W.W. Brizell (sic), on the Foster ranch at Corona, 75 miles northwest of Roswell.

Wilcox said that Brizell does not have a telephone and so did not report finding the disc until the day before yesterday. Brizell told the sheriff he didn't know just what the disc was, but that at first it appeared to be a weather meter.

The sheriff quoted Brizell as saying the object "seemed more or less like tinfoil." The rancher described the disc as about as large as a safe in the sheriff's office.

The safe is about three and one-half by four feet.
[End]

That Brazel did believe the debris might be from a 'weather meter' seems to be proven, as I've previously highlighted, by his son's recollections in 'The Roswell Incident':

"...when dad first got into Roswell, it was the weather bureau he called first about this stuff he had found. It was the weather bureau that told him he had better see the sheriff about it".

The true nature of the debris which Brazel found is patently obvious from the 'Roswell Daily Record' article of 9 July - and please, no 'statement made under duress' bollocks.

It evidently wasn't, as we can see:

'Harassed Rancher who Located 'Saucer' Sorry He Told About It'

"W.W. Brazel, 48, Lincoln county rancher living 30 miles south east of Corona, today told his story of finding what the army at first described as a flying disk, but the publicity which attended his find caused him to add that if he ever found anything short of a bomb he sure wasn't going to say anything about it".

As his elder sister, Lorraine, noted in 'The Roswell Incident', "Mac didn't ever like to be in the limelight". It was the resulting, unexpected publicity which Brazel lamented.

"Brazel was brought here late yesterday by W.E. Whitmore, of radio station KGFL, had his picture taken and gave an interview to the Record and Jason Kellahin, sent here from the Albuquerque bureau of the Associated Press to cover the story.

[...]

"Brazel related that on June 14 he and 8-year-old son, Vernon were about 7 or 8 miles from the ranch house of the J.B. Foster ranch, which he operates, when they came upon a large area of bright wreckage made up on (sic) rubber strips, tinfoil, a rather tough paper and sticks".

There's the "rather tough paper", "tinfoil" and sticks.

No dispute about these, plus Brazel reportedly confirms there were "rubber strips".

Although the stated 14 June date isn't certain, it may be correct.

"At the time Brazel was in a hurry to get his round made and he did not pay much attention to it".

Confirmed.

"But he did remark about what he had seen."

Confirmed.

"...and on July 4 he, his wife, Vernon, and a daughter Betty, age 14, went back to the spot and gathered up quite a bit of the debris".

He did return later to collect some of the debris.

"The next day he first heard about the flying disks, and he wondered if what he had found might be the remnants of one of these".

Brazel first heard of the 'flying disks' media frenzy when he went into Corona.

"Monday he came to town to sell some wool."

Not true, according to his son, as published in 'The Roswell Incident'; "Dad never sold any wool in Roswell".

"I believe his original intention was to go to Roswell and buy a new Jeep pickup truck - he certainly wouldn't have made the trip just on account of the stuff he had found - but I don't believe he bargained for what he got himself into".

"...and while here he went to see sheriff George Wilcox and 'whispered kinda confidential like' that he might have found a flying disk".

Apparently only after first contacting the 'weather bureau'.

"Wilcox got in touch with the Roswell Army Air Field and Maj. Jesse A. Marcel and a man in plain clothes accompanied him home, where they picked up the rest of the pieces of the 'disk'".

OK.

"...and went to his home to try to reconstruct it".

Is there any reason to doubt this?

"According to Brazel they simply could not reconstruct it at all. They tried to make a kite out of it, but could not do that and could not find any way to put it back together so that it would fit".

If they attempted to reconstruct a kite from the 'flying disk' debris, some of it must have resembled a kite, presumably why it was described elsewhere at the time as a "kite-like object", covered with tinfoil.

"Then Major Marcel brought it to Roswell and that was the last he heard of it until the story broke that he had found a flying disk.

Brazel said that he did not see it fall from the sky and did not see it before it was torn up, so he did not know the size or shape it might have been,...".

True.

"...but he thought it might have been about as large as a table top".

Possibly accurate - see Sheriff Wilcox's comments above.

"The balloon which held it up, if that was how it worked, must have been about 12 feet long, he felt, measuring the distance by the size of the room in which he sat. The rubber was smoky gray in color and scattered over an area about 200 yards in diameter.

When the debris was gathered up the tinfoil, paper, tape, and sticks made a bundle about three feet long and 7 or 8 inches thick, while the rubber made a bundle about 18 or 20 inches long and about 8 inches thick. In all, he estimated, the entire lot would have weighed maybe five pounds".

[...]

"There was no sign of any metal in the area which might have been used for an engine and no sign of any propellers of any kind,..."

True.

"...although at least one paper fin had been glued onto some of the tinfoil".

Is there any reason whatsoever to doubt this?

"There were no words to be found anywhere on the instrument, although there were letters on some of the parts".

Apparently accurate.

"Considerable scotch tape and some tape with flowers printed upon it had been used in the construction".

Crucial evidence, as summarised in the following:

Date: Sun, 16 Jul 1995 21:31:29 -0400
From: DRudiak <drudiak@AOL.COM>
Subject: Roswell Crash Materials Eyewitness Testimony

B&M: Charles Berlitz and William Moore, "The Roswell Incident," 1980.

F&B: Stanton Friedman and Don Berliner, "Crash at Corona", 1991
R&S1: Kevin Randle and Don Schmitt, "UFO Crash at Roswell"

4. TAPE-LIKE MATERIAL (AND "HIEROGLYPHICS", FLOWER PATTERNS)

BESSIE BRAZEL SCHREIBER:

(B&M) "Some of the metal-foil pieces had a sort of tape stuck to them, and when these were held to the light they showed what looked like pastel flowers or designs. Even though the stuff looked like tape, it would not be peeled off or removed at all. It was very light in weight, but there sure was a lot of it."

(F&B) "Some of [the aluminum foil-like] pieces had a sort of tape stuck to them. Even though the stuff looked like tape, it could not be peeled off or removed at all. Some of these pieces had something like numbers and lettering on them, but there were no words we were able to make out. The figures were written out like you would write numbers in columns, but they didn't look like the numbers we use at all."

(Pflock, USAF, from affidavit 9/22/93): "...Sticks, like kite sticks, were attached to some of the pieces with a whitish tape. The tape was about two or three inches wide and had flower-like designs on it. The 'flowers' were faint, a variety of pastel colors, and reminded me of Japanese paintings in which the flowers are not all connected. I do not recall any other ... markings."

LORETTA PROCTOR:

(Pflock, FUFOR, from affidavit 5/5/91) "...There was also something he [Mac Brazel] described as tape which had printing on it. The color of the printing was a kind of purple. He said it wasn't Japanese writing; from the way he described it, it sounded like it resembled hieroglyphics."

(R&S1): "He said there was more stuff there, like a tape that had some sort of figures on it."

[End]

"No strings or wire were to be found."

Apparently not so - see previous evidence.

".. but there were some eyelets in the paper to indicate that some sort of attachment may have been used".

OK.

"Brazel said that he had previously found two weather balloons on the ranch, but that what he found this time did not in any way resemble either of these".

Understandable. This was something different, despite it consisting of "rubber strips, tinfoil, a rather tough paper and sticks".

"I am sure what I found was not any weather observation balloon," he said. "But if I find anything else besides a bomb they are going to have a hard time getting me to say anything about it".

Clearly not sentiments expressed under any 'pressure'.

What does it take before 'Roswell' and the hugely successful 'MJ-12' hoax are acknowledged to be untenable scientific evidence for the most incredible claim - that the crash of a 'spaceship' from another planet/dimension not only occurred, it has been kept secret for over 50 years?

Maybe just the courage to concede, as many of us have, that it was a mistaken possibility, principally founded on seductive testimonies from now discredited 'witnesses' such as Gerald Anderson, Glenn Dennis, Frank Kaufmann, etc.

What does it take before some people object to being targeted as gullible by the 'MJ-12' hoaxer(s)?

Incidentally, it's now over a year since I detailed the considerable anomalies re Kaufmann's supposed 'Top Secret' Roswell report - see:

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1998/apr/m30-004.shtml>

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1998/jun/m01-017.shtml>

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1998/jun/m02-018.shtml>

Is there any reason why the questions raised therein still can't be addressed?

Re the tape with purple/pastel flowers, although it's doubtful this could successfully be followed up, the 'Las Vegas Review-Journal' of 9 July, 1947 does mention, "Those men who saw the object said it had a flowered paper tape around it bearing the initials 'D.P.'"

James.
E-mail: voyager@ukonline.co.uk

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Filer's Files #22 --1999

From: George A. Filer <Majorstar@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 00:13:18 EDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:27:55 -0400
Subject: Filer's Files #22 --1999

Filer's Files #22 --1999, MUFON Skywatch Investigations
George A. Filer, Mutual UFO Network Eastern Director,
June 4, 1999, Majorstar@aol.com (609) 654-0020

UFO reports decrease in US, but increase in Canada, Mexico and the UK.

FLORIDA

GAINESVILLE -- On Friday, May 7, 1999, Cheryl Kirkland and her boyfriend= were traveling west on NW 39th Avenue between Main and NW 6th Streets, Alachua County. Cheryl said, "I was in the passenger seat, while my boyfriend was= driving when I noticed three objects in the distance on my side ahead at= 8:15 PM. As we got closer, I realized that they were floating, not flying. I know they were not birds since I am a bird enthusiast and have experience in= bird identification. They were three "balls" dark gray to black in appearance and were in a vertical triangular formation (not a triangular flight pattern horizontal and parallel to the ground). I thought that they= were perhaps balloons but decided they were rather large to be balloons and= did not think three balloons would float and remain in a triangular pattern.= They were the size of a small automobile. Two of the balls moved up and down. I said, "What are those three balls in the sky -- slow down!" We drove at 30 mph and slower. They flew right by in a perfect spherical= shape. My boyfriend slowed down and glanced over and saw the objects, but could= not get a good look. I told him to pull over. He said he couldn't. I yelled,= "Pull over." He argued, "There's no place to pull over!" He was able to drive slowly, while I kept my eye on the objects. Then they just vanished. = My boyfriend said he did briefly see three objects and they were moving up= and down. I called the police, but the officer I spoke with seemed skeptical. He told me to call the local TV station. I spoke to the local= TV meteorologist, who said there were no weather balloons in this area. He suggested they may have been reflections from the sun. However, they were= not shiny. They were dark balls and definitely solid objects. The UFO was= sighted for 3 to-4 minutes at 1/4 mile. Thanks to Ben Field BUFOD:
<http://www.abcfield.foirce9.co.uk>

TEXAS

KARNES CITY -- Michael Harvey writes that in the summer of 1971, I was working the night shift for Conoco Oil Company at an open pit uranium mine= west of Karnes City. I was one of six people operating Caterpillar 657B earth movers. We were down to about 210 feet deep when this incident happened. It was about 11:10 PM, just after shift change. We were getting=

ready to crank our machines, when the 85 acre pit lit up as if it was daylight. The light was so bright that I had to squint because it hurt my= eyes. I remember hearing a high pitched hissing noise and the hair on my arms stood on end. I was so scared! I fell to the ground and started praying. I remember trying to look up, but the light was so bright I could= not. After about two minutes, the light started getting dimmer and I could= finally look up at it. What I saw amazed me. The object was round and the= bright light was coming from the center of the bottom of the UFO. Around= the perimeter of the craft were hundreds of penlight size light beams that alternated in all colors of the spectrum. Now, I know they were laser= beams. The UFO was rising up slowly at first and then went straight up out of= sight in about 10 seconds. I was crying and shaking and so was everyone else. = The other shift workers thought we were crazy when we told them what had happened. But, we got the last laugh. This is how we proved the sighting= actually happened. There is a vein of uranium ore that runs from George, West Texas to almost Texarkana, Texas. When determining where to place a uranium mine, the following steps are accomplished: (1) A geologist with a= Geiger counter flies over the area and finds the highest radiation reading. = (2) Drilling trucks are sent out and core samples are drilled to determine= the highest concentration of ore. These core samples are drilled in a grid= pattern and every core sample is given a tracking number and logged in showing the concentration and amount of uranium present. (3) The open pit mine is then laid out according to these core samples. When this UFO incident happened, we were about two feet away from a layer of hard rock called the "tap rock" that lies directly on top of the uranium ore. The uranium ore varied in depth from 6 to 18 inches and had about the same brown=

color as low grade coal. Two days after this incident, the tap rock was removed to expose the uranium ore. We were astounded to find that the uranium ore was now a chalky white substance that had NO radioactivity at all! There was a 250 foot diameter circle of this chalky material in the center of the pit. Outside of the circle, the uranium ore was still as potent as before the incident. Core samples do not lie. This chalky material was uranium before this incident. Many a night I have thought= about what happened and wondered why the UFO needed the uranium? Thanks to M. Harvey Sam Rayburn Lake, TX mharve@inu.net

ARIZONA CONTRAILS AND UFO

PHOENIX -- Gary Graham was shooting photographs of strange contrails on May= 7, 1999, at 10:00 AM. He was later interviewed by Linda Moulton Howe on the= Art Bell show. Gary stated, "I've been kind of interested in the contrails= and been taking pictures of them for the last several months. And so, I looked up into the sky and the sky was just full of contrails that morning,= including an X. I've seen a lot of contrails up there, but not an X every= single time." Snip. Linda asked, "WHAT DID YOU SEE?" Gary stated, "When I= first looked at this, it looked almost like a round, metallic ball in the sky. I kind of focused in over the roof of my next door neighbor's house= and just outside one of the clouds up there and fairly close to one of the contrails. There was this round, metallic, ball-looking thing. And then right next to that, fairly close to it, there was a dark spot on the film. = I zoomed in on it and could still see what appeared to be kind of a round metallic object up there, but then the two dark spots -- or actually, the dark spot -- looked like two dark spots. It looked to me as if it could be= a couple of military jets." Thanks to Gary Graham and Linda Moulton Howe. = See photos on: Contrail Connection <http://www.contrailconnection.com/lmhl.htm> garyariz@home.com

BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA UFO SIGHTINGS

Last week we reported on four major UFO sightings in the Surrey Corridor between May 21 and 23, 1999. Bill Oliver UFO*BC reports there have been numerous UFO sightings this year over British Columbia. The first sighting=

occurred in January when Richard was traveling east on Zero Avenue, when he=

saw a wedge-shaped aircraft stationary above the power lines. It was 'so low,' and displaying white flashing lights. Richard had two other= sightings.

MAPLE RIDGE: On April 20, 1999, a couple who saw at 9:15 PM a small pulsating light approaching at only 250 feet above the ground. When the light became stationary, all the lights in the town went out! About ten minutes later they saw a big white flash and a meteor-like streak heading in=

a northwestern direction, towards Pitt Lake. They heard a "rushing wind sound" and the city lights then came back on. BC Hydro confirmed that Maple=

Ridge had an eleven minute transmission feed loss into a substation at 9:15=

PM.

CRESCENT BEACH -- On 22-April, a couple saw a brilliant flash of light in= the

night sky replaced by a circular spinning red light. The object moved out= of

sight after a 30 second viewing. Five days later a man and a woman came= upon

several swirls of grass laid down and woven in an area of high grass, that=

may have been caused by the UFO. The pattern was about 15 feet in diameter=

and was very apparent in the otherwise normal grass area.

RICHMOND -- George, Linda and their 11-year-old son were driving south= across

Oak Street Bridge May 1, 1999. Linda said, "What's that?" She pointed at a=

square, flat object "floating" about 1000 to 1500 feet above the ground. It=

had 8 "flood lights" on the front, white in color and steady in their illumination. At Shell Road, the object passed overhead at 10:00 PM

displaying an underside view of "aluminum sheeting." This object made no discernible noise and no power source could be seen. The craft was seen for=

15 to 20 seconds and appeared to be heading towards Steveston Highway= instead

of the Vancouver Airport. The estimated speed was 150 mph and although it=

lacked "depth," it appeared to be the size of a Boeing 737. George phoned=

the control tower, but was told they had nothing unusual on radar. This is=

the third sighting of very, very thin rectangular objects.

SURREY -- On May 3, 1999, at 9:30 PM, Gilan (9) and his ten-year-old sister=

saw 30 blue lights surrounding a large blue ball, which they watched for 4=

minutes. On May 7, 1999, a boy resting in his bed looked out the window 10:45 PM, saw a bright white shiny circle move south across the sky. The object was the size of a penny at arm's length.

WHITE ROCK -- Debbie was attending to her young son, in his bedroom on April=

27, when a blast of blue light entered the room through the horizontal= blinds

at 4:30 AM. Looking onto the street from another window she was astonished=

to see a cluster of 8 to 12 rectangular lights beamed onto the road in front=

of her neighbor's driveway. The lights were stationary and covered an area=

about 8 by 8 feet. She could also sense a really deep hum. After viewing=

this for about ten seconds she was so shocked she returned to her son's= room.

As she did so, a blast of white light came from the back of her house in= the

Dogwood Park area. Looking into the park, she could see the white light of= a

UFO amongst the trees.

On May 7, 1999, Johan was driving down Fir Street at 9:00 PM, when he saw a large yellow, and blue-gray patch of light traveling across the water in an easterly direction. He estimates the object was "300 meters in diameter"! = The light appeared to be pulsating. He viewed it from his car for about 30= seconds.

On May 8, a couple and their two children were driving southeast on Highway #99. Upon reaching 152nd Street at 9:30 PM they saw a large wedge-shaped craft approaching slowly, at a very low altitude. It had a bright white light in the center, a blue light on one side and a red light on the other= side. A small conventional airplane flew diagonally across its path! The= wedge-shaped craft veered south towards White Rock. Total viewing time was= at least 4 minutes.

On May 9, Kevin and a friend were also driving south on Highway #99 when= they spotted a "stealth" aircraft stationary about 100 feet above the trees at 10:15 PM. The object displayed four headlights. Shortly afterwards they observed a "starburst" in the clear night sky, the color being orange to= red. When the light display faded away, the craft began to move away slowly. At= this point a red and blue flashing light appeared, one at each wing tip. = The object had been above the highway 4 minutes. The airport said, their radar= coverage is limited to 1,000 feet and above, and that they had nothing to report at this time.

Fifteen minutes later, Aliza, Sasha and Jennifer were leaving McDonalds at= 10:30 PM, when Sasha spotted a "HUGE" boomerang-shaped object slowly approaching at a very low level. They stopped the car and got out to gaze= at it as it passed silently overhead. It had 6 to 8 broad beamed red, green= and white "headlights" flashing on and off, but not sequentially. The lights like an "image" in the clear night sky. After 8 seconds, the object disappeared from view in an instant! All three young women were strongly affected by what they saw. On May 19, 1999, Laura and a friend saw a large= white triangle come down vertically over White Rock at 11:44 PM. It was the= "size of her fist held at arm's length.

BURNABY - The next night, on May 10, Sid and Leon were on Burnaby Mountain= when they spotted a "massive," long craft below the tops of the trees at 10:43 PM. It initially appeared stationary, but started moving slowly, with= no discernible noise. The right side facing them had a yellow light, a long= red light and a blue to green or gray light. They viewed it for 6 to 8 minutes. Twenty minutes later it returned, with the light configuration in= reverse. VICTORIA, Two nights later on 12 May a married couple was at the= gazebo a favorite UFO viewing spot at the University of Victoria. They were=

looking eastward across the Straits of Juan De Fuca, towards Vancouver, when= they saw a bright light, the color of fire, indulge in high speed erratic motions around 9:00 PM. They watched it for about 8 minutes before it=

landed or disappeared into the ocean? The light was 1/2 the size of a dime held at= arm's length. A few minutes later, another fiery object appeared in the= same spot and "danced" around the sky in an identical manner. After eight minutes, this triangular shaped object also disappeared in a similar manner.= Later, a third yellow to gold object appeared and repeated the antics of the= two previous objects for about 8 minutes before disappearing.

MUD BAY -- On May 14, 1999, a married couple was walking along Mud Bay at 8:15 PM, when they saw a 35 foot long 'black thing.' It had an upright= 'tail

fin' traveling through the water from marker to marker. It made no sound=
and
left no wake! The man is convinced it was neither a sea lion nor a whale. =

At 8:30 PM they were on the road near "1000 Steps" at Crescent Beach when
they saw on the road an orange spot of light about ten feet in diameter.
RICHMOND -- On May 15, 1999, two people observed two red objects high in=
the
sky at 9:15 PM. The objects were seen for a two or three minutes and
displayed unusual flight patterns flying from right to left and then
reversing. They did not maintain a consistent light as they blinked=
randomly
without sequence for the total sighting time. Thanks to Louise A. Lowry and=
Bill Oliver UFO*BC oliver2849@home.com

CONTRAILS OVER BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA

VANCOUVER -- On May 21, 1999, more unusual contrail or 'chemtrail' patterns=
were seen again. This was probably the "heaviest" day since mid-April. The=
first sighting was at 12:30 PM, was a single odd looking contrail to the
east, which was "bent" at a fairly sharp almost 90 degree angle, looking=
like
an "L" floating in the sky. By 2:30 PM, we noticed several contrails off in=
the west that noticeably expanded, and formed 'beads' along the bottom of=
it,
like 'drips.' Over the next two hours the western half of the sky became
filled with six contrails, that became very thick. Most were horizontal and=
parallel to each other, while another one crossed the sky at an odd looking=
angle. I noticed a large X type pattern composed of a large, very thick,
translucent looking contrail and a narrower but still large contrail. At
about 4:00, another, even bolder X was seen. I've noticed many of the=
larger
contrails seem to appear out of nowhere. No planes are heard or seen. The=
contrails were at a lower altitude than the cumulous clouds at 6,000 to
12,000 feet and too low for normal contrail formation.
On May 26, 1999, the "contrails" were seen en masse today. Since 11:30 AM,=
the activity was virtually nonstop. There were numerous contrails in all
directions, including large Xs and "grid patterns" with four crossing each=
other overhead. Some of the contrails are *very* thick and wide, others are=
thinner. Some looked very low in altitude, others were higher up. I
observed a low flying twin engine plane that repeatedly circled overhead. =
Using my binoculars I could see its landing gear was down, and it had a
flashing light on its tail. It did not leave a noticeable contrail, since=
it
was too low for any normal contrail formation. Later, I observed a vaporish=
"contrail" like pattern that began to develop as it cut through the sky. A=
second and third contrail developed and they all seemed to blend into one=
big
one. The contrails slowly developed and thickened after repeated flybys of=
the aircraft, rather than simply being initially "sprayed out" in the usual=
noticeable manner. That area of the sky was then later filled with the big=
wide low level contrails. Thanks to Paul Anderson Director The Millennium=
Project Web: <http://persweb.direct.ca/psa>

MEXICO

PUEBLA -- On June 1, 1999, three UFOs were filmed by Mexican Television=
over
the city of Puebla in broad daylight. Mexican television has shown at least=
three UFOs hanging over the city of Puebla southeast of the Mexican capital.=
Judging by the film shown by "Atsteka" television the UFOs were visible in=

the sky for around five minutes. The phenomenon had been watched on Monday=
morning by dozens of people. They said, the UFOs, were rather large, and
were lined up in space eight kilometers wide. The UFOs had a silver color,=
a round shape and emanated a powerful light. One of them quickly disappeared,=
while the other two moved southwest, flying at a very high speed. Mexican=
Civil Aviation officials have not given any explanation of the incident yet.=
Channel 9 in Chile also carried the video report as part of its breaking=
news reports of UFO sightings over South America. Thanks to Guillermo Alarcon
ufoalarcon@webtv.net

CHILE

SANTIAGO -- Guillermo Alarcon reports that on Saturday, May 19, 1999,=
Channel 7 showed a video of a UFO over the Chilean capital in broad daylight. The=
program was broadcast at 10:00 PM, on a breaking news report. There was=
also another UFO image filmed the night before. Thanks to: Guillermo Alarcon
ufoalarcon@webtv.net Editor's Note: The government of Chile is working with=
UFO investigators to investigate various UFO reports. They are taking a=
very open stance concerning the intruding UFOs. It would be refreshing if the US=
government would do likewise.

UNITED KINGDOM METEOROLOGISTS SEE UFO

WESSENDEN RESERVOIR -- John Morris age 48 reports that he and a colleague=
had a sighting of a UFO on Friday, May 28, 1999, at 11:30 AM. John states: "I=
viewed a metallic craft, triangular in dimensions; approaching some forty
feet in length, from tip to tip." Said craft was in view for some 45
seconds, flying at high speed and amazing versatility some six feet above=
the ground. It disappeared over the crest of a hill above rolling moorland. =
The nearest town is Huddersfield. The weather conditions were clear and dry=
with a calm wind. No sound was heard. The craft flew amazingly close to the
ground following the rolling hills at about six feet. A video was made of=
the craft. There was no missing time experienced and permission is granted=
to publish this report. Thanks to Ben Field BUFOD:
<http://www.abcfield.foirce9.co.uk>. Editor's Note: We would like to get copy=
of these videos to place in the Air Victory Museum's, UFO exhibits.

HOW TO STOP ABDUCTIONS

Wes Clark writes, "The abductees we work with have had great success in
stopping abductions by calling for help from Jesus. The book of Acts should=
be read because it has many parallels with the present day UFO abduction
phenomena. We are not trying to tell anyone what they should believe, we=
are reporting -- what our cases have proved. I am reporting on what I have=
found in some not-so-ancient Greek writings. It's amazing how few things have
changed in the enemy's tactics since the first century. In the Acts of the=
Apostles Chapter 19, Paul writes:

"A team of itinerant Jews who were traveling from town to town casting out=
demons planned to experiment by using the name of the Lord Jesus. The
incantation they decided on was this: "I adjure you by Jesus, whom Paul
preaches, to come out! Seven Sons Of Sceva, a Jewish priest, were doing
this. But when they tried it on a man possessed by a demon, the demon
replied, "I know Jesus and I know Paul, but who are you?" And he leaped on=
two of them and beat them up, so that they fled out of his house naked and=

badly injured. The story of what happened spread quickly all through Ephesus, to Jews and Greeks alike; and a solemn fear descended on the city, and the name of the Lord Jesus was greatly honored. Many of the believers who had been practicing black magic confessed their deeds and brought their incantation books and charms and burned them at a public bonfire." Acts 19, verse 13 to 19.

Wes further states, "The implications of this record are tremendous! These seven brothers tried to do what many of their contemporaries were successfully doing -- casting out evil spirits, also known as "Space Pals" in the name of Jesus Christ! This is EXACTLY what today's former abductees have done! The reason these guys were not successful is because they used the name of Jesus like a magic word, like "abra cadabra." They weren't using the power of the name of Christ with any authority because at that point, they had no personal relationship with Jesus Christ, hence, no Sonship rights. (Reference Romans 8:16-17.) This evil spirit recognized that right away, hence his statement, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are YOU?" It recognized, of course, the power and authority of Jesus Christ, and also Paul, who as a joint-heir with Christ, used the name with authority. These seven brothers however did not have that authority. The evil spirit saw their bluff and called them on it, and as the story points out, they took quite a beating. This also by the way suggests that demonic entities can manifest physically as the wounds these guys received were obviously physical. The people of Ephesus were able to understand something that we today, cannot seem to grasp -- the power of Jesus Christ. There is absolutely no mystery about if it exists, what the source of it is, or what it all means. Not only does it suggest the reality of spiritual warfare. It also suggests it is not a game for spiritual lightweights and/or people who don't know what they're talking about. This is unlike all the ambiguous double talk shrouded in mystery that we get from many sources. If one must attack these findings, one must attack the cases. To do that, one must call them liars, and to do that, one must call every abductee who ever came forward with their story a liar. Thanks to Wesley M. Clark, wclark59@bv.net

HEAVIEST HURRICANE SEASON EVER PREDICTED. Fourteen major hurricanes are predicted during the next 6 months by the U.S. National Hurricane Center.

UFO CONFERENCES: June 5 & 6, The 9th UFO/ET Congress at the Days Inn, Rt. 206 Bordentown, NJ. For more information call Pat Marcattilio at (609) 631-8955 or Tom Benson (609) 883-6921. Derrel Sims, implant investigator and Bob Durant on Roswell are two of the scheduled speakers. On July 2-4, 30th Annual MUFON 1999 International UFO Symposium at Hyatt Regency Crystal City Hotel in Arlington Virginia. E-mail mufonhq@aol.com

TAPE OF EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE UFO ENCOUNTER

Lunar Astronaut Dr. Edgar Mitchell was at Edwards the night the UFO chase occurred. The 6th person to walk on the moon said, "The night it happened I investigated it myself and this was a real event." Sam Sherman's audio documentary tape called THE EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE ENCOUNTER on the night of October 7, 1965, uses the actual voice recordings provided by the Air Force. During this event 12 high tech luminous UFOs invade secure air space and came down low over the runways at Edwards AFB. Tower operator Sgt. Chuck Sorrels

spotted them and notified the Air Defense Command. Sgt. Sorrels is heard on=
the original tapes and in a new segment where he verifies the event as it is=
heard on the archival recordings. The UFOs are described and a decision is=
made to launch F-106 fighter interceptors. You are there in an important
part of UFO history. Hear it for yourself, its the best UFO tape ever made=
and its record of a real event. The cost of the tape is \$14.95 each plus
\$2.00 for shipping -- total \$16.95 -- you can send either a personal check=
or
money order to: Independent International Films, Box 565, Dept. GF, Old
Bridge, New Jersey 08857.
BUY IT AND LISTEN TO THE TAPE WITH YOUR FRIENDS!

MUFON JOURNAL For more detailed investigative reports subscribe by writing=
to
103 Oldtowne Road, Sequin, TX 78155-4099 or E-mail Mufon@aol.com. Filer's=
Files Copyright 1999 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may=
post items from the Files on their Websites provided that they credit the
newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue that the item=
appeared. Send your letters to me at Majorstar@aol.com. If you wish to=
keep
your name confidential please so state.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

UK UFO Weekend

From: Sue Lawrence <NevadaFighter@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 07:13:44 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:34:13 -0400
Subject: UK UFO Weekend

Hi All,

UK UFO Weekend

The UFO Forum present the UK UFO conference weekend including special international guest Donald Schmidt.

On Saturday 5th June at 7pm BST (2 pm eastern, 1pm central, 12 pm mountain, 11 am pacific) Nick Pope, former MoD UFO investigator and author of 'Open Skies, Closed Minds' and 'The Uninvited'.

Nick will be talking about 'Ufology For The New Millenium' and the latest developments in alien abduction research.

Following at 8.30pm BST (3:30 pm eastern, 2:30 pm central, 1:30 pm mountain, 12:30 pm pacific) live from the Roswell Museum, will be Donald Schmidt with some startling new revelations on the Roswell saga to reveal.

On Sunday 6th June at 7pm BST(2 pm eastern, 1pm central, 12 pm mountain, 11 am pacific) we welcome Nick Redfern, author of 'A Covert Agenda', 'The FBI Files' and soon to be released 'Cosmic Crashes'.

Nick will be discussing the information he has gained from many government documents released by the UK and US governments, including UFO radar tracking, military interceptions of UFOs, and the Joint Intelligence Committee's UFO involvement.

At 8.30 pm BST (3:30 pm eastern, 2:30 pm central, 1:30 pm mountain, 12:30 pm pacific) we will be joined by Matthew Williams, expert on UK government cover-ups, secret underground facilities, and crop circle maker. Matthew will be discussing the latest information on the underground tunnels that he has found to exist below Rudloe Manor and surrounding RAF bases, plus his experiences whilst making crop circles.

All these conferences will be held in the 'Special Guests' Conference room, and will be available via the internet on <http://go.compuserve.com/ufo>

Sue Addison

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/nevadafighter>
<http://go.compuserve.com/ufo>
<http://go.compuserve.com/paranormal>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 11:47:06 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>From: David Rudiak <DRudiak@aol.com>
>>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes
>>To: updates@globalserve.net

>>The Eastonian Times-Picayune is back, starting off with the
>>usual bird-brained theories about the original Kenneth Arnold
>>sighting. Bruce Maccabee, myself, and others argued ourselves
>>blue in the face with all sorts of mathematical and other
>>arguments why birds couldn't possibly work (can birds outfly a
>>plane?). A lot of good it did. Don't get me started.

>Why don't we get you started? Did it ever occur to you (and
>Maccabee) that your mathematical arguments and analysis of the
>Arnold case are only right if you assume Arnold was absolutely
>incapable of human error? But what if he was wrong? What if, for
>example, he saw another flight of some 20-25 objects not too
>long after his original sighting which certainly sound like
>birds to most of us? What if he went on to report seven UFO >
>sightings total? What if he eventually concluded that UFOs are
>space animals -- "living organisms...in the atmosphere"?>

Regarding Arnold's first sighting... which has been the subject
of my discussion.... there is no assumption that Arnold was
"absolutely incapable of human error." Anyone who thinks there
was such an assumption does not understand the nature of the
analysis. In fact, the arguments assume that Arnold could have
been in error in some places. But, let's get down to the crux
of the matter: which Arnold statements would you like to reject
or modify?

- 1) Arnold says he saw flashes of sunlight on his plane. Did he
or didn't he? What did he see?
- 2) Arnold said the initial flashes came from an area north of
Mt. Rainier. Did he perhaps get the direction wrong, or is there
something else?
- 3) Arnold thought the objects were a little higher than he was
(9,500 ft, vs his 9,200). What do you think the TRUE altitude
was, if you don't accept Arnold's statement?
- 4) Arnold described them as "flipping and flashing". If this is
not what he saw, then what do you think he saw?
- 5) Arnold claimed he looked at his dashboard clock when the first
one passed Mt. Rainier.... Did he get the time wrong? If so, by
how much?
- 6) Arnold looked again at the clock as the last one passed
Rainier.... did he get the time wrong? If so, by how much?

7) Arnold said he turned the plane sideways and looked through his open window. At this time he would have been flying south, parallel to the objects. Was he wrong/lying?

etc.

Any sighting can be broken into a series of observational details, each of which can be analyzed, but all together of which form the information content of the sighting.

The skeptic assumption is that Arnold was wrong in one or more of his descriptive details. For example, that Arnold overestimated the distance. But he said the objects were going in and out of mountain peaks which were about 20 miles away. Was he wrong?

Clearly if the details can be modified "at will" any sighting can be explained. The analysis of the Arnold sighting has been carried out with the fulfill realization that Arnold could have been wrong on some fine points. But to get a conventional explanation one has to assume Arnold was wrong on some major points.

If you are going to "complain" that Arnold wasn't perfect, then specify where you think he was wrong and we can argue over whether or not it makes sense in the context of the sighting to assume he was wrong..

>Don't get me started.

>You, Maccabee and others can mathematically analyze Arnold's >original statements all you want, or until Hell freezes over, >whichever comes first. And it doesn't mean a goddamn thing unless >you think he was absolutely dead on and incapable of any error >in perception whatever.

Not very clever remark. Sounds "whiney"

>Now explain how Miracle Man, i.e., Arnold, came to believe that >UFOs were living organisms.

>Troubling, isn't it?

Perhaps, but so what?

When the _interpretation_ is separated from the _observation_ and the _observation_ is analyzed, the witness' suggestion as to the _interpretation_ becomes irrelevant.

You seem to be saying that because Arnold in later years concluded saucers were animals, that therefore one can't believe the observational details in his first sighting.

Sorry, I don't buy it..

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

UFOs in Piracicaba and Sao Pedro, Brazil

From: **Thiago Ticchetti** <thiagolt@opengate.com.br>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 23:31:18 -0300
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 12:10:19 -0400
Subject: UFOs in Piracicaba and Sao Pedro, Brazil

More news.

Several UFOs were seen flying last Saturday and last night in Sao Pedro e Piracicaba, district of Sao Paulo.

Around 40 ufologists from the UFO group "UFO-Genesis, from Piracicaba, were doing a skywatch when small luminous lights were seen.

Some people reported had seen the same objects in Jardim Jupi=E1 and Bongue neighbourhood.

According to ufologist, Prof. Michel Cevell=F3, these phenomena could be the confirmation that the region of Piracicaba presents a new UFO wave.

During the skywatch on Saturday, the researchers used optical instruments and electromagnetism meters. Before they see the objects, the ufology claim that the meter registered some variation in the place.

The spheres had a 50 cm diameter.

Around 11:23PM they saw another UFOs with 15cm diameter, coming from the other side.

THIAGO LUIZ TICCHETTI
Diretor Do Departamento de Publica=E7=E3o e Tradu=E7=E3o Especializadas (= DEPTE - EBE-ET / Brasilia-Brasil)
Director of the Publication Department and Specialized Translation
ICQ - 35119615
***** STOP THE WAR *****

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Intruders Foundation Website

From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 10:50:24 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 15:07:40 -0400
Subject: Re: Intruders Foundation Website

>Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 15:58:02 -0400
>To: updates@globalserve.net
>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>Subject: Intruders Foundation Website

>Hi All,

<snip>

>I will continue to moderate and maintain the Abduction
>Information Center. Members can simply continue to access the
>website and interactive e-mail list the same as always. However,
>AIC will no longer be affiliated with Budd or the Intruders
>Foundation.

>I have no idea who will pick up the work. For now, I am no
>longer the webmaster for IF and I will no longer represent
>either Budd or the Intruders Foundation in any way.

>I hope this doesn't create an inconvenience for anyone.
>It's just something I have to do for myself.

I am saddened by this development, worry about losing the solidity of
your passionate involvement, and hope it was not some bland and
convenient partisanship that caused its precipitation.

Consider me a supporter -- whatever the genesis.

As I've written -- it's a wonder that you have lasted this long
still maintaining the rationality that you so abundantly
portray.

You are a true hero -- John; a pioneer. Those that follow
shuffle in your footprints.

It was you after all that convinced us that this phenomena was
happening to real people. You interested the lay person with
your believable discourse, the wealth of your spirit, and your
seemingly tireless enthusiasm.

You did this in the face of all ridicule, discouragement, and
irritation.

You did it for virtually nothing.

We'll all live to see your vindication and your ultimate
success, I'm sure.

Good luck, and damn the torpedoes.

Write the book.

Lehmborg@snowhill.com

--

Ponder the Wit & Wisdom of Ching Chow!
View "Unstill Life" -- Animation . . . and more.
Consider Matter, Mind & Movement.
See the current HTML "Apology to MW" with illustration.

Take a ride in the Teleporter.

Explore "Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Fortunecity URL.

<http://www.fortunecity.com/roswell/arecibo/46/>

<Updated 27 May>

John Ford Restoration Fund -- Send your checks and money orders to _me_, Alfred Lehmborg (cut out the lawyers, they got their's) at:
304 Melbourne Drive, Enterprise AL, 36330. Strict records kept.
\$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, burned at the fundamentalist's stake.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpDatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Ted Roach?

From: Roy Hale <roy.hale@virgin.net>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 18:04:07 +0100
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 17:53:50 -0400
Subject: Ted Roach?

Hi People,

Does anyone on this list have a contact address for Ted Roach who wrote "Physics of A Flying Saucer" I would like to interview him for the next issue (7) of Down To Earth?

Also a big thank you to Marc Bell of WUFOG for supplying me with a freaky picture for my gallery. Who said you can't make faces out of wood!

Cheers Roy..

Find The Lost Haven & Down To Earth Magazine
@ <http://freespace.virgin.net/roy.hale/index.html>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: *U* Map: North America 1947

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 13:45:45 EDT
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 18:00:28 -0400
Subject: Re: *U* Map: North America 1947

>Subj: Re: UFO UpDate: Re: *U* Map: North America 1947
>Date: 6/4/99 4:07:58 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>From: larryhat@jps.net (Larry Hatch)
>To: updates@globalserve.net (UFO UpDates - Toronto), YoungBob2@aol.com

Larry, All:

>>From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
>>Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 15:01:45 EDT
>>Subject: *U* Map: North America 1947
>>To: updates@globalserve.net

>>Sidereal Sightings Histogram.

<snip>

>That's where I goofed, I'm off by a good hour of R.A., even though
>the data seems centered around 20 hours RA.

>>The galactic center is not in Capricorn, it is at 17H 45.7m
>>Right Ascension, -29 deg Declination, two Zodiacal signs to the
>>west, in Scorpio.

Actually, you were three hours off in Right Ascension

>>But, again, for this peak of reports I suggest an Observer
>>Effect. The jump in sightings you point to undoubtedly comes
>>from reports in early August, during the summer months when
>>folks are outdoors and when it gets dark by 9 P.M.

>Bob: I ran the same routine with data from all months except
>August. I got essentially the same curve. -LH

Was there an increase in sightings at other times when the
galactic center was highest, for example 1 A.M. in early May or
4 A.M. in early March? I also wonder whether an examination of
sightings from Australia where the galactic center can be nearly
directly overhead, Sydney for example is about 35 degrees South,
shows anything?

>I'm sure there is some seasonal effect. Apparently there
>is some other effect as well.

How about an increase in daylight sightings at times when the
galactic center is high, this might eliminate seasonal effects
because these would be at other times of the year?

I would very much like to read the complete paper from the SSE
meeting. Can you point me in the right direction or send a copy
or scan to me directly?

Clear skies,
Bob Young

Search for other documents from or mentioning: youngbob2

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 4](#)

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <dstacy@texas.net>
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 13:50:47 -0500
Fwd Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 18:02:50 -0400
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Jerome Clark <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes
>Date: Thu, 03 Jun 99 08:26:28 PDT

<snip>

>I'm at a loss to understand what Dennis is trying to say here.
>The notion that UFOs may be living organisms -- "space animals"
>-- long ago went out of fashion, but it was a view held (however
>naively in retrospect) by a number of Ken Arnold's prominent
>contemporaries. Even Project Sign personnel characterized it as
>"one of the most intelligent theories we have received." The
>eminently respectable Civilian Saucer Intelligence of New York
>(Bloecher, Davis, Mebane) took the idea seriously, and it was
>discussed in writings by a variety of other early UFO writers,
>including Charles Fort, Desmond Leslie, M. K. Jessup, John
>Phillip Bessor, Curtis Fuller, Trevor James Constable, and Ivan
>T. Sanderson. Arnold picked up his ideas from notions current
>in the late 1940s and 1950s.

>For a full discussion of the theory and its history, see my The
>UFO Encyclopedia, 2nd Ed., pp. 872-77.

>Arnold was anything but a fruitcake, and I am startled and
>depressed that Dennis would suggest as much on such flimsy --
>well, actually, nonexistent -- evidence. This is revisionist
>ufology at its worst. I would have expected better of Dennis.

Jerry,

Arnold may well have been aware of the writings of the people
you mention. But judging from his own writings, he based his
belief that UFOs were some type of living organism on his own
experiences. See the following, for example:

"This is the same sort of impression [of a living thing] I got
after seeing these same things again in 1952. Two of them flew
under me at Mount Lassen. I got a movie of these, and one was
just as solid as a Chevrolet car. But you could see the pine
trees right through the other one that was following it. I too
got the feeling that here was something that was alive, rather
than that they were machines."

From "How It All Began" by Kenneth Arnold in Proceedings of the
First International UFO Congress, p. 28, which you helped edit,
according to the cover. You quote the article in your The UFO
Book.

Has anyone ever seen that movie, BTW? Does anyone have any idea
of what may have happened to it?

Little more than a month after his first sighting, on July 29,
Arnold had his second encounter with UFOs.

"As I was letting down into LaGrande valley, I saw far off my
left and a little lower than my plane [another airplane].
Suddenly, as I continued to lose altitude, I was confronted by a

flock of what looked like ducks. I knew they weren't ducks because they were brassy-colored and large -- at least three feet across or possibly four or five. There were a couple dozen of them, possibly more, and they were bunched and coming right at me. Eventually they swerved away -- and because they had the flight characteristics of the first flying saucers I decided to take after them. When I dived into the cluster, these things, whatever they were, soared away as if I was standing still."

That from the following article in the Proceedings, "The Maury Island Episode," also by Arnold himself, p. 32.

Too bad we didn't get as detailed a description of his second sighting as we did with his first one. Even though this is a much closer encounter, Arnold is vague about their size, speed, and number, and doesn't even mention their shape, although it's possible he gave more details in his own book, which I haven't read.

I'm not sure how many saucer sightings Arnold reported over his lifetime. I think I've seen anywhere between five and seven. One can make of that what one wants, or nothing at all. He could have been prone to "see" saucers (and if his first account is truly accurate, who could blame him!) -- or he could have been extraordinarily lucky.

I take back my remark about Arnold being a fruitcake, personally. Had I been more careful in my original post, I would have said something like, "One may not always know whether one is dealing with a fruitcake or not when (whatever)." And then of course one would have to define fruitcake.

So Arnold was what he was.

And I'd still like to see that movie!

Dennis

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

Re: Intruders Foundation Website

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <updates@globalserve.net>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 19:38:37 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 10:50:27 -0400
Subject: Re: Intruders Foundation Website

>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 10:50:24 -0500
>From: Alfred Lehmborg <Lehmborg@snowhill.com>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Intruders Foundation Website

>>Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 15:58:02 -0400
>>To: updates@globalserve.net
>>From: John Velez <jvif@spacelab.net>
>>Subject: Intruders Foundation Website

><snip>

>>I will continue to moderate and maintain the Abduction
>>Information Center. Members can simply continue to access the
>>website and interactive e-mail list the same as always. However,
>>AIC will no longer be affiliated with Budd or the Intruders
>>Foundation.

>>I have no idea who will pick up the work. For now, I am no
>>longer the webmaster for IF and I will no longer represent
>>either Budd or the Intruders Foundation in any way.

>>I hope this doesn't create an inconvenience for anyone.
>>It's just something I have to do for myself.

>I am saddened by this development, worry about losing the solidity of
>your passionate involvement, and hope it was not some bland and
>convenient partisanship that caused its precipitation.

>Consider me a supporter -- whatever the genesis.

>As I've written -- it's a wonder that you have lasted this long
>still maintaining the rationality that you so abundantly
>portray.

>You are a true hero -- John; a pioneer. Those that follow
>shuffle in your footprints.

>It was you after all that convinced us that this phenomena was
>happening to real people. You interested the lay person with
>your believable discourse, the wealth of your spirit, and your
>seemingly tireless enthusiasm.

>You did this in the face of all ridicule, discouragement, and
>irritation.

>You did it for virtually nothing.

>We'll all live to see your vindication and your ultimate
>success, I'm sure.

>Good luck, and damn the torpedoes.

>Write the book.

>Lehmborg@snowhill.com

I wish I could be funny. I wish I could make a joke. I wish I

could get angry. I can't do any of those things. I won't do any of those things. Maybe later....

When I first discovered AIC and John Velez, I was a mess. I had no idea that I was not insane. In spite of being shrunk by the best shrinks, despite being told they were just some dreams, childhood molestation, a case of the dreaded Mojo of the Magogo, I was never sure. I was not even sure of my memories. Are they memories or that W.C. Fields disease again come to get me?

After a short time and a lot of love and care, and more insight than I have ever witnessed in my (then) 54 years, I was literally transformed. Not by John Velez but by his unerring and insanely competent judgment, logic and reason. Every time he yelled at me (actually it only felt like that, he was in reality, Margo, the friendly Grelb), every time he opened his mouth, responsible words came out. John Velez helped me heal myself. Took 55 years and no one, no one, had been able to do that or help me do that. More than half a century!

I am in the debt of John Velez for ever. As are many like me. We've been exposed for the real people we are, real people with real experiences which are really unexplainable, except for the likely possibilities exposed by his untiring hard work.

Errol Bruce Knappy knows some of what Velez went thru. Errol saw and heard it. And John wound up in Errol's arms, not knowing who the hell he was or where he came from or even if he was a believer or a skeptic. He just LOOKED friendly to John Velez, who had just had a most terrible experience at the hands of a very uncaring and abusive audience.

"I need a hug!" he said to this total stranger. And got one.

That stranger was Errol Bruce Knapp. And I love you for it Errol. I even spelled your name right that last time! And I also love Jeff Rense, for being a gentleman as well.

John Velez is a once in a lifetime person. Aint none like him with the guts to do what he's done. NO ONE! He's "...made shoes for everyone, even me, and he still goes barefoot."

John, as long as I can make me mortgage payment, I promise you as much as I can give. And I promised Rosemarie and me, that I will never ever do what I did again... except for my friends. I know who they are. We should all be that lucky...

Thank you John. I love you like the brother I never had. And since I got me an uncle in the family, just call me anytime some punk gets in your way. Da family will take care of it. Just remember, I may aks you to retain dis favor someday. Ma, Tu Gabeesh?

Your friend and impatient patient,
Jim Mortellaro

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

Re: UK UFO Weekend

From: Tom Carey <TCarey1947@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 20:20:03 EDT
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 12:18:25 -0400
Subject: Re: UK UFO Weekend

>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 07:13:44 -0400
>From: Sue Lawrence <NevadaFighter@compuserve.com>
>Subject: UK UFO Weekend
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>Hi All,

>UK UFO Weekend

>The UFO Forum present the UK UFO conference weekend including
>special international guest Donald Schmidt.

>Following at 8.30pm BST (3:30 pm eastern, 2:30 pm central, 1:30
>pm mountain, 12:30 pm pacific) live from the Roswell Museum,
>will be Donald Schmidt with some startling new revelations on
>the Roswell saga to reveal.

I hope I am not disappointing too many people, but the above is
not quite right. Don is not in Roswell (nor am I). We are
actually between trips, and it will be me, not Don, who will be
on-line for the UFO Forum.

Everything else is correct.

Tom

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 18:05:09 -0700 (PDT)
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 12:40:25 -0400
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 09:30:14 -0400
>From: Tony Spurrier <TSpurrier@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>>Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 09:51:19 -0700 (PDT)
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>From: Jim Deardorff <deardorj@proaxis.com>
>>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>>I don't know who, if anyone, has any written reports, full or
>>partial, from these four. I suppose Colin Andrews or other
>>British crop-formation investigators would be the ones to
>>contact on that.

>Noye's book claimed that Andrews and Delgado ignored these
>reports as they were daytime sightings, and they were trying to
>prove that formations only appeared at night. So much for
>objective research!

Yes, that's what Meaden said there. If true, that's almost as
bad as those ufologists who automatically ignore reports and
evidence from those claiming to be contactees, because they're
not abductees!

>Given that a few of the oil-seed rape formations this year seem
>to refer to the solar eclipse in August, do you think the aliens
>are going to present themselves?

Well, like Clinton, I would need to know what you mean by
"present." They have of course already presented themselves to
thousands of abductees and to the legitimate contactees. But
they've left only meager evidence behind. So perhaps what you
mean is, will they do so (in August), this time leaving all
kinds of irrefutable evidence behind? I doubt it; their
escalation in degree of firmness and abundance of evidence seems
to be growing only gradually over the years.

>Or what other meaning do you think the formations have?

Your guess may be as good as mine; I think they have the same
educational purposes as the rest of the crop circles and
formations have had, and which likewise the UFO sightings and
contacts have had.

>>Here's one for you to ponder, since you have Noyes' (editor)
>>_The Crop Circle Enigma_. Go to p. 22 of that book and you'll
>>see diagrams made by Terence Meaden and Colin Andrews of the
>>crop circle of 1 Aug. '86 at Headbourne Worthy, Hampshire. It
>>was a two-layer system, with an underlayer swirled one way and
>>an upper layer above it, covering it, swirled such that the lay
>>of the [upper-layer] stems was at right angles to that of the
>>layer just underneath. The diagrams depict the direction of the
>>respective swirls. The photograph of it is shown on p. 36 of
>>_Circular Evidence_ by Delgado & Andrews.

>Thanks, I'll definitely check that out.

>>You won't find any crop-circle naysayer talking about this one,
>>or speculating on how it could have been hoaxed, or trying to

>>demonstrate how it might be hoaxed. That's because it's pretty
>>mind-boggling just to wonder about. You have to imagine that
>>somehow every other crop stem out of the many thousands was
>>first bent over (without breaking the stems) in one direction of
>>swirl while the remaining stems all around stood intact. Then,
>>these intact stems were bent over with a swirl at right angles
>>to the swirl given to the other stems.

>Have you asked any circle makers how this could be done?

No, I don't know Doug and Dave's address. I do know that one usually receives only silence or a change of subject upon posing the question to skeptics. So I'll stay tuned for any idea you put forth on how it could be feasibly accomplished for a circle as large as 57 feet in diameter. It was probably no accident that the upper-layer circle of swirled stems did not entirely cover the under layer at the circumference -- if they had, the lower lower might not have been discovered.

>If those signs are to be taken seriously surely they should
>appear in oil-seed rape as you claim they are alien made?

I haven't kept up on it in enough detail, Tony, to know. I would not assume that the tests haven't been made by Levingood on stems from oil-seed rape crop circles.

>You'll find that crop bent at different heights is just a
>natural effect, I gather you saw the program 'Secrets of Crop
>Circles'.

No, I didn't see that. I was referring to certain crop-circle reports wherein the stems within a given formation were all bent over at the *same* approximate height, like 1" or 2" or 4" above the ground, as opposed to the usual 1/4" or so, which trampling on it can try to simulate.

>Can you name any crop circle maker that has been caught at all?

I haven't kept track of the names of any of the admitted hoaxers other than the first names Doug & Dave. I was referring to those hundreds of crop circles over the years that have been astounding in their size, complexity, creative design, bending-over of the stems with minimal breakage, and other features such as braiding.

Their makers were never caught, whereas common sense dictates that if humans had done them, a substantial percentage would have been caught in the act, and/or have left tell-tale signs behind.

Jim Deardorff

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

From: Rense E-News <jocelyn@dewittec.net>
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:40:01 -0600
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 12:45:42 -0400
Subject: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

Jeff Rense Weekly E-News

The Week Ahead
6-6-99 thru 6-12-99

Guests, Announcements, Week's Top Stories
From sightings.com

Jeff Rense E-News is distributed exclusively by Free Subscription.

!! ANNOUNCEMENT !!

We are PROUD to bring you this new FREE service!

Internet Greeting Cards featuring the
Exclusive Award Winning Art of

** JAMES NEFF **
Commercial Artist & jeffrense/sightings.com Webmaster

<http://www.immunotex.com/rense/cards/cards.html>

Presented to Rense E-News subscribers first!

* From Jeff's Desk *

There are hundreds of short, sometimes intriguing but thoroughly unverifiable stories circulating on the net purporting to reveal the truth of human ET visitation and contact. Wading through these sometimes sensational items is not always easy. Most are rather obvious hoaxes, some are very well written and show considerable creativity, while others often contain a mixture of truth and fiction that is not easily dismissed. Most all of them, however, have one thing in common: anonymous or unknown sources. Here is an example of one of the many 'ET revelations' that show up in our mailbox several times a month...

>From Robert Collins, 6-4-99, <LesMiserable@sprintmail.com>:

The following is an account of the meeting I (the source) was involved in with EBE-2.

On March 5, 1983, I was at Los Alamos National Laboratories conducting business on a counterintelligence project. During my visit, a source I'll call LANL-1, asked me to sit in on a very special interview. Not knowing what he was talking about, I questioned him. However, he wouldn't say exactly what the project involved or who was being interviewed. I accompanied LANL-1 to an underground facility west of the Los Alamos complex.

The area was called, Site 30. Access to this facility was gained by entering Area 49. Access to the underground

facility was through building number 49-2091.

Comments: See URL below for TA49: Notice that Bldg 49-2091 is not labeled on the map as expected: But, from other information that "White Building" in upper right of map is the entry to this underground facility.

<http://nis-www.lanl.gov/cgi-bin/wthi?ta=49&bldg=113>

And, off to the right of TA49 is Complex "A" (Dulce Complex?) reference URL, <http://www.pufori.org/articles/images/lab2.gif>

Continuing: An elevator took us down about 60 feet (only estimating). Once we arrived, access was gained through a large vault opening outside the elevator. We walked down a hallway to another vault door. We entered and turned right. We walked about 200 feet turned left and entered vault door to a large room. This room contained two tables, several chairs and recording equipment. I sat near the door. About ten minutes later, three people, who I did not know, entered the room. One, an Air Force Colonel, asked me to sign a security document, which gave me an upgraded clearance, TS/SCI/Group-MJ-B-3/clearance. I've never heard of this but I signed. The Colonel told me I was to listen and not make any sounds during the interview.

I asked the Colonel who was being interviewed and he told me a guest from another Planet! The Colonel left. The other two people set up a table with a microphone and recording equipment, including a camera. About five minutes later, in walks a 4' 9" non human looking creature. It was dressed in a tight fitting cream colored suit. It had no hair and was identified to me as EBE-2. EBE-2 sat in a chair across the table from two civilians and the AF Colonel. I did not know the identity of the three. LANL-1 came into the room and sat next to me. I listened while the three asked EBE-2 a series of questions pertaining to it's home planet. First question was about the temperature, climate and weather. EBE-2 responded in perfect English but sounded like a machine generated voice. Very hard to explain but it was either coming from a device that EBE-2 had in front of him or from something in it's body.

EBE-2 explained the weather of it's planet which was dry, varying temperature between 65-90 degrees. There was 35 hours of constant sunshine and three hours of darkness. Rainfall occurred only during one of it's months each year. The day lasted 38 of our hours. They did not have months but did have years which consisted of approximately 600 of our days. They used a society cycle which I understood to be similar to our months. During this society cycle each Eben worked a certain time and conducted business. There was also a rest cycle which consisted of a regulated period of sleep. I don't recall the exact number of hours or sleep/rest. EBE-2 discussed weather patterns and how they were formed. I don't recall the exact words. However, EBE-2 seemed very intelligent and fully explained each weather pattern in precise detail. He used Earth's equivalents for Meteorology terms. The interesting part of this interview was that I didn't hear any questions being asked by the three humans sitting across from EBE-2. Either the questions were already given to EBE-2 or the three humans were "thinking the questions" and EBE-2 would respond in English.

This interview lasted about one hour. I didn't check my watch but I estimated from the time I entered the room to the end of the interview was about 1 hour and 15 minutes. Considering I was in the room about 15 minutes before EBE-2 arrived, then I can estimate the interview to have been 1 hour. When the interview was completed, EBE-2 stood up and walked to the door. Just before exiting it looked at me. I felt a little strange but I immediately felt happiness! I can't explain it but I just felt really at ease, peaceful. EBE-2 didn't smile but he did make a strange facial expression that I can only assume to be a smile. He then left the room. The Colonel then told me I would be escorted out of the facility by LANL-1.

Former AFOSI Agent

Note - Of course, there is no way to verify this, or countless

other similar stories in cyberspace; all just a part of the never-ending enigmatic landscape of UFOlogy...

* TOP STORIES *

Just a few of last week's most intriguing!
<http://www.jeffrense.com>

- * Recent Remarkable UFO Sightings In Scotland
- * UFOs and JFK - The Conspiracy Question
- * Y2K-EU Alarmed About Russian/East Europe Nuclear Power Plants
- * San Antonio Bees Strike Again - Dogs Killed, Many Stung
- * Yugoslavia Will Never Agree To US, British, French, Or German Troops
- * Fibromyalgia? CFIDS? or Hemochromatosis!?
- * Anthrax Catastrophe Brewing On Asian Island?
- * Entirely New 'TT' Virus Found In California Blood Donors
- * Study Finds Bug Zappers Shower Fly Viruses Into Air
- * Two Huge Planets Drifting Alone In Space Found
- * Largest British Police Force Told To Limit Cell Phone Use
- * Contrail Spraying Continues-More Photos-New Florida Reports
- * Plane Circles For Half-Hour As Controller Has Lunch
- * UFO Info Direct From Ukraine And Eastern Europe Now Available
- * Color Changes In TV Cartoons Cause Seizures-'Pocket Monster' Aftermath
- * Is Handwriting Truly Individual? Computer Scientists Are Finding Out
- * NATO's Lengthening List Of Death And Blunders
- * US Scientists Believe Sound Can Power Engines
- * Clinton Seems Planning For Huge Ground War - 200,000 Medals Ordered
- * John Whitley First To Expose Bilderberg Agenda Again
- * More Puerto Rico Chupacabras Attacks - Fresh UFO Sightings Around US
- * Israeli Sub Lost In 1968 Found Off Crete - Triggers Suicide
- * Great Pyramid To Reopen This Thursday - Photos
- * Belgrade Zoo Animals Know When Missiles/Bombs Will Fall

--<>-- --<<+>>-- --<>--

Don't miss the.... (drum roll please)...

DISCUSSION FORUM for Rense listeners and subscribers!
<http://www3.bravenet.com/forum/show.asp?userid=hj135985>

--<>-- --<<+>>-- --<>--

* LISTENER & SUBSCRIBER COMMENTS *

(All are on file)

Zack: cudos to jeff rensse and his sightings on the radio show... i have watched and listened as he has taken this from the end of the line to a new beginning...he has delivered to us a format unsurpassed in the medium...as a veteran of internet paranormal talk-radio i can speak from experience...there is no better man... no better show...and no one more deserving of our attention than jeff and his fun, fantastic, and foremost informative show...if jeff isn't on the pulse of the provocative, enigmatic, and wondrous areas of information we seek...well...then it has no heart...good luck to you jeff...and thanx.

B.J.: I really Enjoy listening to your radio show. I am an Arkansas State Policeman and I listen to it while I work.

Gary: This is the most informative and up-to date site I have ever seen, and Neff is the world's greatest artist with impeccable musical taste!

Ron: Jeff, if you ever decide on another job, I don't know what the rest of us would do. . .

* THIS WEEK'S GUESTS *
6-6-99 thru 6-11-99

(Please note Jeff's Guest schedule can change due to late breaking stories, etc)

SUN 6-6
Alan Vaughn: Renowned Psychic's Millennial Predicitons
LIVE From England: Tim Matthews: Human Engineered UFOs
MON 6-7
Rayelan (Russbacher) Allan: The War For World Control
TUE 6-8
Steve Allen: The Dumbing Of America
WED 6-9
Michael Lindemann: Weekly UFO/World Update
Doreen Virtue: Divine Guidance - Talking To Angels
THU 6-10
Beatrice Trum Hunter: Labeling The Poisons In Our Food
FRI 6-11
Brad Steiger: Hear Ghosts Recorded On Tape!

Live Real Audio Broadcasts & Archives: <http://www.jeffrense.com>

--<>-- --<<+>>-- --<>--

We've added NEW BOOKS!

Exclusives, hard to find and reprints:

<http://www.immunotex.com/books/>

--<>-- --<<+>>-- --<>--

* PROGRAM INFORMATION *

Program Show Times
Live Coast-To-Coast
Monday-Friday 7-10pm Pacific 10-1am Eastern
Sundays 8-11pm Pacific 11-2am Eastern

Call in Line:
800 850-5043

Program Transcripts at
<http://www.immunotex.com/rense/>

Program Audio Tapes
888 456-4340

Live Real Audio Broadcasts & Archives
<http://www.jeffrense.com>

Advertising
Over 3 MILLION visitors to sightings.com - Cost effective exposure for YOUR product or service, mailto: jocelyn@dewittec.net?Subject=Advertising

Sightings.com info/email center
<http://www.jeffrense.com/1.mail/infocenter.html>

Jeff Rense Y2K RESOURCE CENTER
<http://www.jeffrense.com/y2kresource/y2k1r.html>

RenseWorld! Don't miss it! <http://www.jeffrense.com>

~~~~~

Share with your friends!

Please feel free to forward this issue of the Jeff Rense Weekly E-Newsletter to any and all who are interested... but please forward in its entirety and do not modify it in any fashion without permission. Thank you!

Past issues are archived at <http://www.immunotex.com/rense/>

-----

To subscribe:

mailto:[jocelyn@dewittec.net?Subject=SUBSCRIBE\\_RENSE](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net?Subject=SUBSCRIBE_RENSE)

To unsubscribe:

mailto:[jocelyn@dewittec.net?Subject=UNSUBSCRIBE\\_RENSE](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net?Subject=UNSUBSCRIBE_RENSE)

-----

Jeff Rense Weekly E-News is independently produced by ImmunoTex in cooperation with Jeff Rense. The material and views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of Jeff Rense, sightings.com, or the Jeff Rense - Sightings Radio Program, except for the \*From Jeff's Desk\* segment.

--<>-- --<<+>>-- --<>--

"I will call the Sirens from the sea, and ye Lilin, come ye from the desert, and ye Shedim and dragons from the forests..."  
The Apocalypse of Baruch, 10:8

---

Looking for Brad & Sherry Steiger books?

<http://www.immunotex.com/books/steiger.html>

-----

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:08:20 PDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:06:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

[Greg's message reproduced in its entirety - it \_was\_ five weeks ago --ebk]

>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>Date: Sat, 1 May 1999 11:04:37 -0400

>>Date: Thu, 22 Apr 1999 15:04:47 -0500  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>From: Glenn Joyner <[infohead@airmail.net](mailto:infohead@airmail.net)>  
>>Subject: Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>>My name is Jerry Black, and I will now state, for the record, my  
>>position on the UFO topic.

><snip>

>Am I the only one who never wants to read another word from Jerry  
>Black?

>Since I'm one of Budd Hopkins's many friends, I suppose Black  
>might think I'm on his case because he got on Budd's, in his  
>latest missive. But in fact I lost it with him when I read his  
>latest Whitley Strieber attack, and I have no brief for Strieber  
>at all. I decided to write this note after reading the first few  
>paragraphs of his assault on Stan Friedman, long before I got to  
>the part about Budd.

>My thoughts about Black are very simple. He's hardly the first  
>to raise questions about the Gulf Breeze case, or about  
>Strieber. He does, though, set new records for stultifying  
>self-righteousness, barely concealing a resentment that borders  
>on rage.

>And he doesn't seem to know the difference between a valid  
>argument, an absurdity, and an ad hominem attack. It's absurd,  
>for instance, for him to condemn MUFON, the entire organization,  
>in part because he went to one function 20 years ago, and didn't  
>like what he heard. And it's certainly an ad hominem attack when  
>he talks about Stan Friedman's personality. Flamboyance, in  
>Jerry Black's eyes, seems to be a kind of crime, prima facie  
>evidence, all by itself, that the flamboyant person is only

>Finally, Black isn't, to put it mildly, very well informed about  
>some of the subjects he discusses. For one quick example, take  
>this:

>>Mr. William G. Hyzer informed me that the  
>>technology today is as such that anyone who has a computer and  
>>the money can make a UFO photograph that no one would ever be  
>>able to detect as being a hoax.

>I might note, in passing, Black's exaggerated, almost obsequious  
>respect for Hyzer, who may well be a worthy professional in his  
>field, but surely isn't the fount of unerring wisdom Black makes  
>him out to be. Nobody, nobody at all, is \_that\_ good.

>But this statement about computer imagery is, first, not  
>remarkable, because it's something you hear all the time,



>without having to consult Hyzer or anyone else. Second, it's  
>wrong. Computer-faked images will show subtle signs of fakery,  
>if you closely examine them (and, of course, if you have a deep  
>knowledge of computer graphics). We've discussed that on this  
>list many times. But Black propounds his notion (or Hyzer's) in  
>the same tone of a self-righteous oracle that he uses throughout  
>his broadsides. He makes no distinction between things he might  
>know something about, and other areas, like this one, in which  
>he hasn't a clue.

>Enough. I don't care whether I agree with Black, or disagree  
>with him, about the many points he raises in his open letters.  
>But I'm offended enough by his tone to feel I should say  
>something.

Mr. Sandow, if you keep your word [which I doubt that you will do] then there should be no response from you concerning this message that I am writing, which is in response to your comments regarding my 'Open Letter to Stan Friedman'.

First of all, I take issue with your words that I 'attacked' Whitley Strieber. I wrote Mr. Strieber back in January after reviewing his numerous books for over four months and stating to him some of the problems I had with what his books had to say. A contactee, as you may or may not be aware, has given UFOlogists repeated opportunities to investigate their cases first-hand in terms of staying overnight or setting up motion-detection equipment or other related instruments. Mr. Strieber stayed on the 'offensive' against UFO investigators in the beginning, so this could obviously not be accomplished. I think that was purposefully done. Mr. Strieber has nothing else to offer as proof of his experience with the visitors. In fact, there was a lot of things in Mr. Strieber's books that he was trying to impress people that his stories are real when common sense and logic dictate that these things are not true. I stated those in my original letter.

My second letter was to Mr. Whitley Strieber two months later - after he obviously ignored my previous letter and refused to take the third-party, properly sponsored polygraph test [that I agreed to give him at my expense, by the way], and you feel this was an attack on Whitley Strieber. Don't you know the difference between an attack and a report?

I'm sorry that you don't seem to approve of the tone or the way I write my letters. That is your problem, not mine. I write my letters honestly and openly, and very much to the point.

I'm also very sorry that you are a friend of Budd Hopkins and cannot separate your friendship from Budd Hopkins and your objectivity in terms of his ineptness as a UFO researcher and investigator.

Mr. Budd Hopkins has demonstrated throughout the past twenty years that he is not - I repeat, NOT - a UFO investigator [or researcher]. He is basically a UFO reporter. And for those such as Jerome Clark, Mark Cashman and yourself who do not like that because you are friends with Budd Hopkins -- TOO BAD. His record speaks for itself. The ludicrous book, "Witnessed," is just that -- ludicrous. It has no basis of objectivity whatsoever. Your good friend, Mr. Budd Hopkins, does not believe in polygraph tests. How convenient.

What Mr. Budd Hopkins has done, not only in the "Intruders" book [with Kathy Davis] and the book "Witnessed" with [Linda Cortile], has only reported on what they have told him. He has done no research or investigation whatsoever.

If Mr. Budd Hopkins lived next door to me, we could be very good friends. I have no problems with Budd Hopkins as a good person in the community. My problem with Budd Hopkins and others in the UFO community are how they handle themselves in the UFO field.

Mr. Sandow, you also refer to William G. Hyzer, and I might add, his son James B. Hyzer [who also worked on the Ed Walters/Gulf Breeze pictures], and stated that I have put my total trust in them, and that nobody could be as good as them. But the real issue is that nobody could be as BAD as Bruce Maccabee.

In Mr. Hyzer's preliminary report of the ten pictures that he was given, which included photograph #18 [the famous

"road-shot"], he stated that "ALL" of the pictures showed indications of double-exposure. He could not prove at that particular time that any one of those photographs were absolutely hoaxed, but all showed signs of double-exposure. To the contrary, Mr. Bruce Maccabee and Mr. Jeff Sainio, not only in all their vocal support given at symposiums during this time frame, and through all their reports they wrote, never ONCE had a negative comment to make regarding the pictures. So we are to assume, sir, if we adhere to your theory, that Mr. Hyzer made TEN mistakes on all of these pictures, and Mr. Bruce Maccabee is correct.

Mr. Hyzer had no ax to grind, whatsoever. Mr. Jeff Sainio and Mr. Bruce Maccabee obviously did, or we could assume that Mr. Maccabee is not the great and professional photo-analyst that we have been led to believe in the past.

This is the first time that I am aware of that Mr. Bruce Maccabee has been confronted with an independent photo-analyst of the quality of Mr. Hyzer, working on the same project. And it appears to me that we, in the past, have been misled by believing Mr. Bruce Maccabee's professional experience in photographic analysis was much greater than it obviously is. So yes, I have a great deal of trust in Mr. William G. Hyzer, and if you take the time to look on my web-site, you will see a whole page providing you with Mr. Hyzer's background.

If you wish to believe Mr. Bruce Maccabee over Mr. William Hyzer, possibly because of your friendship, that is your problem.

The photographic evidence speaks very clearly for itself. Any of the pictures that Mr. Bruce Maccabee claims would be so hard for Ed Walters to produce, Mr. Hyzer has already shown how HALF of them could be re-produced very easily with a minimal amount of experience. He expressed one of these theories in "Photo Methods" magazine.

If we are to believe Mr. Bruce Maccabee, he claims that Ed Walters was a complete idiot in terms of photographic knowledge. Here is a man, sir, when divorced, was worth 2.5 million dollars. Idiots do not make 2.5 million dollars.

Mr. Rex Salisbury, in his interview with numerous young people who were familiar with Ed's son and his family, said that every time they had seen Ed, he had a camera around his neck. Mr. Ed Walters was very well-versed in the camera that he used. He had quite a bit of experience with it, he was a camera BUFF. But if you wish to believe Mr. Bruce Maccabee, who said he was an 'idiot with a camera,' that, again, is your problem. The evidence doesn't show this.

Also, you make mention of my condemnation of MUFON, the entire organization. Sir, you didn't read that correctly. I stated that when I was at the MUFON symposium in 1978, I heard the word "I" expressed so many times I could've bought my wife a mansion if I could have \$100.00 for each one that said "I." There were many people there from MUFON, but there were also people there from other organizations, such as APRO and other groups in attendance. This is not reflecting upon the entire MUFON organization. Certainly I think Walt Andrus is a disgrace to the MUFON organization -- PERIOD. Mr. Walt Andrus has never been a UFO investigator and never will be. He is strictly an administrator, and should assume that position and let someone else take over the reigns of the MUFON organization -- without question. I have many friends in the MUFON organization, Mr. Tom Duley is one, Mr. William Jones, who was State Director for Ohio, is another, I have alot of respect for Mr. Dan Wright... so I was not condemning the entire Mutual UFO Network. You, sir, stand corrected on that.

And finally, you stated that I am not the first one to raise questions about the Gulf Breeze case or Whitley Strieber. It's not just a matter of raising questions. Sure, Mr. Jerome Clarke and yourself may raise questions, but was has been done about it? Have his books been reviewed? Has anyone offered Mr. Strieber a polygraph test? As far as I know, this is the first third-party polygraph test that Mr. Strieber has ever been asked to take. The same with Gulf Breeze: I didn't just stand aside and say "I think there's a problem here..." I spent over four years, sir, researching and investigating [along with Rex

Salisbury and Barbara Becker] the entire Gulf Breeze episode, almost at the expense of losing my wife because I was so involved with it.

Don't tell me that I just bring up questions. I don't just 'bring up questions.' I take action.

JERRY BLACK  
6276 Taylor Pike  
Blanchester, Ohio 45105  
513-625-2613

E-mail: [blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)  
Website: <http://members.xoom.com/blackshole/>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: James Easton <[voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)>  
Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 04:19:27 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:23:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Regarding:

>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

Bruce wrote:

>>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Regarding Arnold's \_first\_ sighting... which has been the  
>subject of my discussion... there is no assumption that Arnold  
>was "absolutely incapable of human error." Anyone who thinks  
>there was such an assumption does not understand the nature of  
>the analysis. In fact, the arguments assume that Arnold could  
>have been in error in some places.

Bruce,

Surely it's not debatable whether Kenneth Arnold "could" have  
been in error in "some" places, that fact is acknowledged and  
highlighted in your paper - 'The Complete Sighting Report of  
Kenneth Arnold, with Comments and Analysis'.

>But, let's get down to the crux of the matter: which Arnold  
>statements would you like to reject or modify?

We could start with those you have previously accepted!

>1) Arnold says he saw flashes of sunlight on his plane. Did he  
>or didn't he? What did he see?

So far as I can see, this claim didn't surface until Arnold's  
much later book, 'The Coming of the Saucers'.

>2) Arnold said the initial flashes came from an area north of  
>Mt. Rainier. Did he perhaps get the direction wrong, or is there  
>something else?

Did Arnold state this before it was claimed in his book, or did  
he originally and consistently say the objects were first seen  
over the slopes of Mount Rainier, for example:

'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian - June 26, 1947'

"Mr. Arnold reported he was flying east at 2:50 p.m. Tuesday  
toward Mt. Rainier when the objects appeared directly in front of  
him 25-30 miles away at about 10,000 feet altitude".

'Norman, Oklahoma Transcript - June 26, 1947'

"Arnold said the strange aircraft were skittering across the southwest slope of Mount Rainier when he first sighted them".

'Oregon Journal - June 27, 1947'

"Arnold, general manager and owner of the Great Western Fire Control Company, said he first saw the objects when they flashed in the sun low over the slopes of Mt. Rainier".

>3) Arnold thought the objects were a little higher than he was >(9,500 ft, vs his 9,200). What do you think the TRUE altitude >was, if you don't accept Arnold's statement?

>From your detailed analysis, I thought you had determined, "it appears that they were lower than 6,000 ft and that Arnold overestimated their altitude".

Further quoting from your research:

"These statements about how they flew with respect to the mountain peaks are very important because they provide information on the distance from Mr. Arnold. These mountain peaks lie along a wide north-south line extending southward from Mt. Rainier to Mt. Adams. These peaks were about 20 miles east of Arnold at the time. These statements also provide the altitude of the objects. To Arnold they appeared to be approximately at his altitude because they seemed to be 'pretty much on the horizon to me.' Since he was flying at 9,200 ft, this implies that they were close to that altitude. (Arnold actually stated his letter that they were at 9,500 ft.) However, the mountain peaks south of Rainier generally are 5,000 to 7,000 ft high, with the higher ones being farther away (more to the east) from Arnold. Hence his statement that there were higher peaks on the far side of the pathway indicates that the objects were definitely lower than about 7,000 ft".

"Is it reasonable to assume that he could have made an error of several thousand feet in estimating their altitude? The answer to this question lies in the fact that Arnold inferred the altitude by observing that the objects appeared to be almost exactly on his horizon (i.e., level with his altitude). But it is very difficult to determine the exact horizon from an airplane. In this case, the angle (the "depression angle") between exact horizontal and his downward sighting line to the mountain peaks south of Mt. Rainier was very small. The depression angle from Arnold's plane at 9,200 ft altitude to the top of a 5,500 ft high mountain at a distance of 20 miles (105,600 ft) was about 20. Such a small angle would be difficult to detect from an airplane. So the answer is yes, he could easily have made an error of 4,000 ft in estimating the altitude of the objects. Perhaps if he had looked up the actual altitudes of the mountain peaks south of Mt Rainier he would have revised his statement".

>4) Arnold described them as "flipping and flashing". If this is >not what he saw, then what do you think he saw?

He also described them as "fluttering and sailing". Would you disagree that's consistent with birds and far removed from a 'craft'?

>5)Arnold claimed he looked at his dashboard clock when the first >one passed Mt. Rainier.... Did he get the time wrong? If so, by >how much?

Although I can't see it's significant, curiously, he also claimed the timing was taken on his watch:

'Chicago Daily Tribune - June 25, 1947'

"I took out my watch and checked off one minutes and 42 seconds from the time they passed Mount Rainier\*\*\*".

'Norman, Oklahoma Transcript - June 26, 1947'

"I clocked them with a stop watch during the time it took them to fly from Mount Rainer to Mount Adams".

The question is, if Kenneth Arnold's estimate of the objects' altitude was in error by some 4,000-5,000 feet - in which case the objects were only flying at about half the altitude he thought - then how can we have any confidence in his other perceptions?

If that was so grossly mistaken, as evidenced in your analysis, then it MUST affect all related judgements and estimates.

>6) Arnold looked again at the clock as the last one passed  
>Rainier.... did he get the time wrong? If so, by how much?

The timing isn't an issue, it's whether the objects were perhaps much closer than he guessed.

Obviously the closer these objects actually were, the faster they would appear to travel between two distant, fixed points.

>7) Arnold said he turned the plane sideways and looked through  
>his open window. At this time he would have been flying south,  
>parallel to the objects. Was he wrong/lying?

In that early radio interview, he claimed, "I turned the plane around and opened the window".

When he turned his plane "around" it was during the timing exercise and we don't know if he changed direction by 90 degrees, 180 degrees, or something else.

What effect might the change of direction have had on his perception of the objects' speed and respective distances between them, his plane and the mountains?

>The analysis of the Arnold sighting has been carried out with  
>the fulfill realization that Arnold could have been wrong on  
>some fine points. But to get a conventional explanation one has  
>to assume Arnold was wrong on some major points.

Isn't this the conclusion of your own critique?

As you remarked:

"So the answer is yes, he could easily have made an error of 4,000 ft in estimating the altitude of the objects"

How can that be a "fine point"?

Has that analysis examined what Kenneth Arnold reported to the press in the days following his sighting?

I've been looking at this and note, for example, that the 'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian' newspaper on 26 June reported, "Mr. Arnold admitted the angle from which he viewed the objects would make difficult precise estimation of their speed...".

>If you are going to "complain" that Arnold wasn't perfect, then  
>specify where you think he was wrong and we can argue over  
>whether or not it makes sense in the context of the sighting to  
>assume he was wrong..

I trust some relevevant points are cited above.

Kenneth Arnold's original story is a relatively simple tale.

He observed nine reflective objects which at first he thought were geese, because their flight characteristics were similar.

Arnold then dismissed this possibility as the objects appeared to be travelling too fast, concluding they must instead be airplanes.

Yet Arnold never seems to raise any objections to the objects being birds, other than the perceived airspeed. Even in

subsequent interviews, he doesn't rule out the prospect due to what we might have assumed the most obvious conclusion - that birds wouldn't be visible if the objects were truly some 20-30 miles distant.

Arnold then decided to take this opportunity to 'clock' the airspeed of the 'planes'.

It's perhaps crucial to appreciate that Arnold only decided to carry out this exercise because, as he says in the radio interview, "I just thought I'd see how fast they were going, since among pilots we argue about speed so much".

It wasn't a result of Arnold believing the airplanes were travelling at an incredible speed. He only concluded that after first carrying out a timing between two prominent landmarks and then later calculating how far apart those landmarks were in conjunction with the 'stop watch' reading.

As he timed the objects' - believed to be airplanes - what then surprised him was a realisation that they didn't have any 'tails'.

However, as Arnold related, he didn't give either this or the apparently fast airspeed too much thought at the time.

Consequently, he worked out that the distance between the two fixed points was some 50 miles and that if the objects had travelled that distance, as he thought, in the 1 minute and forty seconds recorded, they must have been travelling at an unprecedented speed.

If, as you explained in the detailed analysis, Arnold's estimate of the objects' altitude was grossly mistaken and that when he apparently turned his plane around during this timing exercise, we don't know if he changed direction by 90, or 180 degrees, or something else, then consequently, there can be surely be no confidence in his overall perceptions.

Obviously the closer these 'fluttering' objects actually were, the faster they would appear to travel between two distant fixed points.

When logic kicks in and we consider that the observation was wholly subjective, has proven misconceptions and that Kenneth Arnold reported a subsequent sighting with similar characteristics and which was almost certainly of birds... at what point does this remotely become sustainable evidence of 'alien spacecraft'?

James.  
E-mail: [voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:18:23 PDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:30:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 3 May 1999 17:41:05 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>>Date: Sun, 02 May 1999 07:38:12 -0400  
>>From: Kenny Young <[ufo@fuse.net](mailto:ufo@fuse.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>>>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>>>Date: Sat, 1 May 1999 11:04:37 -0400

>>>Enough. I don't care whether I agree with Black, or disagree  
>>>with him, about the many points he raises in his open letters.  
>>>But I'm offended enough by his tone to feel I should say  
>>>something.

>>Please look beyond the 'tone' and scrutinize the substance of  
>>what Mr. Black has to offer. It would be a mistake to assume  
>>such a dismissive approach to his comments, as many have  
>>repeatedly sought to do.

>Kenny -

>You are a serious investigator, and I have always appreciated  
>your approach to cases.

>However, I am sure that you know that polemic such as that  
>produced by Mr. Black is not the way to generate any sort of  
>improvement in UFOlogy. Personally, I believe he does make, on  
>occasion, valid points. However, they are not typically points  
>which have not been made by someone else, much more courteously,  
>elsewhere.

>Even if Walters and Strieber are the charlatans that Black  
>claims, stridency is not the way to alter their impact on  
>ufology. In regard to the Gulf Breeze case, if Mr. Black would  
>like to demonstrate with appropriate science, and in a  
>reasonable, objective tone, how to account for the following, he  
>will be doing us all a service:

>1) How the obscuration of the object in Photo 1 and Photo 7 has  
>been accomplished. Double exposure, even with the Hyzer method,  
>has been experimentally discredited.

>2) That the light return from objects apparently at the distant  
>edge of the flash is what would be expected from a model at a  
>particular distance (for instance, Photo 13, Photo 16, Photo 23,  
>Photo 35 all have foreground objects whose comparative light  
>return would make that analysis simpler).

>3) That Photo 37L and R, which show that the object is obscured  
>by a tree branch in one stereo frame, can be explained with  
>models and mathematics within Walters' competence. It must be  
>accounted for that the calculated size of the object is  
>consistent with that in other stereo photos taken with other



>equipment at other times, and with non-stereo photos with  
>reference points, such as the road shot.

>4) That Walters possessed sufficient knowledge to successfully  
>and consistently spoof stereo photos so that the calculated  
>diameter would remain consistent with that estimated from other  
>images (including the road shot).

>5) That Photo 38L and R would be possible to create such that  
>the resulting images be consistent with the Nimslo photo results  
>(this requiring models to be suspended tens of feet above the  
>water 100 or more feet from the shore) for two completely  
>different objects of widely different sizes and yet have the  
>resulting measurements be consistent with other photos taken  
>under other conditions, including the other stereo photos taken  
>by Walters.

>6) How the various videotapes could be hoaxed.

>8) How and where Walters was able to construct and test and  
>photograph complex lighted models without anyone's knowledge.

>9) That Walters had the knowledge, the skills and the tools to  
>create and photograph such models.

>10) That he had the mathematical knowledge to spoof the stereo  
>photos or that such could be done by chance.

>11) That Walters' family was in on the hoax.

>12) Walters' motivation for the hoax.

>One of the problems with Black's discussion of Gulf Breeze (to  
>take an example with which I am most familiar) is that he does  
>not seem aware that most of these are issues. The characteristic  
>of the scientific approach is best expressed by the section that  
>appears in every scientific paper: related work. In that  
>section, the author of a paper shows his understanding of the  
>work done by the others in the field on the same problem and  
>demonstrates why his approach is better. Black does not seem to  
>properly counterpoint the important portions of the work done by  
>Sanio or Maccabee, nor does he seem to realize or acknowledge  
>the weakness of some parts of the Hyzer analysis.

>Now none of the above require discussion of Believer Bill, or  
>the model found years later in the old Walters house, or any of  
>the disputable testimony. These are simple qualitative or  
>investigative requirements - and of those, the qualitative tests  
>are of the most interest because they are reproducible on demand  
>and are not subjective in nature.

>Understand - I am not a Gulf Breeze or Streiber partisan. I have  
>many problems with Gulf Breeze, and I have even more problems  
>with Streiber's case. I haven't devoted a lot of time to  
>Streiber because, frankly, it seems to me he offers very little  
>to work with that is not ambiguous, while Gulf Breeze is not  
>ambiguous at all and offers all of the material needed for  
>quantitative analysis. Of course, of the two, Streiber has  
>certainly had a much more profound social effect.

>But, at any rate, I keep my mind open on Gulf Breeze because the  
>above points have not been dealt with to my satisfaction, and,  
>until they are, I have no choice but to leave the case open. And  
>Mr. Black can attack everyone involved in the case as much as he  
>>wants, but until all of the above points have been addressed  
>to my satisfaction, why should I change my mind? If Bruce's  
>analysis is flawed, I believe he will be receptive to the proof  
>- I know I am. If Jeff Sanio's analysis is flawed, he should  
>also be receptive to the proof. And if Hyzer's analysis is  
>flawed, there should be some sign that Mr. Black is receptive to  
>the notion.

>Quiet, carefully reasoned, qualitatively backed analysis means a  
>lot more to me than any polygraph test, paid for by someone else  
>or not. And certainly Mr. Black's attitude does nothing to  
>generate confidence in me that the results he will bring forward  
>are any more objective than those he denounces.

Mr. Mark Cashman;

I wanted to take this time to thank you for responding to Kenny Young's remarks. Firstly, I appreciate his support, but do not need it. I am sorry if you and a few others do not like the tone of my letters.

My letters were simply investigative letters to Mr. Whitley Strieber in response to his 'lack of response' regarding my invitation to have him take a third-party polygraph test financed at my own expense. I am trying to show people that when his books are read, there is much to be desired in terms of believability once you get past the fantastic ability that Mr. Strieber has in putting words on paper. There has been no evidence whatsoever to support Whitley Strieber's case -and there should be, because he is/was an alleged contactee. We don't expect that from people like the three women from Casey County, Kentucky who, in 1976, had one experience only. But when you deal with contactee's such as Billy Meier, George Adamski and Daniel Frye - we expect more. Certainly I do. Mr. Whitley Strieber made sure that all the investigators were kept at bay and unable to perform an analysis by staying overnight or throughout a weekend to view what he was seeing when he had these supposed encounters with 'The Visitors.' Motion picture cameras, motion detection equipment, audio tapes... all could have been set up in Mr. Strieber's home to try to get this information on audio or videotape. It was never done because Mr. Strieber did not allow it. His books certainly do not prove anything whatsoever. That he allowed his son to come out is a major strike against the believability of his claim, having the child put in that dangerous peril that he claims was present there.

Also, your remarks about Gulf Breeze are well taken. I will be making a final report on Gulf Breeze in which I will show you and any objective person that all the pictures that were taken by Mr. Ed Walters could have -and were- taken by him in a hoaxed manner. Mr. Bruce Maccabee, again, has sought to make it appear as if Ed Walters was a complete idiot with a camera. However, I have learned -along with investigator Rex Salisbury- from talking with kids in the neighborhood who frequented the Walters house quite often, that whenever you saw Ed, you saw a camera around his neck. We have four youngsters who will testify [and who DID testify] to Rex Salisbury and his wife Carol, that Ed Walters would double-expose Polaroid film and play tricks on them. For instance, he would take a picture of a reflection in the mirror and leave the picture in the camera and take another picture of one of the girls and say: "I wonder which one of you will have the spirits behind you tonight?" It would obviously be the first photograph that he would take, and when he pulled the picture out, there would be a strange reflection situated behind the girl.

So we know for a fact that Ed Walter's was a camera buff, unlike what Mr. Bruce Maccabee tries to portray. And when you try to use the expertise of Mr. Bruce Maccabee against Mr. William G. Hyzer and his son, you are talking about apples and oranges. There is NO comparison -NONE- between the abilities of Mr. William G. Hyzer and his son James in contrast to Mr. Bruce Maccabee and Mr. Jeff Sainio. PERIOD.

I will show in my report how the rest of the case, including photograph #19, just does not hold up. There is not one piece of evidence [although Bruce Maccabee strangely states there are many] that will substantiate this Ed Walters case. There is nothing.

A lot of times when you have people perpetrate hoaxes, such as [in my opinion] Ed Walters, Whitley Strieber, etc., they always try to rely on other people's stories or sightings to confirm their own. That is exactly what both men have done. You cannot, as an objective investigator, accept testimony from another person because they say they saw an object which looks similar to Ed's, and say "that makes Ed's real." When you have a nationally publicized case, you are bound to have people come out of the woodwork, as we've had on every nationally exposed case, and say that they also saw something very similar. To give you a quick example, Mr. Art Hufford, one of the MUFON investigators on the Gulf Breeze case, saw an object during the daylight for twenty seconds. He drew that object and went around on national TV [I heard him at least twice] and said to Ed Walters: "I saw something exactly like what you saw." But if you look at Art Hufford's drawings, there are no portholes or

windows in Mr. Hufford's UFO. Does it have a similar shape? Somewhat, but there are no windows or portholes. So obviously, contrary to what Art Hufford told the national media, he did not see the same object that Ed Walter's allegedly photographed [which shows portholes and windows]. Since he was caught and this was brought to his attention by myself and other investigators, he later stated that "there may have been windows, but I didn't see any." So contrary to popular belief, Art Hufford did not EVER see the same object that Ed Walters photographed.

I will be issuing a final Gulf Breeze report, and challenging Bruce Maccabee and Jeff Sainio on photograph #19 to back up their claims. The crux of photograph 19 is that Mr. Hyzer claims there is no luminosity projecting downward from the object, which there should be due to light bouncing off the hard surface. Mr. Jeff Sainio claims, just by looking at his first generation copy, that he can see the luminosity on the road -not with instruments, but with the naked eye. Don't you find it unusual that Sainio can assert this while Hyzer cannot detect this using the most sophisticated equipment that is the best in the business? You sir, have to determine who is telling the truth and who is not. Who has an ax to grind, and who doesn't, Mr. Cashman.

I will be offering Mr. Bruce Maccabee and challenge that he should not be able to refuse. If he does, then he shows me very clearly that he has been blowing smoke all these years. That challenge will be issued in my final report on Gulf Breeze.

If you would like to call me sir, I can go over some of these issues privately with you and have no problem with that, and would more than happy to do that for you Mr. Cashman, to show you where exactly that Mr. Bruce Maccabee keeps leading people astray, and what the true facts are on Gulf Breeze. Some of the things you will be seeing in my report have obviously not been made public by the MUFON organization, because they do not want this case to be exposed as the hoax it is [because they ran with it prematurely].

Thank you for your time, I hope to hear from you.

Jerry Black  
6276 Taylor Pike  
Blanchester, OH 45107

513-625-2613  
E-mail: [blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)  
Website: <http://members.xoom.com/blackshole/>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Larry Hatch Away For A Week

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 23:16:11 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:25:55 -0400  
Subject: Larry Hatch Away For A Week

Dear list:

I will be away for a week starting today (Saturday 05 June).

Please continue sending messages with the understanding that I cannot reply rebut or anything else.

I will be in Boston for a day looking for that famous bar from the long running Cheers sitcom among other things... the one that doesn't serve Gripple.

The rest is work. (Ugh!)

' Til later, Best!

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 00:53:47 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:28:37 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

<snip>

>Regarding Arnold's first sighting... which has been the subject  
>of my discussion.... there is no assumption that Arnold was  
>"absolutely incapable of human error." Anyone who thinks there  
>was such an assumption does not understand the nature of the  
>analysis. In fact, the arguments assume that Arnold could have  
>been in error in some places. But, let's get down to the crux  
>of the matter: which Arnold statements would you like to reject  
>or modify?

Bruce,

Well, let's do get down to the crux of the matter. Since neither you nor I were in the cockpit with Arnold on that fateful day, neither of us have any idea as to how accurate, or inaccurate, he was in his perceptions. My point was simply that you and Rudiak can make any kind of calculations you want and they remain essentially meaningless in real world terms. They could well be right -- and they could well be off by who knows what exponential factor. My point was that we don't know. And for you and Rudiak to suggest otherwise -- as if the case were automatically solved in non-conventional terms -- is simply wishful thinking on both your parts.

>1) Arnold says he saw flashes of sunlight on his plane. Did he  
>or didn't he? What did he see?

I have no idea, since I wasn't there at the time, but neither do you. But if the objects were a good 20 miles or more away, as Arnold claimed, then I seriously doubt whether he could have discerned "flashes of sunlight on his plane." He might have seen light flashing off distant small objects, which is altogether a different thing.

<snip>

Your other questions can be addressed in similar fashion. Where was Arnold wrong in a specific instance? I don't know. Where was Arnold right in a specific instance? You don't know, and neither does David Rudiak.

<snip>

>The skeptic assumption is that Arnold was wrong in one or more  
>of his descriptive details. For example, that Arnold  
>overestimated the distance. But he said the objects were going  
>in and out of mountain peaks which were about 20 miles away. Was  
>he wrong?

I don't know. Do you? My question was, what if he was wrong?

>Clearly if the details can be modified "at will" any sighting  
>can be explained. The analysis of the Arnold sighting has been

>carried out with the fulfill realization that Arnold could have  
>been wrong on some fine points. But to get a conventional  
>explanation one has to assume Arnold was wrong on some major  
>points.

So? How do you presume to know that he wasn't wrong on some maor points?

>If you are going to "complain" that Arnold wasn't perfect, then  
>specify where you think he was wrong and we can argue over  
>whether or not it makes sense in the context of the sighting to  
>assume he was wrong..  
>

Sorry, Bruce, can't do. For all I know, he could have been wrong in general. A little more than a month after his original sighting, he claimed another one of small objects, 3-5 ft. in diameter, numbering a couple of dozen or more. If you or Rudiak would like to exercise your mathematical abilities on this case, you're perfectly welcome to. In fact, I wish you would.

A few years later, in 1952, Arnold claimed to have filmed two UFOs, one of which could be seen through, and which apparently led him to conclude that UFOs were living objects. Arnold would go on to claim several more sightings in his lifetime. Lucky dude, eh?

Have you seen the film Arnold claimed to have taken on this occasion? Neither have I. Odd that he didn't make it publicly and readily available, isn't it, as it would have surely proved, or at least supported, his earlier claim.

>>You, Maccabee and others can mathematically analyze Arnold's  
>>original statements all you want, or until Hell freezes over,  
>>whichever comes first. And it doesn't mean a goddamn thing unless  
>>you think he was absolutely dead on and incapable of any error  
>>in perception whatever.

>Not very clever remark. Sounds "whiney"

Sorry, we can't be clever 24 hours a day, can we?

>>Now explain how Miracle Man, i.e., Arnold, came to believe that  
>>UFOs were living organisms.

>>Troubling, isn't it?

>Perhaps, but so what?

>When the interpretation is separated from the observation  
>and the observation is analyzed, the witness' suggestion as to  
>the interpretation becomes irrelevant.

It's late here, so I'm not going to address the above statement in any detail. If you had it to do over, though, I think you would have put it differently.

>You seem to be saying that because Arnold in later years  
>concluded saucers were animals, that therefore one can't believe  
>the observational details in his first sighting.

>Sorry, I don't buy it..

Well, something of the sort, although it's not quite as straightforward as that. I simply have reservations about Arnold's first sighting that are serious enough to lead me to wonder whether or not they are worthy of the mathematical calculations you and Rudiak have devoted to same, in light of some other statements by Arnold.

Such as his second sighting, little more than a month later, and his claim of having filmed a living, transparent UFO in 1952. (See my response to Jerry Clark for additional details.) Have you ever seen this film? Wouldn't you admit that, if it exists, it would prove much more evidential than anything Arnold had to say about his earlier June, 1947, sighting?

So where is the Arnold film that would obviate anything he had to say about his 1947 sighting? Wouldn't it save you and Rudiak some serious calculus? But what if there isn't any such film?

I trust you or Rudiak will get back to us on this matter post

haste. After all, why mathematically analyze Arnold's claims when you could be mathematically analyzing his film?

Dennis

<http://www.anomalist.com>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: **Dennis Stacy** <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 01:14:28 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:34:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 10:23:58 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Steven Kaeser <[steve@konsulting.com](mailto:steve@konsulting.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

<snip>

>Dennis-

>Have you really become so frustrated with the "genre" that you  
>have to resort to this type of posting? The subjects you raise  
>have all been argued to death on this list (and others) and you  
>throw them out as bait to begin those arguments anew. The  
>worst part of it is that you lump them all together, in spite of  
>the fact that the provenance of each is so vastly different,  
>which is a tactic used by CISCOP.

>Personally, I'd rather be reading discussions about the issues  
>at hand, rather than discussions about the discussions.

>Steve

Uh, Steve,

Actually my most recent posts were in response to David Rudiak  
calling James Easton bird-brained, to which I took exception on  
general principle and called him bird-brained back.

While you may not have appreciated them, the questions I asked  
Rudiak were direct and to the point. As one of the more  
vociferous online supporters of the ET crash at Roswell theory,  
I simply wanted him to follow up his "logic."

He's so good at pontificating about what did and didn't land  
near Roswell that I hoped he would share his bountiful knowledge  
about same with the rest of us mere mortals, clueing us in to as  
how many UFOs actually crashed, where and when, how many bodies  
were retrieved therefrom, where they were sent, when MJ-12 was  
organized, by whom and when, who it consisted of and so on. Oh,  
yes, and by the way, how much of that Corso crap did he  
subscribe to?

Sorry you aren't interested in answers to same. But not to  
worry: Rudiak doesn't have any.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**



Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Resignation

From: **Jim Mortellaro** <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 13:05:55 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:48:49 -0400  
Subject: Resignation

Effective June 4, 1999, I have resigned from the Intruders Foundation Action Committee as a result of personal considerations. This is my decision and has little to do with the actions taken by other members except the coincidence of timing.

Budd has my word that he may depend on me for any assistance on a personal level. What little I've done, remains with him, a true researcher and gentleman. It's my way of saying thanks for his help to crazy people all over the world who think they've been abducted by lizards.

You're better off without lizard spawn and Gripple drinkers, Budd.

Jim Mortellaro

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena

'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Alfred's Odd Ode #306

From: Alfred Lehmborg <[Lehmborg@snowhill.com](mailto:Lehmborg@snowhill.com)>

Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 05:53:37 -0500

Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:39:50 -0400

Subject: Alfred's Odd Ode #306

Apology to MW #306 (For June 5, 1999)

Everything is UFOs from caps on down to shoes. It's written into histories we didn't hide or lose. It's tied to an environment that evolves beyond the few to a brand new kind of living that is right for me, if not for you. It's wrapped up in psychology -- philosophy, etiology. It redefines these liberally, makes them strange and other worldly. It turns your world inside out, and makes new rules that you can't flout. Floating in your airy castle, crashing down is such a hassle, but you built up in the air advised by demons selling there.

You must give up your pride, I've found, that you should wear creation's crown. You are not the dead lock nut. You'll stake no claim beyond the rut of that which you will not admit -- denial, and you're filled with it. Around you monstrous rocks profound are coasting in a dance, they've found, that threaten us right here on Earth with mayhem like a god's foul curse. Threatened like some brainless chickens, we cluck and scratch and fake admissions that we have lit the torch of \*light\*, and strive for \*God\*, and \*truth\*, and \*right\*. Nothing's further from the truth, we stand unmasked, too proud -- aloof. Too proud by far -- our small advancement loses it's attached enhancement as we find we're mewling infants wallowing in our filth's contentment.

Edit all your moldy tomes for evidence you keep alone. Write your works of snide derision; accuse the rest of imprecision. Pepper speech with fallacies that prove your thoughts have callused knees. Dredge up \*facts\* all out of context; cite them like you have no pretext; hide behind a noxious nym like "Love lies Squealing, or "anonym." Spew the proof you have no stones; that you're a pest and not alone. A cyber bug that sucks the blood of spirit you have lost now -- bud. Write your message, spread the lie that we see nothing in our sky. Laugh at a conspiracy; pretend that you're not on your knees; deny the scales affixed to eyes to push away some fear you hide.

Fix your eyes on starry skies, and watch the blackness uncontrived. Time is what you witness there -- time enough and more to spare. Moons and planets, gassy clouds, cosmic dust -- there is no doubt. Beings from space look back towards you, and wonder that you're there -- it's true. Energy exists in time, the frequency we see -- sublime. Power's found at zero points? We light our farts! We're out of joint! Busy with our ethnic cleansing we strut and preen in strife unending, holding out for just a few what blessings grace elitist's views.

In our histories it's been written, we turn our eyes away -- we're smitten. Too much truth there slaps our faces filling holes and gaps or spaces. What we cannot cop to yet, and where our bloated hubris rests, are questions on our lofty status, what we now accept free gratis. Banking on old Aristotle (forgetting as a footnote, Plato) we're buried in our crystal spheres containing what we choose to fear. Wrapped in \*blessings\* of a church that hates the world as devil cursed, we pillage, rape and pour abuse on that which nurtures! It's so abstruse!

UFOs are everything! From ancient times they wail and sing. Through the years they've shown themselves, we've pictures, film we stack on shelves. Anecdotes abound in waves, from Presidents without disgrace, to airline captains coming clean -- these \_craft\_ are NOT a stupid dream. I, myself, have had some sightings. They're not balloons, and gas or lightning -- UFO's are everywhere, they wash your clothes, they set your hair! They've watched us through such trying times, they've likely got our history, Clyde. And there's the rub -- explains all reticence. This is why we hide the evidence. We're afraid we'd be found out -- that \_all\_ would \_know\_ what we're about!

[Lehmberg@snowhill.com](mailto:Lehmberg@snowhill.com)

Everybody has questions to answer. The more you manipulate and control the more questions you should have to answer. The more you hold yourself up as an example to the world of compassion, intelligence and decency the more examination you should you should be able to sustain. Our culture abuses its societal privileges. In the interests of a "National Security" or a "return to traditional values" there hides an impetus so rich with arbitrariness, unfairness, and unethical practice that it can scarcely be believed. The drive is to maintain a status quo so ridiculously canted that it is beyond the limits of rational sensibility. We're so dirty now that the mere admission of these dereliction's and travesties explode the status quo like a penny balloon. Folks from space, watching and perhaps recording our ancient four million year old advance from the African Savanna would have quite a tale to tell -- told as it was from an unjaundiced "Alien View." I'd sure like to hear that story, wouldn't you? Heh! All the news that fits.

All the news.

Restore John Ford!

--

Ponder the Wit & Wisdom of Ching Chow!  
View "Unstill Life" -- Animation . . . and more.  
Consider Matter, Mind & Movement.  
See the current HTML "Apology to MW" with illustration.  
Take a ride in the Teleporter.

Explore "Alfred Lehmborg's Alien View" at his Fortunecity URL.

<http://www.fortunecity.com/roswell/arecibo/46/>

<Updated 27 May>

John Ford Restoration Fund -- Send your checks and money orders to \_me\_, Alfred Lehmborg (cut out the lawyers, they got their's) at: 304 Melbourne Drive, Enterprise AL, 36330. Strict records kept. \$350.00 pledged -- \$200.00 collected!

"I cleave the heavens, and soar to the infinite. What others see from afar, I leave far behind me." - Giordano Bruno, burned at the fundamentalist's stake.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 5](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: **Jerome Clark** <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Sat, 05 Jun 99 11:49:54 PDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:51:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 13:50:47 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>Date: Thu, 03 Jun 99 08:26:28 PDT

Hi, Dennis and listfolk:

>Arnold may well have been aware of the writings of the people  
>you mention. But judging from his own writings, he based his  
>belief that UFOs were some type of living organism on his own  
>experiences. See the following, for example:

>"This is the same sort of impression [of a living thing] I got  
>after seeing these same things again in 1952. Two of them flew  
>under me at Mount Lassen. I got a movie of these, and one was  
>just as solid as a Chevrolet car. But you could see the pine  
>trees right through the other one that was following it. I too  
>got the feeling that here was something that was alive, rather  
>than that they were machines."

From time to time (though fairly rarely), UFO witnesses have reported the sensation that what they were observing was a living object. On June 1, 1933, a mountain climber on Everest told of seeing winged objects which "seemed to pulsate in and out as though they were breathing." There is the famous Crawfordsville, Indiana, monster story from September 1891, not to mention the tradition of powder ser ("rot from the stars," aka "star jelly"). Plus the remarkable case from Biskopsberga, Sweden, in May 1808, a full account of which was published in a contemporary issue of Transactions of the Swedish Academy of Sciences. Again, I refer interested listfolk to my coverage of these and related matters in The UFO Encyclopedia, 2nd Ed., pp. 872-77. If any of you know of other cases, I encourage you to post them here.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 19:31:28 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 10:07:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 99 11:49:54 PDT

<snip>

>>From time to time (though fairly rarely), UFO witnesses have  
>reported the sensation that what they were observing was a  
>living object. On June 1, 1933, a mountain climber on Everest  
>told of seeing winged objects which "seemed to pulsate in and  
>out as though they were breathing." There is the famous  
>Crawfordsville, Indiana, monster story from September 1891, not  
>to mention the tradition of pvdre ser ("rot from the stars," aka  
>"star jelly"). Plus the remarkable case from Biskopsberga,  
>Sweden, in May 1808, a full account of which was published in a  
>contemporary issue of Transactions of the Swedish Academy of  
>Sciences. Again, I refer interested listfolk to my coverage of  
>these and related matters in The UFO Encyclopedia, 2nd Ed., pp.  
>872-77. If any of you know of other cases, I encourage you to  
>post them here.

>Jerry Clark

Jerry,

Actually you can find another case in the Arnold article already  
cited, pp. 27-8, of the Proceedings of the First International  
UFO Congress. It precedes Arnold's own remarks quoted here  
earlier, but snipped this time.

I find it highly unlikely that Boeing would fly one of its test  
planes over Mexico, but that's what Arnold relates. I also find  
it highly unlikely that Boeing had a test (or any other) plane  
capable of 1500 mph and 67,000 feet altitude, but, again, that's  
the way Arnold has it. The last time I looked, Boeing was in the  
business of building big, slow passenger planes.

Does anyone know if they ever did any high-speed design test  
planes for the military? I know they did the B-47 and the B-52,  
but after that they went commercial.

Arnold doesn't give a date for the episode.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Resignation

From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 02:42:59 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 10:28:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Resignation

>From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
>Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 13:05:55 EDT  
>Subject: Resignation  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>Effective June 4, 1999, I have resigned from the Intruders  
>Foundation Action Committee as a result of personal  
>considerations. This is my decision and has little to do with  
>the actions taken by other members except the coincidence of  
>timing.

Hi All,

Just in case the timing of this second 'resignation' from IF  
has caused anyone to wonder what's going on over there,  
I'd just like to say that it is purely coincidental and that  
one has nothing to do with the other. Jim left for his  
reasons and I left because I have some real financial  
issues and considerations.

IF is one of the few safe and sane places that anyone  
who suspects that are having UFO/abduction related  
experiences can contact for information or help. I just  
didn't want anyone to think that because two people have  
left within days of each other that there was anything  
wrong with IF.

I put the very best of me into IF for more than five years.  
It is a source of pride for me to know that I was instrumental  
in helping to make its services and Budds' research work  
more accessible than it was before I came along. I was  
concerned that these resignations might reflect negatively  
on IF (or Budd) so I rush to defend its reputation. I have  
the right. I have a lot of my life and my soul invested in it.

Peace,

John Velez

---

[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)  
ABDUCTION INFORMATION CENTER  
<http://www.if-aic.com/>

"Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind."

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: 'Topographic Brain Mapping of UFO Experiencers'

From: Julie Bedford <[jewels@inet.net.au](mailto:jewels@inet.net.au)>  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 11:04:48 +0800  
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 10:23:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'Topographic Brain Mapping of UFO Experiencers'

>From: Tim D. Brigham <[TBrigham@ksinc.net](mailto:TBrigham@ksinc.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: 'Topographic Brain Mapping of UFO Experiencers'  
>Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 23:19:15 -0500

>'ello all,

>After my recent request for info regarding  
>electrophysiology/neurophysiology of experiencers, I  
>'coincidentally' recieved the Rhine Institute's latest issue of  
>The Journal of Parapsychology, which lists in its yearly  
>bibliography an article titled "Topographic Brain Mapping of UFO  
>Experiencers."

>Authors are listed as Don and Moura (1997). Published in Journal  
>of Scientific Exploration, 11, pg 435-454. Although

>I am now a member of the SSE, I don't have this issue onhand,  
>and wondered if anyone on this list might who would be willing  
>to send me a copy to aid in the literature review that I am  
>engaged in while I consider exploring this area further in an  
>experimental manner. If so, please contact me directly.

To the List

I can probably get a photocopy of this article for you as a  
friend of mine has located this issue.

You can email me direct

Jules

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

From: Dan Geib <[geibdan@qtm.net](mailto:geibdan@qtm.net)>  
Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 08:56:24 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 10:39:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

>From: Rense E-News <[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)>  
>To: Rense E-News <[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)>  
>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:40:01 -0600  
>Subject: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

<snip>

>-----  
>Jeff Rense Weekly E-News  
>-----

>The Week Ahead  
> 6-6-99 thru 6-12-99

> Guests, Announcements, Week's Top Stories  
> From sightings.com

>Jeff Rense E-News is distributed exclusively by Free Subscription.

> \* From Jeff's Desk \*

>There are hundreds of short, sometimes intriguing but thoroughly  
>unverifiable stories circulating on the net purporting to reveal  
>the truth of human ET visitation and contact. Wading through  
>these sometimes sensational items is not always easy. Most are  
>rather obvious hoaxes, some are very well written and show  
>considerable creativity, while others often contain a mixture of  
>truth and fiction that is not easily dismissed. Most all of them,  
>however, have one thing in common: anonymous or unknown sources.  
>Here is an example of one of the many 'ET revelations' that show  
>up in our mailbox several times a month...

>>From Robert Collins, 6-4-99, <[LesMiserable@sprintmail.com](mailto:LesMiserable@sprintmail.com)>:

>The following is an account of the meeting I (the source) was  
>involved in with EBE-2.

<snip>

Dear Jeff,

It is funny that you post one of ol' Uncle Bob's 'stories' . In my opinion he is the King of unverifiable UFO stories. They are always great in content, fun to read, but as you state, most all of them, however, have one thing in common: anonymous or unknown sources. This does seem to be one field of research where people are considered 'knowlegable' bases on these mysterious 'unknow sources'. What ever happened to fact based reasearch? These 'stories' make good folklore, but not much else

UFO Folklore !

<http://www.qtm.net/~geibdan/framemst.html>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## What's New at Magonia

From: **Mark Pilkington** <[m.pilkington@virgin.net](mailto:m.pilkington@virgin.net)>  
Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 13:39:58 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 10:45:38 -0400  
Subject: What's New at Magonia

<http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk/newmag.htm>

What's new at Magonia

06/06/99

Visions of Bowmen and Angels  
The strange case of Arthur Machen and the Angels of Mons.  
By Kevin McClure

Magonia Monthly Supplement #15  
ETH - questions that need answering; Satanic update; Allagash  
under fire Mark Pilkington

"A heathen perhaps, but not, I hope, an unenlightened one."  
Lord Summerisle

-----  
Magonia Online

<http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Joe Murgia <[Ufojoel@aol.com](mailto:Ufojoel@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 09:46:49 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 10:53:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:18:23 PDT

>I will be making a final report on Gulf Breeze in which I will  
>show you and any objective person that all the pictures that  
>were taken by Mr. Ed Walters could have -and were- taken by him  
>in a hoaxed manner.

Your report should include photos that were created that match  
all of the Gulf Breeze photos. Saying something can be hoaxed  
and actually re-creating the hoax are two different things. Let's  
see you re-create the photos that you say are so easy to  
re-create.

>Mr. Art Hufford, one of the MUFON investigators on the Gulf  
>Breeze case, saw an object during the daylight for twenty  
>seconds. He drew that object and went around on national TV [I  
>heard him at least twice] and said to Ed Walters: "I saw  
>something exactly like what you saw." But if you look at Art  
>Hufford's drawings, there are no portholes or windows in Mr.  
>Hufford's UFO. Does it have a similar shape? Somewhat, but there  
>are no windows or portholes. So obviously, contrary to what Art  
>Hufford told the national media, he did not see the same object  
>that Ed Walter's allegedly photographed [which shows portholes  
>and windows]. Since he was caught and this was brought to his  
>attention by myself and other investigators, he later stated  
>that "there may have been windows, but I didn't see any." So  
>contrary to popular belief, Art Hufford did not EVER see the  
>same object that Ed Walters photographed.

No, this is not correct. Art Hufford might have seen the same  
object and he might not have seen the same object. There's no  
way to tell for sure since his sighting wasn't detailed enough.  
You criticize the others for jumping to conclusions on what they  
saw when you do the same thing. You are biased, in my opinion,  
to there being nothing to the entire Guf Breeze case. You have  
no idea what Art Hufford saw and either do I. Might have been  
the same, might not have been the same. No way to tell with the  
data provided. That's an unbiased opinion.

And where do you get off saying that Hufford was "caught". Do  
you have proof that he was purposely trying to deceive the media  
and others?

I have lots of questions about Gulf Breeze and Whitley Strieber  
but I am able to remain unbiased with my conclusions until  
conclusions are reached either way. This is something you do not  
seem to be able to do.

Joe Murgia  
Tampa, Florida

:  
:  
:

:

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 6](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Ron Decker <[decker@wt.net](mailto:decker@wt.net)>  
Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 08:53:27 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 10:56:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 99 11:49:54 PDT

>>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 13:50:47 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>>Date: Thu, 03 Jun 99 08:26:28 PDT

>>Arnold may well have been aware of the writings of the people  
>>you mention. But judging from his own writings, he based his  
>>belief that UFOs were some type of living organism on his own  
>>experiences. See the following, for example:

>>"This is the same sort of impression [of a living thing] I got  
>>after seeing these same things again in 1952. Two of them flew  
>>under me at Mount Lassen. I got a movie of these, and one was  
>>just as solid as a Chevrolet car. But you could see the pine  
>>trees right through the other one that was following it. I too  
>>got the feeling that here was something that was alive, rather  
>>than that they were machines."

>>From time to time (though fairly rarely), UFO witnesses have  
>>reported the sensation that what they were observing was a  
>>living object. On June 1, 1933, a mountain climber on Everest  
>>told of seeing winged objects which "seemed to pulsate in and  
>>out as though they were breathing." There is the famous  
>>Crawfordsville, Indiana, monster story from September 1891, not  
>>to mention the tradition of pvdre ser ("rot from the stars," aka  
>>"star jelly"). Plus the remarkable case from Biskopsberga,  
>>Sweden, in May 1808, a full account of which was published in a  
>>contemporary issue of Transactions of the Swedish Academy of  
>>Sciences. Again, I refer interested listfolk to my coverage of  
>>these and related matters in The UFO Encyclopedia, 2nd Ed., pp.  
>>872-77. If any of you know of other cases, I encourage you to  
>>post them here.

Mr. Clark,

If memory serves, I recall reading years ago an account of  
seemingly living UFOs in Brad Steiger's book, "The Gods of  
Aquarius" (I'm working from memory here so don't hold my feet  
to the fire on the author and title).

The UFO encounter went something like this: some pilots in a  
western state went flying one day and landed their airplanes  
atop a mesa for a rest and look-see. To their surprise a small  
UFO landed near them. It appeared to be in distress due to  
something having taken a bite out of its rim. The bite looked  
like one one might take from a sandwich. The group saw metal  
strips hanging from the 'wound.'

To their greater surprise several larger UFOs soon descended to

the mesa top, appeared to attend the 'wounded,' smaller UFO and escorted it away.

The impression of the witnesses was that the actions of the small UFO and its larger counterparts were identical to that of a young animal that had been attacked by a predator, escaped and ministered to by its pack.

I'm not sure if this is the sort of thing you requested list members post but here it is. This was the first time I'd read any report that even hinted at the possibility of UFOs being anything other than piloted machines. At the time the oddity of the concept made quite an impression on me.

Best regards,  
Ron Decker

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## UpDates Server Problem

From: **Moderator UFO UpDates - Toronto**  
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 12:43:18 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 12:43:18 -0400  
Subject: UpDates Server Problem

There appears to be a problem sending mail to List subscribers.

As of Sunday afternoon [June 6] the GlobalServe outgoing e-mail server and Eudora 4.1 stopped talking to one another for the second time.

I am still able to send mail to single addresses - hence this message to the Archive at ufomind.com

The Admin people at the ISP have been notified and are working the problem.

Unfortunately, I was unable to post notice to the List of Larry Fenwick's guesting on our program 'Strange Days... Indeed' on CFRB 1010 and the Web last night.

With some sleuthing the List should be functioning shortly.

Errol Bruce-Knapp

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: The Enigma Channel

From: John Hayes <[jhayes@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cableinet.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 11:47:41 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 22:22:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: The Enigma Channel

Another message from the Enigma Channel:

Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 08:47:34 +0100 (BST)  
To: John Hayes <[jhayes@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cableinet.co.uk)>  
From: [chris-e@dircon.co.uk](mailto:chris-e@dircon.co.uk) (Victor)  
Subject: Re: THE ENIGMA CHANNEL

Subject: Hello From the ENIGMA CHANNEL - SEASON ONE documentary deadline!

FROM: Christopher Everard, The Enigma Channel, London

Hello to all our Production Partners!

Our growing family of documentary film-makers now spans the entire planet - we are very pleased to have all of you on-board - thankyou all for responding so swiftly and joining our Production Partnership Programme (PPP) - nearly everyday we're receiving submission VHS cassettes.

You still have time to submit documentaries for the first season of programmes on The Enigma Channel - a FINAL CALL will be e-mailed in about one month's time - which isn't very far away, so if you definitely want to join the Programme then get your submission cassettes to me as soon as possible to the address below. If you want us to re-email the Independent Production Agreement (IPA) then let us know.

We have started to assemble a list of FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions) from all the corresspondence we have been getting from our Production Partners - these may help some of you decide if you wish to join after having read them:

THE ENIGMA CHANNEL: FAQs:

1. Does joining the PPP affect any of the existing distribution arrangements I have made with other companies?

NO - Not as far as the Enigma Channel is concerned anyway - allowing us to centrally distribute and sell your VHS cassettes is not an EXCLUSIVE arrangement - you can still sell them direct, or through your distributor.

2. Does it matter if the picture and audio quality is not very good on my master tape?

We can often improve the look and sound of all tapes you send to us. Try and make a GOOD COPY (don't send master tapes) - we'll let you know if we think it's broadcastable.

3. How will I know how many cassettes you have sold on my behalf if I take Option 3 on the PPP agreement?

You'll be able to monitor via e-mail all the orders coming through the Enigma video-store and book-store.

4. If I agree to join your PPP and have my documentary shown on

the Enigma Channel, does this mean I cannot show the documentary anywhere else?

Having your documentaries shown on the Enigma Channel is not an Exclusive Arrangement - you're still the copyright owner, the material is still your property and you can show it anywhere you wish - obviously, if there should be another internet tv station wishing to show the same documentary, then we'll probably put your show 'on rotation' - it's unwise to clog the web up with multiple downloadable copies of the same documentary.

5. Can we visit you in London?

Yes, anytime - we'll help make arrangements for your stay and you're welcome to use our video editing studio.

OK - that's it - if you want to submit a documentary for broadcast then do it THIS WEEK - print out your IPA form, sign it and send the tapes to us as soon as possible...

THE ENIGMA CHANNEL  
163 Churchbury Road  
London SE9 5JB  
ENGLAND

toodlepip...

Christopher Everard  
Chairman/CEO: The Enigma Channel  
direct line - 0181 850 2109  
[END]

Regards,

John Hayes

[jhayes@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cableinet.co.uk)  
[webmaster@ufoinfo.com](mailto:webmaster@ufoinfo.com)

UFOINFO:- <http://ufoinfo.com>  
UFO Roundup:- <http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>  
Filer's Files:- <http://ufoinfo.com/filer/>  
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences:-  
<http://ufoinfo.com/ufoicq/>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## BWW Media Alert 19990606

From: [BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com)  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 09:53:40 EDT  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 22:23:58 -0400  
Subject: BWW Media Alert 19990606

Bufo Calvin  
P O Box 5231, Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Internet: [BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com)

Website: <A

href="http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin"><http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>

</A>

<A

href="http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/redirect-home/bufosweirdworld">Link  
to Amazon.com

</A>

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED (permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this  
edition of Bufo's WEIRD WORLD provided that attribution is made to  
<http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>. It is good etiquette to check with  
strangers before you e-mail them something. If you forward this, please make  
sure it is clear that you are forwarding it).

June 6, 1999

This one may be a bit lighter than usual: busy week.

As usual, let me know what you think at <A href="mailto:  
[bufocalvin@aol.com](mailto:bufocalvin@aol.com)>BufoCalvin@aol.com  
</A>.

On to the listings: Times are generally Pacific.

### RADIO

Eddie Middleton's very popular show in the South, Nightsearch, has a website  
at

<A href="http://listen.to/nightsearch"><http://listen.to/nightsearch></A>.

Starting soon, the new website at

<A href="http://www.nightsearch.net/"><http://www.nightsearch.net/></A>.

Unfortunately, no streaming audio. Sundays from 2:00 to 4:00 PM (Pacific).

The call-in line is 901-365-1430.

Sunday, June 6, 2:00 PM (Pacific), Llew Wykel (Stonehenge, aliens, etc.)

Don Ecker, of UFO MAGAZINE, hosts STRANGE DAZE on the Liberty Works. It can  
be heard on streaming Real Audio at

<A

href="http://www.broadcast.com/radio/talk/lwrn"><http://www.broadcast.com/radio/talk/lwrn>

</A>.

Mike Jarmus, REALITY AND BEYOND, 7:00 PM Sundays,

<A href="http://spectrum.orn.com/omega.ram"><http://spectrum.orn.com/omega.ram>

</A>. Streaming audio available

### ART BELL - DREAMLAND

Currently, the most popular talk show on this area.

<A href="http://www.artbell.com/"><http://www.artbell.com/></A>. Live streaming  
audio (and video) available.

### JEFF RENSE - SIGHTINGS

Jeff is well-versed on the topics, but likes to let the guests speak,  
resulting in one of the best radio shows on these topics. You can hear Real  
Audio of the show, and there are archives as well. Go to

<A HREF="<http://www.sightings.com/>"><http://www.sightings.com/></A> for more information. The show is on at 7:00 PM Pacific Monday through Friday, and 8:00 PM Pacific on Sunday. You can hear it anywhere through your computer. Please note that Jeff also often covers topics which I do not consider relevant to this list. To subscribe to the Jeff Rense Weekly E-news (which includes articles and a complete guest listing), e-mail (subject: Subscribe) <A HREF="mailto:[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)">mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net</A>.

Sunday, June 6, 8:00 PM, Alan Vaughn (psychic predictions for the millenium);  
Tim Matthews on human-engineered UFOs (live from England)  
Wednesday, June 9, 7:00 PM, Michael Lindemann, Weekly UFO/World report;  
Doreen Virtue on talking to aliens  
Friday, June 11, 7:00 PM, Brad Steiger on ghost recordings

PAUL WILLIAMS & SCOTT CARR: UFO DESK

This New York show has been around for years, but is now available on streaming audio. The website is

<A HREF="<http://www.escape.com/~paulw/ufodesk.html>"><http://www.escape.com/~paulw/ufodesk.html></A>. It runs at 8:00 PM (Pacific) on Sundays.

JEFF MISHLOVE AND THE VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY

Webcast every weekday at 8:00 PM for two hours, with a repeat at 10:00 PM.

Webcast at

<A HREF="<http://www.wisdomradio.com/>"><http://www.wisdomradio.com/></A>.

#### TELEVISION

##### A&E (USA)

Sunday, June 6, 11:00 AM, THE UNEXPLAINED: THE TWIN CONNECTION

Next Wednesday, June 16, 4:00 AM, EXTRATERRESTRIALS (UFOs)

Next Friday, June 18, 4:00 AM, ALIEN ABDUCTIONS

##### THE DISCOVERY CHANNEL (Europe)

Tuesday, June 8, 1:35 PM (GMT+1), ANIMAL X (sea monsters; animals predicting earthquakes; mystery UK carnivores)

##### THE DISCOVERY CHANNEL (USA)

Friday, June 11, 8:00 PM, UFOS IN AUSTRALIA

Friday, June 11, 11:00 PM, UFOS IN AUSTRALIA

Next Monday, June 14, 9:00 PM, ROSWELL

Next Friday, June 15, 12:00 AM, ROSWELL

##### THE HISTORY CHANNEL (USA)

Monday, June 7, 6:00 PM, HAUNTED HISTORY: NEW ORLEANS

Monday, June 7, 10:00 PM, HAUNTED HISTORY: NEW ORLEANS

Tuesday, June 8, 11:00 AM, 20TH CENTURY WITH MIKE WALLACE: ARE WE ALONE? (UFOs)

Tuesday, June 8, 4:00 PM, 20TH CENTURY WITH MIKE WALLACE: ARE WE ALONE? (UFOs)

Tuesday, June 8, 6:00 PM, HAUNTED HISTORY: NEW ENGLAND

Tuesday, June 8, 10:00 PM, HAUNTED HISTORY: NEW ENGLAND

Next Sunday, June 13, 10:00 AM, HAUNTED HISTORY: NEW ORLEANS

Next Sunday, June 13, 11:00 AM, HAUNTED HISTORY: NEW ENGLAND

##### LOCAL CABLE (USA)

BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED (I'm short on time this week, so I'm going to list it the way it was sent to me...trimmed down for dates only):

SUNDAY CH 56 1:30 AM MANHATTAN NEIGHBORHOOD NETWORK NY

JUNE 6.1999 LOUIS Handwriting and Tea Leaf Analysis

JUNE13,1999 JENNY SMEDLEY AUTHOR #1 BESTSELLER IN THE UK "RIPPLES

Jenny speaks about her past life with Garth Brooks then known as Ryan Fitzgerald

JUNE20,1999 BETTY,BOB,BECKY ANDREASSON LUCA A four part series on how there family survived multiple abduction experiences. They are the family that many books have been written on there experience such as The Andreasson Legacy, also The Andreasson Affair. 'AWESOME SHOWS' DON'T MISS"

JUNE 27.1999 \*PART 2 OF THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY

SUNDAY CH35/80/96 930PM CABLEVISION OF WOODBURY NY

JUNE 6.1999 JENNY SMEDLEY AUTHOR REINCARNATION

JUNE13,1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PART 1 ABDUCTIONS

MONDAY CH27 10AM CABLEVISION OF RIVERHEAD NY

JUNE 7.1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PART 1 ABDUCTIONS

JUNE 14.1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PART 2 ABDUCTIONS



Tuesday, June 8, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #3024 (Israeli UFOs; near-death experiences; Bigfoot; "UFO defense manual")  
Wednesday, June 9, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #3025 (Hangar 18, UFOs and the Air Force; psychic detective; reincarnation; alien abductions; life on Mars)  
Thursday, June 10, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #3026 (UFO technology; trauma-induced ESP; Bahamian Obeah rituals; Mexican UFOs; intuitive healing)  
Friday, June 11, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4027 (UFO tape; psychic detective; alien autopsy: Bigfoot)

SPACE (Canada)

Monday, June 7, 5:00 AM (time zone unknown), MYSTERIES, MAGIC & MIRACLES (Roswell)  
Next from Sunday, June 13, 7:30 AM, MYSTERIOUS FORCES BEYOND (psychic healing)  
Next from Sunday, June 13, 12:30 PM (time zone unknown), ANIMAL X-FILES (Jersey Devil; Howick Falls monster in South Africa)  
Next Sunday, June 13, 5:30 PM, IN ADVANCE OF THE LANDING (a well-respected examination of UFO beliefs ((pre Heaven's Gate...from 1991)

SYNDICATED (USA)

Tuesday, June 8, MAURY (psychic and author James Van Praagh)  
Tuesday, June 8, MONTEL WILLIAMS (psychic and author Sylvia Browne)

SYNDICATED (USA)

---

This is Bufo saying, "If =everything= seemed normal, that =would= be weird!"

---

You can stop receiving this from me just by asking (note: it is commonly redistributed, and I can't control you getting it from those sources) by e-mail at [BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com). You can also subscribe or unsubscribe to Bufo's WEIRD WORLD Media Alert the same way. Also, please let me know if there is something in the media you think I should cover. Deadline is Tuesday, the week before.

---

Back to <A HREF="<http://members.aol.com/BufoCalvin/index.html>">BufoCalvin's Home Page

</A>

Back to <A HREF="<http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin/ma.html>">Bufo's WEIRD WORLD Media Alert

</A>

Back to <A HREF="<http://members.aol.com/weirdware/books.html>">Bufo's WEIRD WORLD Books

</A>

E-mail to <A HREF="mailto:[bufocalvin@aol.com](mailto:bufocalvin@aol.com)">BufoCalvin@aol.com</A>

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [bufocalvin](#) | [jocelyn](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## List Subscribers

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 23:09:44 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 23:09:44 -0400  
Subject: List Subscribers

The problem with getting mail out to the List has not yet been resolved.

To those of you have found your way to the archive, I apologise. The UpDates ISP people are working on the problem.

Rather than not distribute messages, I'm going to send them here, to the archive, until such time as GlobalServe resolves the problem. Once that happens I'll send the back-logged traffic to the subscriber list.

ebk

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Protocol Bookburning Conspiracy

From: Stan Friedman <[fsphys@brunnet.net](mailto:fsphys@brunnet.net)>  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 17:23:44 -0300  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 23:16:15 -0400  
Subject: Re: Protocol Bookburning Conspiracy

>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Protocol Bookburning Conspiracy  
>Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 20:08:29 -0500

>Stanton,

>If I'm blowing in the wind, so are you. Note that my original  
>post referred to a worldwide cover up. Orchestrated by who and  
>how? You haven't got a clue because there ain't no such animal,  
>no matter how the US classifies or compartmentalizes its own  
>information. You missed the point completely, which doesn't  
>wholly surprise me.

>>It is interesting that there was nothing published about the  
>>enigma code-breaking work so vital to winning WW 2 for 30 years,  
>>though 12,000 people were involved!. There was nothing published  
>>about the Corona reconaissance satellites launched from 1960 on,  
>>until more than 30 years later even though there were almost a  
>>dozen failures to begin with and even though thousands of people  
>>were involved. The NRO was established by a TOP SECRET Executive  
>>Order in 1962. There was nothing in public for well over a  
>>decade..Annual Budget estimated at \$8Billion. The DCI admitted  
>>to a black budget of 26.6 Billon dollars a couple of years back.  
>>Do you really think nothing can be kept secret?.

>You just mentioned several highly classified things that  
>weren't\_ keep secret (or were subsequently revealed in an  
>unambiguous fashion) and then asked me if anything could be kept  
>secret. There's your answer right there. In effect, no. Kept  
>secret for awhile, yes, no one disputes that; kept secret  
>forever, no way.

>You forget that the Manhattan Project was infiltrated early on.  
>You forget that the Chinese just walked away with virtually  
>every nuclear secret in our arsenal. You forget that there were  
>only 15 copies of the Pentagon Papers -- and one of them wound  
>up being published in the NY Times. You forget that Corona,  
>MK-ULTRA, and the NRO have now all been made public.

>So what secret(s) is being kept to this very day? UFOs, of  
>course, because that conveniently suits your career on the  
>lecture circuit. And what has been leaked? There is not one  
>convincing, unambiguous document that would lead anyone to  
>believe that anything remotely resembling MJ-12 exists in any  
>form or fashion in this day and age\_.

>>Common sense tells us that based on the history of successful  
>>secrecy over the past 60 years, and the arrogance of press  
>>people who think that if something were happening, they would  
>>know about it, that of course secrets can be kept.. Where have  
>>you been? How much time did you spend working on highly  
>>classified programs.? I hate to use the old refrain, but  
>>absence of evidence doesn't mean evidence for absence.

>>Stan Friedman (Gone until June 2)

>What "successful secrecy"? I hate to use an equally old

>refrain, but all of the previous highly classified, supersecret  
>programs you mentioned are now widely known, if only in  
>generalities as opposed to specifics. Where's our UFO  
>whistleblower? Tim Cooper? To laugh. Richard Doty? To laugh.

>As for "absence of evidence doesn't mean evidence for absence,"  
>you've dined out on that canard long enough, up to and including  
>the free spaghetti you're eating in San Marino, Italy, this  
>week. (Hope you showed them those tired NSA slides of yours.)

>It's your theme song, something you sing everytime someone asks  
>you where your evidence is. When cornered with bad, dubious or  
>duplicitous evidence you trot it out like a mantra, like a pit  
>bull promoting Taco Bell.

>Where was Kent Lorenzo's negative Roswell testimony in any of  
>your books or writings? Yet you apparently talked to him as  
>early as 1992, but didn't like what he had to say (NOT!) about  
>alien bodies at Roswell, did you? Where's any mention in your  
>books and writings about the negative findings Tom Deuley and I  
>turned up about the alleged El Indio-Guerrero crash mentioned in  
>the patently spurious MJ-12 briefing? Missing in action, aren't  
>they, although I'm sure Deuley's kept you well informed about  
>our three visits to  
>the area?

>So who's keeping secrets here? Seems you're keeping some of  
>your own, Stan, especially those that go against your argument.

>Dennis

Been gone indeed to San Marino, but did not show blacked out documents. My talk was about interstellar travel, I did show real nuclear propulsions systems that most people have never seen.

I have to laugh at the notion that, because a number of secrets kept for a very long time have finally been released, means that there are none being withheld. Wishful thinking indeed. I certainly wasn't implying that no spies have been successful . Of course they have. It is rather interesting that there really haven't been any later Daniel Ellsbergs... despite all the people who have had clearances and all thebillions of pages.. You and Tom Deuley can be happy in saying there was no crash near the Texas- Mexico border. I find it interesting that in his MUFON J article Tom makes no references to the many papers that have been published by me nor to TOP SECRET/MAJIC nor to the the FBI investigation of the EBD and their buying Colonel Weaver's proclamation that the documents are BOGUS.. hand written at that. Seems a shame that my FOIA request for all documents leading to that conclusion received a "we have nothing in response to your request". My appeal received the same response.Nothing like research by proclamation. I guess you are in good company Dennis

I also find it interesting that in visits to 18 Archives I have yet to see any TS Code word documents. The Kennedy Library has 10 drawers full of such material being reviewed by the CIA because of Exec. Order 12958. Maybe that is why the fate of the Kennedy casket has finally been revealed...real important for national security!!

Many countries such as England do not even have an FOIA,but do have Official Secrets Acts.

The reasoning seems to be that since clearly Mark McGuire did not hit a home run more than 70% of the time, he never hit one.

Since some secrets have been released all have been NOT

The pasta was excellent in San Marino..

Stan Friedman

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Nasa Programming Computer To Seek Alien Life

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 00:03:57  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 23:23:17 -0400  
Subject: Nasa Programming Computer To Seek Alien Life

Source: The Sunday Times.

Stig

\*\*\*

Sunday June 6 1999

INNOVATION

Biology

Computer to seek alien life

\*\*

SPACE scientists are programming a hugely powerful computer to recognise signs of life on other planets, writes Sean Hargrave.

By the end of next year, Nasa specialists claim the computer will be able to recognise every variant of microbial life on Earth. This database could then be added to any of the 10 missions destined for Mars in the next decade.

If the plan got approval, it would require a rover vehicle to split rocks. Microscopes would then scour the newly exposed surface and stop if the computer revealed they had discovered an object that resembled life.

David Noever, a research scientist working on the project as Nasa's Marshall space centre in Alabama, claims the technology will help to focus the search for life on other planets.

"It's a little like having a filter on your e-mail," he says. "If you get it right, you can just get the couple of messages you are interested in rather than dozen of junk-mail messages offering get-rich schemes." Teaching a computer what it should consider life is a time-consuming project. The team has been working on the system for a year and now claims it is 90% reliable at recognising thousands of types of terrestrial life.

Noever says: "We basically program in thousands of pictures of what microbial life looks like and then randomly show the computer images of what is not life, like a book or car. It can then recognise the patterns and recognise whether an object is organic or not."

The earliest the database could be flown on a mission is thought to be 2005. By then the Nasa team will have programmed the computer to be able to predict what life may have evolved into on different planets.

"We are going to program in varying atmospheres and gravity conditions and see what the computer predicts microbial life could look like on other planets," says Noever.

"That way we'll have a better chance of not missing something just because it wasn't like what we have on Earth."

Copyright 1998 Times Newspapers Ltd. This service is provided on Times Newspapers' standard terms and conditions. To inquire about a licence to reproduce material from The Times, visit the Syndication website.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## He's Keeping Eye On Close Encounters

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 00:22:51  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 23:24:55 -0400  
Subject: He's Keeping Eye On Close Encounters

Source: Spokesman Review/Spokane.net June 6,

<http://www.spokane.net:80/news-story-body.asp?Date=060699&ID=s589805&cat=>

Stig

\*\*\*

He's keeping eye on close encounters

Grayden Jones - The Spokesman-Review

\*\*

He's seen the radiation burns and hair fall out. He's documented the paralysis and fried corneas.

In more than 400 cases, John Schuessler has recorded evidence of physical injury by people who claimed they have had close encounters with unidentified flying objects.

"It can happen to anyone at any time," said Schuessler, deputy director of the San Antonio, Texas-based Mutual UFO Network Inc. (MUFON). "Most people are apathetic about UFOs, but when it happens to them, it changes their life."

Schuessler, who lives in Littleton, Colo., is in Spokane this weekend to hold private meetings with members of MUFON, an organization that tracks and researches UFO incidents. The local chapter has 18 members.

The retired Boeing engineer is considered the nation's expert in the dramatic case of Betty Cash and Vickie and Colby Landrum, two Texas women and a grandson who in 1980 claimed they were nearly killed by radiation from an object that hovered over their Oldsmobile Cutlass.

Schuessler rejects any suggestion that bug-eyed, bulb-headed aliens are communing with humans. He's convinced that the long list of physical injuries are proof that something other than hallucinations are behind many UFO sightings reported each year.

Nine out of 10 UFO reports are bogus and can be explained by science, Schuessler said.

Schuessler said he spent 16 years researching his book, "The Cash-Landrum UFO Incident." He concluded that a diamond-shaped object with power and mobility not known on Earth scorched the Texas women. Federal officials have attempted to cover up the incident, Schuessler said, denying any knowledge of military helicopters that witnesses said were tracking the object.

Jerry Rolwes, director of MUFON in Spokane, said that since 1994 there have been 10 documented cases of UFOs across the Inland Northwest. One of the most spectacular occurred in early 1996 when a Sagle, Idaho, woman, her teenage daughter and two Sandpoint police officers witnessed an unexplained, bright object over a lake.

"I've never witnessed a UFO," Schuessler said, "but it intrigues the heck out of me."

\*

What are your thoughts on "He's keeping eye on close encounters"?

If you have a comment or reply to this story that you'd like to share, fill in the form and click submit. Note: Replies are limited to 250 words and must be signed with a valid email address. No profanity or libelous statements will be printed.

(Go to the page for the form - Stig)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Joachim Koch <[AchimKoch@compuserve.com](mailto:AchimKoch@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 18:22:22 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 23:35:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake  
>Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 14:28:46 +0100

>Hi,

>I have been following this debate with interest, as I trust has  
>Paul Fuller. Paul and I have written three books on circles and  
>been involved since before Colin Andrews and Pat Delgado even.

Hi Jenny, what a pleasure to have you here!

I followed this debate, too, and in another thread ("American Billionaire...") I tried to explain that the the crop circle phenomenon is not mainly a physical/scientific phenomenon and still resists all tests with the available equipments which were applied throughout all those years.

I would like to remind of all the teams who have been investigating the crops on various occasions in the past. No one produced evidence for a circle to be "genuine" though there have been some. The crux is: we don't understand the "technology" of the real circlemakers. Our apparatuses are build to find what they are designed for - nothing else.

Here I would like to remind of the efforts of Dr. Meaden and his (rich) Japanese colleagues, who have been very enthusiastic about the "plasma vortex theory". Especially the Japanese tried several times to take the Phenomenon by surprise with heavy-weight equipments of hundreds of thousands Dollars worth. They were sitting for weeks on top of the hills nearby of Tim Carson's Farm - and had no results.

At the same time not far away two German students - the Duerckheims - were blessed with the famous sighting of a white light/body gliding through a field nearby where a formation already existed. They took it with their video camera.

And that little example should make you all here in this list very thoughtful, too: the Intelligence behind the crop circle phenomenon is no mouse to be tested in our laboratories! It has his/her/its own agenda and it does what he/she/it/they want(s) to do - without any respect to our understanding what is going on.

And I would like to remind of a nother team, who tried to solve the problem once ans for all: the "ARGUS" team under the leadership of Michael Choroust. This young scientist came to Wiltshire with a team of sophisticated colleagues and equipment. all funded with thousands of Dollars "by a rich American individual".

We all know what happened to their research and results. We all remember how enthusiastic we've been when first results about "13 unusual radionuclids" were published and how disappointed we were when we had to learn that it was a "fata morgana".



And so on and so on.

Busty Tailor, from his rich archive of videos and slides, showed Hans and me slides of stalks which were burnt from the inside while looking quite normal from the outer shells - typical sign of microwave-like activity. But this evidence is something we do not find regularly in the fields.

And the oil-seed rape formations. Usually you cannot bend this plant - except it is young. This is something the hoaxers know. An excellent article had been published by Anthony Horn in the CCCS's Journal "The Circular" (Vol. 5:1, Issue 17, Summer 1994). Read page 20 f. and you'll understand. There is no magic in formations in fields of young oil-seed rape. It's a trick.

And I also would like to remind you of the guide to hoax crop circle formations issued by B.O.R.I. (Boring Old Robert Irving). This man has fooled thousands of people throughout the years with his sometimes excellent self-made arrangements in the fields. This man has caused much damage to the farmers, the plants and the reputation of the phenomenon in general. And don't forget: he once was a buddy of Mr. Jim Schnabel, a former (?) CIA-employee. These two created many formations which up to today many croppies wouldn't admit to be hoaxes. Many books are full of aerial shots of their "artworks".

Those here in this list who state that some features of genuine circles cannot be reproduced by hoaxers haven't been in England - or are simply naive - or don't want to accept the truth.

After a preparation phase of two years, Hans-Juergen Kyborg and I started our research on the spot in Wiltshire - the only place where ever a genuine crop circle phenomenon manifested - in 1991. We had found out that these signs in the fields were "glyphs", a real script and we decoded the characters with the help of a kind of "Rosetta-Formation" we identified in 1990.

We started to communicate with the Intelligence behind the whole Phenomenon on July 13, and received an answer on July 17, 1991. At first glance, it seemed to be too easy but exactly that's the way it was meant to be: easy, free, available for all, without any restriction of education or origin.

For three years, we kept our experiences with us, then we thought that the time had come to tell what happened. We dared to write two articles to the honourable magazines "The Cerealogist" and "The Circular" in Britain - and they published it completely.

We recommend to read: "The Circular", Vol. 4:4, Issue 16, March 1994, and: "The Cerealogist", No. 12, Summer 1994.

The crop circles up to 1992 are messages from the stars and about the stars, to remind us who we are, where we are, where we do come from and where we shall go.

Especially one region in the skies is pinpointed by our "answer formation" of Preshute Downs and Barbury Castle: It is the centre of the the Winter Hexagon (Winter Circle), where a star is emphasized: HD 42807. It is a sunlike star and its second planet may harbour life.

We also solved an enigma in the astronomical ceiling of the tomb of Senenmut in Deir-al Bahari. It is the same star that is pinpointed in this ceiling.

In the oldest known texts of the Egyptian culture, the famous "Pyramid Texts", this star, which travels in space where the centre of the Duat of the Egyptians is located, is designed to be "the star where the Gods are born."

The Intelligence who manifested in England with the help of the early crop circles, has challenged us to look, to think, to count one on and one together, to find out who we are, where we are, where we do come from and where we shall go.

How tiny and ugly do these creatures look like who have slanted eyes and do violate and mutilate people against the positive power of these early agriglyphs near old positive power points in Wiltshire, England.

If there is a hidden agenda, if there have been deals with extraterrestrials and military-industrial complexes in the U.S.A. and elsewhere, we have a chance to overcome this. The early crop circles shall resist any explanation of their mechanism of creation because that's not what was meant. It was the meaning. The fact that something like that materialized near ancient places was important, should make us aware of these old stones, of their existence and their function.

We have learned how to "use" the old places. This knowledge is not new. It was abused by every power in the past because they knew: once you have the place you have the land.

One recent example for this is the erection of an observatory of the Vatican on top of an old American Native hill.

Those who see the circles within the fields and the fields within the landscapes and the landscapes as a part of the planet and the planet as one piece of a giant solar system within the beautiful Milky Way and themselves as a part of all this - those will come foreward.

This time - it is was necessary to know how those circles were formed. It was necessary to realize that it happened. Just that.

Hans-Juergen Kyborg & Joachim Koch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Students On A Mission To Find Life In Space

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 00:43:16  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 23:38:02 -0400  
Subject: Students On A Mission To Find Life In Space

Source: Australian News Network,

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au:80/hed/4309477.htm>

Stig

\*\*\*

Students on a mission to find life in space

By VANESSA WALKER

2jun99

THE search for extra-terrestrial life will get some new recruits next year when the University of Western Sydney introduces a degree in space science.

Undergraduates will study astronomy, astrophysics, rocketry, satellite technology and telecommunications.

The degree grew out of the success of the Search for Extra Terrestrial Intelligence (SETI) centre at the university.

Stuart Hazell, dean of informatics, science and technology, said the expansion of the SETI program, in which Australia listens in to artificial space sounds on a range of frequencies, gave the university a subtle nudge.

"We saw the chance to create a niche area in space science after we were granted more radio channels," he said.

Earlier this year the university increased the number of channels from 8 million to 58 million.

Australia's location in the southern hemisphere and the development of a optical observatory in the central western NSW town of Parkes give the university the best chance to discover extraterrestrial life.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

## A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

### Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 22:01:40 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 00:13:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

In the 'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian, of 26 June, 1947, it's reported of Kenneth Arnold that, "He said he could estimate the distance of the objects better because an intervening peak once blocked his view of them. He found the peak was 25 miles away, he related".

Perhaps we can still clarify further whether it could have "blocked his view", or, if it's more likely that he simply lost sight of the objects against this intermediate 'peak'.

It's important if his perception that the objects 'vanished' behind a distant peak, was a main reason Arnold believed they were some 25 miles distant.

In 'Resolving Arnold - Part 2: Guess Again', Martin Kottmeyer wrote:

"The absence of a large population of corroborative witnesses near Mount Rainier seems sufficient grounds for wondering if the event was much more localized than Arnold surmised. A critical look at the distance estimate is both warranted and necessary. One must almost certainly accept the objects passed in front of Mount Rainier's snow field as Arnold claimed. The angular velocity of the objects indicated by Arnold's clocking of the objects between Mount Rainier and Mount Adams is .8 degrees per second. At that speed it would take nine seconds to cross the face of Mount Rainier at the 9,200 foot level indicated by Arnold's report. This is too long for a spurious observation related the fleetingness of the phenomenon. This would rule out explanations based on distant sky phenomena like a train of meteors, Campbellian mirages, or density-shifting space animals.

What of distances closer than Mount Rainier's vicinity? It has been pointed out that Arnold spoke of the objects having "swerved in and out of the high mountain peaks." This would seem to put a lower limit to the distance if one could first determine which peaks they swung around and if they were broad enough to have a transit time to regard the observation as secure. Arnold was slightly more specific in later recountings of the event. In The Coming of the Saucers he said they momentarily disappeared "behind a jagged peak that juts out from Mount Rainier proper."

In his memoir for the First International UFO Congress he says, "When they turned length-wise or flat-wise to me they were very thin and they actually disappeared from sight behind a projection on Mount Rainier in the snowfield." These are not exactly the same thing, but they give a fair indication of what to look for on the geological survey maps.

Arnold estimated the crafts were at an altitude of 9,200 feet plus or minus 1,000. The task at hand is thus to locate some feature extending above the 8,200 foot level. This yields a neat little surprise. There are no such peaks between Mount Rainier and Mount Adams. The closest thing I could find was Pyramid Peak which stands only 6,937 feet tall in front of Mount Rainier's base".

This seems to concur with Bruce Maccabee's assessment:

"These statements about how they flew with respect to the mountain peaks are very important because they provide information on the distance from Mr. Arnold. These mountain peaks lie along a wide north-south line extending southward from Mt. Rainier to Mt. Adams. These peaks were about 20 miles east of Arnold at the time. These statements also provide the altitude of the objects. To Arnold they appeared to be approximately at his altitude because they seemed to be "pretty much on the horizon to me." Since he was flying at 9,200 ft, this implies that they were close to that altitude. (Arnold actually stated his letter that they were at 9,500 ft.) However, the mountain peaks south of Rainier generally are 5,000 to 7,000 ft high, with the higher ones being farther away (more to the east) from Arnold. Hence his statement that there were higher peaks on the far side of the pathway indicates that the objects were definitely lower than about 7,000 ft. Furthermore, he stated that they went behind some (or at least one) of the lower, closer peaks. Geological survey maps show that mountain peaks which the objects could have disappeared behind have altitudes of 5,000 to 6,000 ft. Hence it appears that they were lower than 6,000 ft and that Arnold overestimated their altitude".

In the early, detailed radio interview, Arnold states, "I could see them against the snow, of course, on Mt. Rainier and against the snow on Mt. Adams as they were flashing, and against a high ridge that happens to lay in between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams".

If the objects were seen against the snow of Mt. Rainier, Mt. Adams and a high ridge that was between the mountains, what 'peaks' could they have gone behind?

In a related point, the 'Chicago Daily Tribune', of 25 June, quoted Arnold as saying, "I counted nine of them as they disappeared behind the peak of Mount Rainier".

Could the objects have gone behind the mountain, when they were also supposed to be travelling across its slopes, e.g., "low over the slopes of Mt. Rainier" and "not more than 500 feet over the plateau", according to statements attributed to Arnold in the 'Oregon Journal' of 27 June?

Aside from this earliest 'Chicago Daily Tribune' report, did Arnold ever claim the objects "disappeared behind the peak of Mount Rainier"?

Also in that radio interview, Arnold states, "due to the fact that I had Mt. Saint Helens and Mt. Adams to clock them by, I just thought I'd see just how fast they were going".

Did Arnold ever mention again that he used Mt. Saint Helens as a reference point, or was this probably an error and he meant Mt. Rainier?

In his letter to the Air Force, he claimed, "I watched these objects with great interest as I had never before observed airplanes flying so close to the mountain tops, flying directly south to southeast down the hog's back of a mountain range. I would estimate their elevation could have varied a thousand feet one way or the other up or down, but they were pretty much on the horizon to me which would indicate that they were near the same elevation as me. They flew like many times I have observed geese to fly in a rather diagonal chain-like line as if they were linked together. They seemed to hold a definite direction but rather swerved in and out of the high mountain peaks. I could quite accurately determine their pathway due to the fact that there were several high peaks a little this side of them as well as higher peaks on the other side of their pathway".

This is a much clearer explanation.

There were mountain peaks between Arnold and the nine objects and further, higher, peaks beyond. The objects flew in-between this range of high peaks and ridges.

However, it seems these features weren't nearly so high as

Arnold thought and the objects were flying much lower than he perceived, something that Arnold never checked.

In which case, is it agreed Arnold had no idea, not then, not ever, that he was observing from what seems to have been some 4,000, maybe 5,000 feet above the objects?

If it's argued that this \*couldn't\* have directly affected his subsequent judgement of distances between himself and the objects, plus where they were flying in relation to the peaks, what is the basis of that argument?

The Pendleton newspaper article also states, "The Boise flyer said they flew on the west sides of Rainier and Adams, adding that he believed this would make it more difficult for them to be seen from the ground".

Is this 'west side story' of any relevance in understanding the overall perspective?

James.  
E-mail: [voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 22:11:34 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 00:19:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500  
>Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 06:55:58 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>The Eastonian Times-Picayune is back, starting off with the  
>>usual bird-brained theories about the original Kenneth Arnold  
>>sighting. Bruce Maccabee, myself, and others argued ourselves  
>>blue in the face with all sorts of mathematical and other  
>>arguments why birds couldn't possibly work (can birds outfly a  
>>plane?). A lot of good it did. Don't get me started.

>Why don't we get you started? Did it ever occur to you (and  
>Maccabee) that your mathematical arguments and analysis of the  
>Arnold case are only right if you assume Arnold was absolutely  
>incapable of human error?

Did it ever occur to you (and Easton) that your handwaving  
arguments and "analysis" of the Arnold case are only right if  
you assume Arnold was an absolute drooling idiot?

Not that you apparently care or even comprehend, but the issues  
of potential human error have been addressed. E.g., even if  
Arnold erred seriously in his determination of distance,  
thereby also throwing his timed calculation of speed badly out  
of whack, birds still cannot outfly Arnold's plane. The only  
way Arnold could have screwed this up is if he was completely  
unable to tell the difference between objects that flew forward  
of his position vs. falling behind.

Would you care to address just this one point Mr. skeptical  
genius? Please explain to us with that devastating common sense  
you think you possess how birds could outfly Arnold's plane.  
Easton never dared tackle this, and I seriously doubt you will  
either. Instead it will be off to the races with a million more  
Dennis Stacy angry rants and irrelevancies.

> But what if he was wrong?

Wrong about what? Tell us specifically what Arnold could be  
wrong about in his first sighting that would clearly enable  
birds to explain it. Please, not your usual run-off-your-mouth  
garbage, actual specifics reported by Arnold.

> What if, for  
> example, he saw another flight of some 20-25 objects not too  
> long after his original sighting which certainly sound like  
> birds to most of us?

Everything sounds like birds to you guys. Even if his second  
sighting was of birds, it was a completely different situation.  
The second sighting lasted only a few second in completely

different flying and lighting conditions and no geographical landmarks that I know of. The observations were hurried and lacking in detail.

In contrast, Arnold's first sighting lasted several minutes during which he made a number of careful observations to try to determine what he was seeing, such as the timing of flight between two geographical landmarks while on a parallel course.

He also reported the angular spread of the objects, again using landmarks, as the objects flew past Mt. Rainier. Even if his estimated absolute distance to the objects was very grossly in error, the distance between the objects still would have been much too great for them to be flocking birds. E.g., if instead of being 25 miles away, the objects were only 2000 feet from Arnold (so close that it would be impossible NOT to recognize them as large flocking birds like geese), they still would be approximately 50 feet from one another, not the few feet distance required for flocking. This is just one of those simple mathematical arguments, which you ignorantly sneer at, but which is devastating to the bird hypothesis.

> What if he went on to report seven UFO sightings total? What if he eventually concluded that UFOs are >space animals -- "living organisms...in the atmosphere"?

What if he did? Do you have a point here? How exactly does that change the original reported details of his first sighting? How does that validate some silly birds explanation of that sighting?

How do birds outfly a plane Dennis?

>See Clark's "The UFO Book," p. 62.

>Would this lead you to conclude that you had something >approaching a fruitcake on your hands, or would you prefer to >conclude that a living organism crashed at Roswell?

Judging by your typical irrelevant ranting and use of non sequiturs, I would agree that we probably have something approaching a fruitcake on our hands.

>You treat the Roswell case and its witnesses in the same >fashion. When they support your argument, such witnesses as >Proctor et al are absolutely accurate and inviolable in their >recall, never mind interviewed 30 and 40 years after the fact.

You treat the Roswell case and its witnesses in the same fashion. When they support your argument, such witnesses as Moore et al are absolutely accurate and inviolable in their recall, never mind interviewed 30 and 40 years after the fact.

Duhhh, talk about brainless, boilerplate debunking!

Did it ever occur to you in one of your more rational moments, that early witnesses like Floyd Proctor and Bill Brazel were interviewed at virtually the same time and completely independently of Jesse Marcel? Yet they corroborated many of the controversial details also related by Marcel about highly unusual debris properties, or the size and shape of the debris field, or of Brazel Sr. reporting an explosion? So if they misremembered, then you have to explain how they would misremember unusual details in such a similar way. That's a pretty neat trick.

>When they don't -- as in the case of Kent Lorenzo, first interviewed by Friedman in >1992, but never conveniently mentioned since --

Again off on a pointless tangeant.

If you got a problem with Friedman and his reporting, take it up with him. Frankly a lot of us on this list are sick and tired of your endless laundry list of petty grudges.

As for what I wrote about Lorenzo, all I said was that a junior medical officer couldn't be everywhere at all times on Roswell base or off the base. So if he was unaware of anything unusual happening while he was on-duty at the hospital or off-duty at the officer's club, that's interesting information but hardly



conclusive, since we have others at the base who have said they were aware of something unusual happening or were personally involved.

But only "pro-Roswell" people ignore or attack witnesses they find inconvenient, right Dennis?

>they must be, what, part of the ongoing cover up?

Like usual, you're just all over the place, aren't you Dennis? From my post on Mogul paper parachutes, you've raved about Kenneth Arnold being a nutcase and incapable of properly perceiving even the simplest possible things, how UFO and "pro-Roswell" witnesses are never accurate or honest, how you've got a gripe with Friedman about reporting one witnesses' testimony. And now we have your idiotic broad-brushed accusation that "pro-Roswell" people accuse every witness they don't like as being part of a cover-up.

>Don't get me started.

Unfortunately, nobody knows how to stop you.

>You, Maccabee and others can mathematically analyze Arnold's original statements all you want, or until Hell freezes over, whichever comes first. And it doesn't mean a goddam thing unless you think he was absolutely dead on and incapable of any error in perception whatever.

So while flying on a parallel course at 110 mph, Arnold "misperceives" "birds" falling behind him for "birds" rapidly flying past him. That is the ONLY possible and virtually inconceivable misperception that would even remotely allow a bird explanation.

I'm sorry if you find such simple logical arguments like this so incomprehensible. But Maccabee and others did graduate grade school.

>Now explain how Miracle Man, i.e., Arnold, came to believe that UFOs were living organisms.

Typical Stacy talking out of both sides of his mouth. First he attacks Arnold as a "fruitcake." Then we get his grossly hypocritical lectures about how pro-UFO people are so biased in which witnesses they choose to believe and attack those they don't like.

But to label Arnold a liar and a "fruitcake," that's completely different, eh Dennis?

>Troubling, isn't it?

Only to ranting fruitcakes.

>Unless you're the editor of the Rudiak Real Times-Picayune.

There, feel better now Dennis now that you've vented with one of your usual pointless diatribes?

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 7](#)

## Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

From: **Martin Phillips** <[mphillips@btinternet.com](mailto:mphillips@btinternet.com)>  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 15:26:49 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 12:44:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 10:00:42 +0100  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>Subject: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>The debate on the Hudson Valley UFOs caused me to look at Omar  
>Fowler's booklet The Flying Triangle Mystery. He lists some 50  
>cases of FTs seen over the UK and Europe in recent years. In  
>fact FTs seem to be very much in the news just now, with the  
>recent Granada TV series focusing on them. One point struck me;  
>every case without exception occurred at night.  
>There seems to be nothing whatever on an FT seen in daylight.  
>Certainly I have never read of a well-attested daytime sighting  
>of a flying triangle, nor have I ever seen a film of such.  
>Christopher Allan, Stoke-on-Trent

Surely the first British case, where a fully-trained aircraft  
observer saw a triangle flying over the North Sea, counts as a  
daytime observation. The witness was a member of the Royal  
Observer Corps, and trained to recognise any aircraft in an  
instant. He saw a triangle being refuelled by a KC-135, with two  
F111s alongside. I don't think you could ask for a better  
witness.

Martin Phillips

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## UFO History Workshop

From: Jan Aldrich <[jan@CYBERZONE.NET](mailto:jan@CYBERZONE.NET)>  
Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 18:37:45 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 01:57:19 -0400  
Subject: UFO History Workshop

Greeting List,

On the 29th and 30th of June a number of us met at the International Holiday Inn at Chicago's O'Hare Airport to participate in a UFO History Workshop. A more detailed announcement will follow shortly; the present message concerns one of the first projects we agreed to undertake.

The workshop was organized by Tom Tulien who cosponsored the event with the Fund for UFO Research. Michael Swords, Richard Hall, and Jan Aldrich moderated the sessions. Attendance by Dominique Weinstein, Bernard Thouanel, and Jean-Jacques Velasco of France and Maurizio Verga of Italy gave the meeting international perspective.

We basically discussed our current holdings and projects, what should be done, what we would like to do, what as a small group with limited time and money could actually do, and we approved several projects which seemed possible to accomplish. One project was to convert the "Preceedings," an 86 page pre-confernece booklet listing resources, collections, proposals, and comments on various historical topics into an expanded, "Proceedings."

We now come to the purpose of this message, we wish to solicit some of the following information from list members:

- 1) Biography and UFO related projects. For those with an interest in UFO history, a short biography of no more than one page is requested, please include projects you have worked or are working on currently. (Projects do not have to be history related.)
- 2) Inventory of UFO material. For the present please keep the inventory to no more than two pages. Please do not list every UFO book in your collection, but rather the amount of books, what UFO publications do you have complete or nearly complete runs, what is the extend of government material, case files, clipping collections, etc. Please list any unique items you feel are rare or important even if they are only copies. Finally end with:
  - a) Accessibility. Is your collection available to others? If so, what are the conditions. If it is not accessible, please so state.
  - b) Succession Plan. Do you have a plan for the disposition of your material if something should happen to you? It is not necessary to announce your plans, only whether or not you have such a plan.

\*NOTE: As an example to others, all participants agreed that they would each establish a succession plan. The "Proceedings" will discuss the "hows" and "whys" of succession plans in greater detail.

\*\*ALSO NOTE: We intend to update such inventories from time to time and make them more comprehensive. Please keep the inventory you submit on file and consider using it as a shell for a more detailed document.

3) UFO Collections. We are interested in finding and preserving UFO collections--especially "lost" collections. Please let us know of collections that should be preserved. (If you can give any details about whereabouts of the collections, description of contents, and possible contact(s), that would be most welcome.) Obviously we are aware of the papers of Condon, Menzel, Smith, Barker, APRO [we would welcome suggestion on how to get access, here], etc. However, we would like to know about less well known collections including information, if known, on location, contents, accessibility. (As Loren Gross so aptly put it, "We would like to know about 'dry holes,' also." Collections that are known to be lost or destroyed should be listed. Personal papers of individuals associated with UFOs which contain little or no UFO material are of interest. Such information will save time of other researchers.)

4) Proposals for history related projects. In the two days of the workshop we only just skimmed along the surface of what needs to be done. Please let us have your ideas. Please limit the proposal to no more than two pages.

5) Historical papers. Short papers, notes, etc., on some historical aspect or event which is not well known are most welcome. Again, the maximum length should not exceed about three pages.

6) Contacts with official and academic bodies--especially from list members outside the US. This information would be most interesting. Official contacts from several countries are discussed in the current "Preceedings" for Italy, Switzerland, and Sweden. Information from other countries is most welcome.

Please consider submitting a contribution for one or all of the areas listed above. The deadline is 30 June.

At the MUFON convention, it might be possible to met and discuss the historical undertakings either individually or in a small group. (More on this in another message.)

Thanks.

Regards,

Jan

--

Jan Aldrich  
Project 1947  
P. O. Box 391, Canterbury, CT 06331, USA  
Telephone: (860) 546-9135

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

From: **Martin Phillips** <[mphillips@btinternet.com](mailto:mphillips@btinternet.com)>  
Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 15:26:49 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 01:36:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 10:00:42 +0100  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>Subject: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>The debate on the Hudson Valley UFOs caused me to look at Omar  
>Fowler's booklet The Flying Triangle Mystery. He lists some 50  
>cases of FTs seen over the UK and Europe in recent years. In  
>fact FTs seem to be very much in the news just now, with the  
>recent Granada TV series focusing on them. One point struck me;  
>every case without exception occurred at night.  
>There seems to be nothing whatever on an FT seen in daylight.  
>Certainly I have never read of a well-attested daytime sighting  
>of a flying triangle, nor have I ever seen a film of such.  
>Christopher Allan, Stoke-on-Trent

Surely the first British case, where a fully-trained aircraft  
observer saw a triangle flying over the North Sea, counts as a  
daytime observation. The witness was a member of the Royal  
Observer Corps, and trained to recognise any aircraft in an  
instant. He saw a triangle being refuelled by a KC-135, with two  
F111s alongside. I don't think you could ask for a better  
witness.

Martin Phillips

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## An Educational Discourse

From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 03:38:21 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 12:44:16 -0400  
Subject: An Educational Discourse

I have been away at a music festival and have now caught up with the last week's posts. Quite a load of information to peruse and digest.

I don't know why I pursued that mammoth task. I made the time because for some strange reason I am as passionate about the UFO subject as I was thirty years ago. I must be some kind of addict. With the work of EBK and the passion of everyone who takes part in UpDates this has become a vital forum to me.

I originally posted my feelings regarding Jeff Rense's inclusion of anti-semitic material on his site. That led to an interesting thread in which a great deal of information was shared.

I once again thank the people who posted background information on the subject. I hope we all learned some things from this exercise.

Since I was still mentioned in a post yesterday, I would like to make a general statement regarding my past posts on this subject.

In my original post I never condemned Jeff Rense or implied that he should be suppressed in any manner. I was questioning his standards of journalism as he seemed to post a number of political and anti-New World Order articles that were rants that did not contain any facts to support them.

I questioned his scholarship in doing so. He certainly has the right to post whatever he wants. However, if he posts material on the same level as William Cooper it certainly makes me wonder how Jeff Rense thinks.

In my post I suggested that serious UFO researchers think twice about appearing on his show as I hope all of us are trying to keep Ufology above the tabloid level.

I never suggested suppressing his views.

In a previous post I also said, "It feels good to have others think like I do". Mr. Lehmborg, that was a tongue in cheek statement, that's all.

I also feel that the points in this exercise have been well covered.

Since this is a UFO list, to save bandwidth, perhaps if no new points of pertinent interest are exposed, personal debates on this subject can be handled by direct emails.

For now, let's keep our eyes on the sky and try not to trip over our own feet. If you don't think it is a conspiracy, that just shows how good a conspiracy it is.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 01:02:34 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 03:13:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 20:46:23 -0500  
>Fwd Date: Thu, 03 Jun 1999 06:58:11 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>To: [updates@globalseve.net](mailto:updates@globalseve.net)

<snip>

>> Don't get me started.

<snip>

>>David Rudiak

>Getting you started isn't the problem, believe me.

No, the real problem is shutting you up.

Please notice the subject matter of the thread: Mogul  
"parchment" parachutes. Now what the hell does the following  
Stacy junk have to do with that?

>Now that you are, however, perhaps you would be so kind as to  
>answer the following questions, based on your own mathematical  
>analysis of same (And please feel free to call on Maccabee or  
>others as required. Hell, if you want, you can even refer to  
>Arnold.):

>1) How many non-Mogul alien UFOs crashed at or near Roswell in the summer of  
1947?

>2) Where and when?

>3) How many bodies were recovered?

>4) Where were they sent? Did they pass through Roswell?

>5) What cover up and investigative organization resulted as a consequence?

>6) If MJ-12, please supply proof. If not MJ-12, please supply proof.

>7) Does that mean that you support those MJ-12 documents that have surfaced  
or not?

>8) How much of the Corso/Birnes book is true?

>Sorry to have got you started. But trust you can finish.

>Dennis Stacy

This is standard Dennis Stacy diversionary raving. A serious  
weakness of one pro-Mogul skeptical argument is shown. Since he  
won't or can't address that, Stacy has to go off on half a dozen  
tangents: MJ12, alien bodies, Corso/Birnes, JFK, Jimmy Hoffa,



Monica Lewinsky, etc. All are about equally relevant as to whether probably non-existent small paper parachutes explain descriptions of large quantities of parchment-like material covered with strange writing and resistant to burning and cutting.

But if we must go off on Stacian tangeants, here are some quick comments:

1. Body recoveries: The memo Gen. Ramey is clutching in his hand and now being analyzed by several different groups clearly references "the VICTIMS of the wreck you forwarded to ... at Fort Worth, Tex." There's no question about provenance here, is there? Ramey's standing over the body clutching the smoking gun. If the timing of the memo alone doesn't make obvious the victims and wreck being referenced, the next line mentions "the 'disc'" and the line after that has "Roswell" in it. Then towards the end is the mention of "weather balloons," apparently in reference to the "story" being put out.

Nah, must have been referring to some other "wreck" and "victims." Or maybe Mogul carried some experimental hamsters which were dropped back to earth with those "parchment" parachutes? For economy and to confuse potential Rooskie spies, instructions for their care and feeding were written on the 'chutes in ancient Sumerian.

2. MJ-12 type organization:

The following make such an organization quite possible IMHO. The 1950 Smith/Sarbacher memos clearly reference a saucer-study organization, "a small group headed by Dr. Vannevar Bush," and classified "higher than the H-bomb." Ruppelt in his book has several sly references to another organization(s) conducting secret saucer investigations and running in parallel to the more public Projects Sign, Grudge, and Blue Book. See, e.g., his comments on the 1948 Estimate of the Situation (how the "other investigative organization that was helping ATIC" took over most of the investigation from Sign after Vandenberg shot down the Estimate) and the 1951 Lubbock Lights ("The only other peope outside Project Blue Book who have studied the complete case of the Lubbock Lights were A GROUP WHO, DUE TO THEIR ASSOCIATION WITH THE GOVERNMENT, HAD COMPLETE ACCESS TO OUR FILES. And these people were not pulp writers or wide-eyed fanatics, they were SCIENTISTS--ROCKET EXPERTS, NUCLEAR PHYSICISTS, AND INTELLIGENCE EXPERTS.") Who were these guys?

Gen. Exon flat out said his information on Roswell was that it was a crash of an alien spaceship with bodies recovered, he was aware of other crash recoveries (Kecksburg?) during his tenure as C/O of Wright-Patterson in the '60's, and he was also aware of a military version of an MJ-12 type organization (which he called the "Unholy 13") during his tenure in the Pentagon in the 1950's.

Should I also mention the mysterious IPU or Interplanetary Phenomena Unit of which we know little other than it apparently existed sometime in the 1940's and 1950's and dealt with things obviously not simply foreign but "Interplanetary?" How about Project Moon Dust and Operation Blue Fly, clear evidence of rapid response recovery teams in place to retrieve "objects of unknown origin" from space, including allegedly downed UFOs?

And just lately, Bob and Ryan Wood are looking into a CIA document on UFOs released under FOIA which at the end says that a copy of the memo was being forwarded to -- gasp -- "MJ-12!" A copy of the document was given them by the controversial Timothy Cooper. That still raises the usual issue of provenance. The Woods are now making an independent FOIA request to the CIA for the same document. If they get back an identical copy from the CIA as given them originally by Cooper, that would just about prove the existence of an organization actually called "MJ-12" and its association with secret high-level UFO investigations.

There, satisfied?

David Rudiak

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 00:40:29 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 02:35:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

>From: James Easton <[voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)>  
>Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 04:19:27 +0100  
>Fwd Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 13:23:02 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Regarding:

>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

Bruce wrote:

>>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Regarding Arnold's \_first\_ sighting... which has been the  
>>subject of my discussion... there is no assumption that Arnold  
>>was "absolutely incapable of human error." Anyone who thinks  
>>there was such an assumption does not understand the nature of  
>>the analysis. In fact, the arguments assume that Arnold could  
>>have been in error in some places.

>Bruce,

>Surely it's not debatable whether Kenneth Arnold "could" have  
>been in error in "some" places, that fact is acknowledged and  
>highlighted in your paper - 'The Complete Sighting Report of  
>Kenneth Arnold, with Comments and Analysis'.

Here we go again! The question isn't about whether errors could  
be committed, but whether those particular errors are  
\_significant\_ or \_plausible\_ or whether they suggest some other  
reasonable interpretation than non-conventional aircraft.

E.g., while flying on a parallel course at 110 mph, Arnold  
reported the objects flying past him, i.e., from in back to in  
front of his position. They could only do this if they were  
flying \_faster\_ than he was, \_regardless\_ of their distance from  
him. His distance estimate has \_nothing\_ to do with it.

Well James, just that one point rules out your birds, doesn't it  
(though not other aircraft)? The only way it could be otherwise  
is if Arnold was incapable of even the simplest of perceptions,  
such as telling his front from his back and relative direction  
of motion. That fails the plausibility test for error.

>>But, let's get down to the crux of the matter: which Arnold  
>>statements would you like to reject or modify?

>We could start with those you have previously accepted!

>>1) Arnold says he saw flashes of sunlight on his plane. Did he  
>>or didn't he? What did he see?

>So far as I can see, this claim didn't surface until Arnold's  
>much later book, 'The Coming of the Saucers'.

The reason you can't see is because it seems you don't bother to read the very sources you quote. (That also happened in a recent debate as to whether Arnold ever referred to the objects as disk- or saucer-shaped.) Immediately below, e.g., you quote the following newspaper:

'Oregon Journal - June 27, 1947'

"Arnold, general manager and owner of the Great Western Fire Control Company, said he first saw the objects when they FLASHED in the sun low over the slopes of Mt. Rainier".

"Flashed" -- get it?

You also quote the following:

'Norman, Oklahoma Transcript - June 26, 1947'

"Arnold said the strange aircraft were skittering across the southwest slope of Mount Rainier when he first sighted them".

...but omitted the statement from four paragraphs above:

"He landed here ... and told how he spotted the 'EXTREMELY SHINY NICKLE-PLATED AIRCRAFT..."

Or how about the following which you also quote from:

'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian - June 26, 1947'

"Mr. Arnold reported he was flying east at 2:50 p.m. Tuesday toward Mt. Rainier when the objects appeared directly in front of him 25-30 miles away at about 10,000 feet altitude".

But OMIT the two paragraphs IMMEDIATELY above it:

"The Boise man ... described the objects as "flat like a pie pan and somewhat bat-shaped" and SO SHINY THEY REFLECTED THE SUN LIKE A MIRROR. He said THE REFLECTION WAS SO BRILLIANT THAT IT BLINDED HIM 'as if someone had STARTED AN ARC LIGHT IN FRONT OF MY EYES.'"

Since you are obviously referring to the Arnold articles posted on the Project 1947 Web page, how could you have possibly missed the opening paragraph of the June 25 Chicago Tribune?

"The first thing I noticed was a SERIES OF FLASHES IN MY EYES AS IF A MIRROR WAS REFLECTING SUNLIGHT AT ME... I saw the FLASHES as coming from a series of objects that were traveling incredibly fast. They were SILVERY and SHINY and seemed to be shaped like a pie plate..."

How about the Oregon Journal, June 27, last paragraph:

"They hugged the horseback between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams, and the FLASHING THEY MADE IN THE SUN reminded me of the REFLECTION OF A GREAT MIRROR."

Or how about that surviving radio interview (recorded either June 25 or 26)?

" they seemed to flip and flash in the sun, just like a mirror, and, in fact, I happened to be in an angle from the sun that seemed to hit the tops of these peculiar looking things in such a way that it almost blinded you when you looked at them through your plexiglass windshield."

I think anybody who actually bothers to read the original press reportings of the Arnold sighting can safely conclude that Arnold's description of seeing very bright flashing from very shiny objects date right from the beginning. Sheesh!

Furthermore, the issue of flashing or not has NOTHING whatsoever to do with the issue of whether birds can outfly airplanes.

>>2) Arnold said the initial flashes came from an area north of  
>>Mt. Rainier. Did he perhaps get the direction wrong, or is there  
>>something else?

>Did Arnold state this before it was claimed in his book, or did  
>he originally and consistently say the objects were first seen  
>over the slopes of Mount Rainier, for example:

<snip quotes repeated above>

His written report to the A.F. on July 12, 1947, has him stating he first noticed the flashes north of Mt. Rainier but he couldn't make out anything about their shapes until they were closer and passed in front of Rainier. That may explain any discrepancies with the newspaper accounts which generally have him saying he first saw them as they passed in front of Ranier.

However, in terms of your bird theory, this is again an irrelevant point. All accounts have his timing of flight and parallel flight course occurring as the objects passed by the south side of Mt. Rainier. That's when the objects flew PAST him heading south towards Arnold's front, which rules out birds.

>>3) Arnold thought the objects were a little higher than he was  
>>(9,500 ft, vs his 9,200). What do you think the TRUE altitude  
>>was, if you don't accept Arnold's statement?

>From your detailed analysis, I thought you had determined, "it  
>appears that they were lower than 6,000 ft and that Arnold  
>overestimated their altitude".

Again, a non-issue to the main point: how do birds outfly a plane on a parallel course going 110 mph? Any small error Arnold made in determining his true horizon (the difference between 9000 and 5000 feet is only about 2 degrees) has nothing to do with birds outflying airplanes.

Try for once sorting the significant and relevant from the insignificant and irrelevant.

>>4) Arnold described them as "flipping and flashing". If this is  
>>not what he saw, then what do you think he saw?

>He also described them as "fluttering and sailing". Would you  
>disagree that's consistent with birds and far removed from a  
>'craft'?

And this has what to do with the fundamental observation that the objects outflew his plane?

>>5)Arnold claimed he looked at his dashboard clock when the first  
>>one passed Mt. Rainier.... Did he get the time wrong? If so, by  
>>how much?

>Although I can't see it's significant, curiously, he also claimed  
>the timing was taken on his watch:

You're right, it's not significant to your bird theory.

>The question is, if Kenneth Arnold's estimate of the objects'  
>altitude was in error by some 4,000-5,000 feet

More red herrings. It's obvious you have no idea of the difference between angular error and absolute linear error or of the possible significance.

The angular error was extremely small. 4000 - 5000 feet at 25 miles is the same angular error as 160 - 200 feet of a flock of "birds" only 1 mile away.

Since Arnold was flying at 9200 feet, this means your "birds" would have been about 200 feet below him, or flying at 9000 feet. The line of sight is still exactly the same whether at 1 mile or 25 miles.

This actually works AGAINST your bird hypothesis, since it is unlikely that birds would be flying that high.

It also still has NOTHING to do with birds outflying Arnold's airplane. But I doubt if you will ever grasp that.

> - in which case the objects were only flying at about half the altitude he  
>thought - then how can we have any confidence in his other  
>perceptions?

The problem isn't with Arnold -- it's with you. You're completely clueless. Your arguments don't even meet the minimal level of scientific understanding. That's not meant to be mean, but a statement of fact.

>If that was so grossly mistaken, as evidenced in your analysis,  
>then it MUST affect all related judgements and estimates.

One more time, James. Angular error is not the same as absolute error. It translates into different absolute altitudes at difference distances. 5000 feet at 25 miles is the same as 200 feet at 1 mile. In both cases the downward angle is about 2 degrees, a MINOR error by Arnold in judging true horizon. I seriously doubt any of this is getting through to you.

It has little or nothing to do with other related judgments and estimates nor does it have anything to do with your big problem of explaining how birds could outfly Arnold's airplane. You won't tackle that one because you are completely out of your depth.

>>6) Arnold looked again at the clock as the last one passed  
>>Rainier.... did he get the time wrong? If so, by how much?

>The timing isn't an issue, it's whether the objects were perhaps  
>much closer than he guessed.

Again, it's patently obvious you don't grasp the salient issues. Even if your "birds" were 25 feet from Arnold instead of 25 miles, they can't outfly his plane. Actual distance of the objects doesn't matter.

>Obviously the closer these objects actually were, the faster they  
>would appear to travel between two distant, fixed points.

If Arnold were standing still you might have an argument. But he wasn't stationary, was he? He was in an airplane flying at 110 mph and flying on a parallel course. That sets a fundamental lower limit on how fast the objects must be traveling to appear to sweep FORWARD of his position and then disappear in the direction of Mt. Adams. With Rainier about 25 miles to the east, and Mt. Adams about 50 miles to the south, we're speaking of an ANGULAR separation of roughly 60 degrees. Whatever the objects were, they moved FORWARD by a 60 degree angle in Arnold's timed period.

No matter what their distance, that means they were flying FASTER than Arnold's 110 mph. Absolute distance only matters in this situation in determining how much faster than 110 mph.

But even on steroids, your "flock of birds" couldn't begin to match Arnold's air speed.

>>7) Arnold said he turned the plane sideways and looked through  
>>his open window. At this time he would have been flying south,  
>>parallel to the objects. Was he wrong/lying?

>In that early radio interview, he claimed, "I turned the plane  
>around and opened the window".

Why? Because he wanted some fresh air? No, because he was checking to see if they were reflections off his windshield. So he turned the plane south on a parallel course, enabling him to open his side window and see if the objects disappeared as he looked left out the open window in their direction.

>When he turned his plane "around" it was during the timing  
>exercise and we don't know if he changed direction by 90 degrees,  
>180 degrees, or something else.

More cluelessness. Why don't you try something called simple logic? He opened the pilot's window on the LEFT SIDE of the plane to get a clearer view and see if the objects were caused by reflection. Now which direction would he have to be flying to view objects to his east flying south while looking left out his window? This isn't real hard.

If he turned north or completely reversed direction and flew west, then he would be heading AWAY from the objects and would have to be looking through a rear view mirror to follow them.

Maybe that's the James Easton way to track something, but the rest of humanity would turn south to follow then objects. Since they were initially east of Arnold when he turned, he could get a good look at them by looking left through his open pilot's window. As they proceeded ahead, he could still keep them in view through his windshield off to the left. Since he was using Mt. Adams and Mt St. Helens to the south as geographical landmarks for his timing, he could simultaneously keep these in view as well

See, it's not really that hard if you bother to think.

>What effect might the change of direction have had on his  
>perception of the objects' speed and respective distances between  
>them, his plane and the mountains?

You just don't get it do you? It has nothing to do with it or your silly bird theory.

>>The analysis of the Arnold sighting has been carried out with  
>>the fulfill realization that Arnold could have been wrong on  
>>some fine points. But to get a conventional explanation one has  
>>to assume Arnold was wrong on some major points.

>Isn't this the conclusion of your own critique?

No. That's not the conclusion of Maccabee's critique. Learn to read.

>As you remarked:

>"So the answer is yes, he could easily have made an error of  
>4,000 ft in estimating the altitude of the objects"

>How can that be a "fine point"?

Because it was a minor error in elevation angle, and has nothing whatsoever to do with the BIG problems in your bird theory that you refuse or are unable to address.

>Has that analysis examined what Kenneth Arnold reported to the  
>press in the days following his sighting?

>I've been looking at this and note, for example, that the  
>'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian' newspaper on 26 June reported,  
>"Mr. Arnold admitted the angle from which he viewed the objects  
>would make difficult precise estimation of their speed..."

Why not finish the quote instead of doing your usual spin editing job? "Mr Arnold admitted the angle from which he viewed the objects would make difficult precise estimation of their speed, but insisted ANY ERROR WOULD NOT BE GRAVE 'FOR THAT SPEED'"

Kenneth Arnold understood a great deal more than James Easton about simple math and error analysis.

Arnold wasn't saying he couldn't estimate the approximate speed, only that he couldn't be sure of the exact speed because of possible errors. But faster than any jet plane -- definitely!

Here's another quote from Arnold, which further clarifies what he meant (Portland Oregonian, July 11, 1947):

"It took 1 minute and 42 seconds from the southern crest of Mt. Rainier to the southern crest of Mt. Adams. That's a distance of 50 miles. Allowing for an error resulting from my angle of observation, I reported that they were flying at least 1200 miles an hour. Actually it figures out to 1381 or 1382."

Actually it figures out closer to 1600-700 mph. What you obviously don't understand is that Arnold consistently downplayed the speed and tried to take into account possible errors on his part in his timing and estimated object travel distance. Here are some more quotes:

Associated Press story, June 26: "...he timed them at 1:42 minutes for the 47 miles from Mt. Rainier to Mt. Adms. Arnold said, adding that he later figured by triangulation that their speed was 1200 miles an hour. 'I could be wrong by 200 or 300

miles an hour,' he admitted, 'but I know I never saw anything so fast.'"

Radio interview (June 25 or 26): "But when I observed the tail end of the last one passing Mt. Adams, and I was at an angle near Mt. Rainier from it, but I looked at my watch and it showed one minute and 42 seconds. Well, I felt that was pretty fast and I didn't stop to think what the distance was between the two mountains. Well, I landed at Yakima, Washington... I just kind of forgot it then, until I got down to Pendleton and I began looking at my map and taking measurements on it and the best calculation I could figure out, now even in spite of error, would be around 1200 miles an hour, because making the distance from Mt. Rainier to Mt. Adams, in, we'll say approximately two minutes, it's almost, well, it'd be around 25 miles per minute. Now allowing for error, we can give them three minutes or four minutes to make it, and they're still going more than 800 miles an hour, and to my knowledge, there isn't anything that I've read about, outside of some of the German rockets, that would go that fast."

>>If you are going to "complain" that Arnold wasn't perfect, then >>specify where you think he was wrong and we can argue over >>whether or not it makes sense in the context of the sighting to >>assume he was wrong..

>I trust some relevevant points are cited above.

None of them are relevant or show that you have any scientific insight.

>Kenneth Arnold's original story is a relatively simple tale.

Which James Easton will now thoroughly mangle.

>He observed nine reflective objects which at first he thought >were geese, because their flight characteristics were similar.

Arnold then dismissed this possibility as the objects appeared to be travelling too fast, concluding they must instead be airplanes.

In fact, he said "I at first, thought they were geese because it flew like geese, but it was going so fast that I IMMEDIATELY changed my mind and decided it was a bunch of new jet planes in formation." (early radio interview).

>Yet Arnold never seems to raise any objections to the objects >being birds, other than the perceived airspeed.

No, he also thought they were flying too high. That also in one of those articles which you didn't bother to read.

(Pendleton East Oregonian, June 26): "When first sighted, he thought the objects were snow geese. 'But geese don't fly that high -- and, anyway, what would geese be doing going south for this time of year.'"

>Even in subsequent interviews, he doesn't rule out the prospect

How did you deduce that Sherlock? Can you provide even one quote from anywhere or anytime where Arnold said that he ever considered the bird hypothesis again?

He saw something unexpected and unusual: objects flying single file in reverse echelon formation. When confronted with something unusual, people almost always try to correlate it with something familiar to them. In this case, Arnold's instantaneous guess was snow geese, a thought he said he then immediately rejected for reasons of speed and altitude.

>due to what we might have assumed the most obvious conclusion - that >birds wouldn't be visible if the objects were truly some 20-30 >miles distant.

This is so obtuse that I have no idea what point Easton is trying to make.

>Arnold then decided to take this opportunity to 'clock' the >airspeed of the 'planes'.



Well before that he said he observed them disappearing behind one of the subpeaks of Rainier, which is why he placed them at that distance. This was AFTER he had already rejected in his mind the idea that they might be geese. And even if he didn't express it explicitly in interviews, at the time it was probably one more reason for Arnold to think that they weren't birds and hypothesize jet planes.

That wasn't Arnold's only conventional hypothesis. He also considered the possibility that they might be reflections off his windshield, which is why he turned 90 degrees to his south, and opened his side window to see if the images would disappear. They didn't.

>It's perhaps crucial to appreciate that Arnold only decided to  
>carry out this exercise because, as he says in the radio  
>interview, "I just thought I'd see how fast they were going,  
>since among pilots we argue about speed so much".

>It wasn't a result of Arnold believing the airplanes were  
>travelling at an incredible speed.

Where is this going? He said he thought they might be jets and they were flying faster than anything he had ever seen before. So he decided to time how fast. After he landed and had an opportunity to do the calculations, he realized they were flying much faster than any known jet, even when assumed wide margins of error for the timing of the how long it took them to fly between Rainier and Adams. (see quotes above)

> He only concluded that after  
>first carrying out a timing between two prominent landmarks and  
>then later calculating how far apart those landmarks were in  
>conjunction with the 'stop watch' reading.

So I guess what Easton is trying to say here, in his own inimitable way, is that because Arnold didn't realize at the time of the sighting that the speeds would turn out to be unconventional, they weren't unconventional? Is that the illogic?

>As he timed the objects' - believed to be airplanes - what then  
>surprised him was a realisation that they didn't have any 'tails'.

>However, as Arnold related, he didn't give either this or the  
>apparently fast airspeed too much thought at the time.

If Easton would properly present Arnold's thoughts, he was puzzled by the unusual shapes, the precise and co-ordinated weaving formation flying so close to the mountain tops while flying at high speed, their erratic flipping motion, the brilliant flashing, and the lack of tails. Still he thought they might be some sort of new aircraft he didn't know about. E.g., going through a mental checklist of conventional explanations, Arnold said he thought the tails might not be visible because they were painted. He was still puzzled by what he had seen, but thought that when he made inquiries when he landed, some other fliers would be familiar with the unknown aircraft.

>Consequently, he worked out that the distance between the two  
>fixed points was some 50 miles and that if the objects had  
>travelled that distance, as he thought, in the 1 minute and  
>forty seconds recorded, they must have been travelling at an  
>unprecedented speed.

>If, as you explained in the detailed analysis, Arnold's estimate  
>of the objects' altitude was grossly mistaken

Doesn't matter -- not important at all, but Easton is too dense to realize it.

>and that when he  
>apparently turned his plane around during this timing exercise,  
>we don't know if he changed direction by 90, or 180 degrees, or  
>something else,

What blithering nonsense! Not only is it overwhelmingly obvious he turned south from other details of the report, Arnold even said as much.

> then consequently, there can be surely be no confidence in his overall perceptions.

Easton, the perpetually clueless.

>Obviously the closer these 'fluttering' objects actually were,  
>the faster they would appear to travel between two distant fixed points.

Birds on the brain Easton just can't let it go.

>When logic kicks in

Yes, when will your logic ever kick in?

>and we consider that the observation was wholly subjective,

They flew past his plane. That's all anyone with any smarts needs to know to rule out birds. Whether he timed it right or got the distances right doesn't even matter.

And James, timing with something like a watch or clock is called an instrument measurement, not a subjective observation. Arnold noting his air speed was another instrument measurement. Arnold noting his own direction of motion from landmarks and/or instruments was another measurement. Other observations using well-defined landmarks which permit calculations of angles are observational measurements. Scientists might then argue about likely margins of error in these measurements due to such things as instrument error, misperception, etc. and then see if these possible errors change the fundamental result.

In the end, the fundamental measurement that Arnold made was that the line of sight (don't even think absolute distance or speed) from his position to the objects swept south from Mt. Rainier to Mt. Adams (those pesky landmarks) while he flew on an approximately parallel course at 110 mph (instrument panel reading). That means the objects FLEW PAST HIM traveling faster than 110 mph. That's the death to your bird theory right there, though I doubt you will EVER grasp this.

>has proven misconceptions and that Kenneth  
>Arnold reported a subsequent sighting with similar  
>characteristics and which was almost certainly of birds... at  
>what point does this remotely become sustainable evidence of  
>'alien spacecraft'?

The only one with proven misconceptions is James Easton. At what point do any of your preposterous arguments become sustainable evidence of birds?

If you want to argue conventional objects, then it has to be something that could outfly Arnold's plane. Some sort of airplane or jet plane might be a possibility, just like Arnold originally conjectured. So instead of perpetually arguing "birds," one could instead argue like this. If Arnold had only mediocre normal vision of around 20/20 such that he would be unable to distinguish any detail in an object measuring less than 5 min arc, then something like a period fighter plane or jet plane only 30-35 feet long might not be clearly identifiable beyond about 4 miles distance. (This is where one could argue on stronger ground about known limits of human perception.)

From this one can deduce the downward angle from true horizon using Arnold's observation that they seemed to be skimming the mountain tops. Scaling to 4 miles, they would be flying 800 feet below his altitude of 9200 feet. Now apply some sort of plausibility check. Is that a reasonable altitude? Probably.

From his observation using landmarks that the length of the formation would have been about 5 miles at 25 miles distance, one gets the angular width of the formation and the angular separation between objects. Scaled to 4 miles, they would have been separated from each other by about 500 feet. Is this a reasonable separation for some sort of formation flying by planes? Again yes.

Now let's use his measured airspeed, and his measured clocking time and his line of sight observations for direction,

from which one can deduce the angles travelled during the clocking. Again scaling to 4 miles, one can calculate that they would be flying approximately 350 mph. Again that's a reasonable and conventional number.

This doesn't explain other parts of the sighting, such as the weaving formation flying which Arnold found so screwy. But it's a decent start. It's how a real scientific argument would proceed from the existing data.

But your handwaving arguments are complete logical rubbish, an illustration that you've obviously never had any training in scientific analytic thinking. Cheap debating tricks are not a substitute, whatever they taught you with your liberal arts education.

Birds can't possibly explain the first Arnold sighting. Get it?

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## An Apology

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 12:38:31 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 12:38:31 -0400  
Subject: An Apology

In the early hours of this morning (Tuesday) I was able, with some fiddling, here, to post a few of the back-logged messages. Then the GlobalServe mail-server balked, again.

During the course of the open 'window-of-opportunity' sending, somehow, the smaller portion of the split-address files appeared in one message's outgoing headers.

Some subscriber's ISPs saw this message as 'spam' and bounced that message back here. The Archive at Ufomind always strips headers from posts, therefore the offending post was only sent to subscribers.

To those whose addresses appeared in that message's header I apologise. To breach trust on top of the extreme frustration of the last couple of days is mortifying.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: **Brian Cuthbertson** <[brianc@freeside.fc.net](mailto:brianc@freeside.fc.net)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 10:59:56 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 13:00:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 08:53:27 -0500  
>From: Ron Decker <[decker@wt.net](mailto:decker@wt.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

...

>If memory serves, I recall reading years ago an account of  
>seemingly living UFOs in Brad Steiger's book, "The Gods of  
>Aquarius" (I'm working from memory here so don't hold my feet  
>to the fire on the author and title).

>The UFO encounter went something like this: some pilots in a  
>western state went flying one day and landed their airplanes  
>atop a mesa for a rest and look-see. To their surprise a small  
>UFO landed near them. It appeared to be in distress due to  
>something having taken a bite out of its rim. The bite looked  
>like one one might take from a sandwich. The group saw metal  
>strips hanging from the 'wound.'

>To their greater surprise several larger UFOs soon descended to  
>the mesa top, appeared to attend the 'wounded,' smaller UFO and  
>escorted it away.

>The impression of the witnesses was that the actions of the  
>small UFO and its larger counterparts were identical to that of  
>a young animal that had been attacked by a predator, escaped and  
>ministered to by its pack.

>I'm not sure if this is the sort of thing you requested list  
>members post but here it is. This was the first time I'd read  
>any report that even hinted at the possibility of UFOs being  
>anything other than piloted machines. At the time the oddity  
>of the concept made quite an impression on me.

Based on the rapid evolution of our own technology, is it really  
so surprising that an incredibly advanced technology might not  
manifest machines that have attributes of living things?

Even today NASA is experimenting with craft that modify their  
own missions. And we've had the lightbulb what, 100 years?

-Brian

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 12:08:24 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 13:11:03 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 08:53:27 -0500  
>From: Ron Decker <[decker@wt.net](mailto:decker@wt.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 99 11:49:54 PDT

>>>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 13:50:47 -0500  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>>>Date: Thu, 03 Jun 99 08:26:28 PDT

>>>Arnold may well have been aware of the writings of the people  
>>>you mention. But judging from his own writings, he based his  
>>>belief that UFOs were some type of living organism on his own  
>>>experiences. See the following, for example:

>>>"This is the same sort of impression [of a living thing] I got  
>>>after seeing these same things again in 1952. Two of them flew  
>>>under me at Mount Lassen. I got a movie of these, and one was  
>>>just as solid as a Chevrolet car. But you could see the pine  
>>>trees right through the other one that was following it. I too  
>>>got the feeling that here was something that was alive, rather  
>>>than that they were machines."

>>>From time to time (though fairly rarely), UFO witnesses have  
>>>reported the sensation that what they were observing was a  
>>>living object. On June 1, 1933, a mountain climber on Everest  
>>>told of seeing winged objects which "seemed to pulsate in and  
>>>out as though they were breathing." There is the famous  
>>>Crawfordsville, Indiana, monster story from September 1891, not  
>>>to mention the tradition of powder ser ("rot from the stars," aka  
>>>"star jelly"). Plus the remarkable case from Biskopsberga,  
>>>Sweden, in May 1808, a full account of which was published in a  
>>>contemporary issue of Transactions of the Swedish Academy of  
>>>Sciences. Again, I refer interested listfolk to my coverage of  
>>>these and related matters in The UFO Encyclopedia, 2nd Ed., pp.  
>>>872-77. If any of you know of other cases, I encourage you to  
>>>post them here.

>Mr. Clark,

>If memory serves, I recall reading years ago an account of  
>seemingly living UFOs in Brad Steiger's book, "The Gods of  
>Aquarius" (I'm working from memory here so don't hold my feet  
>to the fire on the author and title).

>The UFO encounter went something like this: some pilots in a  
>western state went flying one day and landed their airplanes  
>atop a mesa for a rest and look-see. To their surprise a small  
>UFO landed near them. It appeared to be in distress due to

>something having taken a bite out of its rim. The bite looked  
>like one one might take from a sandwich. The group saw metal  
>strips hanging from the 'wound.'

>To their greater surprise several larger UFOs soon descended to  
>the mesa top, appeared to attend the 'wounded,' smaller UFO and  
>escorted it away.

>The impression of the witnesses was that the actions of the  
>small UFO and its larger counterparts were identical to that of  
>a young animal that had been attacked by a predator, escaped and  
>ministered to by its pack.

>I'm not sure if this is the sort of thing you requested list  
>members post but here it is. This was the first time I'd read  
>any report that even hinted at the possibility of UFOs being  
>anything other than piloted machines. At the time the oddity  
>of the concept made quite an impression on me.

>Best regards,  
>Ron Decker

Hi Ron,

As you say, whether there is anything to this "living UFO" thing  
or not, if your story has any validity, one would also have to  
wonder as to what there was around, big enough to take a bite  
out of that saucer. As a pilot flying around in my C-172, I'd  
hate to think there was something big enough up there that could  
start snacking on one of my wings. Scarey:-)

Don Ledger

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 12:47:58 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 13:17:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:08:20 PDT

>>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>>Date: Sat, 1 May 1999 11:04:37 -0400

>>>Date: Thu, 22 Apr 1999 15:04:47 -0500  
>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>>From: Glenn Joyner <[infohead@airmail.net](mailto:infohead@airmail.net)>  
>>>Subject: Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>>>My name is Jerry Black, and I will now state, for the record, my  
>>>position on the UFO topic.

>><snip>

>>Am I the only one who never wants to read another word from Jerry  
>>Black?

>Mr. Sandow, you also refer to William G. Hyzer, and I might add,  
>his son James B. Hyzer [who also worked on the Ed Walters/Gulf  
>Breeze pictures], and stated that I have put my total trust in  
>them, and that nobody could be as good as them. But the real  
>issue is that nobody could be as BAD as Bruce Maccabee.

>In Mr. Hyzer's preliminary report of the ten pictures that he >  
>was given, which included photograph #18 [the famous>  
>"road-shot"], he stated that "ALL" of the pictures showed  
>indications of double-exposure. He could not prove at that  
>particular time that any one of those photographs were  
>absolutely hoaxed, but all showed signs of double-exposure. To  
>the contrary, Mr. Bruce Maccabee and Mr. Jeff Sainio, not only  
>in all their vocal support given at symposiums during this time  
>frame, and through all their reports they wrote, never ONCE had  
>a negative comment to make regarding the pictures. So we are to  
>assume, sir, if we adhere to your theory, that Mr. Hyzer made  
>TEN mistakes on all of these pictures, and Mr. Bruce Maccabee  
>is correct.

I have commented and criticized at length Mr. Black's claims on  
this list in the past. To avoid using valuable bandwidth yet  
again.....,let me invite anyone who wishes to see my discussion  
of Black's comments please request by email.  
[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)

I will, however, remark that in the above, aside from being  
given the attribute of being the worst photoanalyst in the UFO  
field ("Nobody could be as BAD as Bruce Maccabee" (spelling  
corrected) I would like to point toward Hyzer's essential  
honesty in this:) "He could not prove at that particular time  
that any one of those photos was absolutely hoaxed but all  
showed signs of double exposure."



Hyzer was correct... he could not prove hoax.... he could not prove double exposure. The statement that photos have "signs" of double exposure means little unless those signs can be specified. Otherwise it is just an opinion... "This photo looks as if it could have been created by double exposure." There ARE "signatures" of double exposure and a photo can be analyzed to determine whether or not one or more of those "signatures" is present. The Walter's photos were so analyzed and no positive signatures were detected (otherwise Hyzer would have been happy to level the "smoking gun."). Just because a particular photo composition COULD have been created by double exposure doesn't mean it was. I should point out that there are also signatures which point AWAY from double exposure. In some cases these signatures were found. IN the first 5 photos, for example, Sainio carefully compared the image smears due to camera (hand) motion of the images of the streetlight and of the UFO.. He found they were the SAME. In a double exposure situation this would require that the hand vibration be exactly the same for both the initial (model in a dark room) exposure and the second (outdoor scene) exposure.

I discovered that in the blue beam photo 11 there was positive evidence AGAINST a double exposure.

All of this has been presented before in gory detail. If Mr. Black chooses to "disbelieve".... that is his prerogative. I am well aware that a lot of people think the Gulf Breeze sightings of Ed are a hoax.... even though some people would accept the OTHER sightings as probably true. Such are the vagaries of UFO research.

<snip>

>This is the first time that I am aware of that Mr. Bruce Maccabee has been confronted with an independent photo-analyst of the quality of Mr. Hyzer, working on the same project. And it appears to me that we, in the past, have been misled by believing Mr. Bruce Maccabee's professional experience in photographic analysis was much greater than it obviously is. So yes, I have a great deal of trust in Mr. William G. Hyzer, and if you take the time to look on my web-site, you will see a whole page providing you with Mr. Hyzer's background.

It is true, to some extent that there are few qualified photoanalysts willing to take the time to really analyze any case. However, I should point out that I had consulted with Dr. Robert Nathan of JPL at the very beginning of my research (the "father" of computer photo processing at JPL). I also received input from a number of photographers and other photo analysts over the years of my work on the GB sightings. Hence I was well aware of the criticisms before Hyzer and long before Black came into the picture.

>The photographic evidence speaks very clearly for itself. Any of the pictures that Mr. Bruce Maccabee claims would be so hard for Ed Walters to produce, Mr. Hyzer has already shown how HALF of them could be re-produced very easily with a minimal amount of experience. He expressed one of these theories in "Photo Methods" magazine.

Yes, and the photo he claimed to have explained in that article was Ed's photo 1. However, when his theory was tested by comparison with the original of photo 1 it was found that his theory failed.... even assuming that Ed might have accidentally satisfied certain of the rather stringent lighting requirements set forth by Hyzer's theory.

>If we are to believe Mr. Bruce Maccabee, he claims that Ed Walters was a complete idiot in terms of photographic knowledge. Here is a man, sir, when divorced, was worth 2.5 million dollars. Idiots do not make 2.5 million dollars.

A non-sequitur, as I'm sure all readers will realize. Being a successful home builder does not imply being a photo buff or a photo genius.

>Mr. Rex Salisbury, in his interview with numerous young people who were familiar with Ed's son and his family, said that every time they had seen Ed, he had a camera around his neck. Mr. Ed Walters was very well-versed in the camera that he used. He had quite a bit of experience with it, he was a camera BUFF. But if

>you wish to believe Mr. Bruce Maccabee, who said he was an  
>'idiot with a camera,' that, again, is your problem. The  
>evidence doesn't show this.

Ed had one camera (Polaroid) and a video camera. Some "Buff."  
(No photo magazines, no 35 mm camera)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## UFO Report By Ex-RAF Radar Personnel

From: Dave Ledger <[dledger@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:dledger@cableinet.co.uk)>  
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 23:22:32 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 16:04:47 -0400  
Subject: UFO Report By Ex-RAF Radar Personnel

Strange UFO Captured On RAF Radar In North Of Scotland

Date: Winter 1964-1965.  
Location: RAF Saxa Vord, Shetland Isles, Scotland.  
Source: Retired RAF personnel. Name withheld at Witnesses Request.  
Report and Witness Interview by: Dave Ledger

Before I proceed to report on this significant case, I would personally like to thank the witness involved, for showing his willingness and courage in coming forward after 35 years to discuss and log this extraordinary case report with UFO Scotland. His willingness to discuss the sighting and the relevant details associated, is to be commended and we hope that it may set an example for other ex-servicemen to follow.

REPORT:

During the Month of May 1999, I was lucky enough to have the opportunity of speaking with (for the record) an ex RAF member who was once based at the Early Warning Radar tracking station at RAF Saxa Vord in the extreme North of Scotland. This meeting had been set up by my father who is also ex RAF (retired) and had happened to meet my source via social circles who in turn, agreed to speak with me so that I may document the event.

During the winter of 1964-1965 at the location of Scotland's northern most Early Warning radar tracking station, RAF Saxa Vord in the Shetland Isles, a serious and relatively unknown incident took place which was witnessed by ground Radar personnel who were on duty at the time. The case was also documented and recorded by the Royal Air Force themselves.

My source reports: Radar Operators observed a stationary return on the early warning radar which gained their interest and curiosity. The object was observed sitting motionless at a height of approximately 20,000 feet. (I asked him how the height of the return was established and he informed me that it was obtained by using the radar's height finder on the system.)

The return was a very strong signal which showed up clearly on the radar as a "real structured object", but what caused immediate concern was the fact that this particular object could not be readily identified by the personnel on duty.

Seeing as this was during the "cold war", the personnel had to assume that this anomalous radar return was an incoming hostile as it was now slowly approaching toward the North coast of Scotland from a North Easterly direction. There was no reply from the IFF (which was to inform them if the incoming was friend or foe) so the unknown was treated by the on duty personnel as if it were a hostile, possibly Russian.

For an unspecified amount of time, the unknown object slowly continued to approach toward the Scottish coast, a few minutes followed then a QRA alert was sent to RAF Leuchars in Fife, who in turn, scrambled 2 English Electric Lightnings (which were the interceptor aircraft at that time) to intercept and identify the incoming threat. RAF Leuchars was the nearest station at this time to deal with such a request.

NOTE: I did ask my source the initial range and distance from the coast, that the radar detected the anomaly from, but he could not answer me due to the fact that it may be giving away confidential and secret information, which we do respect here at UFO Scotland. Reporting is one thing but spilling official secrets is not our aim. It has to be said that this range information will also be well outdated by now anyway.

The two Lightnings were vectored, via ground controllers, towards the incoming bogey but as they approached the locale of the unknown object, my source hinted that the object seemed to become aware of this fact and what happened next suprised them all. The object just proceeded to go vertical,rapidly, directly up and up until it was lost on the height finder on the radar system.

I then asked the witness "at what height the Height finder could lose track" and he reported that it was about 100,000 feet.

Significant point: It is a well known fact that no aircraft on this planet at that time or during present day, had or have the capabilities of performing these types of manouveres captured on Radar or could even climb to that altitude period.

The witness then told me that he believed that the anomaly was definately exhibiting intelligent control and was in his honest opinion "Not one of ours!" At one point, when the unknown was witnessed by the radar operators to go vertical instantaneously, the two operators just looked at eachother, shook their heads and said "NO".

It was further established during the interview that Ground Radar returns were out of the question seeing as this incident took place over the North Sea and not over land.

The case was apparently logged through the official channels and apparently, the scrambled Lightnings got nowhere near their targets.

The whole incident still remains unexplained to date and the witness informed me that this particular incident was the only unexplained event that he had ever witnessed during his career and that he did feel that it should be logged as an important sighting pertaining to ufo research and our search for the "REAL TRUTH"

Technical details:

The Radar equipment that the anomaly was recorded and tracked on was known as a "Type 84" Radar System and a "Type 13" height finder.

This particular case has never been heard of publicly, at least to my knowledge, although I personally feel that it should be logged as a very significant report, from a very credible source, which supports the case that we do indeed have unidentified objects penetrating our air defenses on a regular basis and more importantly: The Authorities do know about it but they dont tell!

Report by Dave Ledger for UFO Scotland.

--

=====  
If you see someone without a smile.....give them one of yours :)  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posted by: Dave Ledger (mailto:[UFOSCOT@cablenet.co.uk](mailto:UFOSCOT@cablenet.co.uk))  
VISIT "UFO SCOTLAND" AT:  
<A HREF="<http://wkweb5.cablenet.co.uk/dledger/>">UFO Scotland.</A>  
ICQ pager <http://www.mirabilis.com/4851425>  
\*\*\*\*\*  
THE TRUTH IS JUST AROUND THE CORNER!.....BUT HOW FAR?  
=====  
"The sands of time are trickling away from our dear mother Earth

and yet we continue to fight amongst ourselves and destroy our natural enviroment, leaving all the mess for our children and their children's children to inherit when we're gone."

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

From: [stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk) (Stig Agermose)  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 00:56:39 GMT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 16:09:37 -0400  
Subject: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

Source: Federal Computer Week,

<http://www.fcw.com:80/pubs/fcw/1999/0531/web-nsa-6-3-99.html>

Links are preceded by an asterisk.

Stig

\*\*\*

JUNE 3, 1999 . . . 18:34 EDT

Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

BY DANIEL VERTON (\*[dan\\_verton@fcw.com](mailto:dan_verton@fcw.com))

\*\*

Congress has squared off with the National Security Agency over a top-secret U.S. global electronic surveillance program, requesting top intelligence officials to report on the legal standards used to prevent privacy abuses against U.S. citizens.

According to an amendment to the fiscal 2000 Intelligence Authorization Act proposed last month by Rep. Bob Barr (R-Ga.), the director of Central Intelligence, the director of NSA and the attorney general must submit a report within 60 days of the bill becoming law that outlines the legal standards being employed to safeguard the privacy of American citizens against Project Echelon.

Echelon is NSA's Cold War-vintage global spying system, which consists of a worldwide network of clandestine listening posts capable of intercepting electronic communications such as e-mail, telephone conversations, faxes, satellite transmissions, microwave links and fiber-optic communications traffic. However, the European Union last year raised concerns that the system may be regularly violating the privacy of law-abiding citizens [\*FCW, Nov. 17, 1998].

However, NSA, the supersecret spy agency known best for its worldwide eavesdropping capabilities, for the first time in the history of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence refused to hand over documents on the Echelon program, claiming attorney/client privilege.

Congress is "concerned about the privacy rights of American citizens and whether or not there are constitutional safeguards being circumvented by the manner in which the intelligence agencies are intercepting and/or receiving international communications...from foreign nations that would otherwise be prohibited by...the limitations on the collection of domestic intelligence," Barr said. "This very straightforward amendment...will help guarantee the privacy rights of American citizens [and] will protect the oversight responsibilities of the Congress which are now under assault" by the intelligence community.

Calling NSA's argument of attorney/client privilege

"unpersuasive and dubious," committee chairman Rep. Peter J. Goss (R-Fla.) said the ability of the intelligence community to deny access to documents on intelligence programs could "seriously hobble the legislative oversight process" provided for by the Constitution and would "result in the envelopment of the executive branch in a cloak of secrecy."

Mail questions to \*[webmaster@fcw.com](mailto:webmaster@fcw.com)

Copyright 1999 FCW Government Technology Group

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 12:48:06 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 16:01:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 00:53:47 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400  
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

><snip>

>>Regarding Arnold's \_first\_ sighting... which has been the subject  
>>of my discussion.... there is no assumption that Arnold was  
>>"absolutely incapable of human error." Anyone who thinks there  
>>was such an assumption does not understand the nature of the  
>>analysis. In fact, the arguments assume that Arnold could have  
>>been in error in some places. But, let's get down to the crux  
>>of the matter: which Arnold statements would you like to reject  
>>or modify?

>Bruce,

>Well, let's do get down to the crux of the matter. Since neither  
>you nor I were in the cockpit with Arnold on that fateful day,  
>neither of us have any idea as to how accurate, or inaccurate,  
>he was in his perceptions. My point was simply that you and  
>Rudiak can make any kind of calculations you want and they  
>remain essentially meaningless in real world terms. They could  
>well be right -- and they could well be off by who knows what  
>exponential factor. My point was that we don't \_know\_. And for  
>you and Rudiak to suggest otherwise -- as if the case were  
>automatically solved in non-conventional terms -- is simply  
>wishful thinking on both your parts.

>>1) Arnold says he saw flashes of sunlight on his plane. Did he  
>>or didn't he? What did he see?

>I have no idea, since I wasn't there at the time, but neither do  
>you. But if the objects were a good 20 miles or more away, as  
>Arnold claimed, then I seriously doubt whether he could have  
>discerned "flashes of sunlight on his plane." He might have seen  
>light flashing off distant small objects, which is altogether a  
>different thing.

Amusing. You accuse me and Rudiak of making arguments which try  
to be rational while at the same time saying "I seriously doubt  
whether he could have discerned 'flashes of sunlight on his  
plane.'..... He might have seen light flashing off distant  
small objects.... " which, of course is the crux of the matter.  
If he saw flashes of sunlight whether on his plane or from  
"distant small objects"/..... he wasn't looking at birds which  
don't flash sunlight. And when you say "I seriously doubt..."  
how do you know ? You weren't there.

<snip>

>Your other questions can be addressed in similar fashion. Where



>was Arnold wrong in a specific instance? I don't know. Where was  
>Arnold right in a specific instance? You don't know, and neither  
>does David Rudiak.

Logic such as this leads to throwing out everything which  
doesn't agree with the proposed explanation.

>>The skeptic assumption is that Arnold was wrong in one or more  
>>of his descriptive details. For example, that Arnold  
>>overestimated the distance. But he said the objects were going  
>>in and out of mountain peaks which were about 20 miles away. Was  
>>he wrong?>

>I don't know. Do you? My question was, what if he was wrong?

We all know what it means if he was wrong... and Hynek grabbed  
at this to explain the objects as ordinary military aircraft  
about 6 miles away.

>>Clearly if the details can be modified "at will" any sighting  
>>can be explained. The analysis of the Arnold sighting has been  
>>carried out with the full realization that Arnold could have  
>>been wrong on some fine points. But to get a conventional  
>>explanation one has to assume Arnold was wrong on some major  
>>points.

>So? How do you presume to know that he wasn't wrong on some major  
>points?

Easton has argued that the elevation was wrong and therefore you  
can't believe Arnold. However, I have shown that Arnold's  
estimate of the elevation based on the objects appearing to be  
on his horizon, is understandable. Could he have been wrong  
on any other points? Sure, to some degree. The real question  
is, which points and how far wrong... i.e., what do we have to  
reject to get an explanation/ This is plain old case analysis  
which has been going on for years. Menzel was an expert... he  
offered 6 explanations for Arnold's sighting. None of these  
was birds, by the way.

>>If you are going to "complain" that Arnold wasn't perfect, then  
>>specify where you think he was wrong and we can argue over  
>>whether or not it makes sense in the context of the sighting to  
>>assume he was wrong..

>Sorry, Bruce, can't do. For all I know, he could have been wrong in  
>general. A little more than a month after his original sighting, he claimed  
>another one of small objects, 3-5 ft. in diameter, numbering a couple of  
>dozen or more. If you or Rudiak would like to exercise your mathematical  
>abilities on this case, you're perfectly welcome to. In fact, I wish you  
>would.

Have no information on that case. But, if you can't offer constructive  
argument on Arnold's first sighting... then retire from it.

>A few years later, in 1952, Arnold claimed to have filmed two  
UFOs, one of which could be seen through, and which apparently  
led him to conclude that UFOs were living objects. Arnold would  
go on to claim several more sightings in his lifetime. Lucky  
dude, eh?>

>Have you seen the film Arnold claimed to have taken on this  
>occasion? Neither have I. Odd that he didn't make it publicly  
>and readily available, isn't it, as it would have surely proved,  
>or at least supported, his earlier claim.>  
Who knows what it would have proved if anything. Perhaps the  
images were too small/ Anyway, I haven't seen it.

>>>You, Maccabee and others can mathematically analyze Arnold's  
>>>original statements all you want, or until Hell freezes over,  
>>>whichever comes first. And it doesn't mean a goddamn thing unless  
>>>you think he was absolutely dead on and incapable of any error  
>>>in perception whatever.>

>>Not very clever remark. Sounds "whiney">>

>Sorry, we can't be clever 24 hours a day, can we?

Apparently not.

>>>Now explain how Miracle Man, i.e., Arnold, came to believe that  
>>>UFOs were living organisms.>

>>>Troubling, isn't it?>

>>Perhaps, but so what? >

>>When the interpretation is separated from the observation  
>>and the observation is analyzed, the witness' suggestion as to  
>>the interpretation becomes irrelevant. >

>It's late here, so I'm not going to address the above statement  
>in any detail. If you had it to do over, though, I think you  
>would have put it differently.>  
>Yes, I would define "observation" better. Observation refers to  
>the descriptive details and history of the sighting with as little  
>"interpretation" as possible.

>>You seem to be saying that because Arnold in later years  
>>concluded saucers were animals, that therefore one can't believe  
>>the observational details in his first sighting. >

>>Sorry, I don't buy it..

>Well, something of the sort, although it's not quite as  
>straightforward as that. I simply have reservations about  
>Arnold's first sighting that are serious enough to lead me to  
>wonder whether or not they are worthy of the mathematical  
>calculations you and Rudiak have devoted to same, in light of  
>some other statements by Arnold.

Fine. You don't like calculations? Then go do something else.  
If you want to stand up and be counted in the "explanation"  
camp.... be my guest and join the birds.

>Such as his second sighting, little more than a month later, and  
>his claim of having filmed a living, transparent UFO in 1952.  
>(See my response to Jerry Clark for additional details.) Have  
>you ever seen this film? Wouldn't you admit that, if it exists,  
>it would prove much more evidential than anything Arnold had to  
>say about his earlier June, 1947, sighting?>

I don't know if it would prove more evidential. After all,  
anyone could claim the film was a hoax which Arnold created to  
support his earlier sighting and then he realized that the film  
wasn't very good so he didn't make it available for analysis.

>So where is the Arnold film that would obviate anything he had  
>to say about his 1947 sighting? Wouldn't it save you and Rudiak  
>some serious calculus? But what if there isn't any such film?>.

Who knows what the 1952 film would "say" about the 1947  
sighting. I don't

>I trust you or Rudiak will get back to us on this matter post  
>haste. After all, why mathematically analyze Arnold's claims  
>when you could be mathematically analyzing his film?

Sure. Get us the film.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 12:47:44 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 15:57:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: James Easton <[voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)>  
>To: UFO UpDates <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 04:19:27 +0100

>Regarding:

>>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400  
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>Bruce wrote:

>>>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Regarding Arnold's first sighting... which has been the  
>>subject of my discussion... there is no assumption that Arnold  
>>was "absolutely incapable of human error." Anyone who thinks  
>>there was such an assumption does not understand the nature of  
>>the analysis. In fact, the arguments assume that Arnold could  
>>have been in error in some places.

>Bruce,

>Surely it's not debatable whether Kenneth Arnold "could" have  
>been in error in "some" places, that fact is acknowledged and  
>highlighted in your paper - 'The Complete Sighting Report of  
>Kenneth Arnold, with Comments and Analysis'.>

>>But, let's get down to the crux of the matter: which Arnold  
>>statements would you like to reject or modify?>

>We could start with those you have previously accepted!>

>>1) Arnold says he saw flashes of sunlight on his plane. Did he  
>>or didn't he? What did he see?

>So far as I can see, this claim didn't surface until Arnold's  
>much later book, 'The Coming of the Saucers'.

So far as you can see.....hmmmmmm. ..how far can you see?  
(Oh, say, can you see.....)

Well, let me quote from Arnold's letter to the Air Force as  
found in the Blue Book file: (after searching for the downed  
military aircraft and then turning east toward Yakima)

" I hadn't flown more than 2 or 3 minutes on my course when a  
bright flash reflected on my plane. It startled me as I thought  
I was too close to some other aircraft." Arnold then started  
looking around, and saw the objects to the north of Rainier,  
flying southward. "They were approaching Mt. Rainier rapidly and

I merely assumed they were jet planes. Anyhow, I discovered that this was where the reflection had come from, as 2 or 3 of them, every few seconds, would dip or change their course slightly, just enough for the sun to strike them at an angle that reflected brightly on my airplane."

Later on he refers to seeing them over the complete time of the sighting:

" I might add that my complete observation of these objects, which I could even follow by their flashes as they passed Mt. Adams, was around two and one half or three minutes....."

>>2) Arnold said the initial flashes came from an area north of >>Mt. Rainier. Did he perhaps get the direction wrong, or is there >>something else?

>Did Arnold state this before it was claimed in his book, or did >he originally and consistently say the objects were first seen >over the slopes of Mount Rainier, for example:

>'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian - June 26, 1947'

>"Mr. Arnold reported he was flying east at 2:50 p.m. Tuesday >toward Mt. Rainier when the objects appeared directly in front of >him 25-30 miles away at about 10,000 feet altitude".

>'Norman, Oklahoma Transcript - June 26, 1947'

>"Arnold said the strange aircraft were skittering across the >southwest slope of Mount Rainier when he first sighted them".>

>'Oregon Journal - June 27, 1947'

>"Arnold, general manager and owner of the Great Western Fire >Control Company, said he first saw the objects when they flashed >in the sun low over the slopes of Mt. Rainier".

Thanks for publishing the newspaper versions of the story....  
please note Maccabee's First Law of Reporting: media in, garbage out...

Anyway, what I quoted above came from his letter to the Air Force written several weeks later. He definitely says the initial sighting direction was to the NORTH of Mt. Rainier.

>>3) Arnold thought the objects were a little higher than he was >>(9,500 ft, vs his 9,200). What do you think the TRUE altitude >>was, if you don't accept Arnold's statement?

>From your detailed analysis, I thought you had determined, "it >appears that they were lower than 6,000 ft and that Arnold >overestimated their altitude".

>Further quoting from your research:

>"These statements about how they flew with respect to the >mountain peaks are very important because they provide >information on the distance from Mr. Arnold. These mountain peaks >lie along a wide north-south line extending southward from Mt. >Rainier to Mt. Adams. These peaks were about 20 miles east of >Arnold at the time. These statements also provide the altitude of >the objects. To Arnold they appeared to be approximately at his >altitude because they seemed to be 'pretty much on the horizon to >me.' Since he was flying at 9,200 ft, this implies that they were >close to that altitude. (Arnold actually stated his letter that >they were at 9,500 ft.) However, the mountain peaks south of >Rainier generally are 5,000 to 7,000 ft high, with the higher >ones being farther away (more to the east) from Arnold. Hence his >statement that there were higher peaks on the far side of the >pathway indicates that the objects were definitely lower than >about 7,000 ft".

>"Is it reasonable to assume that he could have made an error of >several thousand feet in estimating their altitude? The answer to >this question lies in the fact that Arnold inferred the altitude >by observing that the objects appeared to be almost exactly on >his horizon (i.e., level with his altitude). But it is very

>difficult to determine the exact horizon from an airplane. In  
>his case, the angle (the "depression angle") between exact  
>horizontal and his downward sighting line to the mountain peaks  
>south of Mt. Rainier was very small. The depression angle from  
>Arnold's plane at 9,200 ft altitude to the top of a 5,500 ft high  
>mountain at a distance of 20 miles (105,600 ft) was about 20.  
>Such a small angle would be difficult to detect from an airplane.  
>So the answer is yes, he could easily have made an error of 4,000  
>ft in estimating the altitude of the objects. Perhaps if he had  
>looked up the actual altitudes of the mountain peaks south of Mt  
>Rainier he would have revised his statement".

The preceding paragraphs were taken from my paper where I  
concluded that the objects were probably at about 5,000 ft. To the  
perceptive reader, however, there will be no contradiction  
between that previous analysis and the discussion here which is  
related to whether or not BIRDS at 5500 ft altitude could have  
caused the sighting;

Arnold said that he believed they were at his level. The  
interpretation of this statement is that there was at most a  
SMALL depression angle, as I calculated in the preceding  
analysis. I estimated it at about 2 degrees (written erroneously  
as 20 in the above paragraph; figure the angle of 4000 ft drop  
over a range of 105,000 ft is 2.2 degrees). Now try to imagine  
the situation with BIRDS which would have been MUCH closer. For  
example, birds might have been, say as much as 1 mile away

>>4) Arnold described them as "flipping and flashing". If this is  
>>not what he saw, then what do you think he saw?

>He also described them as "fluttering and sailing". Would you  
>disagree that's consistent with birds and far removed from a  
>'craft'?

What counts is the "flashing". Can birds create a flash  
like a mirror reflection or a metallic reflection?

>>5) Arnold claimed he looked at his dashboard clock when the first  
>>one passed Mt. Rainier.... Did he get the time wrong? If so, by  
>>how much?

>Although I can't see it's significant, curiously, he also claimed  
>the timing was taken on his watch:

>'Chicago Daily Tribune - June 25, 1947'

>"I took out my watch and checked off one minutes and 42 seconds  
>from the time they passed Mount Rainier\*\*\*".

>'Norman, Oklahoma Transcript - June 26, 1947'

>"I clocked them with a stop watch during the time it took them to  
>fly from Mount Rainer to Mount Adams".

>The question is, if Kenneth Arnold's estimate of the objects'  
>altitude was in error by some 4,000-5,000 feet - in which case  
>the objects were only flying at about half the altitude he  
>thought - then how can we have any confidence in his other  
>perceptions?

He wasn't in error in stating that the objects were at about his  
altitude. As I pointed out, he could well have made an error  
of 2 degrees in depression angle, thinking it was actually  
horizontal. That 2 degrees translates to 4,000 ft or so at a  
distance of 20 miles. However, may I suggest you calculate  
what the distance down from the plane would be for birds only 1  
mile from the plane at a 2 degree depression angle. (Hint:  
birds are at 1/20th of the distance, so at 1/20th of the distance  
down from the plane). Can birds fly at nearly 9,000 ft?

>If that was so grossly mistaken, as evidenced in your analysis,  
>then it MUST affect all related judgements and estimates.

Sorry.... logical deduction based on incorrect premise. Hence,  
wrong.

>>6) Arnold looked again at the clock as the last one passed

>>Rainier.... did he get the time wrong? If so, by how much?

>The timing isn't an issue, it's whether the objects were perhaps  
>much closer than he guessed.

True. If you accept his timing,... then distance (and size)  
is everything.

>Obviously the closer these objects actually were, the faster they  
>would appear to travel between two distant, fixed points.>

True. And there are other consequences. Such as the  
depression angle. Birds 4000 ft below the plane and only 1  
mile away are at nearly 40 degree depression angle.

>>7) Arnold said he turned the plane sideways and looked through  
>>his open window. At this time he would have been flying south,  
>>parallel to the objects. Was he wrong/lying?>

>In that early radio interview, he claimed, "I turned the plane  
>around and opened the window".

>When he turned his plane "around" it was during the timing  
>exercise and we don't know if he changed direction by 90 degrees,  
>180 degrees, or something else.>

Only makes sense to turn to the right. Otherwise would be  
flying away from the objects. Window on left, pilot on left...  
so turn plane to the right and roll down left window. Head  
south.

>What effect might the change of direction have had on his  
>perception of the objects' speed and respective distances between  
>them, his plane and the mountains?

Well, for one thing, if they were birds he would have realized  
within a few seconds that he was gaining on them (Arnold..100 mph  
or more; birds - 50 mph or less)

>>The analysis of the Arnold sighting has been carried out with  
>>the fulfill realization that Arnold could have been wrong on  
>>some fine points. But to get a conventional explanation one has  
>>to assume Arnold was wrong on some major points.

>Isn't this the conclusion of your own critique?

Only the incorrect altitude estimate.... which was not  
surprising considering the distance of the objects.

>As you remarked:

>"So the answer is yes, he could easily have made an error of  
>4,000 ft in estimating the altitude of the objects">

>How can that be a "fine point"?  
Explained above.

>Has that analysis examined what Kenneth Arnold reported to the  
>press in the days following his sighting?>

>I've been looking at this and note, for example, that the  
>'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian' newspaper on 26 June reported,  
>"Mr. Arnold admitted the angle from which he viewed the objects  
>would make difficult precise estimation of their speed...">

Yes, Arnold was honest. From his position nearly 50 mile north  
of Mt. Adams he could not be certain exactly when the objects  
reached the distance of Mt Adams. So he couldn't be sure of the  
exact timing of the objects from Rainier to Adams. He might  
have underestimated a bit.

>>If you are going to "complain" that Arnold wasn't perfect, then  
>>specify where you think he was wrong and we can argue over  
>>whether or not it makes sense in the context of the sighting to  
>>assume he was wrong..

>I trust some relevant points are cited above.  
and "demolished" above.

>Kenneth Arnold's original story is a relatively simple tale.

>He observed nine reflective objects which at first he thought  
>were geese, because their flight characteristics were similar.

No, he first thought they were jet aircraft. He assumed they were metallic because of the flashes. Actually his first thought was that he had gotten too close to some airplane. Then he looked around and saw flashes coming from north of Rainier.

>Arnold then dismissed this possibility as the objects appeared to  
>be travelling too fast, concluding they must instead be  
>airplanes.

>Yet Arnold never seems to raise any objections to the objects  
>being birds, other than the perceived airspeed. Even in  
>subsequent interviews, he doesn't rule out the prospect due to  
>what we might have assumed the most obvious conclusion - that  
>birds wouldn't be visible if the objects were truly some 20-30  
>miles distant.

So far as I know he never considered that they might be birds even though he compared their flight characteristics with birds.. which means he could have proposed to himself the bird hypothesis and rejected it. Arnold referred several times in his letter to the Air Force to his opinion that they were fast jets.

>Arnold then decided to take this opportunity to 'clock' the  
>airspeed of the 'planes'.

>It's perhaps crucial to appreciate that Arnold only decided to  
>carry out this exercise because, as he says in the radio  
>interview, "I just thought I'd see how fast they were going,  
>since among pilots we argue about speed so much".

Crucial? Only? He thought they were jets. Probably wondered just how fast the military aircraft could go

>It wasn't a result of Arnold believing the airplanes were  
>travelling at an incredible speed. He only concluded that after  
>first carrying out a timing between two prominent landmarks and  
>then later calculating how far apart those landmarks were in  
>conjunction with the 'stop watch' reading.  
Wrong. He assumed from the first that they were jets.

>As he timed the objects' - believed to be airplanes - what then  
>surprised him was a realisation that they didn't have any  
>'tails'.

>However, as Arnold related, he didn't give either this or the  
>apparently fast airspeed too much thought at the time.>

It didn't bother him too much while he was flying, even after he found a time of only 102 seconds from Rainier to Adams \ because, as he wrote to the AF, he knew that the army and air forces had fast aircraft.

>Consequently, he worked out that the distance between the two  
>fixed points was some 50 miles and that if the objects had  
>travelled that distance, as he thought, in the 1 minute and  
>forty seconds recorded, they must have been travelling at an  
>unprecedented speed.  
This was after he landed.

>If, as you explained in the detailed analysis, Arnold's estimate  
>of the objects' altitude was grossly mistaken and that when he  
>apparently turned his plane around during this timing exercise,  
>we don't know if he changed direction by 90, or 180 degrees, or  
>something else, then consequently, there can be surely be no  
>confidence in his overall perceptions.

As described above his incorrect estimate of the altitude is understandable. This has no bearing on the accuracy of his recall in turning the plane. As for the turn itself, if he turned to the right he would open the left window near him and look out while flying parallel to the objects. Had he turned to the right he would have flown away from them.

No point in turning 180 degrees or 360.

Makes sense for him to turn to the right, whether unknowns or

birds. However, if brds he woudl have realized immediately that he was going faster

>Obviously the closer these 'fluttering' objects actually were,  
>the faster they would appear to travel between two distant fixed  
>points.

Yes, when flying a "crossing" pattern. And, if Arnold initially saw them toward a direction north of Rainier, then by the time they got right in front of him (and below) they would have been closer.

>When logic kicks in and we consider that the observation was  
>wholly subjective, has proven misconceptions and that Kenneth  
>Arnold reported a subsequent sighting with similar  
>characteristics and which was almost certainly of birds... at  
>what point does this remotely become sustainable evidence of  
>'alien spacecraft'?

When logic kicks in and one attempts to formulate a reasonable reconstruction based on Arnold (traveling 100 mph or faster at 9,200 ft) and birds (traveling 50 m,ph or slower at 5,000 ft) one finds it just doesn't work. Arnold would have gotten close enough to recognize birds by their shapes and by their lower speed and lower altitude.

Sorry.... this pelican has its bellyful.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## The Books Of Charles Fort Now Online

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 05:00:39  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 22:07:45 -0400  
Subject: The Books Of Charles Fort Now Online

Source: <http://www.aracnet.net/~fortean/index.htm>

Go to the page for links!

Stig

\*\*\*

Mr. X, Consulting Resologist

The Fortean Web Site of Mr. X / Le Fortean Site de M. X / El  
Sitio de Fortean de Sr. X / Il Fortean Site di Sig. X / Der  
Fortean Site von Herr X

Mr. X has a great interest in the life and works of the author Charles Hoy Fort. He is a member of the International Fortean Organization. In addition to contributing articles to the INFO Journal and other Fortean publications, Mr. X long ago published the Res Bureaux Bulletin. Since the demise of the Res Bureaux Bulletin, when printing and postal costs became excessive, other resources have been developed, which will allow the rapid processing and dissemination of information to researchers and enthusiasts with Fortean interests, (such as the Internet). The purpose of this web site is to provide a place where Mr. X can communicate with those who share his interests in Charles Hoy Fort and Fortean things.

This site is being expanded to include:

Things pertaining Charles Hoy Fort:

- =95Books by Charles Hoy Fort (The Book of the Damned, New Lands, Lo!, and Wild Talents)
- =95Short stories, a novel, Many Parts (an autobiography), and unpublished writings by Charles Hoy Fort
- =95The correspondence of and to Charles Hoy Fort
- =95Notes written and collected by Charles Hoy Fort
- =95Articles about Charles Hoy Fort (including reviews of his books)

Fortean things of special interest to Mr. X:

- =95UFO reports in Canada
- =95Sea monsters and lake monsters in Canada
- =95Poltergeists
- =95Extraordinary mirages (such as phantom lands)
- =95Spontaneous human combustions
- =95Unknown planets (such as Vulcan, Planet X, and the Ottawa Object)
- =95Caraboo
- =95Articles by Mr. X

New things:

- =95Articles contributed to this site

=95Occasional news of Fortean things  
=95Ryook Phyoo (a collection of Fortean notes, questions, and requests)  
=95Links to other sites of Fortean interest

Communications, (preferably in English), may be sent to Mr. X by  
electronic mail at [fortean@aracnet.net](mailto:fortean@aracnet.net) or by letters to: Box  
1598, Kingston, Ontario K7L 5C8 CANADA.

<snip>

=A9 X, 1998 , 1999

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## The Millennium Project News - June 7, 1999

From: Paul Anderson - TMP/CPR-Canada <[psa@direct.ca](mailto:psa@direct.ca)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 21:07:02 -0800  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 22:13:11 -0400  
Subject: The Millennium Project News - June 7, 1999

The Millennium Project News  
News and Updates from The Millennium Project

June 7, 1999

---

See the TMP web site for links to the following news stories and updates, as well as an archive of previous news and information on other TMP resources:

<http://persweb.direct.ca/psa>

---

### WEEKLY BRIEFING

More of the latest crop circle reports from England, with some beautiful new formations at Barbury Castle and Penton Grafton, as well as other places. Also, experiments that show earthly bacteria can survive simulated Martian conditions, bizarre changes occurring on our own sun, a warning of possible intense solar storms expected at the end of this year which could disrupt power systems here on earth (just in time for Y2K) and the latest weekly UFO reports from George Filer.

In Special Research Projects, a report on how the FAA is lying to the public in regard to Y2K (and how many of you saw the 60 Minutes Y2K story last week? - very thought provoking and challenging). More of the mystery contrails were seen here in Vancouver this week, although not as numerous as on some other days. One large one spread out and drifted past the sun, producing a prominent halo effect. Also reports from Linda Moulton Howe on new "Nano Bombs" being tested by the US military which may be related to the "chemtrails" and a UFO photographed next to a mass of contrails seen over Phoenix in April. More radar anomalies from California and Oklahoma, including corresponding infrared satellite images (see also previous reports on the web site). If there is any real phenomenon behind any of this and not just radar glitches, then this is what we should be looking for, collaborative images from satellites, and not relying on the radar images alone.

Finally a reminder that the next Fields of Dreams crop circle presentation is June 21 in Vancouver, BC at Barlay Manor.

Wishing a good week to all of you.

Paul Anderson  
Director  
The Millennium Project

---

NEWS AND REPORTS

- \* Latest Crop Circle Updates from England
- \* Bacteria Can Grow in Simulated Mars Environment
- \* Changes in Sun Have Scientists Baffled
- \* Ferocious Solar Storm to Herald Millennium
- \* Highlights of Pisa UFO Conference
- \* Filer's Files #22 - June 4, 1999

#### SPECIAL RESEARCH PROJECTS

##### Y2K:

- \* Lies, Lies and FAA Lies

##### Mystery Contrails:

- \* New Reports and Photos from BC, Ontario and Texas
- \* Blowing up Dangerous Germs with Oily "Nano Bombs"
- \* UFO Photographed in Contrails over Phoenix

##### Radar Anomalies:

- \* Ring over California; Radar and Infrared Satellite Images from Oklahoma

#### THE MILLENNIUM FORUM

- \* Next Fields of Dreams Crop Circle Presentation  
June 21 in Vancouver, BC

---

The Millennium Project News is the e-mail update service of The Millennium Project, an independent research organization initiated in January 1999 as an alternative source of news and information to the mainstream media. TMP was founded by future studies researcher Paul Anderson, also director of Circles Phenomenon Research Canada.

TMP News is published weekly or as breaking news develops, with the latest news and reports, information on TMP events and web site updates and is available free by subscription; to be added to or removed from the mailing list, send your request, including either "subscribe TMP News" or "unsubscribe TMP News" and e-mail address to: [psa@direct.ca](mailto:psa@direct.ca)

TMP welcomes your news leads and submissions. Forward all correspondence to:

E-Mail:  
[psa@direct.ca](mailto:psa@direct.ca)

Tel / Fax:  
604.731.8522

Mail:  
Suite 202 - 2086 West 2nd Avenue  
Vancouver, BC  
V6J 1J4  
Canada

=A9 The Millennium Project, 1999

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 00:12:34 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 22:15:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>From: Joe Murgia <[Ufojoel@aol.com](mailto:Ufojoel@aol.com)>  
>Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 09:46:49 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net), [blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)

>>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:18:23 PDT

>>I will be making a final report on Gulf Breeze in which I will  
>>show you and any objective person that all the pictures that  
>>were taken by Mr. Ed Walters could have -and were- taken by him  
>>in a hoaxed manner.

>>Mr. Art Hufford, one of the MUFON investigators on the Gulf  
>>Breeze case, saw an object during the daylight for twenty  
>>seconds. He drew that object and went around on national TV [I  
>>heard him at least twice] and said to Ed Walters: I saw  
>>something exactly like what you saw. But if you look at Art  
>>Hufford's drawings, there are no portholes or windows in Mr.  
>>Hufford's UFO. Does it have a similar shape? Somewhat, but there  
>>are no windows or portholes. So obviously, contrary to what Art  
>>Hufford told the national media, he did not see the same object  
>>that Ed Walters allegedly photographed [which shows portholes  
>>and windows]. Since he was caught and this was brought to his  
>>attention by myself and other investigators, he later stated  
>>that there may have been windows, but I didn't see any. So  
>>contrary to popular belief, Art Hufford did not EVER see the  
>>same object that Ed Walters photographed.

>No, this is not correct. Art Hufford might have seen the same  
>object and he might not have seen the same object. There's no  
>way to tell for sure since his sighting wasn't detailed enough.  
>You criticize the others for jumping to conclusions on what they  
>saw when you do the same thing.

Important aspects of the object Hufford saw did agree with Ed's  
photos: the overall shape, top light and the bottom "power ring"  
light.

And then there are Fenner and Shirley McConnell who saw the same  
thing on July 8, 1988 hovering over the Pensacola Bay near their  
house. They saw "windows" and the reflection in the water of  
the light from the "power ring."

These are only a couple of the sightings that described the  
same thing Ed photographed.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [blackhole60](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: **GT McCoy** <[gtmccoy@harborside.com](mailto:gtmccoy@harborside.com)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 21:49:58 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 22:20:15 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

Hell just froze over, Hi all , I had to answer whether Arnold could measure Time and Distance!!!

>>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>>>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 21:17:52 EDT  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>>The Eastonian Times-Picayune is back, starting off with the  
>>>usual bird-brained theories about the original Kenneth Arnold  
>>>sighting. Bruce Maccabee, myself, and others argued ourselves  
>>>blue in the face with all sorts of mathematical and other  
>>>arguments why birds couldn't possibly work (can birds outfly a  
>>>plane?). A lot of good it did. Don't get me started.

>>Why don't we get you started? Did it ever occur to you (and  
>>Maccabee) that your mathematical arguments and analysis of the  
>>Arnold case are only right if you assume Arnold was absolutely  
>>incapable of human error? But what if he was wrong? What if, for  
>>example, he saw another flight of some 20-25 objects not too  
>>long after his original sighting which certainly sound like  
>>birds to most of us? What if he went on to report seven UFO >  
>>sightings total? What if he eventually concluded that UFOs are  
>>space animals -- "living organisms...in the atmosphere"?)>

I don't buy his 'living organism ' either, but again if the  
Technology is advanced enough..

>Regarding Arnold's first sighting... which has been the subject  
>of my discussion.... there is no assumption that Arnold was  
>"absolutely incapable of human error." Anyone who thinks there  
>was such an assumption does not understand the nature of the  
>analysis. In fact, the arguments assume that Arnold could have  
>been in error in some places. But, let's get down to the crux  
>of the matter: which Arnold statements would you like to reject  
>or modify?

>1) Arnold says he saw flashes of sunlight on his plane. Did he  
>or didn't he? What did he see?

>2) Arnold said the initial flashes came from an area north of  
>Mt. Rainier. Did he perhaps get the direction wrong, or is there  
>something else?

There is this little thing called a compass, and for a while a  
"remote compass" which was somewhat more accurate than a panel



mounted compass. Which Arnold should have (and likely did know how to read.) Also, (from my own experience) any one who is a Native or long time Resident of the Northwest U.S., especially Pilots, knows what is north or south in the Cascade Mountains period.

>3) Arnold thought the objects were a little higher than he was >(9,500 ft, vs his 9,200). What do you think the TRUE altitude >was, if you don't accept Arnold's statement?

It is extremely hard to judge altitude in the sky given the conditions Arnold had.

>4) Arnold described them as "flipping and flashing". If this is >not what he saw, then what do you think he saw?

Swamp gas, Obivoiously.

>5)Arnold claimed he looked at his dashboard clock when the first >one passed Mt. Rainier.... Did he get the time wrong? If so, by >how much?

Well it's a instrument panel, not a dash, but he knew what he was doing, if he was a decent navigator.

>6) Arnold looked again at the clock as the last one passed >Rainier.... did he get the time wrong? If so, by how much?

>7) Arnold said he turned the plane sideways and looked through >his open window. At this time he would have been flying south, >parallel to the objects. Was he wrong/lying?

Arnold was obviously worried about distortion (something we in the UFO community seem to not worry enough about).

>etc.

>Any sighting can be broken into a series of observational >details, each of which can be analyzed, but all together of >which form the information content of the sighting.

>The skeptic assumption is that Arnold was wrong in one or more >of his descriptive details. For example, that Arnold >overestimated the distance. But he said the objects were going >in and out of mountain peaks which were about 20 miles away. Was >he wrong?

>Clearly if the details can be modified "at will" any sighting >can be explained. The analysis of the Arnold sighting has been >carried out with the fulfill realization that Arnold could have >been wrong on some fine points. But to get a conventional >explanation one has to assume Arnold was wrong on some major >points.

Back when Arnold was a Pilot you had to Know how to figure time and distance, speed etc. or die . they didn't have some sattlite feeding you information.

>If you are going to "complain" that Arnold wasn't perfect, then >specify where you think he was wrong and we can argue over >whether or not it makes sense in the context of the sighting to >assume he was wrong..

>>Don't get me started.

>>You, Maccabee and others can mathematically analyze Arnold's >>original statements all you want, or until Hell freezes over, >>whichever comes first. And it doesn't mean a goddamn thing unless >>you think he was absolutely dead on and incapable of any error >>in perception whatever.

He may not have been "dead on" but he saw something and risked his credibililty.

>Not very clever remark. Sounds "whiney"

>>Now explain how Miracle Man, i.e., Arnold, came to believe that >>UFOs were living organisms.

>>Troubling, isn't it?

>Perhaps, but so what?

>When the \_interpretation\_ is separated from the \_observation\_  
>and the \_observation\_ is analyzed, the witness' suggestion as to  
>the \_interpretation\_ becomes irrelevant.

>You seem to be saying that because Arnold in later years  
>concluded saucers were animals, that therefore one can't believe  
>the observational details in his first sighting.  
>Sorry, I don't buy it..

Neither do I.

GT McCoy

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: UFO History Workshop

From: Jan Aldrich <[jan@cyberzone.net](mailto:jan@cyberzone.net)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 06:23:39 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 23:34:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO History Workshop

>Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 18:37:45 -0700  
>From: Jan Aldrich <[jan@CYBERZONE.NET](mailto:jan@CYBERZONE.NET)>  
>Subject: UFO History Workshop  
>To: [PROJECT-1947@LISTSERV.AOL.COM](mailto:PROJECT-1947@LISTSERV.AOL.COM)

>Greetings List,

>On the 29th and 30th of June a number of us met at the  
>International Holiday Inn at Chicago's O'Hare Airport to

The message previously posted on the Chicago UFO History Workshop has the event happening in the future. Sorry, we haven't solved time-travel yet. The real dates of were 29-30 May.

In any case, UFO History exists whether or not UFOs, in fact, exist. There is no question that UFOs were studied by the Air Force, Keyhoe wrote his "Flying Saucers Are Real," numerous accounts were chronicled in newspapers, magazines and by official and unofficial bodies. While UFOs may be dismissed, UFO history *does* exist and can be studied. Many historians might not consider it worthy of study, but it cannot be denied that the history of the phenomenon exists and has had effects on the culture. In fact, in the study of the cold war or aviation history or contemporary culture, this is nearly virgin territory for scholars, something like North America in 1600. The Europeans knew North America was there, and they had actually taken halting steps to exploit it, but in realty it was vast unknown area, a continent whose actual form was unknown.

The same is true about the history of "ufology." Scholars, like the searchers for the Northwest Passage, have tested the margins with treatise on the history of the belief in extraterrestrials. Jodi Dean in her "Aliens in American" appears no different from Cabot mapping some of the coast and hunting for the Northwest Passage, but starting off with a false assumption and missing the potential of a whole continent.

--  
Jan Aldrich  
Project 1947  
P. O. Box 391, Canterbury, CT 06331, USA  
Telephone: (860) 546-9135

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much For

From: Nick Balaskas <[nikolaos@YorkU.CA](mailto:nikolaos@YorkU.CA)>  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 11:07:48 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 23:34:00 -0400  
Subject: Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much For

Hi everyone.

The discovery of these two isotopes of elements 116 and 118 (see below) which have very short life spans strongly suggests that the predicted "island of stability" for elements higher than 114 may not exist. If these elements (and other isotopes of 116 and 118) do have such short life spans as reported, then it would be very unlikely that Robert Lazar's element 115 is a stable element - one that has a life long enough for practical applications.

Nick Balaskas

-----  
PHYSICS NEWS UPDATE  
The American Institute of Physics Bulletin of Physics News  
Number 432 June 7, 1999 by Phillip F. Schewe and Ben Stein

ELEMENTS 118 AND 116 have been discovered at Lawrence Berkeley Lab by crashing a beam of krypton atoms into lead atoms. The three detectable atoms of element 118 have nuclei possessing 118 protons and 175 neutrons for a mass total of 293. The new elements are even further along in the Periodic Table than element 114, whose existence was announced back in January 1999 by scientists in Russia (see Update 412), and further into the "island of stability," the supposed nuclear regime in which certain combinations of neutrons and protons lead to a relatively long life. For all that, the atoms of element 118 still decay after less than a millisecond into element 116 plus an alpha particle. Element 116 then promptly decays into element 114 plus another alpha particle. Ken Gregorich (510-486-7860) led the LBL group that discovered the new nuclei. Four of the team members are German nationals, which prompted DOE secretary Bill Richardson to emphasize the continuing value of international scientists working at US national labs.

(LBL press release, June 7.)

<snip>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Crop Circle Message

From: **Maurizio Baiata** <[mbalien@tin.it](mailto:mbalien@tin.it)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 17:52:51 +0200  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 23:34:00 -0400  
Subject: Crop Circle Message

In this days I read some interesting letters about Crop Circles and if this phenomenon is real or a fake.

Strange question. We have spent more than 20 years of researches, only to repeat the same question?

Thank's God, No!!!

The phenomenon is real. I'm studying the symbols of this marvelous phenomenon by 4 years. Nobody could create the complex message that the Crop Circles presents. If we want believe that someone is hidden behind this phenomenon, the answers are two:

- 1) An incredible black organization with a very advanced technology and a great knowledge of ancient symbols;
- 2) A very advanced and non-terrestrial civilization, (maybe a dimensional intelligence) that is trying to communicate with a part of human race (not all) with a complex system of symbols, only for the people able to understand;

The Crop Circle phenomenon is a beautifull message composed by:

- 1) native american symbols;
- 2) celtics and others european ancient cultures symbols;
- 3) esoteric and masons symbols;
- 4) semitic and religious symbols;
- 5) fractals symbols;
- 6) writing symbols;
- 7) scientific symbols
- 8) other

All is connected to form the message that I have in part readed. I'm writing a book about the message and I'm presenting this research in this days in Italy. Last my presentation was in the Conference of Pisa with Michael Hesemann, Barry Camish and Carlos Diaz.

I can say (and I'm sure about I'm saying), that the message speaks about a new world that is preparing for a new human race. This new man will be able to understand that he is part of a living universe and that the planet Earth is close to a purification. This event will change the face of the planet in a way similar to what happened for Atlantis 12.500 years ago. This is only a part of the message that is possible to read in the field of corn.

If someone want contact me for a clarification or is interested to my presentation for a conference (more than 50 slides to read the message) can write me to my personal address:

[aforgi@hotmail.com](mailto:aforgi@hotmail.com)

All the best to all  
Adriano Forgione  
Editor in chief of:  
UFO Network magazine  
Dossier Alieni magazine

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Intruders Foundation Website

From: Sue Kovios <[bradford@globalserve.net](mailto:bradford@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 07:32:29 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 23:34:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: Intruders Foundation Website

>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 10:50:24 -0500  
>From: Alfred Lehmborg <[Lehmborg@snowhill.com](mailto:Lehmborg@snowhill.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Intruders Foundation Website

>>Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 15:58:02 -0400  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
>>Subject: Intruders Foundation Website

><snip>

>>I will continue to moderate and maintain the Abduction  
>>Information Center. Members can simply continue to access the  
>>website and interactive e-mail list the same as always. However,  
>>AIC will no longer be affiliated with Budd or the Intruders  
>>Foundation.

<snip>

>>I hope this doesn't create an inconvenience for anyone.  
>>It's just something I have to do for myself.

>I am saddened by this development, worry about losing the solidity of  
>your passionate involvement, and hope it was not some bland and  
>convenient partisanship that caused its precipitation.

<snip>

>You are a true hero -- John; a pioneer. Those that follow  
>shuffle in your footprints.

>It was you after all that convinced us that this phenomena was  
>happening to real people. You interested the lay person with  
>your believable discourse, the wealth of your spirit, and your  
>seemingly tireless enthusiasm.

>You did this in the face of all ridicule, discouragement, and  
>irritation.

>You did it for virtually nothing.

John is a passionate man and does everything from the heart. If you've heard him talk about his family you'd know what I mean. If you heard him talk about the IF Conference you'd know what I mean. He doesn't need rewards to make things happen. But there comes a time when you have to draw the line when certain agendas are met at your expense or other circumstances demand your attention.

Like a parent raising a child, you finally have to cut the strings and say 'I've brought you this far. You're on your own now.' But I know John will always be there to catch someone if they fall.

I would like everyone to join me in letting John know we're here to catch him right now. Some may not understand what I mean and some will, and I'll just leave it at that.

John, you're not a quitter and as Arnie Schwarzeneger said to me the other day 'You'll be back'.

>We'll all live to see your vindication and your ultimate  
>success, I'm sure.

>Good luck, and damn the torpedoes.  
>[Lehmberg@snowhill.com](mailto:Lehmberg@snowhill.com)

I don't think vindication is a priority to John. Be at Peace  
with yourself right now John and let the chips fall where  
they may.

Bear hugs to you buddy.

Sooz

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 8](#)

## Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

From: Richard G Brown <[rgbrown@web.net](mailto:rgbrown@web.net)>  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 03:46:00 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 23:34:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

>From: Rense E-News <[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)>  
>To: Rense E-News <[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)>  
>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:40:01 -0600  
>Subject: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

>-----  
>Jeff Rense Weekly E-News  
>-----

<snip>

> \* From Jeff's Desk \*

>There are hundreds of short, sometimes intriguing but thoroughly  
>unverifiable stories circulating on the net purporting to reveal  
>the truth of human ET visitation and contact. Wading through  
>these sometimes sensational items is not always easy. Most are  
>rather obvious hoaxes, some are very well written and show  
>considerable creativity, while others often contain a mixture of  
>truth and fiction that is not easily dismissed. Most all of them,  
>however, have one thing in common: anonymous or unknown sources.  
>Here is an example of one of the many 'ET revelations' that show  
>up in our mailbox several times a month...

>>From Robert Collins, 6-4-99, <[LesMiserable@sprintmail.com](mailto:LesMiserable@sprintmail.com)>:

>The following is an account of the meeting I (the source) was  
>involved in with EBE-2.

>On March 5, 1983, I was at Los Alamos National Laboratories  
>conducting business on a counterintelligence project. During

<snip>

>EBE-2 explained the weather of it's planet which was dry,  
>varying temperature between 65-90 degrees. There was 35  
>hours of constant sunshine and three hours of darkness

I know I'm going to regret this... But how can a planet have  
such vastly unequal periods of day and night? 35 hours to 3?!?  
Shouldn't they be relatively equal?

Even in a binary system it couldn't be consistant enough to be  
35 and 3 every day could it?

- Confused in Canada

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 12:42:48 -0500  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 00:07:27 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

<snip>

>David Rudiak

David,

Arnold claims to have filmed two UFOs over Mt. Lassen in 1952, one of which was transparent, an experience which led him to believe that flying saucers were living creatures capable of changing their density at will.

Wouldn't you agree that this film would be much more compelling evidence than a spoken or written account of having seen something?

Have you ever seen a still from this film published anywhere in the vast UFO literature? Arnold had a working relationship with Ray Palmer, editor of Fate magazine, who I'm sure would have been only too happy to publish a picture of the real thing.

In that same vast literature, have you ever run across a single account by anyone else who ever claimed to have seen Arnold's film?

For the record, I included Arnold's own account of his Mt. Rainier sighting as "What Happened on June 24, 1947," in UFOs 1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers, co-edited with Hilary Evans. I have copies of the illustrated, 272-page hardback available for \$19.95, plus \$3.00 s/h.

Aside from Arnold, the book contains articles by Jenny Randles, Jerome Clark, Jacques Vallee, Bill Chalker, Ray Fowler, Chris Rutkowski, Robert Durant, David Perkins, Col. Hector Quintanilla, Michael Swords, Karl Pflock, James Moseley, Jan Aldrich, Vicente-Juan Ballester Omos and others.

In September of this year I'll be hosting the 36th annual National UFO Conference here in San Antonio. Speakers include Whitley Strieber, Kevin Randle, Joe Firmage, psychotherapist Constance Clear (author of "Reaching for Reality"), Jim Moseley, Tom Deuley, Walt Andrus, and Linda Corley, who conducted the last in-depth interview with Jesse Marcel, Sr.

Details to follow soon.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## What Have We Really Learned

From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 10:58:06 PDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 00:26:51 -0400  
Subject: What Have We Really Learned

50th Anniversary Of Ufology:  
What Have We Really Learned  
by Jerry Black

To all interested parties;

Back in 1997, during the first week in June, I had received a call from a UPI reporter that had contacted Mr. Kenny Young. Evidently, Young had given him my name for a telephone interview, as the reporter wanted my opinion about the 50th anniversary of the modern era of UFOs.

At the close of the interview, the reporter stated: "I guess, Mr. Black, that you will be throwing a party."

I was silent for about three or four seconds, and the reporter said: "Mr. Black, are you still there?"

"Yes sir," I said. "No, I will not be throwing any parties. For one thing, what have we -as a UFO community- accomplished in the last 50-years? In the last 20-years, I have watched ufology take a step backwards almost every year."

"Our self-proclaimed 'leaders of ufology' have let the whole UFO community down. They seem more concerned with writing books, "I told the reporter," and staying in the public eye than they are with finding out the answers to the UFO phenomenon.

"And these are the people who have been entrusted with keeping the people informed as to what's going on in the UFO community.

"Also," I said to the reporter, "people have been writing books about their UFO and abduction experiences, and most of these books have gone unchallenged. Nobody has made an objective, scientific attempt to analyze the people who have written these books, it basically seems 'up to the public' to decide whether or not these people are telling the truth.

"In my opinion, it is the responsibility of the UFO community to critique these books when they come out, and let the general public know where they stand after they have performed a comprehensive and objective investigation.

"None of these things are being done," I said to the gentleman. "So there is no reason for any celebration about the fiftieth anniversary of the modern-era of ufology."

Now some of you have not liked my tone. I do not apologize for that. My tone has not been the way you have perceived it, my tone is one of determination. Determination to speak out against what I feel are the problems we have with the leadership of ufology. I will continue to speak out against the so-called "leadership" in ufology, the people that everyone sees or hears on TV or radio most of the time.

I think it is a disgrace that the Whitley Strieber case has never been investigated. The responsibility for that lies on the two major groups, in my opinion. I believe that Mr. Walt Andrus and Mr. Jerome Clark are responsible to scientifically and

objectively investigate any major case that makes network news - or to which a book has been written about. There haven't been that many cases which have appeared in the last 15 to 20-years to be concerned with, but there have been a few. These few have been allowed to 'run amuck' out there with these people making money without any serious challenge being made to them.

I certainly don't expect MUFON to make any challenge to books that are written by people claiming to be contactees like Whitley Strieber, or people claiming numerous contacts like Ed Walters. Not only does MUFON not do their job by objectively investigating these cases, but rather, they embrace them at their different symposiums around the country. Most recently, Mr. Strieber was even a guest at symposium-type event.

And while Jerome Clark and The Center for UFO Studies say that there are certainly problems with the Gulf Breeze and Whitley Strieber cases, what have they truly done to make a critical investigation of either case?

Realizing that MUFON was investigating Gulf Breeze, was it the friendship displayed by Budd Hopkins [who wrote the foreword to 'Gulf Breeze'] or Bruce Maccabee [who has upheld Gulf Breeze so staunchly] that they don't want to get involved and make their own analysis? Each organisation, regardless of whose case it is, needs to take a scientific and objective look at each issue and write their own report.

In the case of Whitley Strieber, I don't recall ever reading where MUFON or CUFOS, ever asked to set up equipment in Mr. Strieber's home [which he may have denied anyhow]. I don't think anyone has ever asked, until myself, that Strieber take a properly-sponsored third-party polygraph test. If MUFON or CUFOS have asked to stay in Mr. Strieber's home for over a week with this equipment, then I stand corrected. I do know, for a fact, that they never asked him or his wife Anne, to take a polygraph test.

Whitley Strieber, and now Mr. J. Reed, who alleges to have killed an alien and had it taken from his home, both of these gentlemen have taken self-sponsored polygraph tests. And why have they done so? Because CUFOS, by not making a comprehensive report, and by MUFON, courtesy of Walt Andrus' ridiculous investigation practices, have allowed Ed Walters' self-sponsored polygraph tests to stand. So consequently, Mr. Whitley Strieber felt -as I'm sure Mr. Reed did also- "if they approved of his, why can't we take ours?"

I also think that the self-proclaimed leaders in ufology during the past 10 or 15-years have let the UFO community and general public down.

Again we have Stanton Friedman in his latest book with Whitley Strieber writing the foreword. Not only does he write this segment of Friedman's book, but it is noted very prominently on the outside cover of the book, stating: "Foreword by Whitley Strieber." I asked Mr. Friedman if he supported the Whitley Strieber case, or was this done to help sell the book, by either himself or the publisher. There was no response. Regardless, when UFO investigators who have been in the business 10 or 15-years see what they perceive to be one of the self-proclaimed leaders in ufology with Whitley Strieber writing a foreword for their book, they make the assumption that Mr. Friedman supports the Whitley Strieber case. I cannot see how that Stanton Friedman, without taking a look at the Whitley Strieber story, can support that case.

Mr. Stanton Friedman, one of our self-proclaimed spokesmen, not only supports the hoaxed case of Whitley Strieber, but also -because of his loyalty to Bruce Maccabee and what he has said about the Gulf Breeze investigations - supports the hoaxed Ed Walters/Gulf Breeze scenarios.

Finally, in the last 10 or 15-years, we have had the crossovers. Those are investigators in other fields which may or may not be proven later to be related to the UFO phenomenon. One such crossover is Mr. Richard Hoagland. Another crossover is Mr. Colin Andres, and another crossover is Linda Moulton Howe. If we go back much farther than that, even Mr. Bruce Maccabee is a crossover, in which he was formerly a photographic expert to now feeling he has the expertise [which he has certainly shown no

ability for] to be a UFO investigator.

Getting back to the three recent crossovers, they have crossed over from other fields and became professional UFO investigators. Mr. Richard Hoagland, who dealt with the Face on Mars, has made many predictions that have not come true. Mr. Whitley Strieber, who will brown-nose with anyone in ufology if he figures it will benefit him, has claimed that he likes a person like Richard Hoagland because he "lives on the edge." No, Mr. Strieber, he's not living on the edge. What he is hoping for is that one of his predictions will come true so that he could live off of it for years like Jeanne Dixon did with her Kennedy prediction. Yet none of Hoagland's predictions that he has made in the field of ufology have come true.

Andrew Collins, a few years ago, was going to surprise everyone with this remarkable new evidence about UFOs. He held a conference in which people were to pay \$30 per head at a meeting room at Madison Square Gardens in New York City, and when 30 to 50 people attended, there was no 'new evidence' to be had.

Linda Moulton Howe, who is now on the Art Bell show on a regular basis [along with Whitley Strieber], while she is a nice lady that I have had the opportunity to speak with once, can be very gullible at times.

Mr. Art Bell is what I call "Mr. Entertainer." He has given Mr. Whitley Strieber a podium to speak from on a regular basis. In fact, as I understand it, he has retained Strieber to be a part-time host for the program while he is away. Further, I just learned that he is co-authoring a book with Whitley Strieber. I can guarantee that Art Bell has never checked out Whitley Strieber's story on the basis that I have. He has simply taken his word for what he has to say. He allows people to come on his show and he makes no challenges to them whatsoever. It's one thing to let someone come on your show and speak about their experiences like Mr. J. Reed did, but let's ask these people some tough questions. Let's quit playing Mr. Entertainment man and play the serious investigating man who really wants to get down to the truth. Art Bell does not do that. Art Bell is not a UFO investigator, he is an entertainer. And for those people like Linda Moulton Howe who continue to stay on his show just for the sake of being able to get their message out on ufology or other things, I think they lose credibility for doing so.

JERRY BLACK  
6276 Taylor Pike  
Blanchester, Ohio 45107 (513)  
625-2613

Website: <http://members.xoom.com/blackshole/>

YOU CAN E-MAIL JERRY BLACK AT  
[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?

From: **Steven J. Dunn** <[SDunn@LOGICON.COM](mailto:SDunn@LOGICON.COM)>  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 11:33:13 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 00:58:33 -0400  
Subject: Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?

Greetings list members:

A couple years ago, I saw a television interview with Leroy Gordon Cooper where he claimed to have seen a UFO land on a runway at Edwards AFB.

After a fruitless session of looking on the web, I now ask: does anyone out here in mailinglistland have any further information on this sighting?

If so, please email me directly as well as posting, since I do not get a chance to check list every day.

Thanks a bunch.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 19:51:45 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 08:56:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>From: Martin Phillips <[mphillips@btinternet.com](mailto:mphillips@btinternet.com)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999  
>Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 15:26:49 +0100

>>Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 10:00:42 +0100  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>>Subject: Magonia Monthly Supplement 15, May 1999

>>The debate on the Hudson Valley UFOs caused me to look at Omar  
>>Fowler's booklet The Flying Triangle Mystery. He lists some 50  
>>cases of FTs seen over the UK and Europe in recent years. In  
>>fact FTs seem to be very much in the news just now, with the  
>>recent Granada TV series focusing on them. One point struck me;  
>>every case without exception occurred at night.  
>>There seems to be nothing whatever on an FT seen in daylight.  
>>Certainly I have never read of a well-attested daytime sighting  
>>of a flying triangle, nor have I ever seen a film of such.  
>>Christopher Allan, Stoke-on-Trent

>  
>Surely the first British case, where a fully-trained aircraft  
>observer saw a triangle flying over the North Sea, counts as a  
>daytime observation. The witness was a member of the Royal  
>Observer Corps, and trained to recognise any aircraft in an  
>instant. He saw a triangle being refuelled by a KC-135, with two  
>F111s alongside. I don't think you could ask for a better  
>witness.

>Martin Phillips

Hi,

The Northern UFO News files feature several daylight sightings  
of triangles. These include incidents in Cheshire (1989 I  
believe), near Kendal, Cumbria and one just a few yards from my  
then front door at Fleetwood (I was asleep in bed wouldnt you  
know!)

In my view many of the night time triangles (including those in  
Belgium) are mid air refuelling exercises as several of the UK  
cases circa 1989 were proven to be. But the daylight sightings  
are sufficient in number to establish that some form of aircraft  
was seen. That by no means implies it was an alien aircraft, of  
course.

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 15:23:46 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 08:59:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 12:08:24 -0300  
>From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>  
>  
>>Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 08:53:27 -0500  
>>From: Ron Decker <[decker@wt.net](mailto:decker@wt.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 99 11:49:54 PDT  
>  
>>>>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 13:50:47 -0500  
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>  
>>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>>>>Date: Thu, 03 Jun 99 08:26:28 PDT

<snip>

>As a pilot flying around in my C-172, I'd  
>hate to think there was something big enough up there that could  
>start snacking on one of my wings. Scarey:-)

>Don Ledger

Hi Don,

Hay una criatura que se llama "ChupaCessna." It eats UFOs and  
sucks the pilots out of small craft like the creme from a  
cannolli!

Watch yerself up there Don! ;)

Regards,

John Velez

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 15:32:36 -0500  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 09:15:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 01:02:34 EDT  
>Subject: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

<snip>

>And just lately, Bob and Ryan Wood are looking into a CIA  
>document on UFOs released under FOIA which at the end says that  
>a copy of the memo was being forwarded to -- gasp -- "MJ-12!" A  
>copy of the document was given them by the controversial Timothy  
>Cooper. That still raises the usual issue of provenance. The  
>Woods are now making an independent FOIA request to the CIA for  
>the same document. If they get back an identical copy from the  
>CIA as given them originally by Cooper, that would just about  
>prove the existence of an organization actually called "MJ-12"  
>and its association with secret high-level UFO investigations.

>There, satisfied?

>David Rudiak

David,

Looking at my copy of the document, as published in the March, 1999, MUFON UFO Journal, p. 11, there is nothing to indicate that the document is about UFOs. Its subject matter is "Project 63 (UF-103-M)," whatever that might be.

From the text itself, it's impossible to tell what the hell Hilenkoetter was talking about. Whatever it was, it seems to involve the Bureau of Mines, the National Bureau of Standards and the Department of Commerce, all rather odd bedfellows, one might argue, for MJ-12.

Having seen Dr. Wood's take on the Corso-Birnes historical fairy tale, however, also published in the Journal, I'm not overly impressed by any analytical abilities he brings to the issue of document authentication. Nor was Tom Deuley, who routinely handled the real thing during a stint at NSA. See his response to the Wood piece in the May 1999 Journal.

A brief aside on the Corso-Birnes fantasy. A couple of weeks ago, I came across the obituary in the NY Times of the woman who invented Kevlar. I meant to post it at the time, but didn't. Another terrestrial scientist defamed by that dubious duo.

Cheers,

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

## A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

### 'Parchment Parachutes' - Prof. Moore Explains

From: James Easton <[voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)>  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 02:12:32 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 17:44:38 -0400  
Subject: 'Parchment Parachutes' - Prof. Moore Explains

Following recent discussions concerning the 'parchment', or 'tough paper' described by some witnesses to the 'Roswell' debris, I am indebted, as we should all be, to Bob Todd for the following.

Having mentioned the technical queries to Prof. Charles Moore, Bob has kindly taken the time to pass on, with permission of course, an unexpected response.

This contains significant details that I have personally never seen clarified and which may be explained here for the first time, definitively resolving the question of those 'parchment parachutes'.

Prof. Moore writes:

"This is a belated response with a few comments on the extended outburst from [David] Rudiak on the subject of "MOGUL parchment" parachutes.

First. I still have one of the ML-132 parachutes (of the original Word War II design) used to lower radiosondes to Earth after the 350 gram, ML-131 sounding balloon burst at the end of its ascent. This parachute is made with a rather tough, red, parchment-like paper, a wicker hoop that holds the parachute open for easy inflation and eight "risers" made of cotton twine. The paper canopy would be about 59 inches in diameter if it could be laid out flat; each of the 8 triangular gores is about 29 inches long. The paper is unusual; it's stiff and has been treated to prevent absorption of water.

When stretched out as in the load line in an NYU flight train, the distance from the center of the canopy to the point beneath the wicker ring where the 8 risers came together is about 64 inches.

The 8 risers are strong enough to support a 3 pound radiosonde but are too weak to be withstand the 30 pound or so pull that would have been needed in one of the NYU flight trains used in 1947. We reinforced these parachutes by tying a 60 inch long, 500 pound test nylon line between the top center of the parachute and the bottom of the risers (through the wicker hoop) so that, in flight, the risers were slack and carried none of the load. If the parachute were to inflate on descent, the canopy would distend such that the distance from the center of the canopy and the load attachment point would be much less than 60 inches such that the 500 pound test nylon line would be slack and would not interfere with the parachute deployment. The parachute reinforcement consisted of no more than the tying of a strong nylon line between the apex of the uninflated, stretched-out parachute and the load attachment point at the bottom. It was no big deal.

The pre-war radiosonde parachutes developed by the Weather Bureau were made of silk; when the Signal Corps began procuring parachutes for the U. S. Army, they followed the Weather Bureau design but shifted to the water-resistant paper after silk was no longer available in 1942. In 1947, the NYU group was furnished with both paper and some silk parachutes (and radar

targets) from the Signal Corps supplies at Evans Signal Laboratories. As I remember, we preferred the scarcer silk parachutes because they were stronger and lighter. Since both types of parachute were adequate for our purpose which was to prevent free-fall of the instruments from high-altitude, there was no reason to record which type was used on a given flight and this sort of inconsequential detail was not recorded. I suspect that in drawing up the records for a given flight, our data analysts used the available information on the flight train including what had been planned earlier, back in New York, and not what had actually been available and used in Alamogordo. I have no idea as to which version of ML-132 parachute was used on NYU Flight 4 but the fact that a rather tough, parchment-like paper was found along with debris with pink-purple, flower-like figures suggests to me that the debris included part of a ML-132 paper parachute.

Despite Rudiak's information, there is (and was) no metal used in a ML-132 parachute of the types that we used. And contrary to Rudiak's assertion, the ML-132 parachutes were NOT like "tiny toy paper parasols they sometimes stick in alcohol drinks to be cute".

The ML-132 parachutes were used on the early neoprene-balloon flights because those balloons burst suddenly and Dr. Peoples was concerned about free-falling objects being a hazard when they came to Earth. Having demonstrated to Dr. Peoples that there was little danger of free-falling instruments from cluster flights, we used no parachutes on the HELIOS-configured Flight 7. The later polyethylene balloons such as used on NYU Flights 8, 10, 11, 12 did not fail catastrophically and so, no parachutes were used on these flights. On the other hand, the General Mills people under Project SKYHOOK carried cosmic ray measuring instruments aloft suspended under standard, 24-foot diameter, nylon personnel parachutes. The payloads were recovered by cutting the suspension between the top of the parachutes and the balloons floating at high altitudes. The General Mills people and SKYHOOK never employed the ML-132 radiosonde parachute; all of the payloads were far too heavy for such an insignificant parachute.

The reason that we made an effort to recover NYU Flight 5 and the absence from the Brazel debris of other portions of the NYU Flight 4 train are both discussed in some detail in my chapter in the 1997 by Saler et al".

Both Bob and Prof. Moore express they have no further interest whatsoever in 'Roswell' discussions and this is an exception.

James.  
E-mail: [voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)  
Voyager On-line: <http://web.ukonline.co.uk/voyager/>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 19:34:14 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 17:42:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 22:01:40 -0400  
>Fwd Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 00:13:19 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>In the 'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian, of 26 June, 1947, it's  
>reported of Kenneth Arnold that, "He said he could estimate the  
>distance of the objects better because an intervening peak once  
>blocked his view of them. He found the peak was 25 miles away,  
>he related".

>Perhaps we can still clarify further whether it could have  
>"blocked his view", or, if it's more likely that he simply lost  
>sight of the objects against this intermediate 'peak'.  
> It's important if his perception that the objects 'vanished'  
>behind a distant peak, was a main reason Arnold believed they  
>were some 25 miles distant.

Also because they appeared to be skimming and snaking around  
other peaks of the southern Cascade range. If you look at a  
topo map, there isn't anything between Arnold's position and the  
Cascades that could have obscured his view.

>In 'Resolving Arnold - Part 2: Guess Again', Martin Kottmeyer wrote:

>"The absence of a large population of corroborative witnesses  
>near Mount Rainier seems sufficient grounds for wondering if the  
>event was much more localized than Arnold surmised.

Not really. Not only is the area of the sighting very  
sparsely populated even today, the sighting took place midweek  
instead of a weekend, so that potential vacationers from nearby  
cities like Seattle and Tacoma would be less likely to be there.

Add to this the fact that the region is extremely rugged, and  
that from the ground the views are extremely limited by such  
things as surrounding mountains and trees. I took a detour off  
the interstate last year while driving home from Seattle, drove  
south on Highway 7, which takes you past Mineral, where Arnold's  
sighting took place. That's about 30 miles of mountain road,  
where you are about 25-30 miles from Rainier and the Cascades at  
all times.

I thought the views of Rainier and the southern Cascades would  
be magnificent -- right? Wrong! The road follows mountain  
valleys and fir trees line the road the entire way. I saw  
Rainier only once the entire time, through one valley that  
happened to penetrate the mountain barrier to the east.

Even if somebody had been closer to the Cascades and directly  
under the flight path of the objects; high speeds would have  
limited the chance for observation to a few seconds at most.  
They could whiz right over your head and be gone before you even  
knew they were there. E.g., if some camper was at the 3500 foot  
level, the objects were flying directly overhead at around the  
5000 foot level (see arguments below on altitude), and they were  
flying at Arnold's calculated speed of 1200+ mph, or 20+  
miles/min, or 1mile every 3 seconds, or 1700+ feet/sec, the

objects would cover a 60 degree arc of sky in only a second.  
Whoosh -- they're gone!

On a clear day, Rainier is easily seen from from Seattle and Tacoma; in fact it dominates the horizon. However, it's also further away and it would have been harder to see anything. Arnold thought he lost sight of them near Mt. Adams, 50 miles away. Seattle is about 40 miles from Rainier.

I did find one newspaper report from the "Tacoma News Tribune," June 30, which weakly corroborated Arnold's sighting. "Mrs. Mary Hartwell, Rt. 1, Box 531, Spanaway [southeastern Tacoma] said Friday [June 27] she had seen 'nine planes' very high in the air 'two or three days ago.' She said they had the appearance of geese, but definitely were silver colored planes."

Like I said, pretty weak and also vague. The date might be right but the time isn't given. "Very high in the air" also isn't very clear. No impression of speed is given either. Rainier would have been about 35 miles southeast of Mrs. Hartwell. Arnold would have been 20 miles SSE of her position. If Hartwell saw the same 9 objects as Arnold, they should have been low to the horizon from her vantage point. If "very high in the air" meant high angular elevation, then she was reporting something else, maybe even geese, heaven forbid!

There was also prospector Fred Johnson's close-up report from Mt. Adams which started at the same time Arnold's ended when Arnold lost sight of the objects near Mt. Adams.

We also have corroboration in the form of other multi-object sightings, but at other times and places, such as the well-known United Airlines sighting of July 4 over Idaho, in which 9 objects were sighted by a crew of 3 for around 10 minutes before vanishing in an instant. Clearly not birds, unless birds could keep up with a DC-3 for 10 minutes.

> A critical  
>look at the distance estimate is both warranted and necessary.  
>One must almost certainly accept the objects passed in front of  
>Mount Rainier's snow field as Arnold claimed. The angular  
>velocity of the objects indicated by Arnold's clocking of the  
>objects between Mount Rainier and Mount Adams is .8 degrees per  
>second. At that speed it would take nine seconds to cross the  
>face of Mount Rainier at the 9,200 foot level indicated by  
>Arnold's report.

I basically agree with this, and just want to add that if they were actually down around 5000 feet as they crossed the face of Mt. Rainier, the width is closer to 10 miles, and it would have taken closer to 30 seconds to cross the face.

> This is too long for a spurious observation  
>related the fleetingness of the phenomenon. This would rule out  
>explanations based on distant sky phenomena like a train of  
>meteors, Campbellian mirages, or density-shifting space animals.

OK, no problems with this. Basically Arnold had sufficient time to make some unhurried observations as they passed the face of Rainier.

>What of distances closer than Mount Rainier's vicinity? It has  
>been pointed out that Arnold spoke of the objects having  
>"swerved in and out of the high mountain peaks." This would seem  
>to put a lower limit to the distance if one could first  
>determine which peaks they swung around and if they were broad  
>enough to have a transit time to regard the observation as  
>secure. Arnold was slightly more specific in later recountings  
>of the event. In The Coming of the Saucers he said they  
>momentarily disappeared "behind a jagged peak that juts out from  
>Mount Rainier proper."

The earliest quote I can find on this was in the Portland Oregonian, July 11, 1947: "I reckoned the saucers were 23 miles away, because they flew behind one of the peaks of Mt. Rainier, I can show ont he map exactly where the peak is and where I was."

>In his memoir for the First International UFO Congress he says,  
>"When they turned length-wise or flat-wise to me they were very  
>thin and they actually disappeared from sight behind a

>projection on Mount Rainier in the snowfield." These are not  
>exactly the same thing, but they give a fair indication of what  
>to look for on the geological survey maps.

>Arnold estimated the crafts were at an altitude of 9,200 feet  
>plus or minus 1,000. The task at hand is thus to locate some  
>feature extending above the 8,200 foot level. This yields a neat  
>little surprise. There are no such peaks between Mount Rainier  
>and Mount Adams. The closest thing I could find was Pyramid Peak  
>which stands only 6,937 feet tall in front of Mount Rainier's  
>base".

>This seems to concur with Bruce Maccabee's assessment:

Pyramid Peak is a possibility, but is extremely narrow, only a  
quarter mile wide at most. That means that at the speeds Arnold  
was reporting, they would have disappeared from view for maybe a  
maximum of 3/4 second. That might be hard to observe reliably.

Directly below Pyramid about 1 mile to the southwest is Iron  
Mountain, about 1800 m or 5900 feet high and with a wider  
concealing base approaching 1 mile. The saddleback behind the  
peak is down at around the 1600 m or 5000 foot level. Here they  
could disappear possibly up to 2-3 seconds. That would be  
easier for Arnold to observe. This elevation also fits in  
better with them coming off the slopes of Rainier and appearing  
to skim the southern Cascades, which are at about the same  
elevation.

>"These statements about how they flew with respect to the  
>mountain peaks are very important because they provide  
>information on the distance from Mr. Arnold. These mountain  
>peaks lie along a wide north-south line extending southward from  
>Mt. Rainier to Mt. Adams. These peaks were about 20 miles east  
>of Arnold at the time. These statements also provide the  
>altitude of the objects. To Arnold they appeared to be  
>approximately at his altitude because they seemed to be "pretty  
>much on the horizon to me." Since he was flying at 9,200 ft,  
>this implies that they were close to that altitude. (Arnold  
>actually stated his letter that they were at 9,500 ft.) However,  
>the mountain peaks south of Rainier generally are 5,000 to 7,000  
>ft high, with the higher ones being farther away (more to the  
>east) from Arnold.

The important point here is that the taller peaks tend to be  
further away. There were no mountains between Arnold and the  
lower portions of the Cascades to obscure his view. If he did  
see them disappear behind some of these peaks, they were at  
least 25 miles away.

> Hence his statement that there were higher  
>peaks on the far side of the pathway indicates that the objects  
>were definitely lower than about 7,000 ft. Furthermore, he  
>stated that they went behind some (or at least one) of the  
>lower, closer peaks. Geological survey maps show that mountain  
>peaks which the objects could have disappeared behind have  
>altitudes of 5,000 to 6,000 ft. Hence it appears that they were  
>lower than 6,000 ft and that Arnold overestimated their  
>altitude".

But overestimated their angular elevation relative to him only  
slightly -- an important distinction.

>In the early, detailed radio interview, Arnold states, "I could  
>see them against the snow, of course, on Mt. Rainier and against  
>the snow on Mt. Adams as they were flashing, and against a high  
>ridge that happens to lay in between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams".

>If the objects were seen against the snow of Mt. Rainier, Mt.  
>Adams and a high ridge that was between the mountains, what  
>'peaks' could they have gone behind?

This is covered in detail below, and places the closest possible  
approach of the objects at about 15 miles.

>In a related point, the 'Chicago Daily Tribune', of 25 June,  
>quoted Arnold as saying, "I counted nine of them as they  
>disappeared behind the peak of Mount Rainier".

>Could the objects have gone behind the mountain, when they were  
>also supposed to be travelling across its slopes, e.g., "low

>over the slopes of Mt. Rainier" and "not more than 500 feet over  
>the plateau", according to statements attributed to Arnold in  
>the 'Oregon Journal' of 27 June?

>Aside from this earliest 'Chicago Daily Tribune' report, did  
>Arnold ever claim the objects "disappeared behind the peak of  
>Mount Rainier"?

Not that I know of. It sounds like an instance of where the  
reporter misunderstood Arnold and misquoted him. Arnold  
probably said the objects disappeared behind ONE OF the peaks of  
Mt. Rainier, as he said and wrote elsewhere.

>Also in that radio interview, Arnold states, "due to the fact  
>that I had Mt. Saint Helens and Mt. Adams to clock them by, I  
>just thought I'd see just how fast they were going".

>Did Arnold ever mention again that he used Mt. Saint Helens as a  
>reference point, or was this probably an error and he meant Mt.  
>Rainier?

St. Helens and Adams are both about 50 miles south of Rainier  
and equidistant from it, St. Helens about 20 miles west and  
Adams about 20 miles east. For objects on a southerly  
trajectory, both were potential landmarks that Arnold could use  
when he first started timing. St. Helens would have been due  
south of Arnold's position, whereas Adams was more to the  
southeast.

As it was, the objects' trajectory took them in the  
line-of-sight vicinity of Adams where Arnold saw them disappear.  
St. Helens dropped from the report since it wasn't involved  
thereafter.

>In his letter to the Air Force, he claimed, "I watched these  
>objects with great interest as I had never before observed  
>airplanes flying so close to the mountain tops, flying directly  
>south to southeast down the hog's back of a mountain range. I  
>would estimate their elevation could have varied a thousand feet  
>one way or the other up or down, but they were pretty much on  
>the horizon to me which would indicate that they were near the  
>same elevation as me.

And that's how Arnold made his mistake in elevation, by assuming  
the mountain tops were on the same level as he was, instead of  
about 2 degrees below.

>They flew like many times I have observed  
>geese to fly in a rather diagonal chain-like line as if they  
>were linked together. They seemed to hold a definite direction  
>but rather swerved in and out of the high mountain peaks. I  
>could quite accurately determine their pathway due to the fact  
>that there were several high peaks a little this side of them as  
>well as higher peaks on the other side of their pathway".

>This is a much clearer explanation.

>There were mountain peaks between Arnold and the nine objects  
>and further, higher, peaks beyond. The objects flew in-between  
>this range of high peaks and ridges.

>However, it seems these features weren't nearly so high as  
>Arnold thought and the objects were flying much lower than he  
>perceived, something that Arnold never checked.

>In which case, is it agreed Arnold had no idea, not then, not  
>ever, that he was observing from what seems to have been some  
>4,000, maybe 5,000 feet above the objects?

The only thing that can be agreed on is that Arnold reported the  
objects flying across the snowfields of Rainier, seeming to  
disappear behind one of the subpeaks, and then seeming to skim  
and weave around the peaks and ridges of the southern Cascade  
range.

Collectively this means their angular elevation relative to  
Arnold was very close to Arnold's true horizon (0 degrees at  
9200 feet). If we assume the typical absolute elevation of the  
southern Cascades is around 5000 feet and they were indeed  
flying over the Cascades, then they were flying at around 5000  
feet, or about 2 degrees below true horizon. The actual error

that Arnold made was not in estimating absolute altitude, as James Easton perpetually thinks, but in determining his true horizon. He thought it was at distant mountain peak level, which if true would have placed the altitude near that of his plane.

Now exactly how high the objects were in \_absolute\_ (not angular) elevation, depends on how far away they were. If they were James Easton "birds," only a few thousand feet away, then they would have been only a few hundred feet below his plane's altitude, (not 4000 to 5000 feet below). E.g., at 2500 feet distance instead of 25 miles, they would have been 100 feet lower than the plane, or at 9100 feet. That's the same small \_angular\_ down angle as 5000 feet at 25 miles.

>If it's argued that this *\*couldn't\** have directly affected his  
>subsequent judgement of distances between himself and the  
>objects, plus where they were flying in relation to the peaks,  
>what is the basis of that argument?

If I understand this convoluted statement properly, Easton is arguing that the objects were \_much\_ closer and flying behind peaks and ridges that were also much closer. Once again Easton obviously doesn't understand the simple distinction between \_angular\_ elevation (degrees, radians) and absolute elevation (feet, meters). If the objects were James Easton birds 2500 feet away, they would \_not\_ be 5000 feet below him. That would be a downward angle of over 60 degrees. Arnold would be looking at the tree-covered ground, not watching the objects fly across the ice fields of Mt. Rainier.

No, instead they would be flying 100 feet below him at 9100 feet so that they could appear to fly across the Rainier ice fields and skim the Cascades. In order for them to appear to disappear behind some mountain peaks, there would have to be one taller than 9100 feet between Arnold and the nearby birds.

As you can see, this is getting ridiculous. There aren't any tall mountains like that in Arnold's immediate vicinity. If there were, Arnold's most immediate concern would be to avoid plowing into them.

Let's consider something further away. The critical observation here is the one where Arnold said he saw the objects silhouetted and flashing against the backdrop of Rainier's ice and snow fields. The \_edge\_ of Rainier's permanent ice field drops to about the 1500 meter or 5000 foot level. If we assume there was still some unmelted winter snow, then maybe the snowfields came down to around the 4000 foot level, at which point one is maybe still 20 miles from Arnold's position. Any intervening mountains have to be higher than this to obscure the view, and the closer they are to Arnold, the taller they have to be (because Arnold is flying above them and looking slightly down).

Looking at a topo map, the absolute closest mountain to Arnold that I can find capable of doing this is called Mt. Wow, with an elevation of 1800 m or 5900 feet. It was about 15-17 miles from Arnold's position (or about 9-10 miles from Rainier's peak).

This is the \_closest\_ possible mountain to Arnold's position that could have obscured any part of the ice or snow field. If Arnold correctly perceived the objects being momentarily obscured as they passed over the ice field, then this sets the \_lower limit\_ as to how far away they could have been.

That, among many other things, certainly eliminates Easton's "birds." And at 15 miles or more, it practically eliminates any jet plane of the day. Using Arnold's \_conservative\_ calculation of 1200 mph and scaling to the closer distance, the objects would still have to be flying 700-800 mph, faster than any jet of the day. The speed record at the time, set only 5 days before at Muroc AAF, California in a P-80, was 624 mph. It also established this speed record by flying at a much higher elevation where the air was thinner. Jets couldn't fly nearly that fast down around 5000-9000 feet.

>The Pendleton newspaper article also states, "The Boise flyer  
>said they flew on the west sides of Rainier and Adams, adding  
>that he believed this would make it more difficult for them to  
>be seen from the ground".

>Is this 'west side story' of any relevance in understanding the  
>overall perspective?

Not that I can think of. Both sides are very rugged and  
sparsely populated, so I'm not sure what Arnold meant by the  
remark. Maybe somebody else more familiar with the area could  
tell us more. In any case, it seems to be a very minor point.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 21:29:44 -0300  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 17:48:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 12:47:44 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>From: James Easton <[voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 04:19:27 +0100

>>Regarding:

>>>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 09:25:15 -0400  
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>Bruce wrote:

>>>>Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 19:51:19 -0500  
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>>Regarding Arnold's first sighting... which has been the  
>>>>subject of my discussion... there is no assumption that Arnold  
>>>>was "absolutely incapable of human error." Anyone who thinks  
>>>>there was such an assumption does not understand the nature of  
>>>>the analysis. In fact, the arguments assume that Arnold could  
>>>>have been in error in some places.

>>Bruce,

>>Surely it's not debatable whether Kenneth Arnold "could" have  
>>been in error in "some" places, that fact is acknowledged and  
>>highlighted in your paper - 'The Complete Sighting Report of  
>>Kenneth Arnold, with Comments and Analysis'.

>>>>But, let's get down to the crux of the matter: which Arnold  
>>>>statements would you like to reject or modify?>

<snip>

>>Arnold then decided to take this opportunity to 'clock' the  
>>airspeed of the 'planes'.

>>It's perhaps crucial to appreciate that Arnold only decided to  
>>carry out this exercise because, as he says in the radio  
>>interview, "I just thought I'd see how fast they were going,  
>>since among pilots we argue about speed so much".

>>Crucial? Only? He thought they were jets. Probably  
>>wondered just how fast the military aircraft could go

>>It wasn't a result of Arnold believing the airplanes were  
>>travelling at an incredible speed. He only concluded that after  
>>first carrying out a timing between two prominent landmarks and  
>>then later calculating how far apart those landmarks were in

>>conjunction with the 'stop watch' reading.  
>Wrong. He assumed from the first that they were jets.

>>As he timed the objects' - believed to be airplanes - what then  
>>surprised him was a realisation that they didn't have any  
>>'tails'.

>>However, as Arnold related, he didn't give either this or the  
>>apparently fast airspeed too much thought at the time.>

>It didn't bother him too much while he was flying, even after he  
>found a time of only 102 seconds from Rainier to Adams \\  
>because, as he wrote to the AF, he knew that the army and air  
>forces had fast aircraft.

>>Consequently, he worked out that the distance between the two  
>>fixed points was some 50 miles and that if the objects had  
>>travelled that distance, as he thought, in the 1 minute and  
>>forty seconds recorded, they must have been travelling at an  
>>unprecedented speed.  
>This was after he landed.

>>If, as you explained in the detailed analysis, Arnold's estimate  
>>of the objects' altitude was grossly mistaken and that when he  
>>apparently turned his plane around during this timing exercise,  
>>we don't know if he changed direction by 90, or 180 degrees, or  
>>something else, then consequently, there can be surely be no  
>>confidence in his overall perceptions.

>As described above his incorrect estimate of the altitude is  
>understandable. This has no bearing on the accuracy of his  
>recall in turning the plane. As for the turn itself, if he  
>turned to the right he would open the left window near him and  
>look out while flying parallel to the objects. Had he turned to  
>the right he would have flown away from them.

>No point in turning 180 degrees or 360.

>Makes sense for him to turn to the right, whether unknowns or  
>birds. However, if birds he would have realized immediately  
>that he was going faster

>>Obviously the closer these 'fluttering' objects actually were,  
>>the faster they would appear to travel between two distant fixed  
>>points.

>Yes, when flying a "crossing" pattern. And, if Arnold  
>initially saw them toward a direction north of Rainier, then by  
>the time they got right in front of him (and below) they would  
>have been closer.

>>When logic kicks in and we consider that the observation was  
>>wholly subjective, has proven misconceptions and that Kenneth  
>>Arnold reported a subsequent sighting with similar  
>>characteristics and which was almost certainly of birds... at  
>>what point does this remotely become sustainable evidence of  
>>'alien spacecraft'?

>When logic kicks in and one attempts to formulate a reasonable  
>reconstruction based on Arnold (traveling 100 mph or faster at  
>9,200 ft) and birds (traveling 50 mph or slower at 5,000 ft)  
>one finds it just doesn't work. Arnold would have gotten close  
>enough to recognize birds by their shapes and by their lower  
>speed and lower altitude.

>Sorry.... this pelican has its bellyful.

Bruce James and Dennis,

I'm not going to go over this point by point but just make a few  
observations.

The first is an obvious disregard for one simple fact and that  
is the stated Callair altitude that Arnold gave as 9,200 feet.  
I've brought this up before with James who seems to want to  
ignore it. The fact is Arnold did not know what his true  
altitude was because he had no way of verifying it. He looked at  
his altimeter and saw 9,200 feet and gave that as his altitude.  
That could have been out as much as two or three thousand feet  
[don't say it can't happen, it's happened to me] from the



station pressure at take-off in the warm lowlands to the cool temps a couple of hundred miles away in the mountains. Note Well that pilots are constantly updating their altimeter settings.

Every time you call a tower or a unicom or some other uncontrolled airfield where someone is manning a radio and has the instruments, they give the local pressure called "station pressure" and the wind speed and direction before they say anything else and you update your altimeter. Now Arnold was without radio and in real wilderness in that area so had no way to update his altimeter. James you can ignore this all you want but it is a fact of life. The chances are that Arnold's altimeter was reading high or low because he was a region of cold heavy air and had come from a warm region where he had originally set his altimeter to the field elevation.

Observation: If Arnold turned his aircraft to get a better look he would have turned [banked] his plane to keep the objects on his side [the left] for better visibility. In this case he would have turned right about 90 degrees. However he probably would have lost sight of the objects for the few seconds it took to accomplish the maneuver because his left wing [the Callair is a low wing] would have come up, obscuring his vision.

I've also tried to impress on others the type of skill that Arnold would have had with some 3,000 hours of flying time and the skills and knowledge required to fly in the mountains without killing yourself. The winds around mountains can be vicious and are always unpredictable. You don't just fly through the area, fat dumb and happy and hope the airport shows up in your windscreen after a certain amount of time has passed. The only way you know that you are going to reach your destination before you run out of fuel is by knowing your ground speed and how many gallons your a/c burns per hour at cruise. You find out the former by measuring the distance between two points on your chart and clocking your time to cover that distance. Knowing that will give you your ground speed. I'm not going to go into the other steps such as figuring for the winds/drift and maintaining an accurate heading, but mention this because I've said before that I'll bet that Arnold knew right down to a mile where he was at all times. For him not have known would have been foolhardy at best and suicidal at worst.

I've been a bit put off by the impression being floated, by some, that Arnold was some kind of dolt who was frittering around the mountains with no particular idea of where he was, didn't know birds from jets, couldn't estimate distances or work out a speed/time problem, despite the fact that he would have done them dozens of times during each flight. The pilots back then didn't have the luxury of Loran C or GPS and so had to rely on their piloting and navigation skills.

For your edification it is a lot easier to clock a time over a measured distance by using a stopwatch than it is by the panel clock because you can be more precise, but a panel clock [usually an 8 day windup clock with a sweep second hand] works almost as well. It was his clock and he was used to it. You must remember that Arnold relied on his sense of distance and experience in flying to formulate his estimate of the situation when he saw the UFOs. Don't blow that off so easily. 3,000 hours of flying at 100 MPH is 300,000 miles of distance flown. You can pack in a lot of experience in that time frame.

I believe that it was Bruce that wondered if birds could fly at 6,000 or was it 9,000? feet. My Flight Supplement cautions pilots to watch out for Canada Geese at 32,000 feet when they are migrating. If I remember correctly a DC-3 struck a bird over Mount Everest during WW II while flying the "hump" as they called it.

I don't mean to be snotty but try to remember that Arnold was a highly skilled pilot and not a fool. He had to be a careful and skilled pilot to navigate the type of terrain that he did.

Another observation. We'll probably never know what Arnold saw that day as is true of many other cases, but I think you are drawing a long bow if you stick with your bird theory James.

Don Ledger

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Info About Mr. Haktan Akdogan?

From: **Thiago Ticchetti** <[thiagolt@opengate.com.br](mailto:thiagolt@opengate.com.br)>  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 23:56:08 -0300  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 17:52:30 -0400  
Subject: Info About Mr. Haktan Akdogan?

Hello,

I need your help, please, someone knows something about the UFO  
Researcher, Mr. Haktan Akdogan. Please contact me.

Thanks .

THIAGO LUIZ TICCHETTI  
Diretor Do Departamento de Publica=E7=E3o e Tradu=E7=E3o Especializadas  
( DEPTe - EBE-ET / Brasilia-Brasil)  
Director of the Publication Department and Specialized Translation  
ICQ - 35119615

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 01:10:18 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:21:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 22:01:40 -0400  
>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>In the 'Pendleton, Oregon East Oregonian, of 26 June, 1947, it's  
>reported of Kenneth Arnold that, "He said he could estimate the  
>distance of the objects better because an intervening peak once  
>blocked his view of them. He found the peak was 25 miles away,  
>he related".

>Perhaps we can still clarify further whether it could have  
>"blocked his view", or, if it's more likely that he simply lost  
>sight of the objects against this intermediate 'peak'.  
>It's important if his perception that the objects 'vanished'  
>behind a distant peak, was a main reason Arnold believed they  
>were some 25 miles distant.>

Thanks for compiling all these statements about object height  
relative to the mountains and the distance to the objects.

<snip>

>This seems to concur with Bruce Maccabee's assessment:

>"These statements about how they flew with respect to the  
>mountain peaks are very important because they provide  
>information on the distance from Mr. Arnold. These mountain  
>peaks lie along a wide north-south line extending southward from  
>Mt. Rainier to Mt. Adams. These peaks were about 20 miles east  
>of Arnold at the time. These statements also provide the  
>altitude of the objects. To Arnold they appeared to be  
>approximately at his altitude because they seemed to be "pretty  
>much on the horizon to me." Since he was flying at 9,200 ft,  
>this implies that they were close to that altitude. (Arnold  
>actually stated his letter that they were at 9,500 ft.) However,  
>the mountain peaks south of Rainier generally are 5,000 to 7,000  
>ft high, with the higher ones being farther away (more to the  
>east) from Arnold. Hence his statement that there were higher  
>peaks on the far side of the pathway indicates that the objects  
>were definitely lower than about 7,000 ft. Furthermore, he  
>stated that they went behind some (or at least one) of the  
>lower, closer peaks. Geological survey maps show that mountain  
>peaks which the objects could have disappeared behind have  
>altitudes of 5,000 to 6,000 ft. Hence it appears that they were  
>lower than 6,000 ft and that Arnold overestimated their  
>altitude".

>In the early, detailed radio interview, Arnold states, "I could  
>see them against the snow, of course, on Mt. Rainier and against  
>the snow on Mt. Adams as they were flashing, and against a high  
>ridge that happens to lay in between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams".

>If the objects were seen against the snow of Mt. Rainier, Mt.  
>Adams and a high ridge that was between the mountains, what  
>'peaks' could they have gone behind?>

My guess is a few peaks just south of Rainier.

>In a related point, the 'Chicago Daily Tribune', of 25 June,  
>quoted Arnold as saying, "I counted nine of them as they  
>disappeared behind the peak of Mount Rainier".

I think this is wrong.

>Could the objects have gone behind the mountain, when they were  
>also supposed to be travelling across its slopes, e.g., "low  
>over the slopes of Mt. Rainier" and "not more than 500 feet over  
>the plateau", according to statements attributed to Arnold in  
>the 'Oregon Journal' of 27 June?>

>Aside from this earliest 'Chicago Daily Tribune' report, did  
>Arnold ever claim the objects "disappeared behind the peak of  
>Mount Rainier"?

No.

>Also in that radio interview, Arnold states, "due to the fact  
>that I had Mt. Saint Helens and Mt. Adams to clock them by, I  
>just thought I'd see just how fast they were going".

>Did Arnold ever mention again that he used Mt. Saint Helens as a  
>reference point, or was this probably an error and he meant Mt.  
>Rainier?

Perhaps. Or, since he didn't know where they were going,. he  
may have figured they would pass by Adams or St. Helens (farther  
to the west) and he could use whichever was convenient as  
reference point.

>In his letter to the Air Force, he claimed, "I watched these  
>objects with great interest as I had never before observed  
>airplanes flying so close to the mountain tops, flying directly  
>south to southeast down the hog's back of a mountain range. I  
>would estimate their elevation could have varied a thousand feet  
>one way or the other up or down, but they were pretty much on  
>the horizon to me which would indicate that they were near the  
>same elevation as me. They flew like many times I have observed  
>geese to fly in a rather diagonal chain-like line as if they  
>were linked together. They seemed to hold a definite direction  
>but rather swerved in and out of the high mountain peaks. I  
>could quite accurately determine their pathway due to the fact  
>that there were several high peaks a little this side of them as  
>well as higher peaks on the other side of their pathway".>

>This is a much clearer explanation.

>There were mountain peaks between Arnold and the nine objects  
>and further, higher, peaks beyond. The objects flew in-between  
>this range of high peaks and ridges.

>However, it seems these features weren't nearly so high as  
>Arnold thought and the objects were flying much lower than he  
>perceived, something that Arnold never checked.

>In which case, is it agreed Arnold had no idea, not then, not  
>ever, that he was observing from what seems to have been some  
>4,000, maybe 5,000 feet above the objects?

Unless he looked up the altitudes of the mountains, how would he  
know yes, he could have measured the altitudes with his  
airplane, had he thought of it and dared to fly close to them).  
As I pointed out in my analysis (not reproduced here), Arnold  
said they appeared to be on his horizon...so he assumed they  
were at his altitude. However, if they were 20 miles away, as  
Arnold thought, they could have been 4000 ft lower and still be  
"on his horizon", specifically, at a depression angle of only 2  
degrees, so small it is lost in th "noise."

>If it's argued that this \*couldn't\* have directly affected his  
>subsequent judgement of distances between himself and the  
>objects, plus where they were flying in relation to the peaks,  
>what is the basis of that argument?

It is so argued... because of his statement that they were going  
in and out of the mountain peaks. He wouldn't have to know the  
altitudes of th peaks in order to observe that some were in  
front of and others behind the objects (2 degree depression

angle, remember?)

>The Pendleton newspaper article also states, "The Boise flyer  
>said they flew on the west sides of Rainier and Adams, adding  
>that he believed this would make it more difficult for them to  
>be seen from the ground".

>Is this 'west side story' of any relevance in understanding the  
>overall perspective?

More forest on the west side?

.....

PELICANS

For Pelican Partisans Only:

Let's forget the claim of going in and out of the mountains for the moment and simply concentrate on the directions to the objects (a) when first seen, (b) when passing Mt. Rainier, (c) when in the direction of Mt. Adams.

Assume Arnold was close to Mineral, Washington, about 25 miles radially from Rainier; more specifically, 23 miles west and 10 miles south of Rainier.

OK, get yourself some graph paper with 1" squares (or larger) and let 1" = a mile (or some other convenient square size on the graph paper).

At the left side of the paper near the middle place a point. That is Arnold's starting position. Let north be "up" on the graph paper. Draw a line from Arnold's starting position at a azimuth of 15 degrees. This is approximately the direction to Mt. Baker.

Draw another line with azimuth 23 degrees. This is the direction to Mt. Rainier (about 25 miles away.... it will not appear on your graph paper unless you have BIG paper or squares smaller than 1"). Draw another line at azimuth 95 deg. This is Arnold's track toward Yakima. Draw a final line at azimuth 136 deg. This is the direction to Mt. Adams over 50 miles away. Now let's construct a diagram of ARNOLD vs the PELICANS.

The bird explanation was discussed at length last fall (Nov. and Dec) and then it dropped out of sight. Although I attempted a reconstruction such as presented here way back then, I was missing a key piece of data about PELICANS... a piece which has now been supplied by Mr. Easton (I believe he could have supplied it last fall, but didn't). We knew back then that Pelicans could achieve a top speed of 50 mph (more likely to be 20-30, however). What we know now is that the upper limit of altitude as suggested by the ornithologists and glider pilots is 6,000 ft (more likely under 3,000). So let's characterize Pelicans this way: wingspan - 10 ft length - 3 ft (? a bit much?) TOP speed - 50 mph or 0.83 miles/min or 73 ft/sec TOP altitude - 6,000 ft. Flight Direction: 170 azimuth (could be 180 or 160...won't make much difference to this disaster)

Let us charactersize Arnold by altitude - 9,200 ft speed - 100 mph or 1.67 mi/min or 147 ft/sec

Note that this estimate of Arnold's speed is probably low. We also characterize this reconstruction by the overall time of the observation. arnold said 2.5 - 3 minutes. Let's pick 2.5 (as being advantageous to the P hypothesis) In that time birds fly 2.5 x .83 = 2.1 miles In that time Arnold flies 4.2 mi

Now go to your finely executed graph paper with the radial lines emanating from Arnold's starting position and follow me. Mark 2 miles along the 15 deg azimuth radial. This is the assumed initial distance of the pelicans. At this distance they would appear as dots against the sky...or mountainous background (Ignore observation by of arnold about metallic-like bright flashes).

What do we find at the START of the sighting?

-angular size (birds seen nearly head on, flying south) , 2 miles horizontally, 3200 ft down, radial distance = 2.1 miles, angular size = arctan (10 ft/2.1 miles) = 0.9 mr = 0.052 degrees

(mr = milliradians)... detectable -depression angle is  $\arctan([9200-6000]/2 \times 5280) = 17$  degrees (not exactly "on the horizon"; 17 degrees down should be noticeable, whereas 2 degrees would be "lost in the noise." Therefore ignore arnold's claim about the objects being on his horizon....)

Now draw a line from this initial bird position along the 170 azimuth direction. Make the line 2.1 miles long, the distance the birds flew during the sighting and see where it ends.

Amusing.

On my diagram it ends right on Arnold's path. But by this time Arnold would be 4.2 miles along his path, about 0.8 miles from where he started, and the pelicans would be about 3 miles behind him. This means that at all times they would have been to his left and the sighting line to them would rotate to the left and behind.

Please keep in mind that this is a DYNAMIC situation: Arnold and the pelicans are moving. If one is clever one can find a point of closest approach by marking off time intervals and measuring the distance between the plane and birds at the various interval positions. Try 15 second intervals.. At APPROXIMATELY 45 seconds after the start Arnold has already crossed the path of the oncoming pelicans but they are still about 1.5 miles north of his track. Arnold would be looking back to his left at about 25 degrees west of north or 120 to the left of his heading direction. The depression angle at this time would be about 22 degrees, considerably below the horizon. The angular size would be about 50% greater than the initial value ... probably wings would be distinguished.

At any rate, one can hardly imagine Arnold describing this situation as saying that the "saucers" flew down the hogback chain of mountains toward Mt. Adams. So, to solve this problem, ignore arnold's claim that the objects flew over the mountains south of Rainier and ignore his claim that they were last seen in the direction of Mt. Adams... Now you can accept the Pelicans. Right?

If Arnold turned his plane under these circumstances it would have been a turn to the left and he would have been flying northward, opposite to their direction.

Now, as alternatives one could assume various initial distances of the pelicans from Arnold's starting position, e.g., instead of 2 miles along the 15 degree azimuth direction, try 1 mile, or 1/2 mile. go ahead. Try it. See what you get.

OR, try something more "realistic." Assume Arnold was wrong in saying he first saw the objects north of Rainier. Ignore this observation of arnold. Instead, assume he first saw them in the direction of Rainier. So, mark off 2 miles along the 63 degree azimuth.

Now mark 15 second intervals of 0.21 miles along the 170 degree azimuth flight path southward of the pelicans. Also mark 15 second intervals of 0.42 miles along Arnold's path. You will find, oddly enough, that the flight paths nearly cross in 5 intervals, i.e., 1 min, 15 seconds. Arnold has gone 2.1 miles and the birds have gone 1.04 miles from their respective starting points. At this time the pelicans are roughly 0.1 miles = 528 ft north of Arnold and at an angle of about 105 deg to the left of his heading. The radial distance is now  $(528^2 + 3,200^2)^{0.5} = 3243$  ft. The angular size of 10 ft wingspan is 3 milliradians... easy to resolve wings. The depression angle is  $\arctan(3200/528) = 81$  degrees. Arnold is looking almost straight down at the birds. After this the birds would be behind Arnold, and below.

Ignore arnold's claim that he saw the objects in the direction of the chain of mountains south of Rainier AND ignore his claim that he last saw them in the direction of Mt. Adams. After proper ignoring, pelicans are definitely in the running.

One can, of course, play with the reconstruction a bit. If the initial pelican distance is pushed farther away the pelicans stay to north of Arnold's flight path during most or all of the sighting. This decreases the depression angles somewhat, but never do the pelicans appear to be south of Mt. Rainier

If the initial pelican distance is decreased, to say 1 mile, then Arnold passes their flight track in about 30 seconds, about 15 seconds ahead of them. The depression angles are large all the time.

Anyway, I invite Pelican Partisans to invent their own reconstructions and prove that the objects could have been pelicans. Please be specific as to which of Arnold's sighting details we no longer need to accept as accurate in order to accept the pelican hypothesis as accurate.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## NIDS Roper Poll Results

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:11:37 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:11:37 -0400  
Subject: NIDS Roper Poll Results

Source: <http://www.sightings.com/ufo3/react.htm>

Jeff Rense's Sightings Homepage

How Would Humans React If ET Landed? - NIDS Roper Poll

6-8-99

PRESS RELEASE  
National Institute for Discovery Science  
June 7, 1999

HOW WOULD HUMANS REACT IF E.T. LANDED?

NASA and the scientific community are actively searching for evidence of extraterrestrial life, but what if we were confronted with undeniable proof that ETs exist and have been visiting Earth?

A nationwide survey by the Roper Organization has uncovered the following:

...one out of four Americans think most people would "totally freak out and panic" if such evidence were confirmed.

...eighty percent of influential Americans think the US government would classify or suppress evidence of extraterrestrial life.

The Roper survey was conducted on behalf of the National Institute for Discovery Science (NIDS), a privately funded scientific research organization based in Las Vegas, NV. The pollsters asked a nationwide sample of 1,971 men and women a variety of questions concerning a sudden confirmation of extraterrestrial life. (The poll has error margins of 2.5 percent.)

Among other findings:

When asked what they thought UFOs were:

25% thought they were alien spaceships 19% said UFOs are normal events that are misinterpreted by witnesses, and 12% thought they were secret government programs 9% said hallucinations 7% said travelers from other dimensions.

When asked whom they would choose to make first contact with ETs on Earth:

20% said the military 29% said scientists 14% said the government 11% said religious leaders, and 20% said a private organization that had planned for such a contingency.

"There have been no systematic studies about the potential impact of confirmed contact", says Dr. Colm Kelleher, deputy

administrator of NIDS. A 1960 report by the Brookings Institute and an internal RAND document from 1968 predicted profound social consequences if contact were confirmed, but there have been no follow-up studies.

For more information about the Roper survey and about NIDS, keep reading, or visit the NIDS website at:  
<http://www.accessnv.com/nids>

When asked how they would react psychologically to confirmation of advanced extraterrestrial life:

32% said they were "fully prepared to handle it" 17% said they would "rethink their place in the universe".

Yet when asked how they think OTHERS would react to the same news:

25% said that "most people would totally freak out and panic" 10% said most others would "act irrationally and become dangerous to others" 14% said that others would "begin to act very strangely" 36% said "most people would be very concerned", and only 13% said "most people would handle the information in a calm and rational way".

Since 1995, NIDS has been conducting scientific research into unconventional and novel areas including aerial phenomena research. NIDS's president and founder is Robert Bigelow. The Las Vegas based organization employs a staff of Ph.D. level, multi-disciplinary scientists and is advised by a world class science advisory board.

Kelleher pointed to ongoing serious scientific studies on the remote possibility of an asteroid striking the planet. "On the other hand we have no government programs, no contingency plans that are in the public domain for coping with the possibility of E.T. contact. Yet these numbers from Roper say that 80% of the trend-setters in America do not trust the government to inform the public and one in four of the general public think there would be total panic if confirmation of advanced extraterrestrials occurred", said Kelleher.

The full text of the poll can be accessed on the NIDS website at: <http://www.accessnv.com/nids>. Or contact Dr. Colm Kelleher at NIDS at 702-798-1700 or [nids@anv.net](mailto:nids@anv.net).

Jean Henry of the Roper Organization can be reached at:  
914-698-0800

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 18:17:16 -0500  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 17:56:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 12:48:06 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

<snip>

>Logic such as this leads to throwing out everything which  
>doesn't agree with the proposed explanation.  
>

No, logic such as this simply means that when you're dealing with an anecdotal account the only fact you have is the anecdote itself. Which anecdote may or may not be true in particular, or may reflect varying degrees of subjectivity and misperception in general.

The only evidence we have for Arnold's sighting is Arnold's account of same.

Less than five weeks after his first sighting, he was reporting a second encounter with an even larger flock (no pun intended) of flying saucers. A few years later he claimed to have filmed two flying saucers over Mt. Lassen, one of which was transparent. I'm not sure how many sightings he claimed in all, but it would appear to be another three or four.

My point was that either he was extremely fortunate to have had so many sightings -- or that one should tread with caution, which would include his original sighting account. And I'm glad to see that you agree that you weren't there, either. For a minute there, I thought you and Rudiak were in the back seat.

I raised the point about the film because I ran across Arnold's claim of same while rereading some of his writings.

My questions re same were ones of simple curiosity. Has it ever surfaced? Has anyone else ever seen or heard of it? In short, what happened to it? Some confirmation of its existence would at least go a ways toward establishing Arnold's overall credibility and reliability.

I thought Arnold advocates might be interested in nosing around for it, for its historical value, if nothing else. If memory serves, Arnold has at least one surviving daughter. Perhaps it's in her father's files. Perhaps not, possibly pilfered by the MIB. (Remember that publicity photo of Arnold posed beside his airplane, movie camera in hand?)

And please note that in discussing Arnold I haven't mentioned Maury Island once.

<snip>

>Sure. Get us the film.

>Bruce Maccabee

Not my job, I'm afraid. But I did bring it to your attention. If you aren't interested, we can leave it at that. Or maybe Rudiak will be moved to look for it.

After all, it's you two who are backing up Arnold's claims to the hilt, not me. If I looked for it and didn't find it you'd just complain that I hadn't looked hard enough. And we'd be right back where we started. You saying that's Arnold's original observation can be separated from his many other sightings and claims, and me saying, maybe, but maybe not, too.

I'd still like to see that film when you find it.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 22:20:55 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 17:50:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Regarding:

>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 19:31:28 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Dennis wrote:

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 99 11:49:54 PDT

>Actually you can find another case in the Arnold article already  
>cited, pp. 27-8, of the Proceedings of the First International  
>UFO Congress. It precedes Arnold's own remarks quoted here  
>earlier, but snipped this time.

>I find it highly unlikely that Boeing would fly one of its test  
>planes over Mexico, but that's what Arnold relates. I also find  
>it highly unlikely that Boeing had a test (or any other) plane  
>capable of 1500 mph and 67,000 feet altitude, but, again, that's  
>the way Arnold has it. The last time I looked, Boeing was in the  
>business of building big, slow passenger planes.

>Does anyone know if they ever did any high-speed design test  
>planes for the military? I know they did the B-47 and the B-52,  
>but after that they went commercial.

>Arnold doesn't give a date for the episode.

Dennis,

I asked Camille (see the last Voyager newsletter), our resident Boeing expert about this and she replies:

"Give me a time window for the Boeing reference, so I know roughly when I'm looking for.

Most people are not aware of how much military work Boeing was involved with; production line gets publicized, custom work doesn't, especially if it is classified. I suspect that the reference to Mexico is one of two relentlessly usual mistakes; either the location was New Mexico (You would not believe how often this gets scrambled!) home of White Sands, Los Alamos etc etc etc, OR it was over the Gulf of Mexico either by intent or accident. Boeing had something that looks like Stealth on the drawing boards prior to 1968 : that's certainly 'high speed test design'.

During WWII & on into the Cold War, Boeing co-produced (that's almost the right term) projects with the other major aircraft companies, for the military. I believe this was the case with much of the missile work during the Cold War. Some of the missile R&D investigated how much wing you needed or could have (I'm doing this from memory, not quoting the notebooks), which could explain the '1500mph/67,000 ft' reference to an airplane

shaped object. How was the airspeed arrived at? Who recorded the altitude, & with what?

Either probable location, New Mexico or over water, increases the room for error in both those measurements or estimates".

Is there any information that can be added?

As an aside, is the "Proceedings of the First International UFO Congress" available on-line, or could someone maybe e-mail a copy of the Kenneth Arnold material to me?

Appreciating that Camille lived in Dallas, I mentioned that the query came from your good self, a fellow 'Texan'.

She replied, "By the way, Dallas, where I live, is in Oregon, not Texas".

The hell was I supposed to know that.

California, Arizona, Canada, Montana... too many States for us Brits.

James.  
E-mail: [voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 22:46:53 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:27:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

>From: [stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk) (Stig Agermose)  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon  
>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 00:56:39 GMT

>Source: Federal Computer Week,

><http://www.fcw.com:80/pubs/fcw/1999/0531/web-nsa-6-3-99.html>

>Links are preceded by an asterisk.

>Stig

>\*\*\*

>JUNE 3, 1999 . . . 18:34 EDT

>Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

>BY DANIEL VERTON (\*[dan\\_verton@fcw.com](mailto:dan_verton@fcw.com))

>\*\*

>Congress has squared off with the National Security Agency over  
>a top-secret U.S. global electronic surveillance program,  
>requesting top intelligence officials to report on the legal  
>standards used to prevent privacy abuses against U.S. citizens.

>According to an amendment to the fiscal 2000 Intelligence  
>Authorization Act proposed last month by Rep. Bob Barr (R-Ga.),  
>the director of Central Intelligence, the director of NSA and  
>the attorney general must submit a report within 60 days of the  
>bill becoming law that outlines the legal standards being  
>employed to safeguard the privacy of American citizens against  
>Project Echelon.

>Echelon is NSA's Cold War-vintage global spying system, which  
>consists of a worldwide network of clandestine listening posts  
>capable of intercepting electronic communications such as  
>e-mail, telephone conversations, faxes, satellite transmissions,  
>microwave links and fiber-optic communications traffic. However,  
>the European Union last year raised concerns that the system may  
>be regularly violating the privacy of law-abiding citizens  
>[\*FCW, Nov. 17, 1998].

>However, NSA, the supersecret spy agency known best for its  
>worldwide eavesdropping capabilities, for the first time in the  
>history of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence  
>refused to hand over documents on the Echelon program, claiming  
>attorney/client privilege.

>Congress is "concerned about the privacy rights of American  
>citizens and whether or not there are constitutional safeguards  
>being circumvented by the manner in which the intelligence  
>agencies are intercepting and/or receiving international  
>communications...from foreign nations that would otherwise be  
>prohibited by...the limitations on the collection of domestic  
>intelligence," Barr said. "This very straightforward  
>amendment...will help guarantee the privacy rights of American

>citizens [and] will protect the oversight responsibilities of  
>the Congress which are now under assault" by the intelligence  
>community.

>Calling NSA's argument of attorney/client privilege  
>"unpersuasive and dubious," committee chairman Rep. Peter J.  
>Goss (R-Fla.) said the ability of the intelligence community to  
>deny access to documents on intelligence programs could  
>"seriously hobble the legislative oversight process" provided  
>for by the Constitution and would "result in the envelopment of  
>the executive branch in a cloak of secrecy."

>Mail questions to \*[webmaster@fcw.com](mailto:webmaster@fcw.com)

>Copyright 1999 FCW Government Technology Group

Please remember that Echelon is a joint program shared by countries other than the US. Just this evening a show titled "Big Brother" was on the Discovery Channel. On that show a former member of ESC (the Canadian equivalent of the NSA) claims that the US trades domestic spying with other countries. In other words, since domestic spying is illegal, he claims that the US has other countries spy on our domestic targets as a trade for us spying on other countries' citizens.

Due to the 13 Echelon Sattelites covering all sectors of the globe, no electronic communications can evade monitoring. Who knows what programs may have been developed to unscramble encryption? Big Brother (and to be equal, Big Sister) may be hot on your trail. From now on I'm only going to communicate through whispers what I don't want THEM to know. Does this give you the same feeling as seeing a police car in your rear mirror? Or a gray by your bedside? Or a bird flying faster than your plane?

"Paranoia runs deep, into your heart it may creep"  
Crosby, Stills, Nash and Young

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: UFO Report By Ex-RAF Radar Personnel

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 11:49:48 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:33:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: UFO Report By Ex-RAF Radar Personnel

>Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 23:22:32 +0100  
>From: Dave Ledger <[dledger@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:dledger@cableinet.co.uk)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: UFO Report By Ex-RAF Radar Personnel

>Strange UFO Captured On RAF Radar In North Of Scotland

>Date: Winter 1964-1965.  
>Location: RAF Saxa Vord, Shetland Isles, Scotland.  
>Source: Retired RAF personnel. Name withheld at Witnesses Request.  
>Report and Witness Interview by: Dave Ledger

>Before I proceed to report on this significant case, I would  
>personally like to thank the witness involved, for showing his  
>willingness and courage in coming forward after 35 years to  
>discuss and log this extraordinary case report with UFO  
>Scotland. His willingness to discuss the sighting and the  
>relevant details associated, is to be commended and we hope that  
>it may set an example for other ex-servicemen to follow.

>REPORT:

>During the Month of May 1999, I was lucky enough to have the  
>opportunity of speaking with (for the record) an ex RAF member  
>who was once based at the Early Warning Radar tracking station  
>at RAF Saxa Vord in the extreme North of Scotland. This meeting  
>had been set up by my father who is also ex RAF (retired) and  
>had happened to meet my source via social circles who in turn,  
>agreed to speak with me so that I may document the event.

<snip>

Hi,

Thats a very interesting case. Of course, as a radar only sighting it lacks a certain dimension. But that was true of a very similar incident - the West Freugh, Scotland, affair of April 1957. From what little we know of that radars detected a similar object that changed course and flew vertically to a height beyond any recorded by aircraft of the day. As a result a civil defence alert resulted.

When I was making my BBC TV documentary on the MoD UFO files in 1996 I interviewed Ralph Noyes, the head of the MoD division that studied UFOs in the 1960's. He worked for the Air Minister at the time of West Freugh and the two 1956 radar cases (Lajenheath/Bentwaters and the Isle of Wight incident). Although both the latter feature string visual sightings and multiple radar trackings (see accounts in my 1998 book 'Something in the Air') Noyes told me that the West Freugh (non visual) case was the biggest of all so far as depth of concern in Whitehall. I asked why. I never really understood the answer save that the height and actions of the UFO were such that they eliminated any prospect of a known aircraft and thus posed a real threat to the UK. This may well explain why the 1964 Shetland episode was such a big deal.

When Ralph pointed me in the right direction I found records at

the PRO in Kew which referred to all three 1957/8 radar cases (with no names mentioned). This was interesting because the MoD were furious at the fact that the West Freugh case became public knowledge (as a result of the civil defence alert) and they clearly went to considerable lengths to ensure future radar incidents were kept mum.

So far as I know nothing has been traced on MoD records about the Shetland case, even though by the 30 year rule it should now be. My suspicion is that after the West Freugh debacle such cases were put in the hands of a department other than what is now Air Staff 2A and Noyes more or less agreed asd much; although Nick Pope - curiously - continues to say his team got all the UFO stuff. Sorry, Nick, I dont buy that. You didnt get to see the gun camera film taken during RAF interceptor pursuits of radar trackings. Ralph told me he did see these - but he had a civil service rank of Air Commodore as opposed to Nick's rank of Captain. This probably gave Ralph access to the other department data but Nick was restricted to Air Staff 2A - records that in my view exist as a scapegoat to deflect the public away from the existence of the real hot stuff like this Shetland case. ]

Where they are is a good question - DSTI, DI 55 - perhaps? But there are many of them. Over my 25 years I have gathered data from witnesses on about 10 other UK radar cases like the one here reported - not one of which features in any Air Staff released file. They are still happening. I lectured to RAF Shawbury a few years ago and had a long talk to the radar officer there. He mentioned two then recent radar intercepts (one over Birmingham and the other Nottingham) - then withdrew when he saw a senior officer approach. I would not be amazed if these things were happening every other week and they are, of course, being siphoned off far away from Air Staff 2A.

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much For

From: Kim Burrafato <[lensman@stardrive.org](mailto:lensman@stardrive.org)>  
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 10:30:46 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:44:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much For

>Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 11:07:48 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)  
>From: Nick Balaskas <[nikolaos@YorkU.CA](mailto:nikolaos@YorkU.CA)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much For Lazar?

>Hi everyone.

>The discovery of these two isotopes of elements 116 and 118 (see  
>below) which have very short life spans strongly suggests that  
>the predicted "island of stability" for elements higher than 114  
>may not exist. If these elements (and other isotopes of 116 and  
>118) do have such short life spans as reported, then it would be  
>very unlikely that Robert Lazar's element 115 is a stable  
>element - one that has a life long enough for practical  
>applications.

>Nick Balaskas

Nick,

I wouldn't be so quick to dismiss the island of stability thesis. I read that they expect to create element 119 fairly soon, and that it will in turn decay into elements 117 and 115 respectively. No one knows what the decay time of those elements will be. I'd say the jury is still out as far as the possibility of creating superheavy, stable elements. Time will tell.

Kim Burrafato

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

**Re:**

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 99 09:30:39 PDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:37:37 -0400  
Subject: Re:

>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Ufology: What have we really learned?  
>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 10:58:06 PDT

Patient and gentle listfolk:

>"Yes sir," I said. "No, I will not be throwing any parties. For  
>one thing, what have we -as a UFO community- accomplished in the  
>last 50-years? In the last 20-years, I have watched ufology take  
>a step backwards almost every year."

Ufology has many problems. One of them is the sort of  
simplistic, chest-beating polemic with which Jerry Black has  
decided, yet again, to bless us. Fortunately, for all its  
faults ufology -- unlike, say, its critics -- has a long,  
honorable tradition of self-criticism. Unfortunately, the sort  
we encounter here tells us more about Black than about the  
field. His characteristically personality-centered approach is  
singularly unhelpful.

>"Our self-proclaimed 'leaders of ufology' have let the whole UFO  
>community down. They seem more concerned with writing books, "I  
>told the reporter," and staying in the public eye than they are  
>with finding out the answers to the UFO phenomenon.

Let's have some specific names here, and even before that, this:  
Exactly who have proclaimed themselves "leaders of ufology"?  
Names and quotes, please.

In my experience, all kinds of people write books on UFOs, for  
all kinds of motives. Most, I have no doubt, are sincere and  
well meaning, even if many of their books are not very good.  
One can criticize the failings of these works without slandering  
their authors, unless one believes, as apparently Black does,  
that ufology's problems can be solved if we focus on the  
personalities (or at least what we imagine to be the  
personalities) of those with whom we disagree.

>"And these are the people who have been entrusted with keeping  
>the people informed as to what's going on in the UFO community.

And some of them have done a damned good job of it, and  
virtually none have received the recognition, appreciation, or  
(for that matter) financial reward they deserve. Some -- such  
as, to cite but one example, the heroic Jenny Randles -- are on  
this very list.

>"Also," I said to the reporter, "people have been writing books  
>about their UFO and abduction experiences, and most of these  
>books have gone unchallenged. Nobody has made an objective,  
>scientific attempt to analyze the people who have written these  
>books, it basically seems 'up to the public' to decide whether  
>or not these people are telling the truth.

Sadly, Black, who seems not to have read many of the "objective,  
scientific attempts" to analyze UFO cases, believes that  
"objective, scientific attempts" really should be devoted to the

Re:

analysis of personalities and motivations of UFO researchers. A bizarre reading of what ufology is about, and an invitation for the field to collapse into navel-gazing irrelevance. Ufology, at least to most of us, is not the study of ufologists.

>"In my opinion, it is the responsibility of the UFO community to  
>critique these books when they come out, and let the general  
>public know where they stand after they have performed a  
>comprehensive and objective investigation.

"Objective" apparently is Black's favorite word, even if objectivity as such is not much in evidence in his polemics -- unless, of course, he defines objectivity as whatever he chooses to believe at any given moment.

In fact, UFO books are regularly reviewed in the UFO press and pronouncements favorable, unfavorable, or in-between regularly rendered. What he says here is rank nonsense, though I can think of a less polite term. But being a polite sort of guy, I won't use it here. I'll just let the rest of you think it.

>"None of these things are being done," I said to the gentleman.  
>"So there is no reason for any celebration about the fiftieth  
>anniversary of the modern-era of ufology."

Maybe if Black actually started reading UFO literature.... Nah, he's too busy patting himself on the back and trashing everybody else.

>I think it is a disgrace that the Whitley Strieber case has  
>never been investigated. The responsibility for that lies on the  
>two major groups, in my opinion. I believe that Mr. Walt Andrus  
>and Mr. Jerome Clark are responsible to scientifically and  
>objectively investigate any major case that makes network news -  
>or to which a book has been written about. There haven't been  
>that many cases which have appeared in the last 15 to 20-years  
>to be concerned with, but there have been a few. These few have  
>been allowed to 'run amuck' out there with these people making  
>money without any serious challenge being made to them.

This has got to be a first: Walt Andrus and me being mentioned in the same sentence. I want to thank Black for giving me the best chuckle I've had in a while.

Actually, I have neither time nor inclination to "investigate any major case that makes network news." I am practically never asked by reporters (with whom I speak rarely, in any case) about current cases. On those infrequent occasions I am asked about UFO matters by media types, it is almost always about historical ufology, a subject on which, as author of The UFO Encyclopedia, I think I can speak with some degree of authority (though not, of course, infallibility). Were I to be asked about those exceedingly rare sightings that "make network news," I would either decline comment or point to possible historical precedents.

The last time I recall being asked about a current UFO claim was by BBC, when the alien-autopsy film was getting its first publicity. I said I knew only a little about it but suspected a hoax; I then turned the discussion to earlier UFO hoaxing.

>And while Jerome Clark and The Center for UFO Studies say that  
>there are certainly problems with the Gulf Breeze and Whitley  
>Strieber cases, what have they truly done to make a critical  
>investigation of either case?

Actually, IUR ran a number of critical articles on the case in the late 1980s and early 1990s and even published a 1990 monograph by Zan Overall. CUFOS' investigator Bob Boyd was among the first to look into the case, and the organization sold and distributed his paper on the episode, Failure at Science (1988).

>Realizing that MUFON was investigating Gulf Breeze, was it the  
>friendship displayed by Budd Hopkins [who wrote the foreword to  
>'Gulf Breeze'] or Bruce Maccabee [who has upheld Gulf Breeze so  
>staunchly] that they don't want to get involved and make their  
>own analysis? Each organisation, regardless of whose case it is,  
>needs to take a scientific and objective look at each issue and  
>write their own report.

Re:

Apparently, to the endlessly self-righteous Black, only dishonorable motives -- ones, moreover, that he can freely speculate about without ever having to document -- will do. Honorable persons, in my observation, come down on both sides of Gulf Breeze, and I know that CUFOS' skeptical stance was not affected by the contrary judgments of others. I disagree with Hopkins and Maccabee about the significance of Ed Walters's claims. At the same time I respect their views as those of thoughtful, honorable men. What grown-up believes that only those who agree with us are decent human beings?

>In the case of Whitley Strieber, I don't recall ever reading >where MUFON or CUFOS, ever asked to set up equipment in Mr. >Strieber's home [which he may have denied anyhow]. I don't think >anyone has ever asked, until myself, that Strieber take a >properly-sponsored third-party polygraph test. If MUFON or CUFOS >have asked to stay in Mr. Strieber's home for over a week with >this equipment, then I stand corrected. I do know, for a fact, >that they never asked him or his wife Anne, to take a polygraph >test.

So? CUFOS has never conducted an investigation of Strieber's claims. Nor has it promoted them. We are a volunteer organization with distinctly limited resources. It seems to us, and I suspect to most reasonable persons, that ufology would be better advised to employ what resources it has to investigate those cases that are likely to produce useful results (CE2s, most prominently). By any standard Strieber's claims are minimally evidential at best.

On the other hand, IUR and JUFOS, the two CUFOS publications (which as far as I know Black doesn't read), have carried some of the best, and most original, work on the abduction phenomenon in general, including pioneering studies of patterns in abduction data, psychological profiles of abductees, the relationship of earlier folk traditions to current abduction experiences, abduction-monitoring experiments, and physical evidence (see, for example, Bill Chalker's important article in the current IUR).

Where disciplined, scientific work on the abduction phenomenon is concerned, CUFOS not only has nothing to apologize for but has been at the forefront.

>Whitley Strieber, and now Mr. J. Reed, who alleges to have >killed an alien and had it taken from his home, both of these >gentlemen have taken self-sponsored polygraph tests. And why >have they done so? Because CUFOS, by not making a comprehensive >report, and by MUFON, courtesy of Walt Andrus' ridiculous >investigation practices, have allowed Ed Walters' self-sponsored >polygraph tests to stand. So consequently, Mr. Whitley Strieber >felt -as I'm sure Mr. Reed did also- "if they approved of his, >why can't we take ours?"

>I also think that the self-proclaimed leaders in ufology during >the past 10 or 15-years have let the UFO community and general >public down.

>Finally, in the last 10 or 15-years, we have had the crossovers. >Those are investigators in other fields which may or may not be >proven later to be related to the UFO phenomenon. One such >crossover is Mr. Richard Hoagland. Another crossover is Mr. >Colin Andres, and another crossover is Linda Moulton Howe. If we >go back much farther than that, even Mr. Bruce Maccabee is a >crossover, in which he was formerly a photographic expert to now >feeling he has the expertise [which he has certainly shown no >ability for] to be a UFO investigator.

Note the childish insult, repeatedly demonstrated in his recent postings, in which Black cannot help indulging himself. He continually refers to Bruce Maccabee, Ph.D. (American University, 1970), as "Mr.", as if the latter's doctoral degree came out of a diploma mill rather than from one of our country's most respected universities. Moreover, Dr. Maccabee has been a working physicist all of his professional life. It doesn't follow, of course, that therefore he's never wrong about anything (\_nobody\_ is never wrong about anything), but it does tell us that Dr. Maccabee has educational and professional credentials that even his critics are obliged to respect. One

Re:

gets the impression here, as elsewhere, that Black seeks to infantilize ufological discourse.

>Getting back to the three recent crossovers, they have crossed  
>over from other fields and became professional UFO  
>investigators. Mr. Richard Hoagland, who dealt with the Face on  
>Mars, has made many predictions that have not come true. Mr.  
>Whitley Strieber, who will brown-nose with anyone in ufology if  
>he figures it will benefit him, has claimed that he likes a  
>person like Richard Hoagland because he "lives on the edge." No,  
>Mr. Strieber, he's not living on the edge. What he is hoping for  
>is that one of his predictions will come true so that he could  
>live off of it for years like Jeanne Dixon did with her Kennedy  
>prediction. Yet none of Hoagland's predictions that he has made  
>in the field of ufology have come true.

This is the first time I have ever Hoagland referred to as a ufologist. The fact that Black has to pretend that he is one in order to make his point tells us volumes. Likewise, occultist/fantasy-writer Andy Collins (of whom I doubt that any but a tiny number of non-Brit list members have heard) below:

>Andrew Collins, a few years ago, was going to surprise everyone  
>with this remarkable new evidence about UFOs. He held a  
>conference in which people were to pay \$30 per head at a meeting  
>room at Madison Square Gardens in New York City, and when 30 to  
>50 people attended, there was no 'new evidence' to be had.

I am astonished. "There was no 'new evidence' to be had." I am shocked. Shocked. This has got to be one of the hugest scandals I've ever heard of in all my years as a ufologist.

>Linda Moulton Howe, who is now on the Art Bell show on a regular  
>basis [along with Whitley Strieber], while she is a nice lady  
>that I have had the opportunity to speak with once, can be very  
>gullible at times.

Wow. Linda Howe "gullible at times"? Who would have imagined? One can only, alas, envy Jerry Black's keep grasp of the obvious.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?

From: **Georgina Bruni** <[georgina@easynet.co.uk](mailto:georgina@easynet.co.uk)>  
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 20:30:43 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:51:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?

>From: Steven J. Dunn <[SDunn@LOGICON.COM](mailto:SDunn@LOGICON.COM)>  
>Subject: Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?

>A couple years ago, I saw a television interview with Leroy  
>Gordon Cooper where he claimed to have seen a UFO land on a  
>runway at Edwards AFB. After a fruitless session of looking on  
>the web, I now ask: does anyone out here in mailinglistland  
>have any further information on this sighting?

See Website- <http://www.edwardsufo.com>

A UFO Alert took place at Edwards Air Force Base in California on October 7, 1965. 12 Luminous UFOs came low over the runway of this secure test facility and F-106 Interceptors were scrambled after the objects. All of this action was captured on Classified U.S. Air Force Audio Tapes which have now been declassified and are available to the public along with official documentation. As featured on: Art Bell, Sightings (2 episodes) and The Geraldo Rivera Show.....

Georgina Bruni - Editor in Chief Hot Gossip UK  
Check out Bruni's Column at [www.ufocity.com](http://www.ufocity.com)

\* \* \* \* \*  
E-mail: [georgina@easynet.co.uk](mailto:georgina@easynet.co.uk)  
E-mail: [104707.336@compuserve.com](mailto:104707.336@compuserve.com)  
\* \* \* \* \*

HOT GOSSIP UK  
[www.hotgossip.co.uk](http://www.hotgossip.co.uk)

Celebrating three years on the World Wide Web  
Britain's first on-line Gossip Magazine

\* \* \* \* \*

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 11:31:07 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:40:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 12:42:48 -0500  
>Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 00:07:27 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Arnold claims to have filmed two UFOs over Mt. Lassen in 1952,  
>one of which was transparent, an experience which led him to  
>believe that flying saucers were living creatures capable of  
>changing their density at will.

So? I guess this is leading to the usual Stacian argument that Arnold was a screwball and/or liar, and probably a rapist and drunkard as well.

Let's assume for the moment that Arnold flipped his wig and started claiming to see all sorts of weird things flying around some time after his first report of June 24, 1947? What's that got to do with the specifics of his first sighting?

What has remained impressive about this sighting for the past half century is how detailed and methodical Arnold was in his observations. Using what he had on hand he systematically attempted to gauge object speed, size, distance, shape, separation, and elevation. He was flying in a plane on a parallel course, which puts a lower limit on the possible speed. He timed their flight between two prominent landmarks from an excellent vantage point. In fact, I've been racking my brain to recall any other comparable case where somebody did a timed measure of speed. All other measures of UFO speed that I can think of have come from radar or eyeball estimates.

If one assumes the witness was honestly reporting something he saw to the best of his ability, then the report is rich in details that enable one to analyze various hypotheses ("birds"!) quite independently of what the witness may have thought.

Arnold was clearly upset afterwards by press ridicule, something that continues into the present in the form of calling him a "fruitcake" in public forums -- eh Dennis? Certainly at the time, people who spoke to him were impressed with his sincerity and level-headedness. But maybe hurt and also primed to the reality of something strange flying around after his first sighting, it's conceivable later Arnold blew up sightings of lesser things in his mind. Since there are almost no details on his future sightings (unlike his first), there is really little to be said or concluded about them. Maybe he wanted personal vindication after his perceived bad treatment in the public media following the first sighting.

I don't know that this happened. It's a possibility. But certainly the first sighting was uncontaminated by preconceived notions. That comes through in the methodical and detailed nature of Arnold's observations, in which he was testing various conventional hypotheses in his mind as the sighting occurred. They flashed brightly in the sun. Their shape was unusual. They flew in a screwy, co-ordinated formation. He knew they were flying fast, but he didn't know how fast. Maybe they were a new type of military jet plane. He timed their flight, and was later astounded when he calculated their speed as well into the

supersonic. Nothing he knew of flew that fast. So he started talking to fellow people in aviation about what they might be. Word got around. The press got involved. And then it blew up and Arnold was at the center of a storm of controversy.

I don't see someone here seeking fame or fortune or attention, but just an ordinary, honest guy who was very curious and also a very good observer of detail. He just wanted an explanation for what he had seen. What happened afterwards was totally unexpected to him. And I rather doubt that he changed that much afterwards to warrant your rather nauseating description of "fruitcake."

>Wouldn't you agree that this film would be much more compelling evidence than a spoken or written account of having seen something?

Since I haven't seen this film (and neither have you), why would it necessarily be compelling evidence? There are all sorts of UFO film and photos which are dismissed out-of-hand as hoaxes. Oh, Arnold the "fruitcake" hoaxed a film to vindicate himself! Or maybe the images are of poor quality and lack points of reference. You can't tell much from that. In that case, spoken and written accounts might contain better quality information.

>Have you ever seen a still from this film published anywhere in the vast UFO literature?

Can't say that I have. So? What if all Arnold got on film was nondescript dots? What if the film was over- or underexposed and all detail was wiped out? There wouldn't be much to publish, would there? Since I haven't seen the film (and neither have you), how can we make any judgments about it?

>Arnold had a working relationship with Ray Palmer, editor of Fate magazine, who I'm sure would have been only too happy to publish a picture of the real thing.

Would he have published a dot? A smudge? A washed-out, overexposed image?

I took two pictures last Fall of a bright red object which seemed to be following my jetliner for some 40 minutes. It was probably just another jet on a parallel course and brightly reflecting the setting sun, but who knows?

Well, how did my sensational "evidence" come out? All I got were two faint red dots barely visible through the clouds and smeared around by camera motion. Do you think Ray Palmer would have published that, even if it had been of the "real thing" and I had been the famous Kenneth Arnold?

>In that same vast literature, have you ever run across a single account by anyone else who ever claimed to have seen Arnold's film?

No. Can't say that I have. So? Without knowing anything about what was supposed to be on the film, you seem to jump to an awful lot of conclusions. Maybe the film never publicly materialized because the images were of such poor quality they were worthless as evidence.

>For the record, I included Arnold's own account of his Mt. Rainier sighting as "What Happened on June 24, 1947," in UFOs 1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers, co-edited with Hilary Evans. I have copies of the illustrated, 272-page hardback available for \$19.95, plus \$3.00 s/h.

Shameless plug slipped in nicely. Never hurts to exploit the "fruitcakes" for a little gelt, eh Dennis?

>Aside from Arnold, the book contains articles by Jenny Randles, Jerome Clark, Jacques Vallee, Bill Chalker, Ray Fowler, Chris Rutkowski, Robert Durant, David Perkins, Col. Hector Quintanilla, Michael Swords, Karl Pflock, James Moseley, Jan Aldrich, Vicente-Juan Ballester Omos and others.

I can see that some of us aren't on your social list. Sniffle.

>In September of this year I'll be hosting the 36th annual National UFO Conference here in San Antonio. Speakers include Whitley Strieber, Kevin Randle, Joe Firmage, psychotherapist

>Constance Clear (author of "Reaching for Reality"), Jim Moseley,  
>Tom Deuley, Walt Andrus, and Linda Corley, who conducted the  
>last in-depth interview with Jesse Marcel, Sr.

>Details to follow soon.

Actually sounds interesting. Keep us posted.

Anybody know anything about Linda Corley's interview with  
Marcel? Haven't heard of it before.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 13:43:02 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 18:49:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?

>From: Steven J. Dunn <[SDunn@LOGICON.COM](mailto:SDunn@LOGICON.COM)>  
>Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 11:33:13 -0700  
>Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 00:58:33 -0400  
>Subject: Gordon Cooper's Edwards AFB Sighting?

>A couple years ago, I saw a television interview with Leroy  
>Gordon Cooper where he claimed to have seen a UFO land on a  
>runway at Edwards AFB.

>After a fruitless session of looking on the web, I now ask:  
>does anyone out here in mailinglistland have any further  
>information on this sighting?

The date was May 3, 1957. The landing wasn't on a runway but out on a dry lake bed on the Edward's range. Cooper said he saw the film immediately afterwards that had been shot by two range photographers, but hadn't personally witnessed the incident. The L.A. Times and a few other newspapers the next day reported that something had happened, but an A.F. spokesperson downplayed the incident as being a mirage. ("The desert air does crazy things.")

The most complete account I've seen was by Dr. James McDonald in his Congressional testimony of July 29, 1968. He tracked down the two range photographers, and also the range director, and interviewed them. He also apparently spoke to Cooper, but maintained his anonymity.

McDonald wrote that the range photographers, James Bittick and John Gettys, said they first saw the object maybe 500 yards off, but the first photos were taken when it was about a mile off. "Both said it had a golden color, looked somewhat like an inverted plate with a dome on top, and had square holes or panels around the dome. Gettys thought that the holes were circular not square. It was moving away from them, seemed to glow with its own luminosity, and had a hazy, indistinct halo about its rim, both mentioned. The number of shots is uncertain; Gettys thought perhaps 30. The object was lost from sight by the time it moved out to about five miles or so, and they did not see it again. They drove to the base and processed the film immediately. All three of the men I interviewed emphasized that the shots taken at the closer range were very sharp, except for the hazy rim. They said the dome and the markings or openings showed in the photos. The photos were taken by the Base military authorities and were never seen again by the men. In a session later than day, Bittick and Carson [the range director] were informed that they had seen a weather balloon distorted by the desert atmospheric effects, an interpretation that neither of them accepted since, as they stated to me, they saw weather balloons being released frequently there and knew what balloons looked like. Accounts got into local newspapers, as well as on wire services."

McDonald then notes that, "I have not seen the photos alleged to have been taken in this incident, I have only interviewed the two who say they took them and a third person [obviously Gordon Cooper] who states that he inspected the prints in company with the two Askania operators and darkroom personnel."

Obviously something happened. Gettys and Bittick also completely corroborated Gordon Cooper's account of what he saw on the developed film when Cooper finally went public about the incident.

A year ago I visited Edward's AFB and looked up the base historian, who talked a lot about his PhD and thought very highly of himself as a military historian. He was a typical UFO skeptic, very opinionated but short on specifics. If there was anything at all to this UFO nonsense he, as a high and mighty AF historian, would certainly have heard about it by now. He was cleared right to the top, so he claimed, and could bust generals right down to privates if they didn't share information with him. (He really did say this stuff.)

He knew vaguely about Cooper's claims, but kept insinuating that Cooper must be mentally unbalanced. He obviously knew nothing about the incident being reported in the papers or the corroboration of Cooper's account by the range photographers and the range director. No, Cooper was nuts and it never happened.

Another famous Edward's UFO incident this self-opinionated base PhD historian knew absolutely nothing about was the multi-sighting, multi-witness incidents of July 4, 1947 at then Muroc AAF. He didn't believe me, so I told him he could look up the AF case reports that are reproduced on Jan Aldrich's Project 1947 Web page.

I then asked him if he would bring out the base logs, newspapers, and anything else for these dates, that might note anything happening. Well, I was wasting my time, he said. There's nothing there. As it turned out, he was right. The otherwise very detailed base logs had nothing on either of these incidents, or on another well-known Edward's radar visual incident of Oct. 7, 1965, from which there is several hours of audiotape, including of the jet interceptor scramble, radar photos, and the report from the base "UFO officer", which he said he had personally uncovered and turned over to one of those "UFO buffs." (These are now publicly available) As an aside, astronaut Edgar Mitchell has recently stated that he was at the base at the time this happened.

Well, what about that incident, I asked? What were those objects? He muttered something vague about how he might have an answer after talking to some of the people, but he wasn't going to share it with me.

Anyway, I bring this up to counter claims by skeptics that if some UFO incident really happened at a military base, then such items as the base logs would definitely have something on it. That's simply not the case. These were three very well-documented incidents at Edwards, and there is nothing there. The only thing on UFO incidents that I found anywhere was speculation in the base newspaper about what might have been filmed by an X-15 camera during an a flight on April 25 (?), 1962 -- ice crystals or paint flakes perhaps?

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

From: Nick Balaskas <[nikolaos@YorkU.CA](mailto:nikolaos@YorkU.CA)>  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 18:28:57 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 19:03:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

>From: Richard G Brown <[rgbrown@web.net](mailto:rgbrown@web.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99  
>Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 03:46:00 -0700

>>From: Rense E-News <[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)>  
>>To: Rense E-News <[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)>  
>>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:40:01 -0600  
>>Subject: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

>>-----  
>>Jeff Rense Weekly E-News  
>>-----

><snip>

>>EBE-2 explained the weather of it's planet which was dry,  
>>varying temperature between 65-90 degrees. There was 35  
>>hours of constant sunshine and three hours of darkness

>I know I'm going to regret this... But how can a planet have  
>such vastly unequal periods of day and night? 35 hours to 3?!?  
>Shouldn't they be relatively equal?

>Even in a binary system it couldn't be consistant enough to be  
>35 and 3 every day could it?

>- Confused in Canada

Hi Richard.

Many Canadians who live in the northern latitudes will tell you that their days and nights are not always of equal length. In fact, if you live north of the Arctic Circle, the days there are now 24 hours long since the sun doesn't set and about 6 months from now the nights will be 24 hours long since the sun won't rise.

Even if EBE-2 had large space mirrors in orbit around its home planet like the ones proposed by the Russians to light up the night sky or if its planet had a large moon which blocked out the light from its sun for 3 hours at a time, this would still not explain how EBE-2's planet has a 35 hour day and 3 hour night.

As for the range of temperatures in EBE-2's home planet, no world in our solar system, including the Earth, has such a small range. Assuming EBE-2 is for real and what it said was accurately reported and true, then maybe EBE-2 comes from an artificial planet controlled with a typical house thermostat.

Nick Balaskas

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 9](#)

## Forgione's Balducci Interview

From: **Adriano Forgione** <[aforgi@hotmail.com](mailto:aforgi@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 23:04:16 CEST  
Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 19:13:15 -0400  
Subject: Forgione's Balducci Interview

Here is my interview with Monsignor Corrado Balducci, the Vatican priest speaking about UFOs.

If someone wants to use my interview with Monsignor Balducci please contact me first

Adriano Forgione  
[aforgi@hotmail.com](mailto:aforgi@hotmail.com)

-----

Interview with Monsignor Corrado Balducci

"Other intelligent beings exist"

The reality of the UFO phenomenon and its theological implications: using reason, extraterrestrials are here. A glimpse of their nature and a mention of the Third Secret of Fatima.

by Adriano Forgione  
(translation from Italian by Dawn A. Bissel)

I met Monsignor Corrado Balducci at the Second Ufological Conference of Ancona, entitled "Alien civilizations: between doubt and reason" on 17 April 1999. Balducci, a demonologist of the Vatican is a very open person with a pleasant manner who is quite well known in the ufological circuit for having openly declared that he believes in the possibility that extraterrestrial intelligences are interacting with Earth. Are his statements made on behalf of the Vatican? I tried to examine the religious repercussions of contact with Monsignor Balducci.

Monsignor, where does your interest in extraterrestrial intelligences spring from? I really became interested in ufology a couple of years ago, even though I started talking about it on TV about four years ago, in 1995. Actually, it all started in 1959 when I began to devote my time to studying demonology. As I had to explore fields such as psychiatry and parapsychology, I indirectly came into contact with topics linked to ufology. I remember that in the Fifties, there was a tendency to deny at all costs the object of parapsychological studies amongst the public, some scientists and also amongst us clergymen. They said that there was no basis for acknowledging parapsychology and phenomena which were called nonsense and fantasy. To put it simply, they denied everything. This was reflected in ufology, which is linked to other frontier topics. As I collected material, I realized that this generalized denial stemmed from illogical fanaticism. There must be something there, even if you just use your common sense, and, using reason, the phenomenon is undeniable. Strict criticism goes against common sense because it goes against the value of human testimonies. In recent years, accounts of ufological events have greatly increased and yet there are still too many people who tend to pass everything off as nonsense. Of course, in many cases, natural phenomena for example, may be wrongly interpreted, but it's absolutely unthinkable to put everything into that category. Total scepticism is completely unjustified.



And what's happening at the moment in your field? I've never told anyone this, but I'll tell you: some theologians have said to me "Balducci, what are you doing, it's all just fantasy!", and they were important theologians, not just anyone. Then when I explained my interest, I defended it tooth and nail so as to say that it's time to change this attitude because if we go on like this, we'll end up weakening and destroying the value of human testimonies. This is what worries me because human testimonies are the basis for our life as an individual, our life in society but above all the basis for the spiritual life of Christians, given that the Divine Revelation is a historical fact that was testified to. God's Revelation is testified to by people and by the gospels. If we believe in the accounts of Biblical miracles, then using reason, we must also believe the accounts of extraordinary events that happen today. It's obvious that we must prove that every affirmation is based on credible foundations. Above all, I decided to get involved in ufology in order to defend human testimonies.

On various occasions you have said that the occupants of UFOs could be more highly evolved spiritually than we are. I must start by saying that angels do not use spaceships. As purely spiritual beings, they are where they want to be and if they wanted to show themselves, they wouldn't have any trouble taking on visible forms. So, when we talk about extraterrestrials, we have to think either of beings like us or, preferably, other types of beings who always combine a spiritual part with a material part, a body, even though they have a different relationship compared with us terrestrial humans.

Nowadays, science accepts the existence of forms of life in the cosmos, even though it doesn't want to take into account the fact that these intelligences could already be here in our planetary sphere, at least in an obvious form. How does theology tackle this problem? Opinions in favour of the habitability of other worlds are held not only by secular scientists, but also theologians and people who died and were made saints like Padre Pio. The book written in 1974 by the priest Don Nello Castello, "Cos=EC parl=F2 Padre Pio" ("Thus Spoke Padre Pio"), says that someone in Padre Pio's confraternity asked him "Father, I thought Earth was nothing compared to the stars and all the other planets", to which Padre Pio replied "Yes, and if we leave the Earth we are nothing. The Lord certainly didn't restrict his glory to this little planet. On other planets, there will be beings without sin.". I can also mention Cardinal Niccol=F2 Cusano (1401-1464) who wrote "there is no star from which we are authorized to exclude the existence of beings, who may even be different to us". The Jesuit and astronomer, Father Angelo Secchi (1818-1866) wrote "It's absurd to consider the worlds that surround us as uninhabited deserts". And I could go on and on. Of course, we still don't have scientific confirmation of this particular issue. However, in the field of theology and the Scriptures we can make some observations. As God's power is limitless, it is not only possible but also likely that inhabited planets exist. In fact, there is a great difference between angels, who are purely spiritual beings, and ourselves, who are made of spirit and matter and whose soul is limited in its actions by the abilities of the body itself. This is explained by the axiom that Nature doesn't take jumps. And so it's likely that the distance between us and angels is reduced by beings who, although they have a body, maybe a more perfect one, have a soul which is less conditioned in its evolution. Probably, not only is this possible and likely but, in my opinion, also desirable. In a not so distant future, these beings could help us, especially on our spiritual path.

Some researchers think that this already happened in the past. That's an interesting point. It's arguable that these beings have been protecting and helping us for a long time. Some people have put forward the hypothesis that some disasters have been avoided thanks to them. If intelligent beings from other planets really existed, we would find the solution as to how to reconcile their existence with Christ's redemption. If Christ is the centre and head of all creation, no world exists which doesn't refer to Christ, as everything is under the influence of the divine Word and His glory. And no glory is possible without the existence of intelligent beings who can understand it. In any case, it's absurd to think that the only form of intelligence is our own. Other intellectual forces, different to the human one and constructed with a different type of structure is not only possible, but extremely probable.

Is your research personal or is it on behalf of the Vatican?  
It's personal.

Twenty years ago, Father Domenico Grasso spoke publicly in favour of the UFO phenomenon. Was it personal research for him too? This research is absolutely personal. The Vatican doesn't decide anything. We aren't told "study this or study that" but it gives great freedom of action to individuals. In the Vatican will be pleased when it knows that Balducci too has spoken about ufology. We don't work according to specific orders, absolutely not.

In your opinion, what are the possible implications of the phenomenon for our current civilization or for the near future, if we acknowledge a possible interaction between man and extraterrestrial intelligences? That's a question which leads me to think that it would be better if we knew what these beings are like. I have already gone into this and I justified my opinion with "likely". What you want to know depends on whether they are inferior or superior to us. If they are like us, there wouldn't be many implications, as they could have a civilization on the same level as our own. It would be different if they were superior beings. In that case a lot of presuppositions could change.

According to some studies, visions of Blessed Virgin Mary are connected to the UFO phenomenon. Some associated phenomena seem to be of a ufological nature. What do you think? It's absolutely out of the question. For pity's sake, Our Lady can do what she wants, and definitely doesn't need a UFO.

Two years ago, an article was published in 'Il Messagero' which quoted some of your statements about a nuclear war and a celestial cataclysm which will happen within ten years. That was a sensationalist article. The truth is, I said that they are two risks we are running. The nearest is a nuclear world war, a danger that's more real when there are two powers involved. So, I speculated on who could be a possible opponent for America, and I said China or the Arab world, but I didn't mean that this would happen tomorrow. I pointed out that for near future I meant around 2030. China first has to develop its commerce and industry to the point where it has enough military power to involve the West in a future war. (At the time of the interview, the war in Kosovo was already under way - Ed). The danger could also be that Russia, being in a destitute state, has already sold arms, technology and people to Third World countries. But I think that however small a country is, it thinks before dropping an atomic bomb on the USA. And what do you think the other, more distant danger is?

An asteroid hitting Earth. I hadn't thought of that. I was actually referring to an ecological crisis which is growing because of the increase in pollution which is faster than any human corrective measure. But of course I'm not talking about only surviving ten years.

Staying with this issue, in an edition of the magazine 'Visto' three years ago, you partly confirmed the text of the Third Secret of Fatima which has been around for thirty years but has never been backed by the Church. Yes. There are two things in the Third Secret of Fatima. Everyone noticed the first, but very few noticed the second. The first tells of a nuclear war before the end of the millennium. From the context, that's clear. In fact, the text talks about the use of arms that are more powerful than a thousand suns. It's clear what arms are intended if we look at what the text goes on to say: "the living will envy the dead". This means that the people who survive the nuclear weapons will suffer from radiation. The other, less known aspect, is the doctrinal crisis of the Church. Three years ago, I was interviewed by Canadian TV. I said: "Yes, the Madonna of the Third Secret of Fatima says this, but no-one has noticed that she first says that it will happen if mankind doesn't mend its ways.". So it's all conditioned by this previous remark. But I am optimistic. We, as people, can influence the realization of a prophecy, change the date and the intensity of the prophesied events and mitigate them. The renewal of spirituality in the young is a good omen. I mean to say, spirituality based on the rules of the Church.

Do you believe that non-terrestrial intelligences could

intervene in a possible future cataclysm? I've already said that it's possible for these beings to come to the aid of mankind. Anyway, we shouldn't expect help from anyone, it has to be us who change and mature.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Info About Mr. Haktan Akdogan?

From: Stan Friedman <[fsphys@brunnet.net](mailto:fsphys@brunnet.net)>  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 22:00:17 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:13:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Info About Mr. Haktan Akdogan?

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net) <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Date: Wednesday, June 09, 1999 9:14 PM  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Info About Mr. Haktan Akdogan?

>From: Thiago Ticchetti <[thiagolt@opengate.com.br](mailto:thiagolt@opengate.com.br)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Info About Mr. Haktan Akdogan?  
>Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 23:56:08 -0300

>Hello,

>I need your help, please, someone knows something about the UFO  
>Researcher, Mr. Haktan Akdogan. Please contact me.

>Thanks.

>THIAGO LUIZ TICCHETTI

He is a Turkish UFO researcher who speaks excellent English and has done a number of radio and TV programs in Istanbul. He was the primary organizer of the huge Istanbul UFO Conference a while back.

His Fax number is 90 216 330 5515

Great Conference

Stan Friedman

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 23:18:12 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:22:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Regarding:

>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 21:29:44 -0300  
>From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Don wrote:

>I'm not going to go over this point by point but just make a few  
>observations.

>The first is an obvious disregard for one simple fact and that  
>is the stated Callair altitude that Arnold gave as 9,200 feet.  
>I've brought this up before with James who seems to want to  
>ignore it.

Don,

If I had seen this mentioned before, I certainly wouldn't have  
ignored it. Your comments are a helpful insight.

>The fact is Arnold did not know what his true altitude was  
>because he had no way of verifying it. He looked at his  
>altimeter and saw 9,200 feet and gave that as his altitude. That  
>could have been out as much as two or three thousand feet [don't  
>say it can't happen, it's happened to me] from the station  
>pressure at take-off in the warm lowlands to the cool temps a  
>couple of hundred miles away in the mountains. Note Well that  
>pilots are constantly updating their altimeter settings.

That's interesting and I don't recall Bruce taking this into  
account in his Arnold 'paper'.

>Observation: If Arnold turned his aircraft to get a better look  
>he would have turned [banked] his plane to keep the objects on  
>his side [the left] for better visibility. In this case he would  
>have turned right about 90 degrees. However he probably would  
>have lost sight of the objects for the few seconds it took to  
>accomplish the manouver because his left wing [the Callair is a  
>low wing] would have come up, obscuring his vision.

I haven't see this useful information before.

>I've been a bit put off by the impression being floated, by  
>some, that Arnold was some kind of dolt who was frittering  
>around the mountains with no particular idea of where he was,  
>didn't know birds from jets, couldn't estimate distances or work  
>out a speed/time problem, despite the fact that he would have  
>done them dozens of times during each flight.

Very much appreciated. It doesn't follow that Kenneth Arnold was  
an idiot if he made an exited, two minute, error of judgement.

>I believe that it was Bruce that wondered if birds could fly at  
>6,000 or was it 9,000? feet. My Flight Supplement cautions

>pilots to watch out for Canada Geese at 32,000 feet when they  
>are migrating. If I remember correctly a DC-3 struck a bird over  
>Mount Everest during WW II while flying the "hump" as they  
>called it.

I had checked out the altitude probabilities for migrating  
American White Pelicans long ago and it seems they're known to  
reach 14,000 feet during migration.

One reference featuring airplanes came from Ann Johnson: "When  
they come migrating through, there are frequently flocks that  
literally disappear from view as they bank and the sun is no  
longer reflecting directly on them. Put the binocs on them and  
there they are. But being a lousy judge of distance, I have no  
idea how high they are. Much higher than the airplanes on  
approach and they are still 10 miles out. You can put the  
numbers on that".

>Another observation. We'll probably never know what Arnold saw  
>that day as is true of many other cases..

Of course, that's exactly what I said in the newsletter.

>.. but I think you are drawing a long bow if you stick with your  
>bird theory James.

As I've also said before, it's not really my theory, although I  
do think it's a better conceivable explanation than meteors,  
'earth lights', mirages, 'billowing snow clouds', etc.

What probably isn't saying much as none of these are tenable.

It's also of course merely an expansion of Martin Kottmeyer's  
theory.

The difference is that if birds were the explanation, there are  
distinctive similarities between the flight characteristics of  
American White Pelicans and what Arnold described, much more so  
than with Swans, as Kottmeyer proposed.

He's quite happy with the new suggestion as are many others who  
embrace some scepticism. Doubtless the resident 'Roswell/MJ-  
12/saucer' zealot is not. ;)

As I wouldn't bother to even read what's a fair bet to be the  
usual diatribe, I'm not in the least interested, even if there's  
some meaningful material amongst the standard drivel.

Although I hadn't intended to post the following on the UpDates  
list, this was an addendum to the last newsletter and contains  
some background which hasn't been published here before:

Realising that Arnold's long out-of-print book was crucial  
evidence I hadn't seen, I was subsequently able to acquiring a  
copy on loan. It was only on reading this, that the full  
significance of Arnold's later sighting became apparent.

I also undertook some further research, which isn't mentioned in  
the newsletter as it was already lengthier than intended.

What follows are relevant findings and additional background,  
some of which is being published here for the first time. It  
will hopefully assist in the understanding the rationalisation  
behind the premise offered.

Indigenous to Washington state, the American White Pelican  
(*Pelecanus erythrorhynchos*) is the largest bird in North America  
and amongst the biggest in the world. A predominately white  
bird, with black primaries and outer secondaries, it weighs up  
to 15 kg, (33 lb) and it's massive wingspan can extend to 3 m  
(10 ft) or more.

The clue to possibly identifying the enigmatic objects remains  
in Arnold's description of their flight characteristics. Often,  
birds have a distinctive signature, the "jizz" as it's known,  
and from this a bird's probable identity can be determined, even  
if the sighting was inconclusive.

Don Baccus, an ornithologist, also commented to Michael Price

[see the newsletter for details of Michael's comments]:

"Michael, my first thought when I started reading your analysis was white pelican. Several years ago, when training a good birder in the finer details of splitting migrating hawks into species, age, etc. at long distances at the beginning of the fall migration season (i.e. training him to run our count), we saw distant white 'blurps' fading in and out of visibility many miles north. This was at the Goshutes, i.e. on the Utah/Nevada border. It was near sunset. It was obvious that the sun was reflecting on their underwings. They'd disappear momentarily and then reappear in sequence. They were flying east-to-west and we first spotted them somewhat to the northeast. I pegged them as white pelicans almost immediately, as the whole cadence of the thing matched the way white pelicans will soar in line (in this case - they'll also 'V' up), and rather than flap all at once, often will each begin to flap as each reaches the position where the previous bird began to flap. Same with turning, etc. Of course, they'll also do this in more of a synchronized formation, too, but I'm sure you've all seen white pelicans flap and glide in the kind of pattern I'm describing.

I couldn't think of any bird that would show such a cadence and literally twinkle white while switching from soaring to flapping".

Investigating this suggestion further, there are notable correlations with Arnold's observations.

Arnold claimed, "They flew like many times I have observed geese to fly in a rather diagonal chain-like line as if they were linked together".

"...they numbered nine. They were flying diagonally in echelon formation..."

In 'Birds of the World', by Oliver L. Austin Jr. p 42, he states:

"Pelicans fly in long lines, sometimes in a V formation, sometimes abreast, sometimes in single file directly behind one another. Most often they form a wide echelon, each bird slightly behind and to one side of the next".

Arnold also mentions, "They were flying diagonally in echelon formation with a larger gap in their echelon between the first four and last five". Discussing this with Michael, he agreed with my assessment that this is standard behaviour in a flock and wrote, "all line-abreast, diagonal and astern flocking birds develop gaps and fill them in randomly".

A further, distinctive connection, is Arnold's claim, "They didn't fly like any aircraft I had ever seen before. In the first place their echelon formation was backward from that practiced by our Air Force. The elevation of the first craft was greater than that of the last".

This is a typical feature of American White Pelicans flying in formation.

Consider also his statements that:

"I observed the objects' outlines plainly as they flipped and flashed against the snow and also against the sky".

"They fluttered and sailed, tipping their wings alternately and emitting those very bright blue-white flashes from their surfaces".

In 'The Birds', by Roger T. Peterson (Time-Life International), he writes:

"Much the simplest form of flight, certainly much less complicated than flapping or hovering, is gliding flight".

"Swallows employ gliding flight, - several strong wing strokes and a glide. So do pelicans travelling in formation...".

"Gliding saves energy, but gravity and air conditions determine

how far a bird can skim before it must flap again".

The parallel between Arnold's objects in echelon which "flipped and flashed", "fluttered and sailed", and a formation of pelicans in echelon "beating and gliding", as 'Birds of the World' describes their flight, seems evident.

As Don Baccus remarked, "I couldn't think of any bird that would show such a cadence and literally twinkle white while switching from soaring to flapping".

Michael Price also confirmed, "Assuming he was looking at birds, the flipflop appearance of these birds would be visible whether higher, same altitude, or lower as the sun might be reflecting strongly and directly off white upper and/or underwing surfaces".

Kenneth Arnold was perhaps after all on the right track when he stated:

"They flew in a definite formation but erratically. As I described them at the time their flight was like speed boats on rough water or similar to the tail of a Chinese kite that I once saw blowing in the wind. Or maybe it would be best to describe their flight characteristics as very similar to a formation of geese, in a rather diagonal chain-like line, as if they were linked together".

Very similar to a formation of geese, but based on the above evidence, remarkably like a formation of American White Pelicans.

It would have been an uncommon, if not rare, sighting, especially with the birds flying south and a possibility which Arnold is most unlikely to have examined.

If that should be the answer and Arnold mistakenly concluded the objects must be distant airplanes, it plays havoc with his estimated calculations.

It's these estimates of speed and distance which are open to dispute and Arnold's 'second coming of the saucers' encounter must surely be considered critical evidence that he was capable of mistaking the distance and airspeed of birds.

American researcher and writer Martin Kottmeyer had previously reached a similar conclusion and more details can be found at:

Resolving Arnold - Part 1, by Martin Kottmeyer  
<http://www.reall.org/newsletter/v05/n06/resolving-arnold-part-1.html>

Resolving Arnold - Part 2: Guess Again, by Martin Kottmeyer  
<http://www.reall.org/newsletter/v05/n07/resolving-arnold-part-2.html>

Kottmeyer thought that Arnold may have been deceived by a flight of swans.

British researcher and author, Peter Brookesmith, asked for an opinion on the results of my investigations and Kottmeyer wrote:

"James Easton's thought that pelicans might be a better guess than swans sounds plausible to me at first blush and no objections come to mind. I guessed swans primarily on the points that I knew they flew high enough and were larger, whiter, faster, and rarer than geese. If pelicans match the flight characteristics better as claimed - cool, I like it.

The people asking we take Arnold's testimony of the distances at face value naughtily ignore the reasons I gave why we can't. If real, the objects had to be huge and visible to scores of people. They also had to be supersonic and generating sonic booms that thousands should have heard. The guys arguing about the trigonometry keep putting the birds and the planes on perpendicular paths, but overlook that Arnold explicitly turned the plane to get a better look out the side window. The paths were parallel. Once you put that straight, the angular sizes and velocity implicit in Arnold's report can fit coherently those of



a swan. I'm not sure if the speed or size of pelicans would materially change the math, but if the flight characteristics are a valid signature I wouldn't sweat such details.

Give Easton my appreciation for offering the alternative".

Any proposition that the American White Pelican was responsible for Arnold's reported sighting, must be able to substantiate that these birds are known to fly relatively fast and at high altitude.

The ideal person to offer an informed opinion would be a pilot who has encountered pelicans in flight and Mike Havener is a glider pilot who wrote an article on his experiences.

He told me, "The birds I was soaring with were at about 3000 - 4000 feet MSL. We were flying in a continuous band of lift, so we were continually climbing. I have seen pelicans at higher altitudes when the lift is really good (maybe 6000 feet MSL)".

"The glider I was flying has a 38 mph stall speed... as a matter of fact, I was flying at 52 mph between thermals, and these birds were staying with me".

So, it seems whilst still not quite supersonic, pelicans are no slouches and under ideal flying conditions, could show a surprising turn of wing.

Mike added, "Since writing the article, I have received several letters from other glider pilots who have shared the same experience. Though none of them mentioned their flight profiles, these reports have come from various locations around the world". [End]

There's more evidence than this, however, that covers the gist of it.

Don't forget, these are no ordinary birds, they have a massive, up to 10ft wingspan, all white, except for the black wing tips.

We could put it this way; supposing that any pilot encountered a small formation of migrating AWP's at high altitude, had never seen this unusual sight before and as such, didn't recognise these as birds at all.

What would he be likely to observe in perfect conditions?

Say..a formation of reflective, bright objects, flying in a diagonal echelon, with maybe some of the 'objects' slightly ahead of the others. They would occasionally 'flutter' and 'sail' as they flapped and then glided. From distance, it would look something like a 'kite's tail' (he might even describe their motion in flight as 'bobbing', skimming, or looking something like a stone skipping across water :) ).

If this was also in a post-war era of aviation development, especially military and when it would be no real surprise to see new airplanes, especially ones which were still 'secret', would the pilot ever realise, or would anyone suggest, that he had seen a formation of AWP's?

If this did apply to Kenneth Arnold, how could he not realise these were birds and believe the 'objects' were much further distant and considerably faster than they truly were.

It would have to be that there was evidence these could not have been birds, or his overall perception was somehow in error.

Although that's another matter and this is already too long, one question which needs to be resolved is how far, maximum, could any bright, reflective object of approx. 10ft by 5ft, be visible from the air?

Peter Kingsmill is a naturalist and Director General of The Redberry Pelican Project (Canada) Foundation. I had also asked Peter for his assessment and he replied, "Everything in Arnold's

description that you quoted points to the strong possibility he saw a flock of AWP's... the formation, the allusion to the tail of a Chinese kite, etc".

"I have also been baffled by optical illusions of distance when these birds are against a backdrop (hills)".

Kathleen Andersen, who lives in the Mt Rainier area and has written about the Arnold case, recently asked some good questions about the factual existence of any AWP's in that area, as she had never known of this.

Peter was one of the relevant experts I contacted and he confirms, "In general, American White Pelicans breed in the mid-west USA and prairie and northern Canada (as far north as Fort Smith, NWT). So indeed, they could be around Washington state, where, incidentally, they also nest in small quantities".

I'm hopeful of shortly receiving some further substantiation about this and details going back to the 1940s.

All irrelevant of course if the answer lies elsewhere!

James.  
E-mail: [voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Guide To U.S. Sightings

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:56:30  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:29:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Guide To U.S. Sightings

Source: The Detroit News,

<http://detnews.com:80/1999/features/9906/08/06080021.htm>

Stig

\*\*\*

What's New

Compiled by Detroit News Staff Writer Barbara Hoover

\*\*

Books: Aliens? Look around you

Itching to ditch this tired old planet? Your way out might just be a copy of UFO USA, a detailed guide to various extra-worldly sightings here and across the nation. Michigan turns out to be a great place to catch that cross-galactic ride -- the authors list it as a certifiable "hot spot." Local incidents include the "Wave of 1966" that swept across the Ann Arbor area (prompting the notorious "swamp gas" explanation), as well as 1995 sightings by air-traffic controllers in Flint. UFO USA is published by Hyperion and costs \$12.95.

<snip>

Copyright 1999, The Detroit News

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## DA Investigating Mysterious Cow Deaths In New

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:06:12  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:19:24 -0400  
Subject: DA Investigating Mysterious Cow Deaths In New

Source: Albuquerque Journal,

<http://www.abqjournal.com/news/6news06-09.htm>

Stig

\*\*\*

Wednesday, June 9, 1999

DA Investigating Recent Cow Deaths

By Brendan Smith  
Journal Staff Writer

\*\*

No one is sure what killed a calf and two cows last month on the Tres Ritos Ranch north of Questa, but ranch manager Tom Reed definitely finds the deaths unusual.

"I come up with more questions than answers," Reed said Monday. "I wouldn't be surprised if we never do find out who or what is doing this. It may be something totally unexpected."

The last cow was found dead May 23 in a pasture near where a dead calf and a dead cow were found earlier in the month, Reed said. The last cow had its udder cleanly cut off and a deep hole with smoothly cut edges gouged into its neck, Reed said.

Each of the three animals had unexplained wounds and missing body parts, Reed said.

The 8th Judicial District Attorney's Office takes cattle mutilations seriously, although no one has ever been charged with the crime, Assistant District Attorney John Day said. The judicial district covers Taos, Colfax and Union counties.

"If someone is up there killing livestock, that's a crime," Day said Tuesday. "Whether (cattle mutilations) are a secret government project or aliens, that's out of my realm."

Dozens of reported cattle mutilations in northern New Mexico dating back to the 1970s have spawned theories about aliens sent to Earth to slice up cows.

Reed said he couldn't explain the three recent deaths from his herd of 40 cattle, but he isn't convinced aliens cut up his cattle.

"I would lean more to the government or cults or something like that. I really don't know anything. I guess that's just speculation," he said. "If the government isn't involved, I think they're covering it up."

Gabe Valdez, a retired State Police officer who has investigated cattle mutilations near Dulce, said he is working with the District Attorney's Office in investigating the recent cattle deaths on Tres Ritos Ranch.

Valdez, who lives in Albuquerque, is now a field investigator for the National Institute for Discovery Science, a private organization that has volunteered to pay for necropsies and lab tests on the dead cattle.

The institute, based in Las Vegas, Nev., researches cattle mutilations, UFOs and reported encounters with aliens. The organization is funded entirely by a Las Vegas entrepreneur who is interested in the paranormal field, said Colm Kelleher, the institute's deputy administrator.

Reed found the first dead cow on May 4 in a pasture on the 3,200-acre Tres Ritos Ranch. The cow's right eye and right ear were missing with a circular cut around the right ear extending down the neck, Reed said.

"There were no tracks where she was injured or hurting and dragged herself around," Reed said. "She was just there."

The calf was found dead four days later in the same area. The calf's right eye and tongue were missing and the genital area had been cut open, Reed said. The calf's rump also was missing but Reed thinks birds may have eaten it.

Valdez said he saw flipped cow patties around the third dead cow that may have been caused by "turbulence," but Valdez didn't know if the turbulence was from an alien spaceship.

"It was an unexplained animal death," Valdez said. "Don't ask me what I think. I don't know who's doing it."

The New Mexico Livestock Board investigated about 30 cattle mutilations in northern New Mexico in 1993 and 1994, including one mutilated cow reported by Reed at the Tres Ritos Ranch in May 1994.

The Livestock Board concluded most of the 1993-94 cattle mutilations were not caused by predators or scavengers. An earlier investigation by the board found there was "possible involvement of clandestine Satanic groups."

Predators or scavengers were blamed for similar cattle mutilations from the 1970s investigated in 1980 by an ex-FBI agent for the 1st Judicial District Attorney in Santa Fe.

The Las Vegas institute hasn't determined what caused the recent deaths of the cows on Tres Ritos Ranch.

The institute has researched about a dozen unexplained cattle deaths, most in New Mexico or Utah, over the past three years, Kelleher said.

After conducting necropsies and lab tests, some of those cattle deaths were determined to be caused by infectious disease, accidental poisoning from insecticides, or the work of predators or scavengers, Kelleher said.

Other cases of cattle mutilations have proved more mysterious.

"There are a small handful for which there are no logical explanations," Kelleher said.

Copyright =A9 1997, 1998, 1999 Albuquerque Journal

Call the Journal: 505-823-3800

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: OZ: Search Fails To Find Clues To UFO

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:52:31  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:24:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: OZ: Search Fails To Find Clues To UFO

Source: ABC News (Australian Broadcasting Corporation),  
<http://www.abc.net.au:80/news/state/qld/archive/metqld-9jun1999-11.htm>

Stig

\*\*\*

Search fails to find clues to UFO

Wednesday 9 June, 1999 (11:06am AEST)

\*\*

A Gladstone police search has failed to find any trace of an object seen falling from the sky near Calliope.

There were several reports of sightings of objects in the sky last night, including a truck driver who says he saw a flaming object move across the sky near Gin Gin, west of Bundaberg.

One of the sightings was made by a Burnett resident Margaret Sheppard.

"It was just this brilliant green object that lit up the sky and came from the north and landed in the area west of Kingaroy," she said.

"When it was gone, poof, dark - the lights went out again."

=A9 1999 Australian Broadcasting Corporation

Updated: Wed Jun 9 11:15:03 1999 (AEST)

AEST =3D Australian Eastern Standard Time

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Australia Searches For ET

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:18:28 GMT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:39:48 -0400  
Subject: Australia Searches For ET

Source:

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/low/english/sci/tech/newsid\\_364000/364833.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/low/english/sci/tech/newsid_364000/364833.stm)

Go to the site for photos of the new detector and the Parkes Telescope!

Stig

\*\*\*

BBC News Online: Sci/Tech

Wednesday, June 9, 1999

Published at 16:44 GMT 17:44 UK

\*\*

Australia searches for ET

By BBC News Online Science Editor Dr David Whitehouse

\*

One of the most powerful searches for aliens in space is about to begin from Australia. It will simultaneously listen to 58 million radio channels.

"The instrument is one of the most powerful in the world and it's going to sift the skies to look for artificial signatures from other intelligent civilisations, should they exist," says Dr Frank Stootman, Chairman of Seti (Search for Extra-Terrestrial Intelligence) Australia and co-director of the Southern Serendip project.

"This is a very significant experiment that will contribute to testing some important scientific paradigms about the origin and development of self-conscious life in the universe," he added.

Right time, right place

The search for ET will be carried out using the Parkes telescope in New South Wales. It is the southern hemisphere's largest radio astronomy telescope.

According to Carol Oliver of Seti Australia, observations made at Parkes are considered to have the best chance of discovering ET because of its geographical location and the amount of time the Southern Serendip team is able to use the telescope.

The Southern Serendip project runs in parallel with normal radio astronomy at the telescope - it takes the same signal feed as the astronomers working on an all-sky survey, thus making double use of telescope time.



Radio waves travel vast distances through space and are relatively easy to detect. This is why scientists believe they offer the best chance of discovering extra-terrestrials, either by looking for a deliberate beacon or by detecting 'radio leakage' from their internal broadcasts.

#### Multi-channel listening

The Seti centre at the University of Western Sydney Macarthur developed a new electronic analysis system in order to look more closely for any faint ET signals in the Parkes radio data.

The searchers divide the radio data into small frequency bands because the ET signal would probably be very faint.

The Seti centre has increased the number of radio channels it can listen to simultaneously from eight million to a staggering 58 million channels. That's like having 58 million radios, each tuned to a slightly different frequency. It will significantly improve the chances of finding ET.

The increase in channels has been made possible in part by a generous donation from the Seti Institute in California, which had its 56 million channel Project Phoenix experiment located at Parkes in the first half of 1995.

#### Relevant Stories:

- \*Screening for alien life (17 May 99 | Sci/Tech)
- \*A signal from ET? (31 Mar 99 | Sci/Tech)
- \*Anyone out there? (09 Jun 99 | Sci/Tech)

#### Internet Links

- \*SETI Australia
- \*Southern SERENDIP

The BBC is not responsible for the content of external internet sites.

=A9

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

From: Wendy Christensen <[christensen@catlas.mv.com](mailto:christensen@catlas.mv.com)>  
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 20:30:17 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:04:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 22:46:53 -0700  
>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

<snip>

>"Paranoia runs deep, into your heart it may creep"  
>Crosby, Stills, Nash and Young

No, no, no...

"Paranoia strikes deep, into your life it will creep...  
It starts when you're always afraid..  
Step outa line the man comes and takes you away..."  
--Buffalo Springfield

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 23:40:42 -0500  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:36:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 11:31:07 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 12:42:48 -0500  
>>Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 00:07:27 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

><snip>

>>Wouldn't you agree that this film would be much more compelling  
>>evidence than a spoken or written account of having seen something?

>Since I havene't seen this film (and neither have you), why  
>would it necessarily be compelling evidence? There are all  
>sorts of UFO film and photos which are dismissed out-of-hand as  
>hoaxes. Oh, Arnold the "fruitcake" hoaxed a film to vindicate  
>himself! Or maybe the images are of poor quality and lack  
>points of reference. You can't tell much from that. In that  
>case, spoken and written accounts might contain better quality  
>information.

What an absurd, convoluted, crappy cop-out! And I thought you  
were supposed to be a UFO investigator. Find the film and then  
analyze it.

>>Have you ever seen a still from this film published anywhere in  
>>the vast UFO literature?

>Can't say that I have. So? What if all Arnold got on film was  
>nondescript dots? What if the film was over- or underexposed  
>and all detail was wiped out? There wouldn't be much to  
>publish, would there? Since I haven't seen the film (and  
>neither have you), how can we make any judgments about it?  
>

David,

I never said that I could make any judgments or claims about  
Arnold's alleged film, having never, as you quite rightly say,  
seen it. Has anyone else?

My point was simply to raise it as an issue in regards to  
Arnold's overall reliability. He made a claim to having seen  
nine, disc-shaped objects over Mt. Rainier. Five weeks later he  
claimed to have encountered another large flight of UFOs. In  
1952 he claimed to have filmed two UFOs, one of which was  
transparent and led him to conclude that UFOs were living  
organisms. Over the next few years he reported another three or  
four sightings.

I thought you might find his claim of filmed UFOs worthy of  
interest and further pursuit. Instead, you and Maccabee both  
respond to this list as if Arnold's claim of having filmed  
"living" UFOs were somehow my problem.

Then you whine about what would we know if the images turned out to be fuzzy or not too clear. Document the existence of the film in the first place and then you can worry about any images captured thereon.

I frankly don't care whether his captured images are good or not. I simply want to know whether something he claimed (the film) can be verified or not. Something you and Maccabee don't seem the least bit interested in.

As hot-shot UFO investigators, I thought one or the other of you might make a token phone call or two in order to determine whether such a film still exists, or ever did exist.

But, no, you'd rather argue angles of elevation ad infinitum.

>>Arnold had a working relationship with  
>>Ray Palmer, editor of Fate magazine, who I'm sure would have  
>>been only too happy to publish a picture of the real thing.

>Would he have published a dot? A smudge? A washed-out,  
>overexposed image?

Ray Palmer? You bet your ass! He would have published anything he could have gotten his hands on (and demonstrably did). Incidentally, not having seen the claimed Arnold film yourself, why do you assume it was of such poor quality?

<snip>

>Well, how did my sensational "evidence" come out? All I got  
>were two faint red dots barely visible through the clouds and  
>smearred around by camera motion. Do you think Ray Palmer would  
>have published that, even if it had been of the "real thing"  
>and I had been the famous Kenneth Arnold?

See the above and consult Jerry Clark, not to mention past issues of publications edited by Ray Palmer. Palmer would have published anything. And in the absence of anything, he wasn't beyond creating his own evidence. Apparently you're not familiar with Palmer's checkered career, which is closely intertwined with Arnold's, as in co-author of Arnold's autobiography. Palmer wound up editing a quarterly, "Inner Space," which adhered (if that's the word) to the theory of a hollow Earth, the source of the saucers, among other things. He may not have given rise to the entire UFO phenomenon, as John Keel claims, but he certainly predated (and predisposed) its conspiratorial ambience. Just in case you ever wonder where you're coming from, although I don't get the impression that introspection is one of your strong suits -- or even a passing fancy.

>>In that same vast literature, have you ever run across a single  
>>account by anyone else who ever claimed to have seen Arnold's film?

>No. Can't say that I have. So? Without knowing anything  
>about what was supposed to be on the film, you seem to jump to  
>an awful lot of conclusions. Maybe the film never publicly  
>materialized because the images were of such poor quality they  
>were worthless as evidence.

Excuse me, but haven't you just done the same thing of which you accuse me of? Besides, the point -- which I continually have to drone into your head -- is this: I don't ultimately care what is on the film. I don't care if it's clear or vague, although, obviously, the clearer the better.

I simply want to see some corroboration of its existence by someone other than Arnold. Unlike his 1947 sighting, which none of us can corroborate or disprove, here is a patent claim of physical evidence in Arnold's own words, which should be subject to proof or disproof.

I simply asked -- and still ask -- what, if anything, the historical (or contemporary) UFO literature had to say about same. As far as you and Maccabee are concerned, you've already answered my questions. You aren't the least bit interested in Arnold's other claims, as long as your mathematical analyzes of his first sighting (whatever that represents) holds up in court.

>>For the record, I included Arnold's own account of his Mt.

>>Rainier sighting as "What Happened on June 24, 1947," in UFOs  
>>1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers, co-edited with Hilary  
>>Evans. I have copies of the illustrated, 272-page hardback  
>>available for \$19.95, plus \$3.00 s/h.

>Shameless plug slipped in nicely. Never hurts to exploit the  
>"fruitcakes" for a little gelt, eh Dennis?

Friedman does it all the time, Dave. I hadn't in awhile, so  
thought I would. Feel free to shamelessly plug your own  
publications. Er, you do have your own publications to plug,  
don't you? Sorry, but you set me up.

Actually, this perfectly good survey of 50 years of UFO history  
has sold miserably, no matter what plugs I or the publisher or  
the publicists have made in its favor. Proving once again, that  
you can keep a good book down. Jerry Clark referred to it as  
"the most intellectually stimulating UFO book of the year," or  
somesuch, causing sales to drop off even further. Thanks a  
bunch, Jerry! Couldn't you have said it surpassed Corso and  
Birnes in sensationalism, Strieber in weirdness, and Jacobs in  
believability? Then we might have sold a copy or two.

But, NO000, we tried to compile a reasonable, responsible  
account/history of UFOs over the last half-century, and this is  
the thanks we get? Try a copy, David, you might like it. Ditto,  
Bruce. A dollar off for my autograph, and that goes for all you  
other fruitcakes out there who don't by any of my publications.  
Allow me this one rant: As a whole, ufologists are the biggest  
cheapskates and tightwads on the planet. There, I feel much  
better!

>>Aside from Arnold, the book contains articles by Jenny Randles,  
>>Jerome Clark, Jacques Vallee, Bill Chalker, Ray Fowler, Chris  
>>Rutkowski, Robert Durant, David Perkins, Col. Hector  
>>Quintanilla, Michael Swords, Karl Pflock, James Moseley, Jan  
>>Aldrich, Vicente-Juan Ballester Omos and others.

>I can see that some of us aren't on your social list. Sniffle.

Yes, but many of us are. Maybe if you had been nicer...and I had  
known you way back when.

>>In September of this year I'll be hosting the 36th annual  
>>National UFO Conference here in San Antonio. Speakers include  
>>Whitley Strieber, Kevin Randle, Joe Firmage, psychotherapist  
>>Constance Clear (author of "Reaching for Reality"), Jim Moseley,  
>>Tom Deuley, Walt Andrus, and Linda Corley, who conducted the  
>>last in-depth interview with Jesse Marcel, Sr.

>>Details to follow soon.

>Actually sounds interesting. Keep us posted.

Thanks, David, I will.

>Anybody know anything about Linda Corley's interview with  
>Marcel? Haven't heard of it before.

>David Rudiak

Corley's interview with Marcel is a conference scoop. It  
reportedly contains some "surprises," the details of which I  
myself am not yet aware. (I have no idea what Firmage is going  
to say, either.) Third parties say it's interesting, though, to  
say the least.

Financials for fruitcakes to follow.

Dennis Stacy  
Alliterator  
<http://www.anomalist.com>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 99 19:38:05 PDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:06:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 18:17:16 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 12:48:06 -0400  
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

Dennis,

>No, logic such as this simply means that when you're dealing  
>with an anecdotal account the only fact you have is the anecdote  
>itself. Which anecdote may or may not be true in particular, or  
>may reflect varying degrees of subjectivity and misperception in  
>general.

>The only evidence we have for Arnold's sighting is Arnold's  
>account of same.

Not true. There's also the Fred M. Johnson's corroborating  
sighting.

C'mon, Dennis. If I didn't know any better, I'd think we were  
dealing here with Phil Klass, desperate to demolish the case  
(or, failing that, Arnold himself), in the hope that once if  
this hated case (or, failing that, witness) gets killed off, the  
entire UFO phenomenon will follow. I know you don't like it  
when people complain of what looks like a pretty consistent  
anti-UFO bias, but jeez, you sure do quack like one....

>Less than five weeks after his first sighting, he was reporting a second  
>encounter with an even larger flock (no pun intended) of flying saucers. A  
>few years later he claimed to have filmed two flying saucers over Mt.  
>Lassen, one of which was transparent. I'm not sure how many sightings he  
>claimed in all, but it would appear to be another three or four.

So what? Arnold was often in the air, in an area rich with UFO  
sightings, and in the early years he was actively looking for  
UFOs. No shred of evidence exists that he was a fruitcake, and I  
am surprised and disappointed -- and, let's add, sickened --  
that we're having to deal, in 1999, with a tired, wretched slur  
like this one. Isn't there a statute of limitations on the  
trashing of witnesses?

>And please note that in discussing Arnold I haven't mentioned Maury Island  
>once.

How kind of you. In fact, Maury Island tells us just how  
honest a guy Arnold was. To those of us who look back at it, it  
seems transparently obvious that Crisman and Dahl were lying  
through their respective chops. Arnold was such a straight  
arrow that it never occurred to him his "witnesses" might not be  
the same. Sadly, years of ridicule and harassment led him to a

considerably darker view of his fellow humans. I guess we can be happy that he is not around to read this new round of Arnold-bashing.

Unlike you, I knew Arnold, who was all he was cracked up to be: sharp, honest, shrewd, conservative, and unimaginative. Not, in short, a fruitcake by any definition except, I gather, yours. His interest in UFOs as such was long past, but he did take the trouble to answer my questions about various claims attributed to him. One, which first surfaced in a Harold T. Wilkins book, was a supposed quote asserting that Arnold had observed evidence of invisible entities in his home. He said the story was a flat-out fabrication. He had no idea where it came from.

As I have already pointed out, evidently to zero effect, Arnold is not the only observer to witness an aerial phenomenon which resembled some sort of organic entity. One famous case -- more fantastic than any Arnold ever reported -- involved Philadelphia police officers who on September 26, 1950, saw an unidentified object fall from the sky and come down in a field. It turned out to be a gelatinous mass which dissolved half an hour later. Oh yeah, excuse me. I forgot. Fruitcakes. Never mind.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## W.W.W Australia Now On Web

From: Diane Harrison <[tkbnetw@fan.net.au](mailto:tkbnetw@fan.net.au)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 15:41:42 +1000  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:52:40 -0400  
Subject: W.W.W Australia Now On Web

The Keith Basterfield Network Australasia -  
<http://www.fan.net.au/~tkbnetw/new>

The Keith Basterfield Network Australasia  
E-Mail [tkbnetw@fan.net.au](mailto:tkbnetw@fan.net.au)  
<http://www.fan.net.au/~tkbnetw>

\*\*\*\*\*  
UFO Australian Research Network Hot Line Number  
1800 77 22 88 Free Call  
\*\*\*\*\*

Hi everyone

W.W.W Australia is now on the Web take a look.

If your logo is not there please send it to me or inform me if  
you wish to join in.

---

W.W.W AUSTRALIA

---

<http://www.fan.net.au/~tkbnetw/new/world.htm>

Regards Diane Harrison & Team  
Co Director of The Australian UFO Research Network 1800 77 22 88  
Australian Skywatch Director

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: What Have We Really Learned

From: **Rob Irving** <[RobIrving@aol.com](mailto:RobIrving@aol.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 06:11:01 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 06:21:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: What Have We Really Learned

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: What Have We Really Learned  
>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 99 09:30:39 PDT

>>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Ufology: What have we really learned?  
>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 10:58:06 PDT

Jerome,

>Likewise, occultist/  
>fantasy-writer Andy Collins (of whom I doubt that any but a tiny  
>number of non-Brit list members have heard) below:

>>Andrew Collins, a few years ago, was going to surprise everyone  
>>with this remarkable new evidence about UFOs. He held a  
>>conference in which people were to pay \$30 per head at a meeting  
>>room at Madison Square Gardens in New York City, and when 30 to  
>>50 people attended, there was no 'new evidence' to be had.

>I am astonished. "There was no 'new evidence' to be had." I am  
>shocked. Shocked. This has got to be one of the hugest  
>scandals I've ever heard of in all my years as a ufologist.

It's likely Jerry meant to say Colin Andrews (the cerealogist),  
for it was he, the self-conferred "world's foremost expert on  
ufology" (so it says on the flyer), who appeared at Madison Sq  
Gardens.

best,

Rob

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell Story

From: Kal K. Korff <[Kalkorff@Kalkorff.com](mailto:Kalkorff@Kalkorff.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 02:27:28 -0700  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 06:18:16 -0400  
Subject: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell Story

Dear List,

Following on the heels of Professor Charles Moore's thorough refutation and disproving of David Rudiak's attempts to deny that Project Mogul is THE explanation for Roswell, I am afraid I have some more "bad news" for those who still emotionally cling to an "ET explanation" for Roswell, despite the existence of no hard, credible evidence to support this hypothesis.

At any rate, I have received several requests concerning former Roswell mortician Glenn Dennis' story, and especially about a new Roswell expose that is coming out, exposing various claims by David Rudiak, Frank Kaufmann, Corso, Don Schmitt, etc.

While I do not know everything that is in this expose as of yet, and don't even have a completed copy, here is some text from the Glenn Dennis portion. This information, as far as I am aware, has been outright ignored by mainstream UFOlogy and certainly CUFOS, the Center for UFO Studies.

The information, by any reasonable criteria, is persuasive, and those who still endorse Glenn Dennis now have the burden of refuting it.

I should note that to the best of my knowledge, and much to his credit, Kevin Randle has withdrawn his endorsement of Glenn Dennis. Perhaps he will do the same for Frank Kaufmann when that information comes out shortly as well.

This information is from a USAF report that as far as I know, HAS NEVER BEEN REVIEWED OR COMMENTED ON, at least this portion of it, on ANY of the main internet UFO-related web sites or publications.

If anyone knows anything different, please let me know. Either this fell through the cracks, per se, or the UFO field chose to ignore it, for whatever reasons. Perhaps it did not, and maybe I am just unaware that is has been addressed.

Can anyone cite a single reference on the web where this information was addressed?

It is my hope that CUFOS will now publish a retraction of their endorsements of Glenn Dennis' testimony, as well as other Roswell "witnesses" that they have promoted over the years, at the expense of the truth. I also hope that other pro-ET Roswell authors will also RETRACT their endorsements with just as much zeal and energy as they originally promoted them.

I doubt this will happen, though.

The pro-ET Roswell promoters owe\_ the public this, I believe, so that consumers do not continue to be MISLED and are informed of the latest information.

As this expose's implications make clear, the UFO field, CUFOS, etc., have a less than admirable track record of setting their own records straight. :-)

Maybe they have and I just missed it, but here's the data. It is now up to those who don't accept it, to disprove it.

Good luck.... :-)

Kal

---

The USAF Even Disproves Glenn Dennis

"Dennis recalled that the nurse was quickly and suspiciously shipped out either the same day or the day after he met with her in the Roswell AAF Officers=92 Club. If this allegation was true, it certainly seemed unusual and verifiable. Therefore, the morning reports, the certified daily personnel accounting records required to be kept by all Army Air Forces units at that time, were obtained and reviewed. These reports did not indicate that a nurse or any other person was reassigned on the days alleged, July 8 or July 9, 1947 (FN 40) The morning reports of the 427th Army Air Forces Base Unit (AAFBU) Squadron "M" the unit that all the medical personnel at Roswell AAF were assigned in July 1947, did not indicate a sudden overseas transfer of a nurse or any other person.

Records indicated that one nurse was reassigned on July 23, 1947, over two weeks after the purported events described by Dennis. (FN41) That nurse was transferred by normal personnel rotation procedures to Ft. Worth AAF (now Carswell AFB), Texas, where she remained on active duty until March 1949. (FN-42) In fact, Squadron "M" morning reports revealed the strength of the Army Nurse Corps (ANC) at Roswell AAF for July 1947 was only five nurses. Of these five nurses none were transferred overseas or killed in a plane crash -- the "rumored" fate of the missing nurse.(FN)

This review of the hospital morning reports also indicated that the name of the missing nurse provided by the witness (Glenn Dennis) was inaccurate. The witnesses (Dennis) stated in several interviews that he believed the nurse=92s name was Naomi Maria Selff. (FN-44) A comprehensive search of morning reports and rosters from the Roswell AAF Station Hospital indicated that no person by this name, or similar name, had ever served there. This finding was supported by a search of personnel records at the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) in St. Louis, Mo., a part of the National Archives and Records Administration. NPRC also did not find a record that a person named Naomi Maria Selff had ever served in any branch of the U.S. Armed Forces.

These findings were consistent with previous efforts of several pro-UFO researchers (Kal Korff, Kevin Randle) who have also attempted to locate this nurse or members of her family. They, likewise, were also unable to confirm her existence. (FN-45) While some UFO theorists continue to allege that this absence of records regarding a nurse by this name is part of a conspiracy to withhold information, the most likely reason for the lack of records is that this name is inaccurate.

Even though the name of the nurse is incorrect, it appears that a nurse assigned to the Roswell AAF Station Hospital in 1947 may have been the basis for the claims. Eileen Mae Fanton was the only nurse of the five assigned to Roswell AAF in July 1947, whose personal circumstances and physical attributes not only resembled those of the missing nurse, but appeared to be nearly an exact match.

The "Missing Nurse?"

1st Lt. Eileen M. Fanton was assigned to the Roswell Army Air Field Station Hospital from December 26, 1946 until September 4, 1947. (FN-46) Fanton, who is deceased, was retired from the U.S. Air Force at the rank of Captain on April 30, 1955, for a physical disability.(FN-47)

In this account, the missing nurse is described as single, "real cute, like a small Audrey Hepburn, with short black hair, dark eyes and olive skin."(FN-48) Lieutenant Fanton was single in 1947, 5=921" tall, weighed 100 pounds, had black hair, dark eyes, and was of Italian descent. (FN-49) Dennis also stated that the nurse was of the Catholic faith, and had been "strictly raised"

according to Catholic beliefs. (FN-50) Fanton=92s personnel record listed her as Roman Catholic, a graduate of St. Catherine=92s Academy in Springfield, Kentucky, and as having received her nursing certification from St. Mary Elizabeth=92s Hospital in Louisville, Kentucky.(FN-51)

The witness also recalled that the "missing nurse" was a lieutenant, was a general nurse at the hospital, and had sent him correspondence at a later date which stated she was in London, England with a New York, N.Y. APO number (military overseas mailing address) as the return address.(FN-52) Records revealed that Fanton was a First Lieutenant (promoted from Second Lieutenant to First Lieutenant in June 1947), and she was classified as a "nurse. General duty."(FN-53) Records also indicated that of the five nurses assigned to the Roswell AAF Station Hospital in July 1947, she was the only one that later served a tour duty in England. Furthermore, she was assigned to the 7510th USAF Hospital, APO 240, New York, N.Y., where she served from June 1952 until April 1955.(FN-54) The 7510th USAF Hospital was located approximately 45 miles north of London at Wimpoole Park, Cambridge, England.

An additional similarity between Fanton and the "missing nurse" is that her personnel record indicated that she quickly departed Roswell AAF and it is probable that the hospital staff would not have provided information concerning her departure. Fanton=92s unannounced departure from Roswell AAF, on September 4, 1947, was to be admitted to Brooke General Hospital, Ft. Sam Houston, Texas, for a medical condition.(FN-55) This condition was first diagnosed in January 1946 and ultimately led to her medical retirement in 1955.(FN-56) Therefore, if someone other than a family member contacted the Station Hospital at Roswell AAF and indeed inquired about Fanton, as Dennis stated he did, the staff was simply protecting her privacy as a patient. The staff was not participating in a sinister "cover-up" of information as alleged by UFO theorists.

#### The Pediatrician

In at least two interviews, the witness (Dennis) stated that a pediatrician stationed at the hospital was involved in the events he described. (FN-57) When asked by an interviewer how he knew the pediatrician was involved, Dennis was quoted as replying, "I know he was involved because I saw him there." (FN-58) Dennis is also quoted as saying that he and the pediatrician were "pretty good friends," and after the pediatrician left the military he (the pediatrician) set up a practice in Farmington, N.M. "I used to go fishing all the time up north and I visited him several times up there and he was involved," Dennis said. "I don=92t remember his name, I think he is still practicing in Farmington."(FN-59)

A review of personnel files and interviews with former members of the Roswell AAF/Walker AFB hospital staff, revealed that only one physician ever relocated to Farmington, N.M. following his military service. The former Capt. Frank B. Nordstrom served at Walker AFB from June 1951 until June 1953.(FN-60) Records also revealed that Nordstrom was indeed a pediatrician and while at Walker AFB, served as the Chief of Pediatric Services.(FN-61) When Nordstrom, a resident of the small town of Aztec, New Mexico, was interviewed for this report, he stated that he did not recall ever meeting Dennis and could not recall any events that supported any of his claims (see signed sworn statement in Appendix B.)(FN-62)

Farmington (population 8,000 in 1954) is located in the primarily rural Four Corners region of New Mexico approximately 300 miles northwest of Roswell. According to Nordstrom, Farmington did not have a pediatrician before his arrival in 1954. From 1954 until approximately 1970, Nordstrom believes he was the only pediatrician in the area. His recollections were confirmed by a local Farmington pharmacist, Charles E. Clouthier.(FN-63) Clouthier also served at the Walker AFB hospital, from 1955 to 1957, and following his military service returned to Farmington, his hometown, where he had lived since 1934. Clouthier has been employed by and co-owned a business, Farmington Drug, since 1957. He is familiar with most, if not all, of the doctors who practice in Farmington and the Four Corners region of New Mexico. Clouthier=92s confirmation that Nordstrom was the first pediatrician to practice in the Farmington area, was based on

both his frequent professional contacts with the local physicians and his experiences as a longtime Farmington resident. (FN-64)

Although Nordstrom believed that he was the pediatrician described (by Glenn Dennis), he was at a loss to explain how Dennis gained information concerning his military and civilian employment history. In a signed sworn statement, Nordstrom stated that he did not recall ever meeting Dennis and had certainly never been visited by Dennis as he had claimed.

One possible source of the information is that from approximately 1958 until approximately 1961 Dennis operated a drugstore in Aztec, New Mexico, a small town near Farmington where Nordstrom resides. However, Nordstrom also did not recall any contact with Dennis in his capacity as a drugstore operator.

#### The "Big Redheaded Colonel"

An indication that Dennis might have mistaken the date of actual events was that he was quoted in at least one book as having said that the officer who threatened him in the hospital was a big redheaded colonel. (FN-74) Research revealed that only one tall colonel with red hair was known to have been assigned to the Walker AFB hospital. Colonel Lee F. Ferrell was the hospital commander from October 1954 until June 1960. (FN-75) Ferrell was 6=921" tall and had red hair. (FN-76)

#### "Captain =91Slatts=92 Wilson"

In at least two interviews Dennis repeatedly made reference to a nurse named "Captain Wilson." (FN-77) He recalled that "Captain Wilson", who he believed was the head nurse, was another nurse stationed at the Roswell AAF hospital in July 1947. (FN-78) Dennis claims he spoke to "Captain Wilson" several times in reference to the alleged missing nurse. (FN-79)

He claims that on the day after he met with the missing nurse at the Roswell AAF Officers=92 Club, he attempted to contact her by telephone at the hospital but was told that she wasn=92t on duty. (FN-80) Instead, he spoke with "Captain Wilson." "I called the station I knew she [the missing nurse] always worked at," Dennis said, "She was a general nurse=85I was informed that she wasn=92t working that day. [Dennis then telephoned] An old girl by the name of Wilson, Captain Wilson, and I asked her, =91what happened=92? She said, =91Glen, I don=92t know what happened, she=92s not on duty.=92 She said she=92d try to get word to her [the missing nurse] that you [Dennis] want to talk to her." (FN-81) Later in the same interview Dennis further described Wilson. "We called her =91Slatts=92 Wilson who was a big tall nurse about six foot two or three - big tall skinny gal - and we called her =91Slatts=92 - everybody called her =91Slatts.=92

She=92s the one who told me she heard there was a plane crash and the nurses went down on a training mission. (FN-82)

The testimony appeared to clearly identify by name, rank, position, physical attributes and by a distinctive nickname, "Slatts," another nurse present at the hospital in July 1947. But a review of the morning reports of the Roswell AAF hospital for July 1947 did not contain the name of a nurse, or anyone else, named Wilson. (FN-83) The only female captain assigned to the Roswell AAF Hospital in July 1947 was the Chief Nurse Capt. Joyce Goddard. (FN-84) Goddard, who was 5=926" tall, was transferred from Roswell AAF to Korea on August 21, 1947. (FN-85)

Therefore, according to Dennis=92 recollection of events, this review of the morning reports indicated that there were two missing nurses, not one - personnel records of individuals assigned to the Roswell AAF/Walker AFB hospital indicated that Dennis=92 recollections of events were apparently inaccurate.

Examination of the August 1947 morning reports did not list a nurse named Wilson, but they did list a nurse named Slattery. (FN-86) Captain Lucille C. Slattery, who retired as a Lieutenant Colonel and is now deceased, was reassigned from Ft. George Wright, Washington, to Roswell AAF on August 7, 1947. (FN-87)

Slattery replaced Goddard as the Chief Nurse and was the only female captain assigned to the Roswell AAF hospital. Interviews

of persons with longtime professional and personal associations with Slattery, revealed that she was known by the unusual nickname of Slatts.(FN-88) Persons interviewed were Air Force nurses who retired in the 1960s, each with more than 20 years of service, including retired Air Force Colonel Ethel Kovatch-Scott, who served as Chief Nurse of the Air Force from 1963 to 1965.

Consequently, a comprehensive review of the morning reports and rosters of the Roswell AAF/Walker AFB hospital revealed that only one nurse named Wilson had ever served there and she did not arrive until February 1956.(FN-91) Captain Idabelle Miller, who became Major Idabelle Wilson in 1958 due to marriage and a promotion, was assigned to the Walker AFB hospital from February 1956 until May 1960.(FN-92)

Upon review of Major Wilson=92s personnel file, it was learned that she was 5=929" tall and thin. Also, she served as the Head Nurse of the surgical ward at the Walker AFB hospital.(FN-93) Therefore, Wilson=92s physical attributes, tall and thin, and position as Head Nurse matched Dennis=92 recollections of "captain Wilson." When contacted by Air Force researchers, Wilson stated she had no recollection of Dennis, of ever having conversations with him, any of the events he described, or of a nurse that was missing.(FN-94) She also made it abundantly clear that as an Air Force officer and medical professional she would not spread a rumor of a plane crash, as Dennis alleged "Captain Wilson" did in conversations with him.(FN-95)

Results of Missing Nurse and Pediatrician Research Examination of the missing nurse and the pediatrician stories, and other facts established by research, provide a foundation for further analysis to determine what actual event(s), if any, were responsible for these claims. Based on information developed, it appears this witness may be mistaken in some of his statements, especially regarding the time frame for these events. The following facts have been established:

a. The only physician who ever relocated to Farmington, N.M., following his military service at Roswell AAF/Walker AFB was the former Chief of Pediatric Services at the Walker AFB hospital, the former Capt. Frank B. Nordstrom. Further, he did not arrive at Walker AFB until June 1951, four years after the purported Roswell Incident, has no recollection of Dennis, the statements Dennis attributes to him, or of any actual events that explain his (Dennis=92) account.

b. The only nurse ever assigned to the Roswell AAF hospital (subsequently renamed Walker AFB) named Wilson, was Idabelle Wilson. She served at the Walker AFB hospital from 1956 until 1960 and had no recollection of ever meeting or speaking with Dennis or any of the activities he described.

c. Captain Lucille C. Slattery, the only Air Force nurse ever known by the distinctive nickname "Slatts," was stationed at the Roswell AAF hospital. However, she did not arrive until August 7, 1947. This was one month after the Roswell Incident, making it improbable that Dennis spoke with her in early July 1947.

d. There is no record that a nurse named Naomi Maria Selff, was ever assigned to Roswell AAF, Walker AFB, or was ever a member of the U.S. military.

e. All nurses assigned to the Roswell AAF hospital in July 1947 have been accounted for, thereby eliminating any possibility that there was ever a missing nurse.

END

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## BUFORA WATCH: BUFORA Sacks Editor for Silence

From: Mike Wootten <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 10:50:10 GMT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 09:28:47 -0400  
Subject: BUFORA WATCH: BUFORA Sacks Editor for Silence

-----  
BUFORA WATCH: BUFORA Sacks Editor for Silence  
-----

Over the past 18 months we have presented the ongoing story of how a once highly respected and objective UFO Research organisation has declined into a shadow of its former self.

In that time, most of the active members of BUFORA have resigned, disgusted with the behaviour of the management. Two years ago BUFORA had a growing membership of over 1000 across the UK and abroad. Unfortunately, two thirds of the membership have left the Association, leaving it financially threadbare and impotent in completing objective research and investigation - activities that the Association should be all about.

Now, BUFORA are following the path of popularist ufology, doing anything to attract gullible new members.

In the latest turn of events, the BUFORA Council have effectively sacked their magazine editor, Robert Moore, to stop him publishing a controversial editorial denouncing the Association for its support of Max Burns and his 'research' of the Sheffield UFO Crash - a crash that never was.

We now publish his editorial that BUFORA management tried to stop you from seeing in full along with the letter Robert received from Chairman Steve Gamble.

The editorial speaks volumes of how BUFORA is managed...

-----  
The "Max Burns Lecture Controversy".  
-----

Most readers will be aware of the so-called March 24th 1997 Howden Moors event (termed elsewhere "The Sheffield Incident"). Issues "5", "6" & "7" of the BUFORA BULLETIN recounted the detailed investigation into this occurrence conducted by long-term BUFORA member and Accredited Investigator Dr. David Clarke.

Also equally prominent over the past few years (and much more widely promoted throughout the UFO community) have been the findings of British UFO researcher Max Burns in relation to this incident; in particular his claim that it was instigated by the UFO-related crash of a Tornado aircraft. On other occasions it has also been proposed that the Howden Moors event was generated by the crash of an experimental man-made "flying triangle"...or even that of an extraterrestrial spacecraft!

However, rather than merely respect the negative verdict arrived at by others investigating this case - conclusions that are firmly based on meticulous and objective research - anyone questioning the validity of Burns' interpretation of the Howden Moors event have been subjected to severe protracted criticism (both on the Internet and elsewhere).

As you will have noticed from the lecture programme printed in last issue's BUFORA BULLETIN, Max Burns has been given an official BUFORA platform to present his somewhat unique interpretation of this case. This is despite the fact that a number of prominent BUFORA council members and other association officers - namely Gloria Dixon, David Clarke and myself - have openly been against this. However (despite our wishes) official BUFORA Lecture Organiser Malcolm Robinson, with little consultation on his part, invited Burns to present his findings in a lecture to BUFORA's membership scheduled for the 5th June 1999.

A (very) short time prior to the details of BUFORA's lecture programme being published, news of the planned Burns' presentation "leaked out" (translation - was discussed with other officers of the association such as BUFORA's press secretary David Clarke)! As a result of this, Malcolm Robinson sent out an e-mail to various BUFORA officers pointedly inferring that there was a "mole" active within BUFORA!

Both myself and others found the usage of such extreme terminology simply incredible! In the 15 years I have been a member of the association the content and speakers of BUFORA's London lectures have never been confidential... at least to my knowledge!

However, it later turned out that this (so-called) "mole" was none other than Gloria Dixon, who - like myself and others - was under the impression that the lecture programme contents was not a state secret! The fact that details of this forthcoming lecture had also been posted on the Internet forum UFO UpDates by Max Burns himself (a site easily accessible to millions throughout the world) is obviously a fact unworthy of any note.

No moles at work here, obviously.....

At the very least, this "mole" remark does a grave disservice to Gloria Dixon, who has worked tirelessly for four years as the association's Director Of Investigations (often under very difficult conditions).

Whilst none of us are against "freedom of speech" (despite inferences from some parties that those against BUFORA providing an official platform for Burns' were comparable to fascists or Stalin-era commissars for adopting this stance), we do feel the association as a whole should reflect the values and ethos of the NIC.

Sadly, both myself and others feel that much of the current lecture programme falls short of this. Why are there seemingly two Ufology's being presented within BUFORA; i.e the objective, sober and logical approach of the NIC and the "populist" approach, as embodied by the lecture programme?

I have always believed it was BUFORA's aim to bridge the gap between these two extremes. Instead, it seems to me that we are encouraging those very same negative, stupid and ill-informed attitudes. Therefore, due to this situation, Gloria Dixon (BUFORA's director of investigations), David Clarke (Press Officer) and myself (BUFORA BULLETIN editor) feel that we have no other option than to resign from the association. While we are sorry to leave, we feel we have to make a stand on this issue.

To do otherwise would be to betray the principles that we brought to BUFORA.

Therefore, due to this situation, Gloria Dixon (Director Of Investigations), David Clarke (Press Officer) and myself (BUFORA BULLETIN editor) feel that we have no other option than to resign from the association. While we are sorry to leave, we feel we have to make a stand on this issue.

No, we are not "fascists", "moles", "the Andy Robert's clique", "government agents" or any of the other myriad titles given to us by certain individuals in relation to this matter. We are merely committed Ufologists who feel that this situation forces us to stand up and be counted, for us to show our active support for the rationalist Ufology that has made BUFORA a major force

for good within ufology for so long.

Unfortunately, there are many within the British UFO community who want this subject to remain in a conceptual stone age...and will inflict severe verbal punishment, abuse and other penalties on those who dare to think otherwise!

We are sickened with the ideological, hectoring "ETH-true-believers-always-knows-best" attitude of certain members of the British UFO community.

We feel the presentation of this lecture on a BUFORA platform is effectively "spitting in the face" of the impressive and competent investigation conducted by David Clarke and Martin Jeffrey. In regards to the latter, Martin Jeffrey is both sympathetic to the ETH and was a even a former supporter of Burns' interpretation of the Howden Moor event!

A fact that speaks volumes for the evidential basis of the so-called Sheffield whatever-it-was "crash"!

- Farewell -

Sadly - at least for me! - this is will be the last issue of the BULLETIN composed under my editorship. Given my views on the "Sheffield Incident", I feel I have no option other than to show my solidarity with David Clarke and Gloria Dixon (major contributors of this BULLETIN over the past few months - as even this issue will testify!).

Furthermore - on a less controversial note - I have also been finding it difficult to keep up with the demanding publication schedule over the past months; a schedule which leaves me very little time other than to work on the BULLETIN. In the long term, it has proved hard for me to meet it's demanding publication-deadline schedules.

However, I have taken steps to ensure that the BUFORA BULLETIN will enjoy continued support from a active and prolific BUFORA editorial team. What they will make of this BULLETIN I will leave in their hands....

I hope that - at least some of you - have enjoyed the various editions I have produced over the past year.

I wish to formally thank all those who contributed information and articles during the term of my editorship; especially Chris Allan, Malcolm Chamberlin, David Clarke, Richard Conway, Gloria Dixon, Tony Eccles, John Heptonstall, Jimme Holman, Martin Manwaring, Anthony North, Elsie Oakensen, Bob Pratt and Jenny Randles.

And also a "thank you" to all those who sent in letters responding to the contents of this journal.

-----  
The Steve (I don't) Gamble Letter  
-----

Hello Robert,

Thanks for your message regarding the June Bulletin.

From your message, it appears that the printing out is around half to two-thirds done, but Arnold is unlikely to receive it before the end of the week, then he will be away for several days. To minimise delay, Arnold will run with the issue 11 I have sent him which he has already received, in the hope that he is able to post it before he goes away.

Don't print out any more of what you have done. Probably the best way forward is for you to let me have what you have done and I will incorporate as much of that as possible into issue 12 and credit both of us as joint editors of that edition.

Sorry to have to bump your issue of the Bulletin, but it is a question of practicality. We are a week behind the posting schedule already, this weekend would bring it to two and if Arnold was not able to do anything for a week that would make us three weeks behind on a six week schedule. The whole system only

works if we are able to have the Bulletin hit the doormats at regular intervals. Your work on Bulletin 11 and on the Bulletin over the last year is appreciated and I do feel bad about having to bump your issue 11.

I know at the moment you are unhappy with BUFORA, but I hope that will improve with time. I certainly hope that you will continue to play a role in the research and investigation sections. John Spencer remarked at the last Research meeting on the good work you had done on the BOLIDE project and that he hoped you would continue after you gave up the Bulletin.

Regards,

Steve

---

Robert had in fact printed and completed issue 11 of the Bulletin before receiving the above spineless email. In our view this is not how you treat people who work hard in their spare time to keep to punishing magazine deadlines. But it has happened so many times. Council are now very good at momentarily silencing people's opinions and stabbing them in the back at the same time.

Now Robert will have nothing to do with BUFORA - along with majority of researchers in the UK.

We suggest you do the same...

BUFORA Watch

-----  
-----  
[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Joel Carpenter <[ufx@mindspring.com](mailto:ufx@mindspring.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 07:00:01 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 09:31:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 1999 19:31:28 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 99 11:49:54 PDT

>Actually you can find another case in the Arnold article already  
>cited, pp. 27-8, of the Proceedings of the First International  
>UFO Congress. It precedes Arnold's own remarks quoted here  
>earlier, but snipped this time.

>I find it highly unlikely that Boeing would fly one of its test  
>planes over Mexico, but that's what Arnold relates. I also find  
>it highly unlikely that Boeing had a test (or any other) plane  
>capable of 1500 mph and 67,000 feet altitude, but, again, that's  
>the way Arnold has it. The last time I looked, Boeing was in the  
>business of building big, slow passenger planes.

>Does anyone know if they ever did any high-speed design test  
>planes for the military? I know they did the B-47 and the B-52,  
>but after that they went commercial.

Dennis-

Boeing's only supersonic projects were a surface-to-air guided  
missile called GAPA, first flown Jan. '46:

<http://www.boeing.com/companyoffices/history/boeing/gapa.html>

and its descendent, BOMARC:

<http://www.boeing.com/companyoffices/history/boeing/bomarc.html>

I think GAPA had been revealed to the public by 1947, hence the  
comments by Arnold's buddies that the objects he saw were some  
kind of guided missiles. Boeing had a test facility at Moses  
Lake, so there may have been some basis for the concept.

- J Carpenter

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Greer Joins The Prophets Conference Visiting

From: [prophets@maui.net](mailto:prophets@maui.net)  
Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 19:53:04 -1000  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 09:34:56 -0400  
Subject: Greer Joins The Prophets Conference Visiting

DR. STEVEN M. GREER, CSETI founder and International Director,  
joins THE PROPHEETS CONFERENCE ~ PORT TOWNSEND, WA, August 27-29

Dr. Greer is widely regarded as the world's foremost authority on the subject of extraterrestrial intelligence (ETI), and is the founder and international director of the Center for the Study of Extraterrestrial Intelligence (CSETI). A lifetime member of Alpha Omega Alpha, the nation's most prestigious medical honor society, Dr. Greer is an emergency physician and former chairman of the department of emergency medicine at Caldwell Memorial Hospital in North Carolina.

Dr. Greer, as director of CSETI, has led research teams throughout the world investigating the existence of ETI, and on several occasions has successfully established preliminary contact and communication with extraterrestrial spacecraft at close range. He has met with and provided briefings for senior members of government, military and intelligence operations in the United States and around the world, including senior CIA officials, Joint Chiefs of Staff, White House staff, senior members of Congress and congressional committees, senior United Nations leadership and diplomats, senior military officials in the United Kingdom and Europe, and cabinet-level staff members of the Japanese government, among others.

Dr. Greer has been seen and heard by millions world-wide on shows such as the Larry King Show, CBS, the BBC, NTV in Japan, "Unsolved Mysteries", "Sightings" and "Encounters" TV programs in the U.S., the Art Bell radio show, and dozens of others TV and Radio programs.

He has addressed tens of thousands of people live at conferences and lectures around the world, including The Prophets Conference ~ Phoenix, the international convention for MENSAs, the high IQ group, the Institute of Noetic Science Board of Directors, and the Sierra Club.

Regarded as the most inspirational, knowledgeable, visionary and charismatic speaker on the ETI/UFO subject, Dr. Greer routinely receives standing ovations and is uniformly greeted with respect and enthusiasm by his audiences. He brings a unique combination of scientific knowledge, credibility, vision, humor and inspiration to his lectures. Dr. Greer relies on first hand knowledge of extraterrestrial activity world wide, and has direct sources for information regarding covert operations dealing with the subject.

Supporters of his work are as diverse as Apollo astronaut Dr. Ed Mitchell, who walked on the moon in Apollo 14, to benefactor and philanthropist Laurance Rockefeller, to former British Ministry of Defense Head and five star admiral Lord Hill-Norton, to the late folk legend Burl Ives.

The scope of Dr. Greer's knowledge and experience permits him to address a virtually limitless diversity of audiences. He is able to relate the ETI subject to political and national security issues, consciousness studies, space exploration, the environment, religion and spirituality, world peace and disarmament issues, global transformation, new sciences, free

energy, studies regarding our future and many other areas.

Dr. Greer at The Prophets Conference ~ Port Townsend

This will be Dr. Greer's second presentation at a Prophets Conference. This time he will be investigating and exploring "The UFO: Anomaly, Reality, Implications" along with an unprecedented panel of leaders in the field made up of Dr. Edgar Mitchell, Joe Firmage, Dr. John Mack, Joan Phillips Ocean, and Dr. Robert Anton Wilson. Dr. Greer will also present an individual workshop, as well as participate with Gregg Braden, Joan Phillips Ocean, Dr. Edgar Mitchell, Ilona Selke, and James Twyman on a powerful panel entitled "Evoking the Numinous: A Path of Revelation, Evolution, Awakening."

The Prophets Conference Information is Available for You at:  
<http://www.greatmystery.org/prophets.html>

You may request The Prophets Conference Brochure by calling toll-free 1-888-777-5981.

Dr. Steven Greer Information <http://www.cseti.org/>

Thank you for forwarding this information to your lists.  
Questions, unsubscribe, subscribe, inquiries, comments, issues?  
Send mail to [Cody@greatmystery.org](mailto:Cody@greatmystery.org)

explore... <http://www.greatmystery.org>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell

From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 09:48:46 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 10:14:37 -0400  
Subject: Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell

>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 02:27:28 -0700  
>From: Kal K. Korff <[Kalkorff@Kalkorff.com](mailto:Kalkorff@Kalkorff.com)>  
>To: [Updates@globalserve.net](mailto:Updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell Story

>Dear List,

>Following on the heels of Professor Charles Moore's thorough  
>refutation and disproving of David Rudiak's attempts to deny  
>that Project Mogul is THE explanation for Roswell, I am afraid I  
>have some more "bad news" for those who still emotionally cling  
>to an "ET explanation" for Roswell, despite the existence of no  
>hard, credible evidence to support this hypothesis.

>At any rate, I have received several requests concerning former  
>Roswell mortician Glenn Dennis' story, and especially about a  
>new Roswell expose that is coming out, exposing various claims  
>by David Rudiak, Frank Kaufmann, Corso, Don Schmitt, etc.

>While I do not know everything that is in this expose as of yet,  
>and don't even have a completed copy, here is some text from the  
>Glenn Dennis portion. This information, as far as I am aware,  
>has been outright ignored by mainstream UFOlogy and certainly  
>CUFOS, the Center for UFO Studies.

>The information, by any reasonable criteria, is persuasive, and  
>those who still endorse Glenn Dennis now have the burden of  
>refuting it.

>I should note that to the best of my knowledge, and much to his  
>credit, Kevin Randle has withdrawn his endorsement of Glenn  
>Dennis. Perhaps he will do the same for Frank Kaufmann when that  
>information comes out shortly as well.

>This information is from a USAF report that as far as I know,  
>HAS NEVER BEEN REVIEWED OR COMMENTED ON, at least this portion  
>of it, on ANY of the main internet UFO-related web sites or  
>publications.

>If anyone knows anything different, please let me know. Either  
>this fell through the cracks, per se, or the UFO field chose to  
>ignore it, for whatever reasons. Perhaps it did not, and maybe I  
>am just unaware that it has been addressed.

The collapse of the Glenn Dennis tale has been discussed in various arenas, articles and books since 1997. Karl Pflock published an "open letter" to Dennis. In the summer of 1997, my book, THE RANDLE REPORT commented at length on Glenn Dennis and why his tale of the missing nurse was not to be believed. Vic Golubic of Phoenix had done the lion's share of the research and provided the information to all of those who were interested in it. Golubic's comment to me, that when he confronted Dennis with the information that Naomi Self (the other spelling Dennis had provided) could not be found in any military record, and that Dennis then said he hadn't provided the correct name, told me the story was a hoax. I published that as quickly as I could.

Let me add a personal note here. Back in 1991 or 1992, as we

were looking for Robert Slusher, I had a conversation with Dennis. He was angry because we had failed to find his nurse. He pointed out that he had broken the confidence and supplied the right name, Naomi Self. I mentioned that it was difficult tracking people from 1947 and that many people had the same name. I mentioned that I had spoken to four or five men named Robert Slusher who had not been in Roswell. Dennis said, oh, I know him and provided the right location.

The point here, however, is that Dennis was insisting that he had given us the right name for his nurse. He insisted that we should be able to find her. When we all, that is, Golubic, me, and others, pointed out that there was no evidence that the woman he was describing never walked the face of the planet, he changed the name. That meant the five or six years of work that had gone into attempting to locate her was for nothing. It meant that we had to begin again. It meant that everything we knew about her could be wrong so that we had no way of attempting to learn more. To me, when the witness retreated in that fashion, it was the last stone.

The point, however, is that there is no new evidence here. We already have had it and it has been circulated throughout the UFO community. We certainly own Golubic kudos for his long and tiring search. We owe them to others who provided information about the missing nurse.

And, for those who don't think my opinion on this, expressed in my book, hasn't cost me, ask yourselves why I wasn't invited to speak at the International UFO Museum? They bring in such notables as Wendelle Stevens and Don Schmitt.

>Can anyone cite a single reference on the web where this  
>information was addressed?

>It is my hope that CUFOS will now publish a retraction of their  
>endorsements of Glenn Dennis' testimony, as well as other  
>Roswell "witnesses" that they have promoted over the years, at  
>the expense of the truth. I also hope that other pro-ET Roswell  
>authors will also RETRACT their endorsements with just as much  
>zeal and energy as they originally promoted them.

But, the Dennis information is out there for all to read. I don't know why CUFOS hasn't published anything about it, but I suspect that it is because no one has written an article about it for them. And, I suspect they feel, as do I, that the information is already out there for those who want it.

KRandle  
[www.randlereport.com](http://www.randlereport.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: What Have We Really Learned?

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 14:45:15 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 10:24:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: What Have We Really Learned?

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: What Have We Really Learned?  
>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 99 09:30:39 PDT

>>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Ufology: What have we really learned?  
>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 10:58:06 PDT

>Patient and gentle listfolk:

>>"Yes sir," I said. "No, I will not be throwing any parties. For  
>>one thing, what have we -as a UFO community- accomplished in the  
>>last 50-years? In the last 20-years, I have watched ufology take  
>>a step backwards almost every year."

>Ufology has many problems. One of them is the sort of  
>simplistic, chest-beating polemic with which Jerry Black has  
>decided, yet again, to bless us. Fortunately, for all its  
>faults ufology -- unlike, say, its critics -- has a long,  
>honorable tradition of self-criticism. Unfortunately, the sort  
>we encounter here tells us more about Black than about the  
>field. His characteristically personality-centered approach is  
>singularly unhelpful.

>>"Our self-proclaimed 'leaders of ufology' have let the whole UFO  
>>community down. They seem more concerned with writing books, "I  
>>told the reporter," and staying in the public eye than they are  
>>with finding out the answers to the UFO phenomenon.

>Let's have some specific names here, and even before that, this:  
>Exactly who have proclaimed themselves "leaders of ufology"?  
>Names and quotes, please.

>In my experience, all kinds of people write books on UFOs, for  
>all kinds of motives. Most, I have no doubt, are sincere and  
>well meaning, even if many of their books are not very good.  
>One can criticize the failings of these works without slandering  
>their authors, unless one believes, as apparently Black does,  
>that ufology's problems can be solved if we focus on the  
>personalities (or at least what we imagine to be the  
>personalities) of those with whom we disagree.

>>"And these are the people who have been entrusted with keeping  
>>the people informed as to what's going on in the UFO community.

>And some of them have done a damned good job of it, and  
>virtually none have received the recognition, appreciation, or  
>(for that matter) financial reward they deserve. Some -- such  
>as, to cite but one example, the heroic Jenny Randles -- are on  
>this very list.

>>"Also," I said to the reporter, "people have been writing books  
>>about their UFO and abduction experiences, and most of these  
>>books have gone unchallenged. Nobody has made an objective,  
>>scientific attempt to analyze the people who have written these  
>>books, it basically seems 'up to the public' to decide whether  
>>or not these people are telling the truth.

>Sadly, Black, who seems not to have read many of the "objective,  
>scientific attempts" to analyze UFO cases, believes that  
>"objective, scientific attempts" really should be devoted to the  
>analysis of personalities and motivations of UFO researchers. A  
>bizarre reading of what ufology is about, and an invitation for  
>the field to collapse into navel-gazing irrelevance. Ufology, at  
>least to most of us, is not the study of ufologists.

<snip>

Hi,

I have been following this debate with interest. Thank you, Jerry Clark, for the kind words, but what was more important were your cogent responses to what, in general, are the criticisms. To a degree I can empathise with these. This does not make them correct, of course.

For a start Jerry Black seems to be confusing Andy Collins with Colin Andrews. Given the names, an easy mistake. He presumably means Colin Andrews (not Andy Collins) regarding pronouncements on ufology. Colin is a crop circle enthusiast who became attracted to UFOs that way and left the UK for the US where he gave various pres conferences in New York (although he comes back here often). Very few in the UK would describe him as a ufologist in preference to a crop circle researcher. Some would call him neither I suspect!

Andy Collins is a different matter. He was a ufologist first and foremost. In the 1970's he investigated many of the UKs biggest cases (eg the Aveley abduction) and wrote extensive articles on them - such as via Flying Saucer Review for the time when under Charles Bowen it did publish worthy material. Andy is still interested in ufology and I talk to him now and then but he got sidetracked into a new field - questing - thanks to a UFO case. Andy is a superb writer in Stephen King mold with the twist that the supernatural stories he tells (about magic, psychic battles and strange lights) are supposed to be true. I cannot answer for that but I believe Andy is sincere. He has published some hugely entertaining reads (such as 'The Black Alchemist') and a book linking UFOs and crop circles with Orgone energy - possibly where the confusion with his reverse namesake comes from. But the two men could never be mistaken for one another in terms of appearance, experience as a UFologist or activities. Today almost nobody in the UFO field realises Andy Collins was one of the leading ufologists in the UK for a decade. He is now almost exclusively seen as leader of the questing fraternity - from which, by the way, has sprung the success of the likes of Graham Hancock, Robert Bauval etc. But I cannot ever recall Andy Collins making the sort of proclamations referred to by Jerry Black.

As for ufology making no progress, its a question I often get asked. My answer is simple. We know far far more about UFOs today than we did 50 years ago. Often that is through eliminating things that UFOs are not. Certainly our skill at discovering IFOs and reducing the total number of 'surviving' cases is vastly better. Our ability to assess UFO photographs is much improved from the days when a picture was considered real until proven otherwise (today we have to be persuaded a case should be regarded as unsolved after carefully eliminating all options). As for the alien contact experience - we have a major data base of knowledge about this. We know witnesses, for example, are visually creative, have an early life recall tendency and enter altered states at the onset of an experience. We know of links with temporal lobe epilepsy and chemical changes in the brain that we did not know before. These sorts of things have come via research. We may not have the jigsaw puzzle built and ready to to admire but we have a lot more of the pieces available to fit in.

It is superficially tempting to think we have gone nowhere for one reason. The biggest noise in public ufology s made by those with the least to say. This is because the media and many UFO enthusiasts (as opposed to ufologists - the two are very different) prefer simple answers. There are no simple answers in ufology and all serious researchers know that. They just get on with quietly investigating, publishing, and building up the evidence and the theories surrounding the evidence whilst the

media portray UFology as if in a time warp. In the public eye it may be stagnant but nobody who is actually a part of it can think this is so. Exciting developments occur on a regular basis. Sadly you wont find them in the major media or in best selling books. You will find them in the important UFO literature (such as that which CUFOS produces) or in the books not written for commercial exploitation but to present good data and research. That Jerry Black appears not to be aware that these things exist is simply a consequence of the fact that you have to go out and find them, because they do not attract six figure advances, author PR tours and chat show circus presentations. But they are out there and if you take the trouble to look for them you will realise that UFO progress is alive and well and getting on fine thank you without the media fanfare.

To pick up on what Jerry Clark said about my writing. My most recent UFO book was 'Something in the Air' - an investigation into mid air encounters. It has a lot of first hand investigation and is certainly none sensational (it actively avoids any attempt to discuss aliens or imply they are behind these incidents). I was paid =A31500 (about \$ US 2300) to write this and it was a years work. It got almost zero publicity over here and has sold 757 copies to date. But it exists and I am proud of it and I knew all of this would be the outcome before I wrote it. Having published as many books as I have I am not stupid enough to think I write them for the money or the publicity. This book has been published in the US recently (by Sterling) and they have retitled it 'UFO Danger in the Air' and given it a terrible cover compared with the excellent British one. This is due to the need to try to hype to sell, I imagine - thankfully less evident in the UK. I just smile at the outcome.

You will appreciate that I cannot pay my way on income of the sort generated by 'Something in the Air' (or the similar advance for the new book that Dr Dave Clarke, Andy Roberts and I have just written together reporting a whole series of well investigated and ultimately solved cases - 'The UFOs that Never Were'). So I do supplement my income by writing more general books like 'The Complete Book of UFOs' or 'The Afterlife' (both of which have done far better - although only in a relative sense - ie that they earn about 75% of what I would be earning if I was still a teacher). The largest advance I have ever been paid for a book is \$US 9,000 - as opposed to Nick Pope's \$70,000 or Tim Good's \$300,000. for recent deals)

As you can see some of us dont write books for fame, glory and money. I can only speak for myself but I make a determined effort to write at least one research orientated book in an 18 month spell - knowing that for this I will get paid a pittance and that it will sell few copies. Even so it is out there to be read by serious researchers. I write the potboilers, if you like, because the publishers pay me a little more to do so and these books subsidise the real research and writing I would otherwise not get out into the shops without them.

People write UFO books for a host of reasons. But the day I stop wanting to write about serious UFO topics and using my books as a vehicle to explore cases and the phenomenon is the day I will stop writing UFO books at all. In no way would I want just to churn out rubbish to make money. In fact, last year I turned down the offer to co-author a book with a number one best selling Gulf War hero (an RAF pilot captured by the Iraqis). He wanted me to do a UFO book with him because his publisher wanted such a book and he knew nothing about the subject. Huge sums were on offer (I could probably have retired). His track record was such that I was almost guaranteed a hit book like none other in my 20 years as a full time writer. I said no. Why? Because I could not write what I considered an honourable book. I would have had to sacrifice some principles to do it. My brother frankly thought I was nuts. This is the first time I have mentioned the decision to ufology and I bet many will also now think I was nuts. Quite possibly this book will appear with some other UFOlogist as co -author who saw it as an opportunity - as no doubt it was. But I am - and always will be - a UFOlogist first and a writer second. Once I realised that fact then there was no choice here.

Please dont think I am saying this to show how wonderful I am and how my shining principles are so much better than yours. It was a decision I made - thats all - and in many ways I suspect I

Re: What Have We Really Learned?

was a fool. My point is only that when making decisions like this some of us - and I am absolutely sure I am far from alone in doing this - put ufology ahead of other considerations such as fame and fortune. Honest endeavour ufology does exist and I am proud to be part of it.

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 11:21:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 14:50:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 23:40:42 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto >[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy >[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>From: David Rudiak >[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 11:31:07 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>>From: Dennis Stacy >[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 12:42:48 -0500  
>>>Fwd Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 00:07:27 -0400  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes>

<snip>

>David,

>I never said that I could make any judgments or claims about  
>Arnold's alleged film, having never, as you quite rightly say,  
>seen it. Has anyone else?

>My point was simply to raise it as an issue in regards to  
>Arnold's overall reliability. He made a claim to having seen  
>nine, disc-shaped objects over Mt. Rainier. Five weeks later he  
>claimed to have encountered another large flight of UFOs. In  
>1952 he claimed to have filmed two UFOs, one of which was  
>transparent and led him to conclude that UFOs were living  
>organisms. Over the next few years he reported another three or  
>four sightings.

Dennis,

You suggest that his reliability with respect to later sightings  
is an indicator of his reliability during his first sighting.

This is not necessarily true. I have noticed that witnesses  
sometimes become less reliable in the sense that once they have  
been "radicalized" by the discovery that there really is  
something strange "out there" they become more likely to believe  
that any following sighting they can't explain might be related  
to the first, i.e., another saucer.

Oddly enough, this does not necessarily apply to a witness'  
evaluation of OTHER PEOPLE'S sightings. In other words a first  
time witness might be skeptical of reports by other people,  
especially if they differ from his/her own, while becoming more  
receptive to believing his own successive sightings are real. In  
a few situations the witness becomes willing to believe almost  
anything in the sky that is not immediately recognizable (e.g.,  
distant lights) is a : "UFO."

There is no indication that Arnold went that "wild".  
Nevertheless, your tacit assumption that Arnold's credibility in  
sightings \_after\_ his first are an indication of how accurate  
his observations would have been during the first sighting  
should be re-evaluated...and perhaps discarded.

It is my opinion that Arnold was likely to be more credible during his first sighting since he didn't know "what he was looking for."

>I frankly don't care whether his captured images are good or >not. I simply want to know whether something he claimed (the >film) can be verified or not. Something you and Maccabee don't >seem the least bit interested in.

Dumb remark. Obviously we would be interested. I don't know of anyone who has seen Arnold's film. Do you?

As for the impact of his film on the credibility of the first sighting, I have already stated my opinion above.

<snip>

>I simply asked -- and still ask -- what, if anything, the >historical (or contemporary) UFO literature had to say about >same. As far as you and Maccabee are concerned, you've already >answered my questions. You aren't the least bit interested in >Arnold's other claims, as long as your mathematical analyzes of >his first sighting (whatever that represents) holds up in court.

As I said above, what happened after his first sighting is not necessarily an indicator of his credibility during his first sighting.

<snip>

>But, NO000, we tried to compile a reasonable, responsible >account/history of UFOs over the last half-century, and this is >the thanks we get? Try a copy, David, you might like it. Ditto, >Bruce. A dollar off for my autograph, and that goes for all you >other fruitcakes out there who don't by any of my publications. >Allow me this one rant: As a whole, ufologists are the biggest >cheapskates and tightwads on the planet. There, I feel much >better!

If ufologists were richer...they might be more generous.

>>>Aside from Arnold, the book contains articles by Jenny Randles, >>>Jerome Clark, Jacques Vallee, Bill Chalker, Ray Fowler, Chris >>>Rutkowski, Robert Durant, David Perkins, Col. Hector >>>Quintanilla, Michael Swords, Karl Pflock, James Moseley, Jan >>>Aldrich, Vicente-Juan Ballester Omos and others.

>>I can see that some of us aren't on your social list. Sniffle.

>Yes, but many of us are. Maybe if you had been nicer...and I had >known you way back when.

At least we now know who bought the book!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

From: Henny van der Pluijm <[hvdp@worldonline.nl](mailto:hvdp@worldonline.nl)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 20:22:00 +0200 (MET DST)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 15:17:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 22:46:53 -0700  
>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

>Due to the 13 Echelon Sattelites covering all sectors of the  
>globe, no electronic communications can evade monitoring.

Hi Josh,

How do you know there are 13 of these satellites and what other  
specific information do you have that has not been reported in  
the press?

```
 /      Met vriendelijke groet/Best wishes      \  
      Henny van der Pluijm  
      hvdp@worldonline.nl  
  
      Technology Pages  
      http://home.worldonline.nl/~hvdp  
 \  
  /
```

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:46:21 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 14:59:54 -0400  
Subject: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

Hi All,

Max Burns gave his much talked about lecture on Saturday (5th June). The talk was detailed and was constructive, the talk was well received, and debated afterwards.

Thanks to Malcolm for this one.....

Roy

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 11:21:20 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 14:58:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 23:18:12 -0400  
>From: James Easton >[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto >[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

<snip>

>Any proposition that the American White Pelican was responsible  
>for Arnold's reported sighting, must be able to substantiate  
>that these birds are known to fly relatively fast and at high  
>altitude.

>The ideal person to offer an informed opinion would be a pilot  
>who has encountered pelicans in flight and Mike Havener is a  
>glider pilot who wrote an article on his experiences.

>He told me, "The birds I was soaring with were at about 3000 -  
>4000 feet MSL. We were flying in a continuous band of lift, so  
>we were continually climbing. I have seen pelicans at higher  
>altitudes when the lift is really good (maybe 6000 feet MSL)".

>"The glider I was flying has a 38 mph stall speed... as a matter  
>of fact, I was flying at 52 mph between thermals, and these  
>birds were staying with me".

>So, it seems whilst still not quite supersonic, pelicans are no  
>slouches and under ideal flying conditions, could show a  
>surprising turn of wing.

>Mike added, "Since writing the article, I have received several  
>letters from other glider pilots who have shared the same  
>experience. Though none of them mentioned their flight profiles,  
>these reports have come from various locations around the  
>world". [End]

>There's more evidence than this, however, that covers the gist  
>of it.

>Don't forget, these are no ordinary birds, they have a massive,  
>up to 10ft wingspan, all white, except for the black wing tips.

<snip>

The important part of which is that birds can go to 14,000 ft when migrating. In his thousands of hours of flying Arnold may not have seen pelicans...and, in fact, we don't know what the odds of seeing pelicans near Mt. Rainier would be. We don't know what the probability would be that they would be flying south. So we must ASSUME pelicans can fly at about 9,000 ft at about 50 mph in order to put them in the ballpark for agreeing with Arnold's observation.

In my previously posted analysis I assume pelican height of 6,000 ft, which was the largest altitude that had been mentioned up to that time (see above). If the pelicans were at about 9,000 ft or at

Arnold's altitude. the depression angle could be small or

zero, so the calculations of depression angle would be moot under these circumstances. The calculation of the horizontal spacing between the pelicans and Arnold would not be mooted, however. Arnold flying east would still overtake the pelicans if he flew in a straight line.

>British researcher and author, Peter Brookesmith, asked for an  
>opinion on the results of my investigations and Kottmeyer wrote:

<snip>

>The people asking we take Arnold's testimony of the distances at  
>face value naughtily ignore the reasons I gave why we can't. If  
>real, the objects had to be huge and visible to scores of  
>people. They also had to be supersonic and generating sonic  
>booms that thousands should have heard.

There weren't scores of people in the wooded area around Rainier and those that were there on the ground very likely had severely restricted fields of view because of mountains and trees. The lack of sonic booms, etc., seems to be common for UFO reports. We are now working on methods of reducing the shock due to speed through air (e.g., Myrabo's "air spike" discussed on this list in months past)

>The guys arguing about  
>the trigonometry keep putting the birds and the planes on  
>perpendicular paths, but overlook that Arnold explicitly turned  
>the plane to get a better look out the side window. The paths  
>were parallel. Once you put that straight, the angular sizes and >  
>velocity implicit in Arnold's report can fit coherently those of  
>a swan. I'm not sure if the speed or size of pelicans would  
>materially change the math, but if the flight characteristics  
>are a valid signature I wouldn't sweat such details.

Wouldn't sweat such details as speed or size?

An obvious indication of a failure to understand the dynamics of the situation. Arnold says he turned his plane, opened the window to avoid reflections. It is logical to assume that it was the left window he opened so he was flying southward parallel to the objects (why turn to the left and fly northward away from them?)

Brookesmith says in the above, that "guys arguing trigonometry keep putting birds and the planes on perpendicular paths, but overlook the fact that Arnold explicitly turned the plane to get a better look out the window. The paths were parallel."

Ignore? Not at all. In fact, this is one of the strongest arguments AGAINST anything in the air that would be moving at Arnold's speed or lower. Once he was flying in the same direction as the objects he could tell within a few seconds whether he was gaining on them, they were moving away from him, or if there was no difference in speed. Since Arnold was flying at least twice as fast as the birds it would only take matter of seconds for him to realize they were flying more slowly than he (note proper use of language; I did not write "slower than him").

>Although that's another matter and this is already too long, one  
>question which needs to be resolved is how far, maximum, could  
>any bright, reflective object of approx. 10ft by 5ft, be visible  
>from the air?

This is, of course, an important point. Related to it is whether or not the tilting of the wings could result in the type of bright flash that Arnold compared with reflection of the sun off metal. A bright reflection from metal can be seen for tens of miles (I have seen same myself...sunlight reflected off a metal roof, visible as a bright spot from an aircraft 10 miles away). Through the rather clear atmosphere about 5,000 ft a bright solar reflection might be noticeable against the sky for several tens of miles, depending upon the size of the reflector.

Consider that the brightness of the solar disc is at least 10,000 times brighter than the clear blue sky. That means that one 1/10000 of the area of the solar disk would be roughly equal to the sky brightness. A flat specular reflector with an angular

size as seen by the observer of  $1/100$  the angular size of the sun (because area is proportional to the square of the diameter or radius), when oriented properly to reflect the sun toward the observer, would barely be visible because the sun's color is different from that of the sky. Looking at a flat mirror with an angular size smaller than the sun's disc is like looking at a piece of the sun, but from a different angle than the direction to the sun (specifically, looking in the direction to the reflector). Since the sun's disc is about 8 milliradians in size (about  $1/2$  degree), a mirror  $8/100 = 0.08$  mr will be about as bright as the sky itself. This would be too small for the naked eye to resolve and would appear merely as a point of light in the blue sky. If the background sky were whitish it might not be seen at all. Consider that a 1 m sized mirror at 1 km has an angular size of  $1/1000$  radian or 1 mr (mirror surface perpendicular) to the line of sight). A 1 m sized surface at 10 km (6 mi) or 10 m at 100 km (60 mi) would have an angle or 0.1 mr. Thus to see sunlight reflected over a large distances we would expect good reflective surfaces on the order of 5 - 10 m in size.

How about birds? Obviously difficult to model. They are diffuse reflectors. Hence they introduce divergence into the light which hits them (whereas a flat mirror merely redirects the light; a curved metallic surface introduces curvature and divergence while redirecting the light).

One could attempt a reasonably complex calculation of the visibility of birds against the sky, but it probably would be only a crude approximation to the actual situation since we don't know what "Color" the sky was that he might have seen the birds silhouetted against (something between "blue" and "white"). Furthermore, since they would be moving they would be more detectable to the eye than stationary objects used in the calculation.

The simplest solution to this problem is simply to assert that they could be detected at a distance of a couple miles even though, if at Arnold's altitude, he could not see them broadside, i.e., he wouldn't see the complete wing-body span even if they did tilt slightly. He would mostly see the effective "vertical thickness" or height of the birds (looking at them "edge on" if they were at his altitude).

>We could put it this way; supposing that any pilot encountered a  
>small formation of migrating AWP's at high altitude, had never  
>seen this unusual sight before and as such, didn't recognise  
>these as birds at all.>

>What would he be likely to observe in perfect conditions?

>Say...a formation of reflective, bright objects, flying in a  
>diagonal echelon, with maybe some of the 'objects' slightly  
>ahead of the others. They would occasionally 'flutter' and  
>'sail' as they flapped and then glided. From distance, it would  
>look something like a 'kite's tail' (he might even describe  
>their motion in flight as 'bobbing', skimming, or looking  
>something like a stone skipping across water :) ).

>If this was also in a post-war era of aviation development,  
>especially military and when it would be no real surprise to see  
>new airplanes, especially ones which were still 'secret', would  
>the pilot ever realise, or would anyone suggest, that he had  
>seen a formation of AWP's?

>If this did apply to Kenneth Arnold, how could he not realise  
>these were birds and believe the 'objects' were much further  
>distant and considerably faster than they truly were.

>It would have to be that there was evidence these could not have  
>been birds, or his overall perception was somehow in error.>

BIG problem: as the dynamic path reconstruction in my last message showed, Arnold would be likely to get close enough to them to notice "small" things like the wings flapping, etc.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: What Have We Really Learned?

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 12:01:52 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 15:04:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: What Have We Really Learned?

>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Ufology: What have we really learned?  
>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 10:58:06 PDT

>50th Anniversary Of Ufology:  
>What Have We Really Learned  
>by Jerry Black

>To all interested parties;

>Back in 1997, during the first week in June, I had received a  
>call from a UPI reporter that had contacted Mr. Kenny Young.  
>Evidently, Young had given him my name for a telephone  
>interview, as the reporter wanted my opinion about the 50th  
>anniversary of the modern era of UFOs.

> Snip... but with respect

>Again we have Stanton Friedman in his latest book with Whitley  
>Strieber writing the foreword. Not only does he write this  
>segment of Friedman's book, but it is noted very prominently on  
>the outside cover of the book, stating: "Foreword by Whitley  
>Strieber." I asked Mr. Friedman if he supported the Whitley  
>Strieber case, or was this done to help sell the book, by either  
>himself or the publisher. There was no response. Regardless,  
>when UFO investigators who have been in the business 10 or  
>15-years see what they perceive to be one of the self-proclaimed  
>leaders in ufology with Whitley Strieber writing a foreword for  
>their book, they make the assumption that Mr. Friedman supports  
>the Whitley Strieber case. I cannot see how that Stanton  
>Friedman, without taking a look at the Whitley Strieber story,  
>can support that case.

>Mr. Stanton Friedman, one of our self-proclaimed spokesmen, not  
>only supports the hoaxed case of Whitley Strieber, but also  
>-because of his loyalty to Bruce Maccabee and what he has said  
>about the Gulf Breeze investigations - supports the hoaxed Ed  
>Walters/Gulf Breeze scenarios.

> Snip yet again with respect

Dear List Members, this post is not marked with an "S"

Mr. White.... Black, sorry.... I always get those two colors  
confused. Anyway, Dear Mr. Sir... I know how you must feel. And  
so I would like very much to make it up to you. I, Dr. Jaime  
Gesundt, ufologist and Vintner, Clinton supporter and Nixon  
advocate, I, the premier researcher in UFOs, will write a  
forward to your next book.

Or, if you like, to your next post. Having my forward on your  
front of the back will make whatever you say even more behind  
than if my forward were not in front, but in the back. 's OK,  
dude.... don't thank me. It's a pleasure to serve you... like  
in that Twilight Zone piece, "To Serve Man!" Remember?

Now you too, can be forwarded by a real poisenality. Me!

Gesundt

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Spat With Talk Show Host - \$60 Million Lawsuit

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:32:44 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:32:44 -0400  
Subject: Spat With Talk Show Host - \$60 Million Lawsuit

Source: <http://www.sightings.com/ufo3/spat.htm>

SIGHTINGS

Spat With Talk Show Host Art Bell Escalates Into \$60 Million Lawsuit

By John Stromnes The Missoulian [www.missoulian.com](http://www.missoulian.com)

6-9-99

ST. IGNATIUS - Staring down the business end of a \$60 million lawsuit, UFO skeptic Robert A.M. Stephens lights another cigarette from a crumpled pack of Checkers and tweaks the screen of his Macintosh computer to pull up yet another document from the Internet.

This one names him as the defendant in that lawsuit. It accuses him of everything from slander to lying about his credentials to maliciously using the Internet to try and destroy the career of syndicated radio talk show host Art Bell.

It is Bell who filed the suit against Stephens and another man last week, focusing national media attention on Stephens and his five-month-old feud with Bell over UFOlogy and Stephens' own credentials.

"Stephens participated ... in a national and international conspiracy designed to impugn Bell and sully his reputation ... " the lawsuit charges.

The lawsuit was filed not only to collect monetary damages and to clear Bell's good name, but also "to take a public stance against the irresponsible and unlawful use of the Internet for illegal or improper purposes," Bell's Los Angeles lawyer states on Bell's Web site. Bell's lawyers, Gerard P. Fox and Davidson M. Pattiz of Fox, Siegler and Spillane LLP, did not return a phone call this week seeking comment.

Stephens, a 47-year-old artist, railroad model maker and computer-imaging expert, is staying in a rambling farmhouse two miles north of St. Ignatius. He shares the house with another family, but Stephens says he provides the cash flow.

Outside, dogs are barking and a disabled vehicle is parked under the carport. Weeds are growing thickly in the fields around the barn.

In a darkened room inside, Stephens is sitting by his computer, a smallish Power Mac with a 14-inch monitor. He apologizes, explaining that his computer system's big monitor was "bombed" in an Internet attack over the weekend by unknown parties. He suspects the culprits are people who have taken extreme umbrage at his attempts to debunk self-appointed UFO experts and their radio talk-show sympathizers during the last five months, he says.

Meanwhile, his state-of-the-art computer, a Mac 93 400, sits unused and unplugged at the end of a cluttered table.

Similar problems have plagued his Web site, shady-pines.com, which for several months lampooned and parodied UFOlogy and radio talk show host Bell. It is no longer up and running, a victim, he says, of his feud with Bell.

The whole thing started on Oct. 16, 1998, Stephens says, knocking another ash off his filter cigarette.

"It started with the Montana UFO," he says.

Some Mission Valley residents may recall the spate of reports of a UFO seen by numerous witnesses that week in October around the Mission Valley. Stephens said the reports he heard were of "a triangle in the sky, with red, blue and green lights, hovering at about 20,000 feet five miles east of U.S. 93."

"It was here for three weeks. All sorts of people saw it," he said. Stephens was not among them.

Although he never saw the suspected craft from outer space, he took it upon himself to report the sightings to various Internet sites interested in such reports. Within five days, his postings had attracted the interest of late-night talk show hosts.

Somehow, he let slip that he is associated with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This gave him instant credibility on the radio shows, as if he were some kind of official spokesman. But the shows apparently did not check with NASA about his supposed association.

Last week a NASA official said Stephens was a volunteer artist in a program that supplied artwork for the agency during the beginning of the shuttle program in the 1980s, and he donated several art works to the program. He does not work for the agency, has never worked for the agency, and is not an agency spokesman about UFOs or anything else, the NASA official said. His access to NASA facilities and tours is the same as that of other civilians, the spokesman said.

Stephens says now: "I don't work for NASA and I will never work for NASA." But he hints that he does have NASA support.

"I have a lot of influence in the agency," he says.

Stephens said his main motive in entering the UFO discussions was to defend NASA against outlandish charges - for example that the agency was part of a government conspiracy to keep the existence of space aliens secret from the American public.

Stephens said other outlandish claims were that NASA was hiding entire planets from the American public and that forces in Washington, D.C., were secretly planning to bomb Washington, D.C., itself.

Stephens said he went on the talk shows and used his Internet expertise to demand evidence from UFOlogists.

His notoriety spread with his accessibility, and he was invited on Bell's radio program as a telephone guest Dec. 30, supposedly to debate a UFO expert. Stephens said that in preparation he assembled a list of some 200 questions to ask the UFO buff. But he said Bell cut him off after a few minutes, much to Stephens' displeasure.

After that, the battle between Bell and Stephens gravitated toward the Internet, with each aspersing the other's credibility.

Stephens says that on April 1, "I publicly and privately asked him (Bell) to stop. He refused and said 'a lot better people than you have tried to take me down.' "

On April 3, Stephens was a guest on another radio show, where the battle escalated. It is the comments on that show that prompted Bell to sue.

Here's what the lawsuit alleges Stephens said, according to a

copy of the suit posted on Bell's Internet Web site:

"A. Approximately 20 years ago, Bell had been 'arrested' and 'served time' for 'trafficking' in various aspects of pornography. B. Bell made pornographic 'videotapes'; and C. The entire story had been confirmed by 'a consortium - a syndication of private' investigators, who had located an original article in the Monterey Herald confirming the story."

None of these allegations are true, the lawsuit says, and making those statements on a radio program, Stephens slandered and defamed Bell, and caused him loss of earnings.

For his part, Stephens says he "categorically denies any and all charges of any kind" alleged in the lawsuit. He said he has yet to be served an official copy of the suit, so he can't respond directly to the allegations. In fact, he said, he has not read past the first page of the version posted on the Internet, and he has yet to retain a lawyer.

Stephens said he views the lawsuit as frivolous and as an attempt to intimidate the Internet service providers that maintain his Web pages, and also as an attempt to muzzle Stephens.

"These lawsuits are a way to stifle my dissent (from UFOlogy orthodoxy) and my defense of NASA," he says.

To some extent, it has worked, he acknowledged. He said his Web page has been pulled from the Internet by its service provider, apparently because of concern about the lawsuit.

He says he has recently received 374 e-mail death threats from UFO cultists, probably because of his feud with Bell.

"I take that seriously," he said. He said he has contacted the FBI.

As for UFOs, he says he does not believe in them, at least the way they are presented by the UFO cult - alien abductions, flying saucers, government conspiracies, and the like.

However something is out there, he says.

"There are anomalous objects in our time-place that defy description and defy denial," he says mysteriously. He notes that the millennium is coming.

"I do believe the way things are headed, we are probably going to know more about (those anomalous objects). But the course that UFOlogy embraces, that of a cult religion, that is not the way."

Meanwhile Bell's Web site, [www.artbell.com](http://www.artbell.com), and other Web pages associated with Bell, continue to vilify Stephens.

But Stephens is not defenseless. Tacking away at his little computer in his upstairs room, chain-smoking, Stephens in the last few days has put up another Web page. It is considerably tamer than shady-pines.com. It shows photos of him in the company of a NASA official at a recent NASA launch site tour.

But at the bottom of the page is a parody photo of Bell in garish costume and dark glasses. Stephens' new site is at\*:

<http://people.Montana.com/~sti3818/>

"If you make fun of the UFO'ers, they go ballistic," Stephens says, unrepentant. "It's a religion that tolerates no sense of humor."

\*[Forbidden

You don't have permission to access /~sti3818/ on this server.

Apache/1.3.6 Server at people.montana.com Port 80

--ebk]

SIGHTINGS HOMEPAGE

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: What Have We Really Learned?

From: Alan Loper <[cheepnis@mindspring.com](mailto:cheepnis@mindspring.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:27:42 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 13:22:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: What Have We Really Learned?

>From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 12:01:52 EDT  
>Subject: Re: What Have We Really Learned?  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Ufology: What have we really learned?  
>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 10:58:06 PDT

>>50th Anniversary Of Ufology:  
>>What Have We Really Learned  
>>by Jerry Black

>>To all interested parties;

>>Back in 1997, during the first week in June, I had received a  
>>call from a UPI reporter that had contacted Mr. Kenny Young.  
>>Evidently, Young had given him my name for a telephone  
>>interview, as the reporter wanted my opinion about the 50th  
>>anniversary of the modern era of UFOs.

>> Snip... but with respect

>>Again we have Stanton Friedman in his latest book with Whitley  
>>Strieber writing the foreword. Not only does he write this  
>>segment of Friedman's book, but it is noted very prominently on  
>>the outside cover of the book, stating: "Foreword by Whitley  
>>Strieber." I asked Mr. Friedman if he supported the Whitley  
>>Strieber case, or was this done to help sell the book, by either  
>>himself or the publisher. There was no response. Regardless,  
>>when UFO investigators who have been in the business 10 or  
>>15-years see what they perceive to be one of the self-proclaimed  
>>leaders in ufology with Whitley Strieber writing a foreword for  
>>their book, they make the assumption that Mr. Friedman supports  
>>the Whitley Strieber case. I cannot see how that Stanton  
>>Friedman, without taking a look at the Whitley Strieber story,  
>>can support that case.

>>Mr. Stanton Friedman, one of our self-proclaimed spokesmen, not  
>>only supports the hoaxed case of Whitley Strieber, but also  
>>-because of his loyalty to Bruce Maccabee and what he has said  
>>about the Gulf Breeze investigations - supports the hoaxed Ed  
>>Walters/Gulf Breeze scenarios.

>> Snip yet again with respect

>>Dear List Members, this post is not marked with an "S"

>>Mr. White.... Black, sorry.... I always get those two colors  
>>confused. Anyway, Dear Mr. Sir... I know how you must feel. And  
>>so I would like very much to make it up to you. I, Dr. Jaime  
>>Gesundt, ufologist and Vintner, Clinton supporter and Nixon  
>>advocate, I, the premier researcher in UFOs, will write a  
>>forward to your next book.

>>Or, if you like, to your next post. Having my forward on your  
>>front of the back will make whatever you say even more behind  
>>than if my forward were not in front, but in the back. 's OK,

Re: What Have We Really Learned?

>dude..... don't thank me. It's a pleasure to serve you... like  
>in that Twilight Zone piece, "To Serve Man!" Remember?

>Now you too, can be forwarded by a real poisenality. Me!

>Gesundt

Dear Dr. Jaime-

I am current putting together a tome which I have tentatively titled

UFology - Observations From the Bleachers

It will cover my observations of the study of UFOs for as long as I can remember. I have been observing ufology since the 60's and have always been facinated by the mysteries in our skies. While i have not undertaken the direct study of any particular cases, I have read everything I could get my hands on and have been following the subject through every means at my disposal. This has included the list which has proven to be quite a resource of information.

I am humbled by the presence of people whose works I have read in the past, present, and future. They represent to me the leading lights in the research that is ongoing. To actually read their posts is probably as close to a personal contact as I will ever get to these folks. I am especially grateful to you sir for providing this list with a bit of levity that is sometimes missing in such studious fields of endeavor.

And so that is why I would like you to write me a forward to be included at the back of my book as if it were an epilogue.

I also would like to say that from my view-looking in from the outside-well it would seem that what is needed most is more serious study. Not name calling and cacophony.

k

"Life is pleasant. Death is peaceful. It's the transition that's troublesome."

--Isaac Asimov

<http://www.mindspring.com/~cheepnis>

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 18:05:01 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 13:37:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 11:21:11 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto >[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 23:40:42 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto >[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy >[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Dennis,

>You suggest that his reliability with respect to later sightings  
>is an indicator of his reliability during his first sighting.

>This is not necessarily true. I have noticed that witnesses  
>sometimes become less reliable in the sense that once they have  
>been "radicalized" by the discovery that there really is  
>something strange "out there" they become more likely to believe  
>that any following sighting they can't explain might be related  
>to the first, i.e., another saucer.

Bruce,

Unlike almost everyone who followed in his wake, Arnold was operating without any UFO baggage when he reported his first sighting. As best I can tell, he thought he saw high-speed military aircraft, not necessarily something interplanetary or overly strange "out there."

It's only my own personal opinion, but the first Arnold sighting has always struck me as being of the nature of almost too good to be true. Something exceedingly startling happens, and rather than being transfixed or mesmerized by events, Arnold immediately goes into measurement mode. He does everything right: notes distant features, pulls out his watch, compares the objects' relative size to a cowlng tool he whips out of his pocket, after first comparing same to a distant DC-4 (convenient, that), rolls down his window and turns parallel to the objects to make sure they're not reflections, etc., each and every base covered. Airtight and snap right. All the while concerned with flying his own airplane.

Can't say it didn't happen that way, just always wondered if it really did.

Five weeks later or so, he reports a second sighting in the vaguest of generalities: "There were a couple of dozen of them, possibly more." He describes them as large, "at least three feet across or possibly four or five." Five weeks into the modern UFO era and Arnold has already seen something like 33 or 45 of the suckers, nine of one kind, size and color, two or three dozen of another kind, size, and color, but all really, really fast. And, therefore, I guess, all legitimate UFOs.

In 1952 he films two UFOs, one of them transparent, but apparently never makes the film public. According to Clark, he logs at least five more UFO sightings, the details of which are even more scanty than those of his second sighting.

I just find it odd that his first sighting gets the Full Monty treatment, and the others, including the film, get the old, "Eh, what's up, doc?" response. Maybe Arnold got bored.

>>I frankly don't care whether his captured images are good or >>not. I simply want to know whether something he claimed (the >>film) can be veriified or not. Something you and Maccabee don't >>seem the least bit interested in.

>Dumb remark. Obviously we would be interested. I don't know of >anyone who has seen Arnold's film. Do you?

No, and that was my point. If you're interested in the film, then you should be interested in trying to learn more about it, such as its actual existence and present location. As opposed, one might argue, to applying trigonometry to Arnold's earlier claims. Both, btw, are worthwhile pursuits, but one possibly leads to something physical (the film), whereas the other leads only to endless argument and speculation.

<snip>

>If ufologists were richer...they might be more generous.

Granted. Alas, now we can look forward to a sociological study titled, "Why Are Ufologists Such Poor Slobs In The First Place?"

>>>>Aside from Arnold, the book contains articles by Jenny Randles, >>>>Jerome Clark, Jacques Vallee, Bill Chalker, Ray Fowler, Chris >>>>Rutkowski, Robert Durant, David Perkins, Col. Hector >>>>Quintanilla, Michael Swords, Karl Pflock, James Moseley, Jan >>>>Aldrich, Vicente-Juan Ballester Omos and others.

<snip>

>At least we now know who bought the book!

Wrong again, Bruce! They all got free copies from the publisher!

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:12:05 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 13:24:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 99 19:38:05 PDT

<snip>

> Isn't there a statute of limitations on the  
>trashing of witnesses?  
>

Jerry,

I think you may have missed a post somewhere along the way, so I won't respond to your above snipped comments except to say, No, there is no statute of limitations when it comes to trashing UFO witnesses. The CIA never sleeps, especially when it comes to UFO Updates!

(This is probably not a good time for me to respond because, as chance would have it, the Ray Suarez program on National Public Radio is playing in the background. Subject matter? Two false memoirs recently published to critical acclaim. One by a Guatemalan woman, who went on to receive the Nobel Peace Prize, the other by some guy who recounted his Holocaust childhood that didn't happen. Don't worry, Jerry, I'm not putting Arnold in their camp.)

<snip>

>How kind of you. In fact, Maury Island tells us just how  
>honest a guy Arnold was. To those of us who look back at it, it  
>seems transparently obvious that Crisman and Dahl were lying  
>through their respective chops.

So much for those statutes of limitation! But I guess nothing Arnold said or wrote can be called into question by anyone?

>Arnold was such a straight  
>arrow that it never occurred to him his "witnesses" might not be  
>the same. Sadly, years of ridicule and harassment led him to a  
>considerably darker view of his fellow humans. I guess we can be  
>happy that he is not around to read this new round of  
>Arnold-bashing.

>Unlike you, I knew Arnold, who was all he was cracked up to be:  
>sharp, honest, shrewd, conservative, and unimaginative. Not, in  
>short, a fruitcake by any definition except, I gather, yours.  
>His interest in UFOs as such was long past, but he did take the  
>trouble to answer my questions about various claims attributed  
>to him. One, which first surfaced in a Harold T. Wilkins book,  
>was a supposed quote asserting that Arnold had observed evidence  
>of invisible entities in his home. He said the story was a  
>flat-out fabrication. He had no idea where it came from.

Glad to have the information. But if Arnold was really so sharp and shrewd, how were Dahl and Crisman able to take him in so easily?

>As I have already pointed out, evidently to zero effect, Arnold  
>is not the only observer to witness an aerial phenomenon which  
>resembled some sort of organic entity. One famous case -- more  
>fantastic than any Arnold ever reported -- involved Philadelphia  
>police officers who on September 26, 1950, saw an unidentified  
>object fall from the sky and come down in a field. It turned  
>out to be a gelatinous mass which dissolved half an hour later.  
>Oh yeah, excuse me. I forgot. Fruitcakes. Never mind.

>Jerry Clark

No, it wasn't to zero effect. In your request for more such cases, I sent you one cited by Arnold himself, remember? If not, see pp. 27-28 of the Proceedings of the First International UFO Congress. You're welcome! Whether it's as fantastic as the Philadelphia case above or not, I leave you to decide.

However, there is absolutely no historical evidence that I'm aware of that Boeing ever had a test plane capable of flying 1500 mph at 67,000 feet. So, either this was a case of straight-arrow Arnold again, or he had a lower credibility threshold than some of us, or he simply got his facts seriously wrong.

I'm sorry you think this is an exercise in nothing more than Arnold bashing. History is a process in constant revision. For but one example, see the revision of the career of anthropologist Margaret Mead. For all I know, she was a perfectly remarkable and upstanding person face to face, but that doesn't render her immune to error. Arnold, alas, is not immune, either.

If you want, all of the above can be overlooked and reduced to a question of historical significance.

Arnold claimed he filmed two UFOs, one of which was transparent. I asked what happened to the film. If your answer, as a UFO historian, is that "we don't know, Arnold never printed any stills from the film, nor did he ever, as far as is known, make the film publicly available for inspection," then, fine, that's history's answer. Cut and print. If your answer is, "I don't know, who cares, and on top of that I'm sick of all this Arnold bashing, and Stacy quacks like a suspiciously anti-UFO duck in the bargain," well, then, that's your (and no doubt Rudiak's) answer. Cut and print. The choice is yours.

The last time I looked, historians had an obligation to the truth as it can best be determined, not to choosing sides in a perceived squabble.

If someone else wants to delve a little deeper, in the hope that the film might still be found in Arnold's remaining files, Godspeed and more power to them. Last I was aware, he had a surviving daughter. A simple letter from someone might suffice.

I simply find the incident and claim exceedingly curious. If he filmed UFOs, then why not show the film? What happened to it? Does anyone know? Does anyone care? And what about that Boeing test plane, anyway? History would like to know.

We do know that he apparently took to carrying a camera in the cockpit because of a posed publicity photograph taken showing him holding what is probably a (Honeywell?) 16mm camera with telescopic lens while standing beside his plane. A reproduction of same can be found on the cover of the March/April 1995 IUR.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

From: **Mike Wootten** <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 22:07:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 13:28:27 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

>From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
>To: Errol Knapp <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture  
>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:46:21 +0100

>Max Burns gave his much talked about lecture on Saturday (5th  
>June). The talk was detailed and was constructive, the talk was

>Thanks to Malcolm for this one.....

That "much talked about lecture" only attracted 35 people to a  
venue that holds over 100 in the centre of London. Just shows  
how marginal the lecture was and BUFORA currently is...

Mike Wootten

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same Packets

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 02:02:41  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:09:40 -0400  
Subject: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same Packets

Source: Wired News,

[http://www.wired.com:80/news/print\\_version/technology/story/20088.html?wnpg=](http://www.wired.com:80/news/print_version/technology/story/20088.html?wnpg>=3D)  
=3D  
all

Links are preceded by an asterisk.

Stig

\*\*\*

updated 4:30 p.m. 10.Jun.99.PDT

A Search for Intelligent Searchers

by Leander Kahney

3:00 a.m. 9.Jun.99.PDT

\*\*

Computer users who are contributing to the SETI (search for alien life) project are inadvertently wasting CPU cycles by processing data that has already been scanned.

Due to failures in coping with the overwhelming response from volunteers, the SETI@home project has been erroneously sending the same packets of radio data to its 500,000 participants.

Opened to the public last month, the SETI@home project uses spare computing cycles on PCs to search for the telltale signs of intelligent life in radio signals beamed to Earth from outer space.

PC users around the globe have loaded screensaver software that scans the data when their computers aren't otherwise in use.

Some volunteers are less than happy.

"Needless to say, a number of participants, myself included, are now scaling down our search for extraterrestrial intelligence until we find some local intelligence to properly manage this project," wrote Tim Keating, a volunteer from Light House Point, Florida, in an email.

According to Keating, volunteers figured out that they were processing the same 115 blocks of data from a two-day period in January that were recorded by the Arecibo radio telescope in Puerto Rico.

New packets of data stopped being sent out around 24 May, Keating said.

What most miffed Keating and other volunteers was the lack of communication from the project's leaders.

"They didn't tell anyone," Keating wrote. "The result: The

world's greatest waste of computing power and energy to date. I estimate ... the SETI@home project is wasting worldwide around eight tons of fossil fuel per hour."

SETI@home has since acknowledged its problems and apologized to volunteers.

"Our 'data pipeline' is not flowing at top speed yet, so we're sending out the same work units [mostly recorded 7 January and 8 January] repeatedly," the SETI site says. "This will be fixed shortly.... So please bear with us during these 'growing pains,' and thanks for being part of this incredible project."

Project director David Anderson said a shortage of manpower and computers led to the project's problems. Initially, the project planned on 150,000 volunteers and was simply overwhelmed when more than 500,000 signed up.

"It's been a combination of a lot of things: a shortage of [hard disk] storage space, computing power, and manpower."

The massive response led SETI@home to allocate most of its computing power to the Web servers that handled the software downloads, leaving it short of machines capable of parceling the raw data into new packets to be processed. Therefore, the same packets of data were sent out over and over. Anderson said that ultimately, SETI@home hopes to process the data as it comes in from the Arecibo telescope.

Most of the project's growing pains will be fixed when the project installs a new batch of donated workstations from Sun Microsystems, the first of which should be online in the next couple of weeks, Anderson said.

The project is also planning to release new client software that fixes a number of bugs.

Anderson said one advantage to having so many volunteers is that the project should easily catch up with the backlog of data once the problems are ironed out. On the downside, he said, some volunteers are cheating.

The project acknowledges the most productive workgroups, leading to intense competition for the highest ranking.

Anderson said that at least two of the top 10 work groups have only reached the rankings because some of the members had cheated.

"I don't want to name names," he said, "But it's fair to say the Unix and Linux crowds are causing most of the headaches. It seems to be the hacker mentality."

Anderson said some groups are claiming credit for processing the same data packet over and over, while others are taking credit for work done by unaffiliated individuals.

Someone else hacked the list of originating countries, claiming that he or she came from Mars, Anderson said.

As for faking contact with ET, Anderson said it would be pointless: Any claim can be checked against the original data.

"Every time there's a loophole, someone's exploited it," he said. "There seems to be a gleeful joy in subverting the system somehow.... It's just another headache for me."

See also: \*Searching for ET with Your PC

Related Wired Links:

E.T. Goes to College  
19.Feb.99

Getting Some Alien Experience  
3.Aug.98

SETIng Sights Closer to Home  
10.Jul.98

ET Phones Home, Via Satellite Dish  
17.Dec.96

Have a comment on this article?

\*Send it.

Copyright =A9 1994-99 Wired Digital Inc. All rights reserved.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [seti](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold's Sighting [was: Re: Voyager

From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 21:47:16 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:25:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold's Sighting [was: Re: Voyager

Regarding:

>Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 01:10:18 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

[I've changed the heading to something more meaningful]

Bruce wrote:

>Let's forget the claim of going in and out of the mountains for  
>the moment and simply concentrate on the directions to the  
>objects (a) when first seen, (b) when passing Mt. Rainier, (c)  
>when in the direction of >Mt. Adams.

Bruce,

That's ideal and thank you for the overall assessment.

Before going further with this, there are a few questions I would like to have resolved.

In your 'Complete Sighting...' report, you refer to the following extract from Arnold's letter to the Air Force:

"There was a DC-4 to the left and to the rear of me approximately fifteen miles distance, and I should judge, at 14,000 ft. elevation".

"I knew they [the objects] must be very large to observe their shape at that distance, even on as clear a day as it was that Tuesday. In fact I compared a zeus fastener or cowling tool I had in my pocket - holding it up on them and holding it up on the DC- 4 - that I could observe at quite a distance to my left, and they seemed smaller than the DC-4; but I should judge their span would have been as wide as the furthest engines on each side of the DC-4".

You then comment:

"Arnold provided an estimate of size in an indirect way: he stated that they appeared to be comparable to the spacing of the engines on a DC-4 (4 engine propeller driven, 117 ft wingspan, 94 ft length, 27 ft height) which he had seen at a distance which he estimated as 15 miles. He estimated the engine spacing to be 45 - 50 ft, although 60 ft would have been a better estimate. By this means he was essentially providing an angular size for the objects: the equivalent of about 60 ft at 15 miles. He reported the size of the objects as 45 - 50 ft by comparison with the airplane as if the plane had been at the same distance as the objects. However, the plane was not at the same distance, so a correction for the distance difference is necessary.

It is possible to make an estimate of the size of the objects assuming his estimate of the distance to the DC-4, 15 miles, was (approximately) correct. (Here comes some math and geometry, so if you are squeamish about such subjects, skip over the next four



sentences.) Using the outer engine spacing as 60 ft, the angular size at his estimated distance is  $60/(15 \times 5280) = 0.00076$  radians or about 2.6 minutes of arc (1 degree = 60 minutes = 0.0174 radians). Projecting this angle to 20 miles, the rough distance of the objects, would yield a size of about  $(20 \times 5280 \times 0.00075 = )$  80 ft. Had he overestimated the distance to the DC-4 (if it had been less than 15 miles away) the calculated angular size, and hence the calculated object size would increase. If he underestimated the distance to the DC-4, then the calculated size would decrease. My own suspicion is that he overestimated the distance and that therefore the objects were larger than 80 ft in length. Unfortunately no investigator pursued this size estimate at the time and with Arnold's death many years ago it is no longer possible to improve the size estimate".

In your paper, 'Still in Default' - 'Originally Published in the Proceedings of the 1986 MUFON International Symposium. Updates to 1998 in square parentheses', you wrote:

[Note: a very complete analysis of Arnold's sighting has been published in the Proceedings of the International Conference of the Mutual UFO Network, 1997. In that much longer paper I point out that Arnold compared the apparent size of the UFO to the spacing between engines on DC-4 aircraft - 117ft wingspan, 94 ft long, 23 ft fuselage height - which he thought was about 15 miles away.

The point is that since Arnold could see the engines on the aircraft at 15 miles - or even if it was only at 10 miles - then he had better than average visual acuity.

Since the engines were about 60 ft apart and since the UFOs were farther away than the airplane the estimated size of the UFOs would be 80 - 120 feet.]]  
[End]

When considering all the probabilities, should your above point be taken into account?

Is it being accepted that Arnold claims to have seen the DC-4s engines at 15 miles, i.e., sufficiently that he could use this observation in a rough calculation?

If the DC-4 was 15 miles distant as Arnold claimed, how do we quantify "better than average visual acuity" then; would it be above average, exceptional or incredible?

In his letter to the Air Force, Arnold also wrote:

"I observed the chain of these objects passing another snow-covered ridge in between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams, and as the first one was passing the south crest of this ridge the last object was entering the northern crest of the ridge. As I was flying in the direction of this particular ridge, I measured it and found it to be approximately five miles so I could safely assume that the chain of these saucer like objects were at least five miles long".

You have referenced this 'five mile' chain in the 'Complete Sighting...' paper, i.e., "Since the length of the 'chain' of objects was about 5 miles (paragraph H [as] above), the leading object was about 5 miles south of Mt. Adams when the last object passed Mt. Adams".

What Arnold doesn't explain here is that he DID NOT measure this ridge at the time.

At least according to the details in his book, when he writes, "Between Mount Rainier and Mount Adams there is a very high plateau with quite definite north and south edges. Part of this chain-like formation traveled above this plateau towards Mount Adams, while part of the formation actually dipped below the near edge. As the first unit of these craft cleared the southernmost edge of this background, the last of the formation was just entering the northern ridge.

I later flew over this plateau in my plane and came to a close approximation that this whole formation of craft, whatever they

were, formed a chain in the neighbourhood of five miles long".

So, the 'five miles' estimate wasn't in fact made until later, quite different from the impression given in his Air force letter.

Would you agree that seems to be correct?

Although it maybe doesn't matter, I'm puzzled by his references to using a watch and then confirming that he didn't. i.e.:

Chicago Daily Tribune, June 25 - "Their speed was apparently so great I decided to clock them. I took out my watch and checked off one minutes and 42 seconds from the time they passed Mount Rainier until they reached the peak of Mount Adams. All told the objects remained in view slightly less than two minutes from the time I first noticed them."

Radio interview - "Well, uh, I uh, it was about one minute to three when I started clocking them on my sweep second hand clock".

"But when I observed the tail end of the last one passing Mt. Adams, and I was at an angle near Mt. Rainier from it, but I looked at my watch and it showed one minute and 42 seconds".

Norman, Oklahoma Transcript, June 26 - "I figure they were moving about 1,200 miles per hour"... "because I clocked them with a stop watch during the time it took them to fly from Mount Rainer to Mount Adams".

'The Coming of the Saucers' - "I remember distinctly that my sweep second hand on my eight day clock, which is located on the instrument panel, read one minute to 3 PM as the first object of this formation passed the southern edge of Mt. Rainier".

"Now, clocking speeds by only your sweep second hand cannot be entirely accurate because several seconds could be lost in breaking your gaze to observe your clock".

"I never thought of checking this with my wristwatch".  
[End]

Anyway, a most striking discrepancy is the following.

>From your 'Complete Sighting...' paper:

"According to Mr. Arnold, at 2:00 PM, June 24, 1947 he took off from Chehalis, in the state of Washington, in his small plane after completing a business trip (he sold and installed fire fighting equipment). He planned to spend about an hour searching for a lost C-46 Marine transport plane that had crashed in the mountains west-southwest of Mt. Rainier. (There was a \$5,000 reward for finding the plane.) After searching for about an hour and not finding anything he turned east toward his next destination, Yakima, Washington. He was near Mineral, Washington, about 22 miles west-southwest of Mt. Rainier and Yakima was about 80 miles ahead of him along a flight path that would take him just about 12 miles south of peak of Mt. Rainier. He leveled out onto his new flight path he was at approximately a 9,200 ft altitude. His sighting began within a minute or two of the turn".

Therefore:

- a) Arnold had spent 'about an hour' searching for the C-46 Marine transport plane
- b) he gave up and turned east towards Yakima
- c) his sighting began a couple of minutes later when he was flying due east.

Yet, according to Arnold's account in his book:

- a) "It was during this search and while making a turn of 180 degrees over Mineral, Washington", that he first noticed the objects. It wasn't when he was flying due east towards Yakima.
- b) After the sighting, he claims, "I tried to focus my mind on a

continued search for the downed C-46 which had crashed some months earlier". It was only then he decided to abandon the search and instead head for Yakima.

This is substantiated by his detailed radio interview, in which he states:

"Well, about 2:15 I took off from Chehalis, Washington, en route to Yakima, and, of course, every time that any of us fly over the country near Mt. Rainier, we spend an hour or two in search of the Marine plane that's never been found that they believe is in the snow someplace southwest of that particular area. That area is located at about, it's elevation is about 10,000 foot, and I had made one sweep in close to Mt. Rainier and down one of the canyons and was dragging it for any types of objects that might prove to be the Marine ship, uh, and as I come out of the canyon there, was about 15 minutes, I was approximately 25 to 28 miles from Mt. Rainier, I climbed back up to 9200 feet and I noticed to the left of me a chain which looked to me like the tail of a Chinese kite, kind of weaving and going at a terrific speed across the face of Mt. Rainier".

According to this, he had spent some 15 minutes searching for the C-46?

If he left Chehalis about 2:15, not 2:00 as you noted, how long would it have approx. taken him to reach Mt Rainier and begin his search?

How do you equate the account given in that radio interview with the story told in the Air force letter, i.e.:

"The air was so smooth that day that it was a real pleasure flying and, as most pilots do, when the air is smooth and they are flying at a higher altitude, I trimmed out my airplane in the direction of Yakima, which was almost directly east of my position and simply sat in my plane observing the sky and terrain. There was a DC-4 to the left and to the rear of me approximately fifteen miles distance, and I should judge, at 14,000 ft. elevation".

"The sky and air was as clear as crystal. I hadn't flown more than two or three minutes on my course when a bright flash light reflected on my airplane. It startled me as I thought I was too close to some other aircraft".

No longer did Arnold's observation originate when he was coming up from the canyon (does he mention the C-46 search at all in that letter?), now, he was coasting along at a steady pace, with not a care in the world.

I trust you will accept there are significant anomalies highlighted here and they have to be addressed first, before looking at any theoretical maths.

I note that Arnold says in his book, "I was flying a specially designed mountain airplane".

Do we know what the modifications were?

If I recall, it was a three (maybe four) seater plane. If there were two seats in the front, which window, left or right, would be nearest to the pilot?

James.  
E-mail: [voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

Re: Kenneth Arnold's Sighting [was: Re: Voyager]

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

From: **Mike Wootten** <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 22:07:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 17:43:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

>From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
>To: Errol Knapp <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture  
>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:46:21 +0100

>Max Burns gave his much talked about lecture on Saturday (5th  
>June). The talk was detailed and was constructive, the talk was

>Thanks to Malcolm for this one.....

That "much talked about lecture" only attracted 35 people to a  
venue that holds over 100 in the centre of London. Just shows  
how marginal the lecture was and BUFORA currently is...

Mike Wootten

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell

From: Tom Carey <[TCarey1947@aol.com](mailto:TCarey1947@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 10:33:16 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:50:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell

Although it is puzzling why Kal Korff is now breathlessly peddling old news as a News Flash [the official AF position on Glenn Dennis came out in 1997], and as I do not know where it is written that CUFOS, especially, must make an official statement concerning Glenn Dennis, as the CUFOS board member most responsible for the continuing Roswell investigation, I will respond.

As matters now stand regarding 'The Glenn Dennis Story', based upon the investigations of many people over many years, his story must be rejected on the basis of a known lie [i.e., he knowingly supplied investigators with a false name for "the nurse"].

Karl Pflock and Kevin Randle have publicly disavowed Glenn Dennis for this reason which is their prerogative.

Our investigation of this story continues in the hope of getting to the ultimate truth behind it [whatever it is] other than just saying, "He lied." and walking away. When we feel that we have reached that point, we will not need badgering from a Kal Korff to put it on the record.

Tom Carey

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: Jim Deardorff <[deardorj@proaxis.com](mailto:deardorj@proaxis.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 18:25:45 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:15:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 14:22:18 -0400  
>From: Tony Spurrier <[TSpurrier@compuserve.com](mailto:TSpurrier@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 18:05:09 -0700 (PDT)  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>,  
>>From: Jim Deardorff <[deardorj@proaxis.com](mailto:deardorj@proaxis.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>>So I'll stay tuned for any idea you  
>>put forth on how it could be feasibly accomplished for a circle  
>>as large as 57 feet in diameter. It was probably no accident  
>>that the upper-layer circle of swirled stems did not entirely  
>>cover the under layer at the circumference -- if they had, the  
>>lower lower might not have been discovered.

>Looking at the diagram [p. 22 of Noye's book or p. 18 of Meaden's  
>book] it looks as though the crop was flattened  
>from the centre spiralling out and then back to the middle and  
>so on. Continue that until all the crop was flattened and you'd  
>end up with the effect of layering described in the book. As the  
>crop was packed down and serrated at the edges it's possible it  
>was done with a roller rather than boards.

You left out a lot of details, Tony, and the "Haying Devil" is  
in the details. If you think about it a little more, you'll see  
that your two sentences don't begin to explain it. How wide a  
swath would you flatten at one time in a swirl from the center  
counterclockwise out to the edge? After you had swirled down the  
lower layer, how would there be about an equal number of stems  
left standing all about for you to start swirling similarly, but  
from the outer edge to the center, so as to form the upper  
layer?

Meaden's attempted explanation was similarly lacking. In his  
book (p. 17) he merely wrote: "...a vortex had initially scribed  
a circle with an outwardly-directed anticlockwise veining...,  
but that a second stage had evolved in which the superior straws  
had shifted again to finish as an anticlockwise-inward pattern."  
So he failed also to figure out how there would be any  
"superior" straws left standing to be swirled orthogonally to  
form the upper layer. That is, the straws forming the lower  
layer weren't bent half way up at right angles to form an upper  
layer; instead the upper-layer stems were bent over very near to  
the ground, as were the lower-layer stems.

In trying to answer my own questions above, I would conceive of:

(a) forming a succession of narrow swaths from the center  
counterclockwise out to the edge, having a width, for  
feasibility, of about 4 inches. So after marking the center of  
the circle, you'd strap a board of 4" width and about 1 or 2  
feet in length to the bottom of each shoe, then march carefully  
outwards from the center in a sort of scuffing style (toe up,  
heel down), so as to lay down the stems in the two swirled paths  
along the direction you're heading. (The boards might consist of  
sawed-off tip sections of skis.) However, you'd be careful to  
leave a strip of standing stems of width 4" in between. Some 135  
trips outward like this should suffice, carefully retracing

one's steps from the outer edge back to the center each time. You'd cover a distance of about 1.8 miles in doing this, and going at 1/4 mph top speed outwards but 1 mph back inwards, this stage should take two hoaxers only a little over two hours to accomplish.

(b) Then the hoaxers would bend over the remaining standing stems -- the other half of the crop within the circle -- moving from outer edge in, using a somewhat wider board strapped to one or both feet, forming swirls at right angles to the lower-layer swirls. This might be accomplished in just one more hour.

But why do I suspect that it would look like a mess when done? In the first place, the 4" wide swaths of the lower layer would not be neatly laid down like that, because as the narrow board is pressed down at each step, most all the stems would splay outwards instead of laying down in the desired direction of travel.

In the second place, this plan is totally flawed because the width of the boards would have to start out at about 0.1", or one stem width, within a couple feet of the circle's center, and only gradually widen to 4" as you approach the circle's outer edge.

Third, it doesn't account for the extra skill needed in plotting a swirled course of travel that is congruent all the way around the circle. So I suspect these are typical reasons why no one has attempted to hoax a two-layer system of a size at all this big.

Or, how would you conceive of doing it, Tony, in a manner that's feasible?

>>I would not assume that the tests haven't been made by Levingood  
>>on stems from oil-seed rape crop circles.

>Why do you think that is?

Since speculating on it, I've learned from Nancy Talbott that Levingood has made such tests on a few bent over canola stalks some years ago, with results consistent with those found in wheat and barley, etc., but that he apparently hasn't written the results up anywhere and hasn't done any testing of canola stalks from more recent cc's. The canola stalks are so bushy and big, and thus extra costly to ship from England to the U.S. East coast, that this has discouraged their study in this country.

>>I was referring to certain crop-circle  
>>reports wherein the stems within a given formation were all bent  
>>over at the \*same\* approximate height, like 1" or 2" or 4" above  
>>the ground, as opposed to the usual 1/4" or so, which trampling  
>>on it can try to simulate.

>Have you got the details of the formation/s where the crop is  
>all flattened at 4" above the ground?

The 4" figure was a ballpak guess. You'll need to ask the cc experts for that data. Wait, I was lucky enough to find one example of this type in my assorted files. It was the "Egg, Tear & Slice" formation in barley reported in Sussex on 21 June 1994. There the crop in the three separate segments of the formation was all bent over from between 17" and 22" above the ground (at least as tough to envision hoaxing as if it had been at 4" above the ground). Instead of swirls, the lay of the bent-over upper sections of the crop consisted of multiple woven "nests." It was reported and described by Barry Reynolds of the Centre for Crop Circle Studies, Sussex Branch, in 9 July 1994. Nothing like it had been seen before.

>>Their makers were never caught, whereas common sense dictates  
>>that if humans had done them, a substantial percentage would  
>>have been caught in the act, and/or have left tell-tale signs  
>>behind.

>Not really, once in the dark your eyes adjust pretty quickly,  
>particularly when there aren't any light sources around the  
>affect the pupils. In the dark circle makers are probably  
>undetectable 200 foot or so into the crop, now given that  
>Wiltshire is a pretty large county the odds really are in their  
>favour.

Well, a car's headlights or engine noise driving towards a



farmer's field at night can sometimes alert the curiosity of the farmer who had to get up in the middle of the night. Or hoaxers in a field can attract the attention of dogs that bark loudly. Etc.

But consider if the odds of hoaxers forming a crop-circle formation at night without being detected were 0.99 (i.e., very good). What then are the odds of doing this over and over 1000 times over several years and never being detected at it? It would seem to be  $(0.99)^{1000}$  (raised to the 1000th power), which is only 0.000043; i.e., terrible odds! But if you only did it 10 times, the odds are 0.9 you wouldn't be caught.

BTW, did you hear about the eye-witness account of the formation of a crop circle that Linda Howe reported on Art Bell recently, as relayed via Nancy Talbott? It was formed somehow by an unidentified pinkish-purple light hovering low over the field (in England), after the light had expanded into a sizeable disk (as I recall); it took only the "usual" 6 to 10 seconds to form. That makes 5 witnesses, as I believe his name is known.

Jim Deardorff

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 05:43:01 -0700  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:45:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

>From: Henny van der Pluijm <[hvdp@worldonline.nl](mailto:hvdp@worldonline.nl)>  
>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 20:22:00 +0200 (MET DST)  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 22:46:53 -0700  
>>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: US Congress, NSA butt heads over Echelon

>>Due to the 13 Echelon Sattelites covering all sectors of the  
>>globe, no electronic communications can evade monitoring.

>Hi Josh,

>How do you know there are 13 of these satellites and what other  
>specific information do you have that has not been reported in  
>the press?

Well Henny, I think you'll need to ask the Discovery Channel as that was reported on their show. I vageuly remember it may have involved the former SCE employee.

To further spice up the stew, that show also stated and visualized (with interviews) that during the height of the Chechen - Russian War the leader of the Chechens was talking on his cellphone exploring peace possibilities. Now he knew that the Russian Electronic listening forces had tracking equipment that would nab him if he stayed on the phone longer than five minutes. They had repeatedly tried to lock in on him but there was a lot of pressure on Russia to quickly and strongly settle this war rather than let it drag on. Yeltsin had to do something to make him look good. So the US co-operated and used their better system to guide a missile right into his cellphone just after he was on the phone for 30 seconds. We helped Yeltsin to look good and victorious. So said a high level expert on the Discovery show.

No, I don't run a conspiracy theory chat line but I'm simply restating a juicy part of the Discovery show. I told you about the domestic intelligence inter-nation trade policy and here is an intelligence and technology gift offered for this purpose: to assassinate the leader of of the Chechnya nation. Thanks to the help of the U.S they finally eliminated him. From Discovery to you. That juicy tidbit above was a total surprise to me.

Now after all these years of feeding my passion to know more about UFOs and aliens I must confess to this list a deep secret I never divulged to another person in the UFO world. I was a teenage UFO delinquent! I must absolve my sin and confess to my fellow ufonauts on this list.

In 1960 at the age of 14 I joined the Civil Air Patrol to enhance my love of airplanes and hopes to be a pilot. At some point in the future we were doing a weekend encampment at our airfield in the country - a 2300ft. grass strip and we stayed in

a tent. No adults were there. Someone that night got the idea (hope it wasn't me) of going out to the road en masse. At least a dozen or so cadets dressed in Air Force fatigues with dummy rifles and Air Force caps. We decided to stand on both sides of the road with flashlights and stop cars as they came. We pointed rifles and checked IDs after men stood across the road in front of the car. We told them that the area had been blocked off due to the crash of a UFO and we interviewed them, asking if they had seen anything. When they were totally befuddled we had them turn around and take the long way we instructed them to follow. I really can't remember what I knew about UFO crashes in 1960 but I sure had an active interest. Was I the culprit? I can't remember.

Suddenly a flashing red light was approaching and it was a police car. They had suddenly started getting tons of calls at the station from people we had stopped at the roadblocks. It was the talk of the town. Crashed flying saucer out near the airport. We quickly made a beeline to our tent and into our sleeping bags, pretending to sleep. When the cops came to the tent we could not hide from them. They knew it was us. I suppose then the senior CAP adults pulled up and shared with us many pieces of their minds about our crashed saucer hoaxing. In the long run I was a good cadet and two years later I was awarded a scholarship for flying lessons. A super cub on a grass strip.

The discussion of the Kenneth Arnold sighting got me remembering learning to navigate by dead reckoning. You'd better reckon your course and speed right or you may end up dead. Reckon or maybe dead. Those were the days. When I flew in Vietnam I used live reckoning. <g>

The last straw: flying reflective geese at a high altitude with a supersonic tailwind occurring only in their sector due to being downwind from the mountains.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Earth Changes TV/Breaking News - Did NASA Erase

From: **Mitch Battros** <[earthcnc@earthlink.net](mailto:earthcnc@earthlink.net)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 22:10:57 -0700  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:32:44 -0400  
Subject: Earth Changes TV/Breaking News - Did NASA Erase

Did NASA Erase It's Tracks Over Solar Explosion?...06/10/99  
by Mitch Battros (ECTV)

This could be one of the largest cover ups from NASA we have seen in a long time, or, it could be nothing at all.

One of our viewers sent in an email stating she noticed NASA had omitted, or erased, JUNE 1ST data on the link below. This just happens to be the date of the C.M.E. (coronal mass ejection). Also take note, it was the BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation) that broke the story. Nothing from our own national networks.

I would like your help in this investigation. If you know of a web site, or perhaps someone working for NASA that can explain the reason for the omission of this date, please forward. Also, send information as to why NASA did not disclose this information to the public at, or before, the time of this event.

Is it NASA's policy to NOT disclose potentially deadly, or at least severely disruptive events? It is not only solar flares were we have seen this omission before. It has also occurred with NEO's (near earth orbits) related to Asteroids.

Sharon B. wrote:

Check out the following web site which is NASA's 10 day animation of the sun. Notice that June 1 (CME) has been omitted from the animation. You will have to slow down the animation to 2 images per second to see that they skip from May 31 to June 2.

<http://www.spaceweather.com/java/solar-anim.html>

Remember, this could be nothing at all. It is possible, NASA was simply taking the day off. After all, it was Memorial Day.

Mitch Battros  
Producer - Earth Changes TV  
Web Site:  
<http://www.earthchangesTV.com>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 00:47:07 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:30:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 99 19:38:05 PDT

>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 18:17:16 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

<snip>

>>No, logic such as this simply means that when you're dealing  
>>with an anecdotal account the only fact you have is the anecdote  
>>itself. Which anecdote may or may not be true in particular, or  
>>may reflect varying degrees of subjectivity and misperception in  
>>general.

>>The only evidence we have for Arnold's sighting is Arnold's  
>>account of same.

>Not true. There's also the Fred M. Johnson's corroborating  
>sighting.

>C'mon, Dennis.

<Huge snip already replied to.>

>Jerry Clark

C'mon, Jerry,

Corroborative by what standards of corroboration?

You leave the misleading impression that Johnson saw the exact  
same thing that Arnold did at the exact same time, and in the  
exact same place -- more or less -- thereby confirming and/or  
corroborating Arnold's original account.

Yet your own account of the Johnson sighting, based on a letter  
he wrote the Air Force two months after the fact (UFO  
Encyclopedia, Vol. I, p. 141), is full of qualifiers ("they  
may...he could well have seen," etc.). So which is it?

To support Johnson's credibility, you'll want to no doubt quote  
the following from the FBI file as established fact:

"Fred Johnson...reported without consulting any records..."  
Qualifier: there is no way the interviewing FBI agent could have  
determined whether this was absolute fact or not. Obviously, he  
is simply reporting Johnson's claim that he hadn't consulted  
any records, made moot, in the event, by Johnson's later  
admission in the same interview that he had "noted an article  
in the local paper...and communicated with the Army for the sole  
purpose of attempting to add credence to the story furnished by  
the man in Boise [i.e., Arnold]."

In the end this is not too fine a philosophical point. The

account has to be distinguished from the fact itself. To assume that they are one and the same, that is, that Arnold's perception and/or interpretation of what he saw is the actual fact itself, and nothing but (no other interpretations permitted), is ludicrous.

Regardless of whether Arnold, or Johnson, or both, were right or wrong, there is no excuse for confusing or mistaking an account of a phenomenon with the phenomenon itself. The two are separate phenomena and forever will be.

That was my point: Rudiak and Maccabee can mathematically analyze Arnold's account until hell freezes over. But it doesn't necessarily tell us that much, if anything, about the purported phenomenon itself.

Moreover, ufology is replete with cautionary tales. Mark Cashman, who I greatly respect, recently revealed in IUR that the 1965 (?) Beaver, Pennsylvania, photos were unaltered fakes. Until that time, however, he had the photo(s) on his web page, subject to all sorts of luminosity analysis and other "corroborative" evidence. The only problem, in the end, was that the original account didn't match up with the phenomenon. In fact, there was no phenomenon.

For another instructive story, read physicist Irwin Wieder's account of the discovery that the infamous 1966 Willamette Pass, Oregon, photo was also a patent hoax. Why did it take so long to explain same? Because, as Wieder so bravely admitted, given the witness's confirmed credentials, he was perfectly contented to remain on automatic pilot, what he referred to as "a pure belief mode." Again, the account and the (non-existent in this case) phenomenon weren't exactly a one-to-one match up, because, again, there was no stimulating phenomenon.

Does this mean, ipso facto, that Arnold is in the same league? Of course not. Does it mean that he could be? I'll leave that up to you to decide.

By the same token, there's no compelling reason, granted Clark's exalted UFO theology (in which witnesses are never confused about anything, but always spot on), to argue that Arnold shouldn't ascend to ufological sainthood post haste. Hey, the guy was only human.

Or did I misread my scripture?

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## DISPATCH # 110 -- the weekly newsletter of

From: [ParaScope@AOL.COM](mailto:ParaScope@AOL.COM)  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 21:34:28 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:21:09 -0400  
Subject: DISPATCH # 110 -- the weekly newsletter of

DISPATCH # 110 -- the weekly newsletter of ParaScope

S O M E T H I N G   S T R A N G E   I S   H A P P E N I N G

6/10/99

Quote of the Week

"Always do sober what you said you'd do drunk. That will teach you to keep your mouth shut."

--- Ernest Hemingway  
-----

Rant of the Week: "Non-Random Shootings of the New Moon"

Every week we pick the wackiest, scariest, nastiest or funniest rant from the deluge of letters received by us here at ParaScope headquarters, and present it to you as our Rant of the Week. This week, N-Ram shares a theory on how recent high school shootings are part of an elaborate plan. Enjoy.

"All school killings part of larger plan. Here are the recent attacks:

1. Pearl, Miss. 10-1-97
2. Paducah, Ky. 12-1-97
3. Jonesboro, Ark. 3-24-98
4. Edinboro, Pa. 4-24-98
5. Fayetteville, Tenn. 5-19-98
6. Springfield, Ore. 5-21-98
7. Notus, Idaho 4-16-99
8. Littleton, Col. 4-20-99

"Using as straight edge ruler and map I found a perfect line between #1, 6, and 8, with 7 slightly above the line. If we make a line from 6 to 7 that line will continue to Ark. And cross #3 in Jonesboro Ark. A perfect line also exists between 3, 2, and 4... # 5 seems to fall outside these patterns. But # 5 does not belong to them because it was not a random killing, it was a boy shooting another boy over a girl friend.

"Thus we have 3 lines and 7 killings lined up perfectly on the lines. These are not RANDOMLY PLACED and hence they are not random incidents.

"Now if you are of a spiritual bent you might suspect angels, demons, or such like. If you are of a bad-alien bent, you might suspect little green men. If you are of a scientific bent you would be forced to suspect HUMAN PLANNING. Now most governments of the world would not be so foolish as to plan such crimes in straight lines. Thus we would be forced to suspect religious/occult groups. These might have a connection to a government, as in infiltration.

"BUT THERE IS MORE!

"Of the incidents: #1, 2, 4, 7 all took place during the exact time of the NEW MOON. #3, 6, and 8 took place 2 to 4 days on either side of the NEW MOON. New Moons played key roles in many ancient religions and occult groups, even the Bible. Number 7 seems to have failed when the boy was discovered before he shot

anyone. Number 8 seems to be the SECOND attempt to meet the New Moon goal.

"These shootings ARE NOT RANDOM, and are hence PLANNED

"I am posting this all over the world to save my ars."

-----  
All rants are printed "as is," with spelling and grammar goofs left uncorrected. Some rants may be edited for brevity or clarity, to the extent such a thing is possible. If you've got a rant you'd like to share, send it to [psscplady@aol.com](mailto:psscplady@aol.com) with "possible rant" in the subject line of your letter.

--+++++-----  
Coming Up Soon on ParaScope!

Catch a number of great stories this week on the ParaScope web site, including regular updates to our Conspiracy Newsline, UFO Roundup and Daily Dose features.

The Paper Trail: Where the Concealed is Revealed  
All-New Edition at <http://www.parascope.com/ds/papertrail/index.htm>

When talking behind closed doors, Richard Nixon didn't mince words. His secret White House taping system recorded ample proof that this president was willing to speak his fears, profanities and illegal orders loud and clear. Now another batch of unheard Nixon tapes has been released -- and word for word transcripts are in the new Paper Trail. Other key stories this month: Nixon aide Henry's Kissingers intimate diplomatic conversations are finally on the record in a new book; and a recent report by Guatemala's truth commission explicitly names the CIA as a moving force in decades of repression by state security forces. It's all new, all declassified, and all in the Paper Trail.

-----  
Fortean Slips: Edition #33!

Enigma editor D. Trull brings us an all-new batch of zany reports from the paranormal fringe.

A Kinder, Gentler Satan: The Roman Catholic Church has revised its official views on the nature of Old Scratch, and this particular overhaul of foul wickedness is far from being your average P.R. con job.

The Bra of Nostradamus: Yes, ladies, there is now special lingerie custom-designed for the End Times!

Aliens Chewing the Fat: A crass advertising campaign has cast EBE's and the obese as mortal enemies, kicking off intergalactic hostilities of hefty proportions.

-----  
ParaScope Newsline  
<http://www.parascope.com/articles/cnews/index.htm>

Navy Jet Illegally Fired Depleted Uranium Ammunition at Puerto Rico Test Range

On February 19, 1999, a Marine Harrier fighter jet illegally fired 267 25mm shells tipped with depleted uranium at a practice range on Vieques Island in Puerto Rico, according to a recent disclosure.

Depleted uranium (DU) is an extremely dense metal used to reinforce large-caliber bullets and shells, allowing the projectiles to penetrate armor. However, shell impact produces a dust cloud of toxic particles laden with radioactive uranium oxide. Airborne particles can be carried by the wind for several miles. If ingested or inhaled, these particles cause a wide range of dangerous health effects. Medical researchers have linked DU to Gulf War illness, which has plagued tens of thousands of U.S. veterans. (A-10 "Warthog" gunships fired



nearly one million DU rounds during the Gulf War, and DU munitions were widely used by U.S. forces during that conflict.)

The Vieques Island incident has raised serious public health concerns and has led to new calls for the Navy to halt its military exercises on the island, which has been used as a training ground since World War II. (The fighter jet involved in the incident was stationed on the U.S.S. Kearsarge, which is currently participating in the NATO bombardment of Yugoslavia. NATO forces are reportedly using depleted uranium munitions as part of "Operation Allied Force.")

The cancer rate on Vieques Island is more than twice the average cancer rate among the people of Puerto Rico. For years, politicians and activists have pointed to the Navy's activities there as the cause of the disproportionate cancer rate.

"Only 57 of the 267 depleted uranium shells [fired at Vieques Island] were recovered by Navy clean-up personnel, indicating that more than 200 may have exploded," according to the Associated Press. Each of the 25mm shells contains a third of a pound of DU. Potentially as much as 70 pounds of depleted uranium particles may have become airborne and been carried by prevailing winds into inhabited areas of the island, home to 9,300 Puerto Ricans.

According to Tara Thornton of The Military Toxics Project, "They fired enough to poison every man, woman and child on the island 420 times over." (Thornton filed a Freedom of Information Act request which led to the Vieques revelation.)

Sen. Eudaldo Baez Galib of the opposition Popular Democratic Party demanded medical testing for all residents of eastern Puerto Rico, and noted that a wind shift could have carried the particles to the nearby U.S. Virgin Islands. Under Nuclear Regulatory Commission guidelines, automatic health testing is required for inhalation of as little as 0.01 grams of depleted uranium.

The Navy claims that Puerto Rican officials were advised promptly of the "accidental" DU firing. But according to an Associated Press report, Puerto Rican Gov. Pedro Rossello's office was not notified, and Secretary of State Norma Burgos was skeptical of the Navy's claims of disclosure. "This is information we have to verify because it wouldn't surprise me if it were more incorrect information, another lie," Burgos said.

The use of DU ammunition in the February 19 incident was a violation of federal and local laws, as well as Navy regulations, the Associated Press reported.

Sources: Michelle Faul, "Puerto Rico Disputes Navy Assertion," Associated Press, May 28, 1999; Michelle Faul, "Navy Admits Firing Uranium Shells," Associated Press, June 2, 1999.

-----

Jane, Stop This Crazy Thing!

Thought you were tough enough to handle the Dispatch and now you realize you're not? Starting to think you've made a wrong turn off the info highway? Well, we're only going to go over this once, so listen up!

To unsubscribe yourself from Dispatch:

- 1) Send e-mail to: [listserv@listserv.aol.com](mailto:listserv@listserv.aol.com)
- 2) In the body of your mail, type: unsubscribe dispatch

That's all there is to it!

Likewise, to subscribe:

- 1) Send e-mail to: [listserv@listserv.aol.com](mailto:listserv@listserv.aol.com)
- 2) In the body of your mail, type: subscribe dispatch

-----

ParaScope  
11288 Ventura Blvd., #904  
Studio City, CA 91604

America Online -- keyword: parascope  
[parascope@aol.com](mailto:parascope@aol.com)

World-Wide Web -- <http://www.parascope.com>  
[info@parascope.com](mailto:info@parascope.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## The Max Burns BUFORA Lecture - A Review

From: David Clarke <[crazydiamonds@compuserve.com](mailto:crazydiamonds@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 14:52:39 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 16:09:41 -0400  
Subject: The Max Burns BUFORA Lecture - A Review

Remember the "Sheffield Incident"?

For some time now we have been waiting with baited breath for the appearance of Max Burns on the hard fought platform he had won in the name of free speech on the BUFORA lecture platform in London.

For more than two years now Max has promised us major new revelations about his claims that an ET Triangle or what is now known as an "FT" (no, not Fortean Times, 'flying triangle' silly!) was engaged in a hostile encounter with a UFO over the Peak District - leading to what Max claims was the loss of an Tornado F3 interceptor and the deaths of at least one of its crew.

I made a decision not to comment further on the case some months ago, having posted my 20,000 word report and conclusions on the Internet, unless some new evidence was forthcoming.

Henceforth I waited....and waited... and waited.

Trumpeted by its BUFORA promoters as the opportunity to answer to all the critics, and the event at which - wait for it - the "scientific evidence" to back up Max's amazing and earth shattering claims would finally be revealed.... it promised a lot.

But what did we get?

Well around 35 people turned up to hear Max's history-making claims at a prime venue in central London, and not one member of the Press! All this despite BUFORA's Malcolm Robinson faxing half the capital's press and even handing out leaflets to tourists in central London.

Who knows, perhaps a D-Notice had been served on the entire UK Press and even tourists too, it being such a fantastic case and all.

Max Burns himself appeared in his best Burtons suit, fresh from having made a miraculous recovery from a particularly nasty bout of food poisoning which, two weeks earlier, had prevented his appearance before a Crown Court Judge in Sheffield just minutes before his trial was due to go ahead.

Odd that isn't it, seeing as Burns had repeatedly stated that nothing would prevent his appearance before a BUFORA audience on June 5 - not even an appearance before a jury, it seems.

What did we learn from the lecture? Precisely naff all, seeing as most of it seemed to be a rip-off from material written by "another researcher" who must remain nameless (guess who?) interspersed with long passages read directly from Max's own completely discredited Sheffield "Flying Triangle" incident report.

Of particular amusement were a series of bizarre and fantastic claims which I will now deal with point by point, illustrating

once again how vivid Max's imagination really is and how shoddy his research has been: (not to mention how gullible anyone in the audience must be who took this nonsense as approximate to any kind of fact)

MAX CLAIM 1: That one of two RAF Spokesman extensively quoted in my Howden Report does not exist (ergo I have made him up). The evidence for this assertion?

"Jerry Anderson (of an Essex UFO group) has assured me that he had searched all the MOD lists and assures me one of the people named does not exist."

THE FACTS: The two people named are RAF Public Relations Officer Allan Patterson and Flight Lieutenant Tom Rounds. Both most certainly do exist and are both at this very moment serving in Kosovo with Britain's K4 group. Patterson is a Senior Civilian Press Officer with the Defence Exports Services Organisation, Whitehall, while Flt Lieut Rounds is the senior Press Officer on the RAF Press Desk at Whitehall. Both can be contacted directly on the Main MOD switchboard when they return, just dial 0171 218 3253 ask for RAF Press Desk Patterson left the RAF Press desk for a new job elsewhere in the MOD at the end of 98. But then any investigator who had regular contact with the RAF, as I do, and had done a good job on this case would know these facts? Apparently not, but it makes a good conspiracy story doesn't it?

Pity about the facts! Either way, I'm sure Allan will be amused to hear he doesn't exist next time I phone him.

MAX CLAIM 2: Max now claims the Tornado F3 destroyed by ET/UFO action over the Peak was an Italian NATO aircraft, and that it came from RAF Coningsby in Lincolnshire. Burns bases his conclusion on a third-hand source who told another researcher he saw six Tornados leaving the base at 20.45. These aircraft were undoubtedly scrambled to pursue a UFO, despite the fact there was a low-flying operation underway that night - so he claims. By a bizarre twisting of the facts and figures, Max works out that two of these aircraft did not return. He then told the audience he had in fact written to RAF Coningsby asking to see a copy of the entire flight log for the night of March 24, 1997 and stating his conviction that one of their Tornado aircraft had crashed in the Peaks on that night!

THE FACTS: I obtained special permission from the base commander to access the flight log for Coningsby earlier this year. The log clearly shows that four Tornados took off and four returned safely to the base at 2125 that night following a routine exercise over the North Sea. The interesting fact is that today I contacted Caroline Hogg, the base Public Relations Officer who deals with all inquiries to Coningsby. Had the base received a letter from one Max Burns asking to access the log, and making a claim about a crashed aircraft?

"Not to my knowledge," she said after recovering from laughter. "And I deal with all members of the public who contact the base." In my presence she searched all correspondence logs since 1997 (the base PRO keeps meticulous records of all letters received) and the only person to have contacted the base about the March 24, 1997, incident was - surprise, surprise, David Clarke. So what are we to make of Max's claim to have contacted the base? He's making very serious claims about the loss of an aircraft and the lives of its crew, and yet he is such a good investigator he has apparently made no effort to even ask those who he claims are directly involved!

Does that not suggest that he doesn't quite believe it himself, not to the extent that he could remove himself from the Internet and actually write a real letter to a real person?

Isn't it far easier just to claim he has done, because he knows all the poor saps listening will just believe what he says without question?

MAX CLAIM 3: That the British MOD have lied to an elected MP, Helen Jackson, when they said in a Parliamentary written answer that the Ministry had received no reports of UFOs on March 24, 1997. As the South Yorkshire Police log contains at least one "UFO" report - the obvious conclusion to Max is that the reply is a lie.

THE FACTS: As Lionel Beer pointed out at the BUFORA Lecture, police reports go to the Home Office, who control the police, not to the MOD. In this particular case, the police classified all the entries in their log as relating to a "suspicious low flying aircraft" incident, NOT as a UFO, therefore there was no reason why they should have been reported to the MOD.

The obvious conclusion is that the MOD did not lie to Jackson, because they did not receive any reports of UFOs, only low-flying aircraft (13 in all, admitted in Parliament).

These facts go straight over the top of Max's head: he just cannot understand the very basic fact that the police never treated the "Sheffield Incident" as a UFO case.

Only Max is responsible for turning this non-case into a fully fledged UFO myth.

MAX CLAIM 4: That Jonathon Dagenhart - the infamous Tornado co-pilot who ejected and was seen on the Peak road covered in "aviation fuel" - had been pressurised by the RAF to retract his story.

THE FACTS: The BUFORA audience - not known for their objectiveness in the first instance - found this yarn particularly hard to swallow, and with good reason. Max's claims about this man - a unfortunate soul who had tried to take his own life that night, but became an unwitting pawn in a UFO believer's fantasy - just do not stand up to scrutiny, and even the hardcore believers were having their doubts. Max desperately tried to justify his claims at the BUFORA lecture by saying if he was not the co-pilot, why had so much pressure been put on him to retract the story?

The facts are that no pressure has ever been placed on Dagenhart. The man went to his superiors at the RAF himself to ask for help when his innocent testimony about a Pakistani-looking man he seen on a road was hijacked by a nutcase and was about to be splashed all over the News of the World.

Wouldn't you be worried, breathless and nearly crying if you found yourself in the same position? And to paraphrase Peter Brooksmith, how many Pakistani pilots/co-pilots are there of RAF Tornados which fly from RAF Coningsby?

I smell something funny here, and it's not aviation fuel.

MAX CLAIM 4: That there is a Government D-Notice in place preventing the entire of the UK Media from running any stories about " the Sheffield Incident." The evidence for this incredible assertion? Well Marc Bell of the Woolwich UFO Centre in London was going on a radio show in the capital to talk about UFOs, and was asked by staff what subject he was going to talk about. Well, the Sheffield Incident of course! Whereupon, he was immediately told under no circumstances was he to discuss that case. THE FACTS: Well come on guys and gals, does this nonsense really merit a reply?

Other than the fact that the chances of any radio journalist in Sheffield, let alone London, having heard of the "Sheffield Incident" (as apart from the real search for a supposed crashed aircraft) are pretty slim.

In fact the D-Notice secretary at the MOD will give any bona fide caller advice on any subject area which falls under any Government restrictions (and this is advice only for editors - not law). I can assure you that Max's lurid fantasies about this case do not fall under this category!

MAX CLAIM 5: That the Bolide meteor explanation for this case "was the original explanation/cover-story" put out by the MOD/Authorities.

THE FACTS: Nowhere have the MOD or RAF ever suggested that a Bolide meteor was responsible for this case. That fact is made perfectly clear in my Howden Moor report, of which Max has a copy. The Bolide explanation was suggested by the British Geological Survey and the Royal Astronomical Society as an explanation for the sonic booms and the lights in the sky seen

that night.

It is not a scenario ever suggested by the MOD - and Max knows this is the case.

So why perpetuate lies?

MAX CLAIM 6: That the first sonic boom recorded by the BGS in the Sheffield area that night at 2152 "was the Tornado jet exploding" after being "zapped" by the UFO, and that the second boom at 2206 was caused by the UFO escaping from the area after the foul deed!

THE FACTS: Utter nonsense. The British Geological Survey had stated on the record and unequivocally that both sonic events recorded that night were caused by sonic booms - that is, air blasts caused by objects breaking the speed of sound - NOT by a ground impact or an aircraft exploding in mid-air. Senior seismologist Glenn Ford has stated the only possible cause of these events was a military aircraft breaching the sound barrier, possibly while performing a mid-air turn over land.

As we know there was a covert, low-flying exercise over the Peak shortly before these two events, it seems more than likely this was indeed the cause. Naughty pilots, not hostile ETs I'm afraid!

MAX CLAIM 7 (don't worry, this is the last one). That the 141 civilian mountain rescue teams scrambled to search the Howden Moors that night "were told to concentrate on an area four miles away" from the site of the "real" crash which was being quietly covered up by Blue Beret types in a military land-rover.

This information came from the wife of the gamekeeper at Strines, who told Max her husband was stopped from going onto his land by the police and had an offer of helping them with the search turned down.

Basically, Max is saying that over a hundred highly trained and highly experienced Mountain Rescue personnel, from seven separate teams, all of whom are civilians who have not signed the Official Secrets Act, were deliberately sent to the wrong area of the moor to conduct a fruitless search while the Military Industrial Complex removed the evidence of aliens under their very nose?

THE FACTS: Max has never contacted the MRS Team involved during the two years he claims he has put into this investigation.

In my book that would have been the very first place to start - as it should any investigator worth his or her salt!

If he had done, as I have, he would have found there was no possible way the MRS could have been "sent" to wrong area of moor, simply because it was the MRS who were organising the search - NOT the police!

It was the civilian mountain rescue members who decided, based upon the bearings taken from the witnesses who saw the low-flying plane, to search almost 50 square miles of moor. They directed the pilots of the two helicopters (police and RAF) from the ground and from the air throughout and thoroughly searched all the possible areas that an aircraft could have crashed.

MRS Team Leader that night Mike France has said there was no possible way his experienced men could have missed the wreckage of a Tornado jet or any other aircraft.

As for suggestions that they had been sent to search the wrong moor etc he responded:

"Utter rubbish, the gamekeeper's wife does not know what she is talking about. We had at least 50 to 60 men searching the Strines Moor area from early on - all was thoroughly searched and we found nothing."

As a measure of how reliable the gamekeepers' wives testimony is, she also claimed in her statement to Max that the land was "privately owned by a former Whitehall man with links to the SAS". In fact, Strines forest is owned by Steven Hastings, a former Tory MP who is married to the daughter of the Earl

Fitzwilliam.

As for her husband Mick not being allowed to take part in the search, he actually went out in a police landrover with PC Mick Hague to help the initial search of the moors, and is quoted as saying so on the Granada TV documentary on the case screened earlier this year! So much for that load of nonsense!!

So - time and time again, Max's wild claims about this case do not stand up to any kind of scrutiny. One lie follows another, and it appears that he is completely incapable of saying anything which is remotely accurate.

Nothing new has been presented at the BUFORA lecture - just the same old rubbish.

His investigation of what he calls "the Sheffield Flying Triangle Incident" has been completely discredited in every detail, and yet still he cannot bring himself to accept this was not a UFO case.

BUFORA, and in particular its current crop of suits, have encouraged this farago of nonsense despite having the true facts at their disposal, and have brought nothing but ridicule and shame upon a once respectable association as a result, losing their Press Officer, Director of Investigations and Journal Editor in the process.

But, as always, Max has to have some new evidence that is always tantalisingly within his grasp.

Lets hope it can answer these basic questions I asked two years ago and ask again: 1. What is the name of the Tornado pilot who died as a result of ET action? 2. From what base did the plane fly? 3. Name one witness who saw an FT shoot down a pursuing Tornado that night.

Methinks we will still be waiting for an answer from Max in the year 2097 if we live that long. Meanwhile, check out the true facts about this classic case of misidentification and mythology in the making on:

[http://www.pufori.org/articles/howden\\_moor/index\\_nf.htm](http://www.pufori.org/articles/howden_moor/index_nf.htm)

and

[http://www.pufori.org/articles/howden\\_moor/index.htm](http://www.pufori.org/articles/howden_moor/index.htm)

and

<http://www.iun.org>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 11](#)

## Filer's Files #23 1999

From: George A. Filer <[Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 10:21:24 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:55:35 -0400  
Subject: Filer's Files #23 1999

Filer's Files #23 --1999, MUFON Skywatch Investigations  
George A. Filer, Mutual UFO Network Eastern Director,  
June 11, 1999, [Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com) (609) 654-0020

Professor Hermann Oberth, the German rocket expert is considered to be one of the fathers of the space age. In 1955, Dr. Von Braun invited him to the US to work at the Army Ballistic Missile Agency and later NASA where he researched UFO propulsion. Oberth stated, "It is my thesis that flying saucers are real and that they are space ships from another solar system. I think that they are possibly manned by intelligent observers who are members of a race that may have been investigating our earth for centuries. I think that they possibly have been sent out to conduct systematic, long range investigations, first of men, animals, vegetation and more recently of atomic centers, armaments and centers of armament production." "Flying Saucers Come From A Distant World" American Weekly, 10/24/54

### CONNECTICUT

BRIDGEPORT -- Skywatch International reports that on June 2, 1999, a large dark gray triangle was observed at 9:53 PM. A friend saw an object from his house 2 to 3 miles away. The witness reports, "I was on the phone and saw a large gray triangle object appear below cloud cover. When it first appeared the UFO displayed two large white lights, that went dark and were replaced by three red lights on its edges. One of the red lights had a flutter to it. The object the size of a 747 aircraft. The rear of the triangle had one half a circle area cut out of it. It moved from the northeast, and made an abrupt turn to the East without making any noise. The object followed the power lines in area for almost four minutes. While the object was visible the family dog was agitated and barking. The weather was partly cloudy. The object appeared solid and was as bright as a star. Thanks to Skywatch International Inc.

CROMWELL -- On June 4, 1999, I was driving east looking towards the rising sun at 5:30 AM. There was a huge brilliant white object hovering in the sky. I normally turn off on a ramp that brings me to Route 9 and north to Hartford, but I drove straight towards the object and the center of Cromwell. At first I was sure it was the morning star, but I knew the object was too large and bright for a star. I observed it for a few minutes more and became bored. So I decided to leave, when the object suddenly shot straight up and was gone. I was wondering if anyone else saw it? This is the third time I have seen a craft like this in the Middlesex, County area. Thanks to Dean Burgess [djburgess@snet.net](mailto:djburgess@snet.net).

### NEW JERSEY DISC SIGHTED

TRENTON -- Ron De Baecke called me to report his sighting on June 7, 1999, of a huge disc shaped unidentified flying object hovering in the sky. He is a retired Army aircraft mechanic and has worked around aircraft most of his life. He and his wife Patricia were driving north on Route 130 near Bordentown, when a shiny bright object caught their attention in the clear blue sky at 7:30 PM. The object appeared to be solid and manufactured



with a shiny metal surface. There were no lights visible on the craft. It was positioned roughly over Trenton, the state capital. Ron estimated the disc to be the size of a football field. Although, there was no other aircraft to help estimate the exact size of the craft, both he and his wife felt the UFO was huge. They drove under some trees along the highway and when they could view the open sky again the craft had disappeared. It was just hovering and then it was gone. Ron stated, "It was so big that others must have seen the craft, this is why we decided to make the report." Until this sighting they were not believers in UFOs. Thanks to Ron De Baecke. Visit our New NJ MUFON website at:  
<http://www.contrailconnection.com/njmufon/index.htm>

ELMER -- On June 10, 1999, Linda Shirley reports seeing a UFO or more specifically lights over South Jersey. I thought at first I was seeing a very bright star in the late afternoon at early dusk. Linda says she saw the lights for only twenty seconds, they were hovering in the air. The lights were bright orange, round, and very bright. Then from a dead stop it descended all the way to the ground, at least it appeared to go to ground because I lost it behind the trees. When it started a direct descent I knew it was not a star. This is the first time I saw one in the daytime. Thanks to Linda Shirley of Elmer.

WANAUKE RESERVOIR -- Jim Cleary of New Jersey Sighting's Website has been investigating the recent action at the Wanaque Reservoir. He interviewed Mike who has always been interested in UFO's and stated, "What I've seen at the Reservoir at this point could fill a 200 page notebook. One time I went with some friends, and usually what we see is numerous lights just kind of sitting there in the sky. They are just above the horizon, fading or intensifying in luminosity and ever so slowly ascending or descending in position. But this time the lights are all sitting there, and I noticed off to our left in the sky is a light. I say to them "Hey check it out. There is one over there, and it turned off." Then I look right and I saw the light, but as I went to speak it shut off. So we were surrounded. That was interesting that time! As I said before usually its just lights that sit above the horizon and either fade in or out or go slowly up or down. If you are not patient you can easily be bored, as my friends often do. Cleary asks, "Would you characterize the lights you have seen mechanical craft of some type or do you think the lights are some types of visible energy phenomena caused by the Ramapoo fault?" Mike said, "There is no way I could tell for sure if they are either craft or energy, but from what I have observed it is my opinion that they are mechanical craft." Cleary asks, "Wanaque has many legends of strange things going on. Are you aware of any of them?" Mike stated, "DuPont has been in Wanaque since at least the 60's. There were a lot of incredible UFO sightings, including one where the UFO actually went into the Reservoir and didn't come out for a week. The Governor went to the schools and held town meetings saying that it was an asteroid. Thanks to Jim Cleary at New Jersey Sightings:

#### TEXAS

LAKE LEWISVILLE -- Amy Hebert reports that on June 6, 1999, I was in my back yard helping my daughter check on her turtle in our pond. I looked up to the west while talking with my daughter and noticed three, large, bright white lights in a row (horizontal) flying to the west at a steady speed at 1:10 PM. I assumed it was an airplane but something seemed strange about the three white lights. I kept watching it while talking to my daughter. Then suddenly three bright red lights emerged from the left side of the three white lights and flew south faster than an airplane would fly. The three bright white lights continued to fly off to the west until I lost sight of it behind the trees. The first object or the three white lights would have been over Lake Lewisville about the time the three red lights emerged. The three white lights were very bright and unusually big as were the three red lights that were a very, very bright red. The lights were not flashing or strobing. The lights were larger than a dime held at arm's length. Thanks to Amy Hebert:  
[yelorose@swbell.net](mailto:yelorose@swbell.net).

#### NEW MEXICO IS INVESTIGATING COW DEATHS

QUESTA -- Brendan Smith writes, No one is sure what killed a calf and two cows last month on the Tres Ritos Ranch, but ranch

manager Tom Reed definitely finds the deaths unusual. The last cow was found dead May 23, 1999, in a pasture near where a dead calf and a dead cow were found earlier in the month, Reed said. The last cow had its udder cleanly cut off and a deep hole with smoothly cut edges gouged into its neck. Each of the three animals had unexplained wounds and missing body parts, Reed said. The 8th Judicial District Attorney's Office takes cattle mutilations seriously, although no one has ever been charged with the crime, Assistant District Attorney John Day said. Dozens of reported cattle mutilations in northern New Mexico dating back to the 1970s have spawned theories about aliens sent to Earth to slice up cows. Gabe Valdez, a retired State Police officer who has investigated cattle mutilations near Dulce, said he is working with the District Attorney's Office in investigating the recent cattle deaths. Valdez is now a field investigator for the National Institute for Discovery Science, a private organization that has volunteered to pay for necropsies and lab tests on the dead cattle. The institute, based in Las Vegas, Nev., researches cattle mutilations, UFOs and reported encounters with aliens. Reed found the first dead cow on May 4 in a pasture on the 3,200 acre Tres Ritos Ranch. The cow's right eye and right ear were missing with a circular cut around the right ear extending down the neck, Reed said. "There were no tracks where she was injured or hurting and dragged herself around," Reed said, "She was just there." The calf was found dead four days later in the same area. The calf's right eye, tongue, and rump were missing and the genital area had been cut open, Reed said. The New Mexico Livestock Board investigated about 30 cattle mutilations in northern New Mexico in 1993 and 1994. The Livestock Board concluded most of the mutilations were not caused by predators or scavengers, but there was "possible involvement of clandestine Satanic groups." The institute has researched about a dozen unexplained cattle deaths in New Mexico or Utah, over the past 3 years, Kelleher said. After conducting necropsies and lab tests, some of those cattle deaths were determined to be caused by infectious disease, accidental poisoning from insecticides, or the work of predators or scavengers. "There are a small handful of mysterious cases for which there are no logical explanations," Kelleher said. Albuquerque Journal, 6/9/99

## UNITED KINGDOM

HOOTON -- John Hayes received this sighting report. The witness stated, "I am from England and on the 2nd of May this year, I saw a blue light above Hooton Leviet near Maltby near Rotherham. It was about 1:00 AM and I was camping in Kings Wood near by and it was just hovering above Hooton. There was no noise and then it moved left and then right and then it was gone. Thanks to: John Hayes [jhayes@cablenet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cablenet.co.uk) [webmaster@ufoinfo.com](mailto:webmaster@ufoinfo.com)

## SHETLAND ISLANDS RADAR SEES UFO

RAF SAXA VORD -- A retired Royal Air Force radar operator reports a strange UFO was captured on RAF radar in the winter of 1964-1965. Dave Ledger of UFO Scotland reports that he recently spoke (for the record) with an ex RAF member who was once based at the northern most Early Warning Radar tracking station at RAF Saxa Vord. The case was also documented by the Royal Air Force. Radar Operators observed a stationary return on their "Type 84" early warning radar, that gained their interest and curiosity. The flying object was observed sitting motionless at a height of approximately 20,000 feet by a "Type 13" radar height finder system. The radar return was a very strong signal that showed up clearly on the radar as a "real structured object." What caused immediate concern was that this particular object could not be readily identified by the personnel on duty. This was during the "cold war," so the personnel had to assume that this anomalous radar return was an incoming hostile craft. It was now approaching the North coast of Scotland from a northeasterly direction. There was no reply from the IFF (identification friend or foe system) so the unknown was treated by the on duty personnel as a hostile, possibly Russian. The unknown object slowly continued to approach toward the Scottish coast. An QRA alert was sent to the nearest interceptor base at RAF Leuchars in Fife. They scrambled two English Electric Lightning fighter aircraft to intercept and identify the incoming threat. The two Lightnings were vectored, via the ground controllers, towards the incoming bogey. As they approached the unknown, it became aware of the interceptors and climbed vertical, rapidly, directly up and up until it was lost on the height finder radar

at about 100,000 feet. The two radar operators just looked at each other, shook their heads and said "NO!" It is a well-known fact that no known aircraft on this planet at that time, had the capability of climbing to this altitude. The anomaly was definitely exhibiting intelligent control and was in his honest opinion: "Not one of ours!" These could have not been erroneous ground returns as this incident took place over the North Sea. The interceptors got nowhere near their targets but the whole incident still remains unexplained. Thanks to Dave Ledger UFO Scotland. Editor's Note: I had a similar intercept experience over England while flying for the US Air Force. When we got close, a hovering UFO also climbed at an astonishing rate.

#### HIGHEST GREENHOUSE GASES EVER

Rick Callahan an Associated Press writer reports. A two-mile-long ice core laboriously drilled out of an Antarctic ice sheet shows that levels of heat-trapping greenhouse gases are higher now than at any time in the past 420,000 years. As the longest ice core record of Earth's weather history obtained to date, the core also shows that those gases -- carbon dioxide and methane -- play a big role in warming the planet when ice ages end. But how this icy record will influence current theory about global warming blamed on human activity is not clear, the researchers said. The ice core gives us the past, not the future. "It's clear that greenhouse gas levels are unprecedented compared with the previous 400,000 years.'" The core was extracted from 1992 to 98 by a U.S.-Russian-French team at Russia's Vostok research station, the coldest spot on Earth. They stopped drilling about 120 yards short of a subterranean lake the size of Lake Ontario that's been trapped for millions of years beneath the ice sheet. Scientists want to send sterilized robots to explore the pristine lake and are protecting it from contamination until then. The new core reveals four ice ages at roughly 100,000-year intervals. All four appear to have given way to balmy times after levels of the heat-trapping gases carbon dioxide and methane rose by amounts smaller than the increase blamed on human industry in the past century. The multinational team reported its findings in the June 3 issue of the Journal Nature. They found carbon dioxide levels rose from 180 parts per million during each ice age's height to 280-300 ppm in the subsequent warm periods. This is far below the current CO2 levels of 360 ppm. Methane levels rose from 320-350 parts per billion during the icy interludes to 650-770 ppb during the warm spells. Current methane levels are 1,700 ppb. The levels of both greenhouse gases are expected to continue their rise due to continued burning of fossil fuels and other human activities. This study is the most persuasive evidence to date that humans are making really large changes to Earth's climate system," said Jonathan Overpeck, at the National Geophysical Data Center in Boulder. Thanks to Albuquerque Journal,  
<http://www.abqjournal.com/news/6news06-09.htm>

#### AUSTRALIA

BBC News Online Science Editor, Dr. David Whitehouse reports that: One of the most powerful searches for aliens in space is about to begin from Australia. It will simultaneously listen to 58 million radio channels. "The instrument is one of the most powerful in the world and it's going to sift the skies to look for artificial signatures from other intelligent civilizations, should they exist," says Dr. Frank Stootman, Chairman of SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence) Australia and Co-director of the Southern Serendip Project. "This is a very significant experiment that will contribute to testing some important scientific paradigms about the origin and development of self-conscious life in the universe," he added. Right time, right place The search for ET will use the Parkes telescope in New South Wales. The SETI Center has increased the number of radio channels it can listen to simultaneously from eight million to a staggering 58 million channels. Thanks to the BBC 6/9/99.

#### RUSSIA

ROSTOV-NA-DONU -- The UFO looked at first like Venus, but was much larger than any planet or star and it moves!" A Russian girl has filmed a possible UFO on a camcorder and the film was shown in a direct report to the Russian evening news ("RTV"-

Moskva "Russian TV" on June 2, 1999. According to a student at Rostov-na-Donu University, the UFO had a bright spherical form and was transforming in shape from time to time on the television monitored in Lithuania. Zoomed in video of the UFO were shown on Russian television. The announcer asked "Whether the UFO could be viewed at this time?" The girl responded, "UFO is at its former place, I see it." The mysterious has been observed by city inhabitants nightly for the last three days. Thanks to Anatoly Kutovoy, [kutovoj@mail.iae.lt](mailto:kutovoj@mail.iae.lt) who translated especially for Filer's Files.

1952, AIR FORCE INTELLIGENCE STUDY IS REVEALING

Joel Carpenter writes that USAF's Stefan T. Possony was a visionary theoretician. He would propose a lot of ideas for the sake of analysis. This didn't necessarily mean that because he committed an idea to paper, he was advocating it. His Air Force Intelligence Special Studies Group was organized to look at "out there" concepts. The whole point was to consider ideas that other intelligence components might think were unlikely, if they even looked at them at all. His hypothesis about a possible relationship between UFOs and meteors was just a hypothesis, and I don't think many scientists took it seriously. It's very clear from Possony's other papers that what he really suspected was that UFOs were Soviet secret weapons. I wouldn't get hung up on the statements about cloud seeding, global warming, and UFOs being a possible threat. Possony DID think UFOs were a possible threat - probably from the USSR. The following Secret memo to the head of USAF Intelligence is revealing:

SECRET: 1 August 1952  
MEMORANDUM FOR GENERAL SAMFORD  
SUBJECT: USAF Interest in Flying Saucers.

At the risk of boring you with a tedious subject, I want to submit a few ideas which may be helpful in making a proper decision. What are the Flying Saucers? It is a well-established heuristic principle that the unknown must be made intelligible by referring to the known. If we ask the question: "What known phenomena bear the greatest similarity to saucers?" The answer seems to be that saucer behavior follows the pattern of electromagnetic phenomena. Assuming for the time being, that the saucers are a natural phenomenon of some electromagnetic kind, and accepting the fact that saucer phenomena have occurred at infrequent intervals throughout history, we should inquire as to the cause of the increased frequency of the occurrence. (The increase is about 4000-fold from 19th-century reports, though elimination from current sightings would tend to reduce this figure). Since the increase in sightings started in 1946-7, it may be fruitful to tie the sightings to events preceding them and of which there were no counterparts at earlier periods. Prior to the upsurge in saucer sightings, the following new activities took place: 1. The carrying of radioactive particles into the upper atmosphere by means of atomic explosions and production; 2. The penetration of the upper atmosphere by guided missiles, new types of balloons, and perhaps aircraft; 3. The production of shock waves at higher altitude, due to the breaching of the sound barrier; 4. The increased output in radio and radar signals, including television; 5. The seeding of clouds for purposes of weather control; 6. The great increase in commercial and private flying. Moreover, the present era is characterized by a general "warming up" of the climate in the northern hemisphere. Furthermore, the solar system may be passing through an area in the universe where there is a great deal of debris and where, therefore, an increase in the intensity of the meteoric bombardment may be expected.

It is probable that flying saucers are not caused by any single one of these factors, but by a convergence of causes. If the saucers are really electromagnetic phenomena, there is a possibility that they are connected primarily with atomic activities, and that they are caused by the encounter=

of radioactive particles and small meteors. In other words, they may be ionized air brought about by the entry of very small meteors into the atmosphere. During burn-up of the meteor metal, the natural degree of ionization may be increased greatly through available radioactive particles,=

with the possible result that after the destruction of the metallic core, there would be a gaseous rotating ion ball subject to movements in the

atmosphere. This "interpretation" occurred to me after an illuminating discussion with General Maxwell, and I emphasize it merely to indicate what=

type of approach the Air Force should take in tackling the phenomena. Incidentally, there was no temperature inversion in Washington for a long time, and therefore, the mirage theory does not explain the latest= sightings.

What is the Air Force interest?

1. The Air Force continuously will be "on the carpet" as long as no satisfactory explanation can be given. Should the saucer activity increase, pressure by the press and even Congress will be quite considerable.
2. We cannot yet rule out entirely that saucers do represent a threat.
3. If there is any validity to the assumption that the saucers are partly the result of atomic activity, the phenomenon would tie in directly with long range detection and if solved, might lead to an increase in our intelligence capability...

I suggest therefore, that before the ATIC program be undertaken, a very small panel of scientists be brought together and be briefed on the documentation which is in the files right now. Stefan T. Possony. Thanks to Joel Carpenter for obtaining this previously classified Air Force Document.

July 2-4, 30th Annual MUFON 1999 International UFO Symposium at Hyatt Regency Crystal City Hotel in Arlington Virginia. E-mail [mufonhg@aol.com](mailto:mufonhg@aol.com)

GET THE BEST REALTORS and help me continue to bring these files to you since my old 486 computer is barely working. As a special aid to our readers, I can find you with the best real estate experts in your area at no cost to you from two of the largest firms. When you obtain your own agent, do you really know their experience level and expertise? How good a producer are they? I can provide you free relocation information and top agents from the largest and most respected real estate firms. There is no cost to you. If you are planning to sell or buy a home and would like a top flight real estate agent call me at 609 654-0020 or-mail [majorstar@aol.com](mailto:majorstar@aol.com) or. Please provide your name, phone #, address, price, and location.

MUFON JOURNAL For more detailed investigative reports subscribe by writing to 103 Oldtowne Road, Sequin, TX 78155-4099 or E-mail [Mufon@aol.com](mailto:Mufon@aol.com). Filer's Files Copyright 1998 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post items from the Files on their Websites provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue that the item appeared. Send your letters to me at [Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com). If you wish to keep your name confidential please so state.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [webmaster](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

From: Joe Murgia <[Ufojoel@aol.com](mailto:Ufojoel@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:11:14 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 01:55:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

>From: Mike Wootten <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture  
>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 22:07:54 +0100

>>From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
>>To: Errol Knapp <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture  
>>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:46:21 +0100

>>Max Burns gave his much talked about lecture on Saturday (5th  
>>June). The talk was detailed and was constructive, the talk

<snip>

>>Thanks to Malcolm for this one.....

>That "much talked about lecture" only attracted 35 people to a  
>venue that holds over 100 in the centre of London. Just shows  
>how marginal the lecture was and BUFORA currently is...

>Mike Wootten

If only one person showed up, that has nothing to do with how  
good or bad the lecture was. I've been to incredible lectures  
with only 15 people in attendance and I've been to awful  
lectures with over 200 people in attendance.

Review the lecture in detail if you're going to knock it.

Joe in Tampa

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 99 14:20:16 PDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 03:06:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:12:05 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 99 19:38:05 PDT

Dennis,

>>In fact, Maury Island tells us just how  
>>honest a guy Arnold was. To those of us who look back at it, it  
>>seems transparently obvious that Crisman and Dahl were lying  
>>through their respective chops.

>So much for those statutes of limitation! But I guess nothing  
>Arnold said or wrote can be called into question by anyone?

It was the view of on-site investigators, prominently including the ill-fated Brown and Davidson, that Crisman and Dahl were pulling a fast one on a naive Arnold. See, for example, Ruppelt's account. The officers actually felt sorry for Arnold and thus chose not to share their conclusions with him, for fear of embarrassing the guy. In short, I am not exactly engaging in revisionism here.

It was also the view of Air Force investigators, reporters, and others who interacted with Arnold at the time of his sighting that he was a straight, sober, reliable guy. Not to point too fine a point on it, but: no fruitcake. I see nothing that supports a revisionist reading of Arnold's personality. I do see things that look to me like a trashing of a decent man who suffered enough already.

>>Arnold was such a straight  
>>arrow that it never occurred to him his "witnesses" might not be  
>>the same. Sadly, years of ridicule and harassment led him to a  
>>considerably darker view of his fellow humans. I guess we can be  
>>happy that he is not around to read this new round of  
>>Arnold-bashing.

>>Unlike you, I knew Arnold, who was all he was cracked up to be:  
>>sharp, honest, shrewd, conservative, and unimaginative. Not, in  
>>short, a fruitcake by any definition except, I gather, yours.  
>>His interest in UFOs as such was long past, but he did take the  
>>trouble to answer my questions about various claims attributed  
>>to him. One, which first surfaced in a Harold T. Wilkins book,  
>>was a supposed quote asserting that Arnold had observed evidence  
>>of invisible entities in his home. He said the story was a  
>>flat-out fabrication. He had no idea where it came from.

>Glad to have the information. But if Arnold was really so sharp  
>and shrewd, how were Dahl and Crisman able to take him in so  
>easily?

I think I've already answered that question. Arnold was very sharp at practical matters (which is why he was such a good observer that fateful June 24), but evidently, in dealing with pathological liars and other extreme personality types, he was capable of being fooled -- as indeed any of us can be when we run into somebody who plays by no discernible ethical rules. Thus, as I'm sure you agree (though you brought up Maury Island in the first place, as if it might somehow be relevant to the sighting question), Maury Island and the Mount Rainier encounter with still-unexplained objects are two entirely separate questions.

I might add as a footnote here that in his later years, which is when I knew him, Arnold had grown bitter and suspicious, trusting practically nobody. It was a sad consequence of years of abuse and harassment.

>I'm sorry you think this is an exercise in nothing more than  
>Arnold bashing. History is a process in constant revision. For  
>but one example, see the revision of the career of  
>anthropologist Margaret Mead. For all I know, she was a  
>perfectly remarkable and upstanding person face to face, but  
>that doesn't render her immune to error. Arnold, alas, is not  
>immune, either.

I guess it's not revisionism as such that I'm objecting to, just the unpersuasive nature of some of the arguments I've seen in recent weeks re the Arnold case. One has the impression with some correspondents that their real target is not Arnold, who is just a means to an end, which is the demolition of the UFO phenomenon generally. Maybe the theory is that if you kill the messenger, the message will die, too.

>Arnold claimed he filmed two UFOs, one of which was transparent.  
>I asked what happened to the film. If your answer, as a UFO  
>historian, is that "we don't know, Arnold never printed any  
>stills from the film, nor did he ever, as far as is known, make  
>the film publicly available for inspection," then, fine, that's  
>history's answer. Cut and print. If your answer is, "I don't  
>know, who cares, and on top of that I'm sick of all this Arnold  
>bashing, and Stacy quacks like a suspiciously anti-UFO duck in  
>the bargain," well, then, that's your (and no doubt Rudiak's)  
>answer. Cut and print. The choice is yours.

My choice: full access to everything Arnold had. The reality: virtually all of it got burned up by the late Mrs. Arnold years ago. I am not the guy, by the way, to lecture to on this matter, since some years ago I tried very hard to get access to everything, including the film, before one of Arnold's daughters finally told me that the stuff no longer existed.

>The last time I looked, historians had an obligation to the  
>truth as it can best be determined, not to choosing sides in a  
>perceived squabble.

Well, I'm all in favor of truth, which often forces one to take sides. If you think historians don't take sides and pot shots at each other, you're a lot less intellectually sophisticated than in fact I know you are.

Incidentally, let me put in a plug for that terrific book you and Hilary Evans put together. It's one of the few UFO books of this decade that people will want to read (or reread) in decades to come. It's also one of the relative handful of 1990s UFOs book not to insult one's intelligence. You have every right to be proud of it. I know I'm proud to be a contributor to it.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)



**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: High Flying Pelicans

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 16:28:16 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 13:38:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: High Flying Pelicans

>Date: Sun, 6 Jun 1999 22:01:40 -0400  
>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

In my last message, regarding the PH (pelican hypothesis)  
I wrote:

>At the left side of the paper near the middle place a point.  
>That is Arnold's starting position. Let north be "up" on the  
>graph paper. Draw a line from Arnold's starting position at a  
>azimuth of 15 degrees. This is approximately the  
>direction to Mt. Baker.

The direction to Mt Baker is approximately 6 degrees. The 15  
degree azimuth must be considered an arbitrary starting direction  
that is roughly consistent with Arnold's claim that the objects  
were first seen "coming from the vicinity of Mt. Baker."

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

## A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

### Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

From: **Tony Spurrier** <[TSpurrier@compuserve.com](mailto:TSpurrier@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 14:22:18 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 15:19:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 18:05:09 -0700 (PDT)  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>,  
>From: Jim Deardorff <[deardorj@proaxis.com](mailto:deardorj@proaxis.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Crop Circle Characteristics - 'Real' vs. Fake

>Well, like Clinton, I would need to know what you mean by  
>"present." They have of course already presented themselves to  
>thousands of abductees and to the legitimate contactees. But  
>they've left only meager evidence behind. So perhaps what you  
>mean is, will they do so (in August), this time leaving all  
>kinds of irrefutable evidence behind? I doubt it; their  
>escalation in degree of firmness and abundance of evidence seems  
>to be growing only gradually over the years.

Jim

I wasn't making a statement, I was asking what you thought of the  
eclipse type designs and your interpretation of them.

>No, I don't know Doug and Dave's address.

Do you really think Doug and Dave were the only one's who  
made crop circles?

>I do know that one usually receives only silence or a change  
>of subject upon posing the question to skeptics.

I wasn't referring to sceptics in general I was talking about  
those that opening admit to making circles.

>So I'll stay tuned for any idea you  
>put forth on how it could be feasibly accomplished for a circle  
>as large as 57 feet in diameter. It was probably no accident  
>that the upper-layer circle of swirled stems did not entirely  
>cover the under layer at the circumference -- if they had, the  
>lower lower might not have been discovered.

Looking at the diagram it looks as though the crop was flattened  
from the centre spiralling out and then back to the middle and  
so on. Continue that until all the crop was flattened and you'd  
end up with the effect of layering described in the book. As the  
crop was packed down and serrated at the edges it's possible it  
was done with a roller rather than boards.

>I would not assume that the tests haven't been made by Levingood  
>on stems from oil-seed rape crop circles.

Why do you think that is?

>No, I didn't see that. I was referring to certain crop-circle  
>reports wherein the stems within a given formation were all bent  
>over at the \*same\* approximate height, like 1" or 2" or 4" above  
>the ground, as opposed to the usual 1/4" or so, which trampling  
>on it can try to simulate.

Have you got the details of the formation/s where the crop is  
all flattened at 4" above the ground?

>I was referring to those hundreds of crop circles over the years that

>have been astounding in their size, complexity, creative design,  
>bending-over of the stems with minimal breakage, and other  
>features such as braiding.

I agree, the human circle makers can really create some  
fantastic designs and effects.

>Their makers were never caught, whereas common sense dictates  
>that if humans had done them, a substantial percentage would  
>have been caught in the act, and/or have left tell-tale signs  
>behind.

Not really, once in the dark your eyes adjust pretty quickly,  
particularly when there aren't any light sources around the  
affect the pupils. In the dark circle makers are probably  
undetected 200 foot or so into the crop, now given that  
Wiltshire is a pretty large county the odds really are in their  
favour.

Tony

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 10](#)

## Re: UK UFO Weekend

From: **Tony Spurrier** <[TSpurrier@compuserve.com](mailto:TSpurrier@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 14:20:23 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 15:28:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: UK UFO Weekend

In case you missed last weekend's UK UFO Weekend in the UFO Forum, and/or enjoy a good conspiracy<g>, here are some quotes from the guests, as well as the library where the transcripts can be found. <http://go.compuserve.com/ufo>

Nick Pope: "...UFOs are of extreme defence significance..."

Transcript: Experiencers/Contact Library

Tom Cary: "It's hand-sized...but it's the "memory metal" ... you fold it up and it flows out like water ... This is INDISPUTABLE proof..."

Transcript: Crashes/Roswell Library

Nick Redfern: "..there are far more covert departments and agencies in the UK investigating UFOs than the Government would have us believe..."

Transcript:Conspiracy Library

Matthew Williams: ".. Rudloe Manor...This promises to be an interesting look at the way the base is secured and the lies that are put out as fronts for the work that goes on there."

Transcript:Conspiracies Library

<http://go.compuserve.com/ufo>  
<http://go.compuserve.com/paranormal>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



MoD and RAF had investigated. This, according to reports, involved a crash by some vehicle, in the wreckage of which there were two badly burned corpses, each about 4 feet tall."

BUFOS were asked about this case but they could only refer to "an incident in Norway in the 1960s" which they thought was an early space mission with apes, that had gone wrong.

Does anyone know anything else about the corpses found by the RAF twenty years ago? It did strike me that it could have been a confabulation of the Berwyn Mountain crash case of January 1974, but I don't think there was that much interest in the case, in terms of a crashed spaceship, until the 1990s.

Could this be another smoking gun, or just another garbled rumour?

#### Reference

1. Power, Tim. "Watch out for a UFO breakthrough", Evening Express (Aberdeen), 9 March 1979

#### LITERARY CRITICISM

Jonathan Downes and Nigel Wright. The Rising of the Moon: The Devonshire UFO Triangle, Domra Publications, 1999. No price given

This is an unusual UFO book by any standards. It begins with Jonathan Downes drowning his sorrows in whisky and pills, and ends with him going into psychotherapy. In between there is a heady brew of Fort, Keel, Holiday, Crowley and Lovecraft mixed with the authors' own research into unexplained events in Devonshire.

They show that the outside world can be as wild and insane as our own minds; UFOs, mystery animals, MIB, poltergeists, monsters, merfolk and pixies have pranced and paraded all over Devonshire for many a long year. Wright and Downes's investigations and research are candid and amusing. In 1997 they attended the BBC Radio Devon stand at the Devon County Show and, amongst Spice Girls impersonators and prize bulls, they talked about UFOs and a friend marched around as a grey alien. Another friend, Richard Freeman, claims that his worship of a spider-god caused a plague of these creatures in Yorkshire. And there is plenty more weird stuff to please a saucer full of hippies.

Given the sensational nature of such topics, and the circumstances of their research, lots of useful, intriguing and detailed local reports are compared and contrasted with theories and cases beyond Devonshire. There are a few odd holes in their research, though. For example, they refer to the British 1909 airship scare as being "not satisfactorily dealt with elsewhere". There are quite a few useful articles on this subject, but this only highlights the fact that ufological work has to be continually rediscovered, due to a lack of bibliographic and archive resources. Despite this, the authors put the phantom airship cases they do find into their proper social context and highlight the fact that such phenomena are not seen in isolation.

It is also a surprise to find them demolishing several of the cases they present earlier in the book, and they certainly have no love for the circus surrounding Roswell or the ETH. They do not dismiss the ETH entirely, but they postulate that UFOs and other Fortean phenomena are caused by energy forms that feed off human emotions. They call this Odylic Liferforce Energy which comes from the Wilhelm Reich school of mystical ufology. Whether such energy vampires exist is an entertaining idea but the authors rightly and artfully cop out by saying their book is "based on personal experience rather than a scientific treatise". A good read anyway.

Nigel Watson

Sarah Moran. Alien Art: Extraterrestrial Expressions on Earth, Bramley Books, 1998. =9C12.99

Like one of his beloved sky gods, Erich von Daniken and his ancient astronaut theories have reappeared on our planet. As proof, this is a picture book of his greatest hits. We get glossy pictures of the Nazca Lines, Japanese figurines, Mayan

pyramids, Costa Rica balls and all the usual suspects.

What puzzles me is if half of these sculptures, carvings, monuments and structures are true remains of alien, or alien-inspired, work, why didn't they leave something a bit more convincing than a bunch of rocks pointing at a star, or carvings of people in funny hats? Sure enough, the construction of many of these artifacts is often remarkable and impressive but not beyond the efforts of humanity. Even a dedicated believer doesn't have to look far to find alternative and more mundane explanations for these objects.

At first appearances this book is a pleasant and uncritical look at ancient astronautics. What is more worrying is Moran's scepticism of Darwinian evolution; the last words of her book are: "Is it so much harder to contemplate that we may have been influenced by visitors from the skies, than that we somehow evolved from an elusive missing link with monkeys? An open mind is all we need." With open minds like that we could all fall into a bottomless pit of gullibility. At least monkeys exist in reality; the space gods or aliens are just a fancy concept.

I don't think science is omnipotent, and there are flaws in Darwinian theory, and it is refreshing that "establishment science" is not slavishly venerated and respected. Charles Fort certainly made it his life's work poking holes and fun at pompous scientists and their precious dogmas. The only problem now is that anyone can kick a stone or read a book, and before you can say "George Adamski" they become an expert who knows better than qualified scientists. Then again, some qualified scientists have weirder ideas than a room full of drunken rabbits. So the point of this argument is that this book is just an excuse for pretty pictures and vacuous questions that pander to brainless dolts.

To summarise: A nice picture book for believers who pray on their knees to von Daniken and swallow his extraterrestrial ejaculations.

Nigel Watson

---

#### LETTERS

Martin Kottmeyer's "Betty Hill's Medical Nightmare" (MMS, No. 12, February 1999) is an absurd bit of speculative overreaching totally unworthy of him. Unlike many of my colleagues on the "pro-UFO" side of the fence, I happen to think Marty has given us some important insights that ufologists would be foolish to ignore. These are best summed up as, "Be very, very careful in teasing out and evaluating the testimony of UFO percipients or alleged percipients. If their experiences were real, never forget that what witnesses think they see during startling and strange experiences is "framed" by their life experiences, and among the most important influences are popular culture and high-profile current events. Maybe what they saw wasn't quite like they remember it. Further, if the witnesses weren't witnesses at all, but hoaxers or dupes instead, then clues to what inspired the hoax and/or its content are likely to be found in popular culture, etc." Sound advice.

Taking one of Kottmeyer's most famous suggestions as an example, suppose Barney Hill did see an alien being with compelling eyes staring down at him on the night of 19 September 1961 (I happen to think he did). However, suppose he also saw that Outer Limits episode featuring "the eyes that speak" just a few days before Dr Simon hypnotically probed his CE-III experience. Barney's recollections that day may well have been importantly influenced by what he'd seen on TV. Thus, if we can't prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Barney didn't see "The Bellerophon Shield", we're left with having to suspend judgement on the accuracy of Barney's description of the "captain", though not necessarily the experience itself.

Regrettably, Kottmeyer almost invariably does himself and the value of his thinking a disservice by trying to make his approach do too much, as in "Medical Nightmare". Without any evidence - none! - he assumes Betty was consumed by fears of radioactive bomb-test fallout, inspired by the not so Lucky Dragon incident, etc., etc., even stating without qualification



that she had an "understandable [radiation] anxiety". (Where did you come up with this intelligence, Marty? Pray, do tell us.) Without a shred of supporting evidence or testimony, he links this presumed anxiety with Betty's compass-needle test of the car and the mysterious spots (not actually suggested by a physicist, by the way), Betty's and the "leader"'s discussion of earthly foods, the nature of the physical exams and biological sample collection to which she and Barney were subjected, and so on. Even more tenuously, he suggests the false-teeth episode was born of bits of nearly 12-year-old wire-service stories of dead saucer pilots with perfect teeth tucked away in Betty's subconscious. (At least the Outer Limits episode was broadcast only days before Barney's recall of the compelling, wrap-around eyes!) And so on, and on, and on.

In a letter earlier this year, Kottmeyer told me his "interest in ufology is mainly in the nature of a mental hobby akin to solving crossword puzzles". While the products of such mental gymnastics can be useful when applied to real-world data whose relevancy is solidly established, they are worse than useless when wielded without such a connection. Marty, with respect, if you can't plausibly marry up theories and facts, stick to crosswords.

Karl T. Pflock,  
Placitas, New Mexico

Dear Karl:

Your challenge to me to come up with evidence that Betty was consumed by fears of radioactive bomb-test fallout associated with Project Bravo is misguided. I did not say she feared fallout from any test. I said she feared she had been exposed to radiation during the UFO encounter. The quote, "She almost panicked . . ." and the claim that she was haunted by the thought she had been exposed to radioactivity appear on pp. 39 and 40 of The Interrupted Journey and I consider that synonymous with anxiety.

I have never denied Barney had an experience. You have termed the claim of influence by "The Bellerose Shield" a "mere nit" elsewhere. Donald Keyhoe singled out the sinister look of the eyes as something that needed to be fully explained and doubtless would praise you for correcting his misimpression of its import. Still, it is not the effects on the assessment of the Hill case that made the finding interesting to me, it was the fact that many post-Hill cases also claimed that aliens had wraparound eyes. Your faith that Barney saw eyes that were "compelling" is puzzling. When I laid out the paper trail for Bullard, he agreed that this particular description does not appear ("The Eyes Still Speak", REALL News, June/July 1998, available on the REALL website).

That the connection of the false teeth episode in the Hill case to the Koehler yarn is tenuous is true, but quite beside the point. The whole exercise was an attempt to show an alternative explanation is possible, not that it was certain. Mack was implying that alternative interpretations of alien medical procedures were not even conceivable. I showed it was not as difficult as he thought. Let me interject that if we accept certain claims that abductions have been happening since before the turn of the century and in massive numbers, the surprise shown over the dentures is a bit odd. Sixty-plus years and they haven't seen dentures before?

In saying stick to crosswords, you presume I do crosswords in the present tense. I have not done any in probably 15 or 20 years. I used to like them, but interests change.

Martin S. Kottmeyer,  
Carlyle, Illinois

First, with respect to your declaration that, to your knowledge, there are no cases with multiple independent witnesses "which cannot be explained with reference to sightings of aircraft or natural phenomena", I find it hard to believe you are not aware of many such cases. So I suspect this was a ploy to draw out ETHers, case lists in hand.

Of course, such sightings are numerous, many of them very

significant in terms of the ETH or, at least, encounters with non-human technology. I'll cite just three of my favourites: (1) 12 August 1953, Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, multiple ground and airborne visual and radar, with apparent UFO reaction to witness actions (see Ruppelt, The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects, pp. 232-235 in Doubleday hardcover, pp. 304-308 in Ace paperback); (2) 30 June 1950, near Kingman, Kansas, multiple ground visual CE-I/II, with apparent UFO reaction to witness actions (see Gross, UFOs: A History - April-July 1950, pp. 66-70); (3) 17 July 1957, over Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas and Oklahoma, multiple airborne and ground radar visual, with radar-emitting UFO and apparent UFO reactions to witness activity (see Brad Sparks, "RB-47 Radar Visual Case", in Clark, The UFO Encyclopedia, 2nd Edition, pp. 761-790).

Second, "Betty Hill's Medical Nightmare" redux, reply to Martin Kottmeyer's rejoinder:

I didn't suggest Kottmeyer claimed Betty "feared fallout from any test" but rather that his suggestion that Betty was primed to fear exposure to radiation by the fallout paranoia of the time - the inescapable meaning of what you wrote, Marty - is offered without a single fact to back it up.

As for the compelling eyes, I misspoke, or "mistyped". What I should have written was that, from the beginning of the investigation in 1961, it was clear Barney Hill was deeply affected emotionally by what seemed to him the intense focus of the UFO "captain". Quoting from Walter Webb's 26 October 1961 report on the case, recounting his interview with the Hills on 19 October: "The "leader" at the window held a special attraction for the witness and frightened him terribly. The witness said he could almost feel this figure's intense concentration to do something, to carry out a plan. Mr Hill believed he was going to be captured "like a bug in a net.""

Whether the leader had compelling eyes or not, it's clear from the outset, well before the "Belloero Shield" and hypnosis, Barney Hill found the figure he saw frighteningly compelling. As I noted in my previous letter to MMS, we are indebted to Marty Kottmeyer for pointing out the "Belloero Shield" problem and thus the need to suspend judgement or at least be very cautious about the eyes that spoke, but only the eyes. I don't recall referring to the possible influence of this Outer Limits episode as a "mere nit", but if I did (sounds like me), I was wrong.

Kottmeyer's point about claims of alien abduction subsequent to the Hill case reflecting key features of that case as it has been recounted is well taken and now well recognised in ufology, in no small degree thanks to Marty. Equally well taken is his case against John Mack's sweeping assertion about alien medical procedures. However, I stand by my criticism of his article with respect to the Hill case. While I am pleased to have Marty's clarification of his intent, the fact remains that, without this clarification, we can only read what he did say, not what he meant to say.

Karl T. Pflock

=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=  
=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=  
=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D

Mark Pilkington

"A heathen perhaps, but not, I hope, an unenlightened one."  
Lord Summerisle

-----  
Magonia Online

<http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk>

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 12](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 16:04:15 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 11:03:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 18:05:01 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes.

>>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 11:21:11 -0400  
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto >[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 23:40:42 -0500  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto >[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>From: Dennis Stacy >[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>>.Parchment Parachutes

>>Dennis,

>>You suggest that his reliability with respect to later sightings  
>>is an indicator of his reliability during his first sighting. >.

>>This is not necessarily true. I have noticed that witnesses  
>>sometimes become less reliable in the sense that once they have  
>>been "radicalized" by the discovery that there really is  
>>something strange "out there" they become more likely to believe  
>>that any following sighting they can't explain might be related  
>>to the first, i.e., another saucer.>

>Bruce,

>Unlike almost everyone who followed in his wake, Arnold was  
>operating without any UFO baggage when he reported his first  
>sighting. As best I can tell, he thought he saw high-speed  
>military aircraft, not necessarily something interplanetary or  
>overly strange "out there.">

>It's only my own personal opinion, but the first Arnold sighting  
>has always struck me as being of the nature of almost too good  
>to be true. Something exceedingly startling happens, and rather  
>than being transfixed or mesmerized by events, Arnold  
>immediatley goes into measurement mode. He does everything  
>right: notes distant features, pulls out his watch, compares the

>pocket, after first comparing same to a distant DC-4  
>(convenient, that), rolls down his window and turns parallel to  
>the objects to make sure they're not reflections, etc., each and  
>every base covered. Airtight and snap right. All the while  
>concerned with flying his own airplane. >

>Can't say it didn't happen that way, just always wondered if it  
>really did.

If you read Arnold's letter to the air force you will see that  
he thought he was doing no more than any pilot would do. He says  
pilots are interested in speeds...and s he thought he would  
clock the speed.

Did he do "everything right" while flying the plane?

He said the flying was so smooth he simply trimmed out the plane on its flight toward Yakima (set adjustments for speed, altitude) and let it fly itself while he enjoyed the scenery.

He did this BEFORE the sighting began.

Hence by the time of th sighting (a few minutes or so after he trimmed out his plane heading toward Yakima, according to the letter to the Air Force) it was not necessary for him to pay 100% attention to flying th airplane.

He could do other things such as wonder about those strange airplanes way over there flying so close to Mt. Rainier in an odd echelon arrangement and he could wonder us how fast these new Army jets could go..... etc.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same

From: Don Allen <[dona@amigo.net](mailto:dona@amigo.net)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 23:09:36 -0600  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 08:44:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same

>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 02:02:41  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>Subject: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same Packets Of Data

>Source: Wired News,

><http://www.wired.com>:80/news/print\_version/technology/story/20088.html?wnpg=  
>all

>Computer users who are contributing to the SETI (search for  
>alien life) project are inadvertently wasting CPU cycles by  
>processing data that has already been scanned.

>Due to failures in coping with the overwhelming response from  
>volunteers, the SETI@home project has been erroneously sending  
>the same packets of radio data to its 500,000 participants.

Thanks for posting this article. It explains why I've been  
processing the same packet from a few days ago and also why my  
processed units stats haven't been getting updated. I was just  
about ready to delete Seti off my machine.

Don

---

"Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God" - Thomas Jefferson

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [seti](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 99 20:06:44 PDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 12:30:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 00:47:07 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 99 19:38:05 PDT

>>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 18:17:16 -0500  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

C'mon, Dennis,

>Corroborative by what standards of corroboration?

>You leave the misleading impression that Johnson saw the exact  
>same thing that Arnold did at the exact same time, and in the  
>exact same place -- more or less -- thereby confirming and/or  
>corroborating Arnold's original account.

>Yet your own account of the Johnson sighting, based on a letter  
>he wrote the Air Force two months after the fact (UFO  
>Encyclopedia, Vol. I, p. 141), is full of qualifiers ("they  
>may...he could well have seen," etc.). So which is it?

The point remains. You said there is no corroboration for  
Arnold's account, beyond his own -- to most of us who don't  
quack like anti-UFO ducks -- impressive testimony. You were  
wrong. Johnson was at the right time and the right to place to  
see Arnold's UFOs. He thought that he saw Arnold's UFOs, and an  
FBI interviewer characterized him as "a very reliable  
individual." (No doubt you know better and will let us know  
what a fruitcake and/or sociopath the man was.) The rest of you  
may be interested in a useful discussion of the relationship of  
Johnson's testimony to Arnold's; see Bruce Maccabee's article in  
IUR, May/June 1995.

>Moreover, ufology is replete with cautionary tales.

Ufology is also replete with puzzling, well-investigated cases  
which continue to resist explanation. One of them is Arnold's.  
The sorts of stories you cite below are notable in being so  
rare, if one puts them in the context of UFO-reporting  
generally. On the other hand, if one considers that they are  
both photographic cases -- which long experience has taught us  
are far more likely to be bogus than other sorts of UFO reports,  
where hoaxing is relatively infrequent -- they're not rare at  
all. To the contrary, the negative resolution of these claims  
should not surprise any sophisticated observer.

>Mark Cashman, who I greatly respect, recently revealed in IUR that  
>the 1965 (?) Beaver, Pennsylvania, photos were unaltered  
>fakes. Until that time, however, he had the photo(s) on his web

>page, subject to all sorts of luminosity analysis and other  
>"corroborative" evidence. The only problem, in the end, was that  
>the original account didn't match up with the phenomenon. In  
>fact, there was no phenomenon.

>For another instructive story, read physicist Irwin Wieder's  
>account of the discovery that the infamous 1966 Willamette Pass,  
>Oregon, photo was also a patent hoax. Why did it take so long to  
>explain same? Because, as Wieder so bravely admitted, given the  
>witness's confirmed credentials, he was perfectly contented to  
>remain on automatic pilot, what he referred to as "a pure belief  
>mode." Again, the account and the (non-existent in this case)  
>phenomenon weren't exactly a one-to-one match up, because,  
>again, there was no stimulating phenomenon.

>Does this mean, ipso facto, that Arnold is in the same league?  
>Of course not. Does it mean that he could be? I'll leave that  
>up to you to decide.

Let's get this straight. First you were intimating that Arnold  
was a fruitcake (or that this is a reasonable possibility). Now  
you're intimating that he's a hoaxer (or that this is a  
reasonable possibility). Which is it?

>By the same token, there's no compelling reason, granted Clark's  
>exalted UFO theology (in which witnesses are never confused  
>about anything, but always spot on), to argue that Arnold  
>shouldn't ascend to ufological sainthood post haste. Hey, the  
>guy was only human.

For those of you who need a translation of the above:

If you don't subscribe to the doctrine that UFO witnesses exist  
to be trashed, however speciously, you're a theologian. One  
might call this the New New Ufology, or maybe just quack logic.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 16:30:47 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 12:45:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 23:18:12 -0400  
>Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:22:39 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

Regarding:

>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 21:29:44 -0300  
>From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>I've been a bit put off by the impression being floated, by  
>>some, that Arnold was some kind of dolt who was frittering  
>>around the mountains with no particular idea of where he was,  
>>didn't know birds from jets, couldn't estimate distances or work  
>>out a speed/time problem, despite the fact that he would have  
>>done them dozens of times during each flight.

>Very much appreciated. It doesn't follow that Kenneth Arnold was  
>an idiot if he made an exited, two minute, error of judgement.

Typical Easton vagueness. What errors of judgment? Explain IN  
DETAIL (not handwaving) how such errors of judgment allow birds  
to explain the sighting.

Since Arnold was MOVING at 100 mph+, for anything to fly past  
him on a parallel course they have to be flying faster than  
this. Even extremely gross errors in distance estimates or  
altitude don't affect this fundamental fact, something Easton  
apparently can't get through his head.

So for Arnold to have thought that "pelicans" were flying  
forward of his position instead of falling behind him, as they  
would have to because of lesser air speed, he would indeed have  
been an idiot.

>>I believe that it was Bruce that wondered if birds could fly at  
>>6,000 or was it 9,000? feet. My Flight Supplement cautions  
>>pilots to watch out for Canada Geese at 32,000 feet when they  
>>are migrating. If I remember correctly a DC-3 struck a bird over  
>>Mount Everest during WW II while flying the "hump" as they  
>>called it.

>I had checked out the altitude probabilities for migrating  
>American White Pelicans long ago and it seems they're known to  
>reach 14,000 feet during migration.

All very interesting, but hardly relevant. Above him, below  
him, even with him, it doesn't matter. We're still waiting for  
Easton's explanation of how these pelicans outflew Arnold's  
plane. But I'm afraid we're all going to have to wait until  
hell freezes over.

>One reference featuring airplanes came from Ann Johnson: "When  
>they come migrating through, there are frequently flocks that  
>literally disappear from view as they bank and the sun is no

>longer reflecting directly on them. Put the binocs on them and  
>there they are. But being a lousy judge of distance, I have no  
>idea how high they are. Much higher than the airplanes on  
>approach and they are still 10 miles out. You can put the  
>numbers on that".

So Easton can put numbers on that, but not Arnold's sighting  
from the air with landmarks as references and some  
instrumentation for airspeed, direction, and time.

What's a 10 foot wigspar at 10 miles? Why only .65 minarc,  
nothing but a nondescript dot with no features and no appearance  
of size.

>>Another observation. We'll probably never know what Arnold saw  
>>that day as is true of many other cases..

>Of course, that's exactly what I said in the newsletter.

Uh, the rest of us see you continuing to defend your untenable  
pelican theory.

>>.. but I think you are drawing a long bow if you stick with your  
>>bird theory James.

>As I've also said before, it's not really my theory, although I  
>do think it's a better conceivable explanation than meteors,  
>'earth lights', mirages, 'billowing snow clouds', etc.

>What probably isn't saying much as none of these are tenable.

Neither is the pelican theory.

>It's also of course merely an expansion of Martin Kottmeyer's  
>theory.

>The difference is that if birds were the explanation, there are  
>distinctive similarities between the flight characteristics of  
>American White Pelicans and what Arnold described, much more so  
>than with Swans, as Kottmeyer proposed.

What's really happening here is that Easton is simply ignoring  
every single observation reported by Arnold that disproves a  
bird theory.

>He's quite happy with the new suggestion as are many others who  
>embrace some scepticism. Doubtless the resident 'Roswell/MJ-  
>12/saucer' zealot is not. ;)

So now pointing out fatal errors in others arguments is  
"zealotry?"

>"As I wouldn't bother to even read what's a fair bet to be the  
>usual diatribe, I'm not in the least interested, even if there's  
>some meaningful material amongst the standard drivel.

A perfect description of a Jame's Easton present pelican post.

>Realising that Arnold's long out-of-print book was crucial  
>evidence I hadn't seen, I was subsequently able to acquiring a  
>copy on loan. It was only on reading this, that the full  
>significance of Arnold's later sighting became apparent.

Arnold's first sighting had very little to do with his later  
one. His first one was prolonged, approximately 3 minutes,  
plenty of time for Arnold to carefully observe and think about  
what he might be seeing. The comes through clearly in the many  
details recounted later, which, among other things, show how  
Arnold was going through a mental checklist of conventional  
explanations and doing his best to test them. Opening his  
window to check for reflections and timing the objects between  
two prominent landmarks were among these.

The second sighting seemingly lasted only a few seconds. I've  
sometimes been puzzled by things I've observed flying when I  
first see them, but given 30 seconds, or a minute or two of  
observation have been able to figure them out. That's the  
difference between a brief glimpse and a fast first impression  
vs. more prolonged observation.

Arnold's sighting, BTW, didn't take place in a vacuum. He

wasn't the only experienced pilot puzzled by multi disk-shaped objects flying in formation. Veteran pilot Richard Rankin was another. His sighting of 10 objects took place one day earlier over California. There was the DC-3 United Airlines sighting of Cpt. Smith and crew on July 4 over Idaho, where 9 objects kept up with the plane for about 10 minutes, then seemed to suddenly disappear.

These experienced pilots were all confused by pelicans that could fly at least as fast as their planes?

>The clue to possibly identifying the enigmatic objects remains  
>in Arnold's description of their flight characteristics. Often,  
>birds have a distinctive signature, the "jizz" as it's known,  
>and from this a bird's probable identity can be determined, even  
>if the sighting was inconclusive.

If you carefully select only those details that you think fit a theory, and arbitrarily dismiss those that don't, why you can prove any theory you like.

>Don Baccus, an ornithologist, also commented to Michael Price  
>[see the newsletter for details of Michael's comments]:

>"Michael, my first thought when I started reading your analysis  
>was white pelican. Several years ago, when training a good  
>birder in the finer details of splitting migrating hawks into  
>species, age, etc. at long distances at the beginning of the  
>fall migration season (i.e. training him to run our count), we  
>saw distant white 'blurps' fading in and out of visibility many  
>miles north. This was at the Goshutes, i.e. on the Utah/Nevada  
>border. It was near sunset. It was obvious that the sun was  
>reflecting on their underwings.

Very, very different from Arnold's sighting, which was early afternoon when the sun and sky were bright. There would be very little luminance contrast between birds at a great distance and the background sky. How about Arnold's comments of seeing them flash brightly even against the snowfields of Mt. Rainier? That's about as bright a background as you can get. How can birds "flash" under such conditions? The answer is they can't.

At sunset, however, the background sky is considerably darker than in broad daylight, and objects reflecting light of the setting sun at higher altitudes can stand out against the background. But that wasn't the situation reported by Kenneth Arnold.

>They'd disappear momentarily and  
>then reappear in sequence. They were flying east-to-west and we  
>first spotted them somewhat to the northeast. I pegged them as  
>white pelicans almost immediately, as the whole cadence of the  
>thing matched the way white pelicans will soar in line (in this  
>case - they'll also 'V' up), and rather than flap all at once,  
>often will each begin to flap as each reaches the position where  
>the previous bird began to flap. Same with turning, etc. Of  
>course, they'll also do this in more of a synchronized  
>formation, too, but I'm sure you've all seen white pelicans flap  
>and glide in the kind of pattern I'm describing.

And here's a another really big difference between Arnold's report and flocking birds. First of all the question, what advantage is there to birds to flock and fly in formation? The answer is that it saves energy for the flock as a whole. The bird in front breaks a path through the air for the bird directly behind it.

IF THE BIRD BEHIND IS CLOSE ENOUGH, it can take advantage of this and save itself a little energy. Military planes also use this principle to save fuel by flying in close formation, as do race car drivers.

But if the birds are more than few feet from one another, nothing is gained. They have to stay close. In fact, Easton soon has another quote from another bird expert saying exactly this. The pelicans fly practically wingtip to wingtip when they are in formation.

Now compare this with what Arnold reported for his sighting. He said the formation of 9 objects seemed to be about the same length as a ridge about 25 miles away. Arnold said he later

flew over the ridge and measured it to be about 5 miles in length. What Arnold was really reporting was an angle:  $5/25 = .2$  radian or about 11 degrees. The angle doesn't change with distance. If you want to find the absolute length of the formation, you have to scale for the actual distance.

Let's compare this with a flock of pelicans only 1 mile away, a distance at which Arnold would have been able to identify very large birds with considerable ease. (E.g., I've been able to clearly identify small sea gulls at  $2/3$  mile.) Since this is only  $1/25$ th the distance, the length of the formation reported by Arnold would likewise be  $1/25$ th of 5 miles, or 0.2 miles or roughly 1000 feet. The distance between each of 9 objects if evenly spaced would be  $1/8$  of this or 125 feet.

The "pelicans" would be over 100 feet apart from one another, much too far apart to get any benefit from flying in formation. If you want to get a feel for the angular width of the formation Arnold was reporting, make your hand flat and then stick it out at arm's length. What would a comparable angular width be for a string of 9 flocking birds at 1 mile? Probably no more than the width of your little finger, if that. Quite a difference, isn't there?

The situation only gets worse if you scale to larger distances. The 1 mile figure was trying to give the pelican theory all the help it could get. But a more realistic figure might be 2 miles, where Arnold might have a very tough time clearly distinguishing the bodies and wings of the pelicans. At that distance they would be 250 feet apart. At 4 miles, 500 feet apart, etc., etc.

And of course, pelicans could never outfly Arnold's plane, not that any of this matters to James Easton.

>I couldn't think of any bird that would show such a cadence and  
>literally twinkle white while switching from soaring to  
>flapping".

So AWP's twinkle white against a darkened sky at sunset. But would they flash brightly like a mirror against a snowy backdrop in bright sunlight?

>Investigating this suggestion further, there are notable  
>correlations with Arnold's observations.

Only the ones James Easton wants to see, while ignoring all those he doesn't.

>Arnold claimed, "They flew like many times I have observed geese  
>to fly in a rather diagonal chain-like line as if they were  
>linked together".

In other words, formation flying, used by both birds and aircraft to save energy. So how does formation flying necessarily indicate birds?

>"...they numbered nine. They were flying diagonally in echelon  
>formation..."

>In 'Birds of the World', by Oliver L. Austin Jr. p 42, he  
>states:

>"Pelicans fly in long lines, sometimes in a V formation,  
>sometimes abreast, sometimes in single file directly behind one  
>another. Most often they form a wide echelon, each bird slightly  
>behind and to one side of the next".

Please note the words, "EACH BIRD SLIGHTLY BEHIND AND TO ONE SIDE OF THE NEXT." That's what it takes to gain any benefit from formation flying.

But that's not what Arnold reported, is it? The objects were WIDELY strung out, not slightly behind one another.

Of course James Easton is free to totally ignore this detailed observation of Arnold's, just like he ignores everything else he doesn't like. He thinks that's what skepticism is about. But what we are really seeing is extremely biased and fuzzy-headed thinking.

>Arnold also mentions, "They were flying diagonally in echelon  
>formation with a larger gap in their echelon between the first  
>four and last five". Discussing this with Michael, he agreed  
>with my assessment that this is standard behaviour in a flock  
>and wrote, "all line-abreast, diagonal and astern flocking birds  
>develop gaps and fill them in randomly".

>A further, distinctive connection, is Arnold's claim, "They  
>didn't fly like any aircraft I had ever seen before.

How is this necessarily a distinctive connection? Couldn't the  
same argument be applied to new aircraft that were our own or  
those that weren't our own? Arnold wouldn't have seen those  
before either.

> In the first place their echelon formation was backward from that  
> practiced by our Air Force.

Yes, aircraft fly in formation too, so how does formation flying  
necessarily indicate they were birds?

>The elevation of the first craft was greater than that of the last".

>This is a typical feature of American White Pelicans flying in  
>formation.

But it is not a typical feature of their formation flying to be  
widely strung out, probably by a factor of 10 or greater over  
that required for proper flocking.

>Consider also his statements that:

>"I observed the objects' outlines plainly as they flipped and  
>flashed against the snow and also against the sky".

Birds can obviously be silhouetted against a snow field, but how  
the hell can they flash?

>"They fluttered and sailed, tipping their wings alternately and  
>emitting those very bright blue-white flashes from their  
>surfaces".

So how do pelicans emit those bright blue-white flashes against  
a snow field backdrop. That's what you would get from something  
like a metal aircraft with a specular finish, not feathers.  
Even if the white feathers reflected equally as well as snow/ice  
(which they do not), there would be no luminance or color  
contrast with the background. They would be invisible.

>In 'The Birds', by Roger T. Peterson (Time-Life International),  
he writes:

>"Much the simplest form of flight, certainly much less  
>complicated than flapping or hovering, is gliding flight".

etc., etc. Like I said, Easton will simply ignore everything he  
doesn't like.

>The parallel between Arnold's objects in echelon which "flipped  
>and flashed", "fluttered and sailed", and a formation of  
>pelicans in echelon "beating and gliding", as 'Birds of the  
>World' describes their flight, seems evident.

How is it evident that they would flash brightly against a snow  
field?

>As Don Baccus remarked, "I couldn't think of any bird that would  
>show such a cadence and literally twinkle white while switching  
>from soaring to flapping".

>Michael Price also confirmed, "Assuming he was looking at birds,  
>the flipflop appearance of these birds would be visible whether  
>higher, same altitude, or lower as the sun might be reflecting  
>strongly and directly off white upper and/or underwing  
>surfaces".

>Kenneth Arnold was perhaps after all on the right track when he stated:

>"They flew in a definite formation but erratically. As I  
>described them at the time their flight was like speed boats on  
>rough water or similar to the tail of a Chinese kite that I once

>saw blowing in the wind. Or maybe it would be best to describe  
>their flight characteristics as very similar to a formation of  
>geese, in a rather diagonal chain-like line, as if they were  
>linked together".

>Very similar to a formation of geese, but based on the above  
>evidence, remarkably like a formation of American White Pelicans.

Uh, aircraft also fly in formation.

>It would have been an uncommon, if not rare, sighting, especially  
>with the birds flying south and a possibility which Arnold is  
>most unlikely to have examined.

>If that should be the answer and Arnold mistakenly concluded the  
>objects must be distant airplanes, it plays havoc with his  
>estimated calculations.

Not at all. His observation of formation angle is independent  
of distance. That rules out a formation of birds, because they  
would have been too far apart from one another to have been  
flocking, no matter what reasonable distance you assume.

His observation that the objects flew past his plane on a  
parallel course rules out birds, completely independent of the  
accuracy of his timing or estimates of their distance or  
altitude.

His report that they flashed brightly in the sun, particularly  
against a snow field, likewise rules out birds.

But James Easton will no doubt just continue to ignore all of  
this and keep plugging pelicans to eternity. It's the Eastonian  
way. And to point out his arguments are seriously flawed and  
biased nonsense seems is nothing but "zealotry" in his mind.

>It's these estimates of speed and distance which are open to  
>dispute and Arnold's 'second coming of the saucers' encounter  
>must surely be considered critical evidence that he was capable  
>of mistaking the distance and airspeed of birds.

His estimates of speed and distance have NOTHING to do with  
whether they could be birds or not. This has been repeated a  
thousand times, but skeptics seem to be too dense to get it, or  
simply don't care.

>The people asking we take Arnold's testimony of the distances at  
>face value naughtily ignore the reasons I gave why we can't.

This is nonsense and simple lying. Critics of birdie theories  
are NOT taking Arnold's testimony of distance at face value.  
Throw out his estimates of distance, and they still couldn't be  
birds. Even if they were two feet from his pilot's window, he  
would fly right past them just the same as if they were 10 miles  
away.

>If real, the objects had to be huge and visible to scores of people.

Nonsense -- vague generalities picked out of thin air. Based on  
various information in the report, if the objects had been 20-25  
miles away, they would have been of conventional jet airliner  
size.

Also have any of these knowledgeable skeptics ever consulted a  
map of the area? It's rugged country and VERY sparsely  
populated. Views are limited, obscured by trees and surrounding  
mountains. Objects whizzing overhead at 2 to 3 times the speed  
of sound would typically be in sight for only a second or two.  
Like I wrote in another post, I've driven through the area,  
right past where Arnold had his sighting at Mineral. I caught a  
glimpse of Rainier and the Cascades only once in over 30 miles.

>They also had to be supersonic and generating sonic booms that  
>thousands should have heard.

No, typically UFO sightings of all stripes are rarely reported  
with accompanying sonic booms. The basic principles of  
suppressing sonic booms are known (e.g., see Paul Hill's  
discussion in his book), as is presently being pursued, e.g., by  
people like Myrabo, generating "air spikes" through powerful  
lasers or microwaves.

>The guys arguing about  
>the trigonometry keep putting the birds and the planes on  
>perpendicular paths, but overlook that Arnold explicitly turned  
>the plane to get a better look out the side window.

Brookesmith is as clueless as Easton. Turning the plane parallel to the flight path, as has been pointed out a million times by "the guys arguing about trigonometry," actually disproves birds immediately because Arnold would have flown past them instead of the other way around. What's so difficult to understand about that argument? It could be explained easily to the average 10 year old without the use of math.

And flying perpendicular to their path on an intercept path, as Arnold was originally before he turned parallel, would have quickly brought Arnold close enough to migrating birds so that he would have soon identified what he was dealing with. It's a dynamic situation with Arnold on the move along with the objects. It sets an absolute lower threshold on how fast the objects could be flying when he turned parallel to their flight path.

>The paths were parallel. Once you put that straight, the angular sizes and  
>velocity implicit in Arnold's report can fit coherently those of  
>a swan.

"Once you put that straight..." Oh brother! What does Brookesmith think critics of the bird theory have been doing all along? The parallel flight path DISPROVES the bird theory, not give it wiggle room to be credible.

> I'm not sure if the speed or size of pelicans would  
> materially change the math, but if the flight characteristics  
> are a valid signature I wouldn't sweat such details.

Of course not. Skeptics never "sweat the details" that demolish their frivolous arguments.

>Any proposition that the American White Pelican was responsible  
>for Arnold's reported sighting, must be able to substantiate  
>that these birds are known to fly relatively fast and at high  
>altitude.

>"The glider I was flying has a 38 mph stall speed... as a matter  
>of fact, I was flying at 52 mph between thermals, and these  
>birds were staying with me".

>So, it seems whilst still not quite supersonic, pelicans are no  
>slouches and under ideal flying conditions, could show a  
>surprising turn of wing.

"No slouches"...."surprising turn of wing." Flowerly language trying to conceal the fact that these birds couldn't fly nearly as fast as Arnold's plane.

>We could put it this way; supposing that any pilot encountered a  
>small formation of migrating AWP's at high altitude, had never  
>seen this unusual sight before and as such, didn't recognise  
>these as birds at all.

>What would he be likely to observe in perfect conditions?

>Say...a formation of reflective, bright objects, flying in a  
>diagonal echelon, with maybe some of the 'objects' slightly  
>ahead of the others. They would occasionally 'flutter' and  
>'sail' as they flapped and then glided. From distance, it would  
>look something like a 'kite's tail' (he might even describe  
>their motion in flight as 'bobbing', 'skimming', or looking  
>something like a stone skipping across water :) ).

Would he observe them flashing with a blinding light, including against a snow field backdrop. Would he observe them outflying his plane on a parallel course? Would he observe them very broadly strung out to the point that formation flying would be useless to birds?

>If this was also in a post-war era of aviation development,  
>especially military and when it would be no real surprise to see  
>new airplanes, especially ones which were still 'secret', would  
>the pilot ever realise, or would anyone suggest, that he had  
>seen a formation of AWP's?

>If this did apply to Kenneth Arnold, how could he not realise  
>these were birds and believe the 'objects' were much further  
>distant and considerably faster than they truly were.

The objects flying faster than his plane on a parallel course  
rules on AWP's completely independently of any of Arnold's  
impressions of speed or of his ability to properly gauge  
distance. This is the simplest of arguments that seemingly will  
never penetrate Easton's thick skull.

>It would have to be that there was evidence these could not have  
>been birds, or his overall perception was somehow in error.

"Overall perception." What the hell does that mean? It's  
typical Eastonian extreme vagueness and hand flailing to conceal  
his obvious inability to directly address the very serious  
objections to his bird theory. The best he can do is call the  
objections "zealotry" and ignore them.

>Although that's another matter and this is already too long, one  
>question which needs to be resolved is how far, maximum, could  
>any bright, reflective object of approx. 10ft by 5ft, be visible  
>from the air?

A complicated and also meaningless question without specifying  
what is meant by bright, reflective, or giving the sighting  
conditions, such as background brightness. Stars, which have no  
angular width to speak of, can be seen against a black night sky  
over distances of many light years, but disappear in daytime.  
It is relative brightness, or luminance contrast, which is most  
important. If there is no contrast with the background, you  
don't see the object, no matter how bright or distant it is.

As mentioned above, 10 feet at 10 miles is .65 minarc, which  
would appear to be a dot under proper conditions, and nothing  
more. Proper conditions would be brightly illuminated by  
sunlight, but against a darker background. If you want to put  
it in perspective, Venus has about the same angular diameter at  
close approach, but when was the last time you ever noticed  
Venus in bright sunlight, even though it's possible if you know  
exactly where to look? Venus is also illuminated by reflected  
sunlight. Pelicans at 10 miles will probably suffer the same  
fate against a bright blue sky in daylight, and would almost  
certainly be invisible against a snowfield background (except  
maybe as a dark, not bright dot). The anecdote of GWPs being  
visible at sunset really underscores the importance of the much  
darker background needed for good luminance contrast, a  
condition which did NOT exist in the Arnold sighting.

>Peter Kingsmill is a naturalist and Director General of The  
>Redberry Pelican Project (Canada) Foundation. I had also asked  
>Peter for his assessment and he replied, "Everything in Arnold's  
>description that you quoted

If its typical Easton selective quoting, then no wonder the guy  
agrees. Did Easton supply him with the quotes of very bright,  
blinding flashes, including against snowfields? Did he provide  
Arnold's air speed and the fact that Arnold reported the objects  
outflying him on a parallel course? How about how widely strung  
out they were?

>points to the strong possibility he  
>saw a flock of AWP's... the formation, the allusion to the tail  
>of a Chinese kite, etc".

Right, but nothing about bright flashes, outflying the plane,  
etc. Figures.

>All irrelevant of course if the answer lies elsewhere!

Well at least he finally got that figured out. Yes, it is all  
irrelevant unless the fatal objections to the bird theory can be  
answered in a rational way, instead of the usual semantic  
evasion and puffery with which we have been treated.

David Rudiak



[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## MUFON '99 International Symposium

From: Sue Kovios <[bradford@globalserve.net](mailto:bradford@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 00:44:52 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 12:46:04 -0400  
Subject: MUFON '99 International Symposium

Forward:  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 20:30:35 -0400 (EDT)

To: [cydonia@listbox.com](mailto:cydonia@listbox.com)  
From: Vincent J. Mooney Jr. <[vincentj@erols.com](mailto:vincentj@erols.com)>  
Subject: [M-TRAC - MSAA] Milamo  
Reply-To: [cydonia@admin.listbox.com](mailto:cydonia@admin.listbox.com)

<snip>

\*\*\*\*\*

MUFON '99 INTERNATIONAL UFO SYMPOSIUM  
"Transcending Politics & Comfort Zones in Ufology"

Friday - Saturday - Sunday July 2,3 & 4, 1999

Virginia MUFON will host the MUFON '99 International UFO Symposium at the Hyatt Regency Crystal City Reagan National Airport 2799 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202  
1-800-228-9000

An attractive room rate of \$89.00 per night has been negotiated, and this includes up to four people, no extra charge. When making reservations be sure to specify that you want one king bed or two doubles. Make reservations directly with the hotel at 1-800-228-9000.

To register for the conference, please mail check or money order payable to:

MUFON '99 International UFO Symposium  
7873 Heritage Dr. Suite 574  
Annandale, VA 22003

### Registration Fees:

Conference presentations (before June 9th).... \$65.00  
Conference presentations (after June 9th)..... \$75.00  
Friday night buffet dinner/party (advance).... \$20.00  
Friday night buffet dinner/party (at door).... \$25.00  
Sunday FUFOR Brunch (advance only)..... \$25.00  
(includes Kelly Cahill's book Encounter)

Children under 13 can attend the Symposium free, while the buffet/party will be at full price.

### Conference Schedule:

Press Conference..... Fri at 1:00 pm  
Buffet Dinner/Party ..... Fri at 6:00 pm  
Presentations (with scheduled meal breaks)..... Sat 9:00 am to 9:30 pm  
Presentations (with scheduled meal breaks)..... Sun 9:00 am to 6:00 pm  
FUFOR Brunch with Kelly Cahill..... Sun 11:00 am to 1:00 pm  
National fireworks on the mall..... Sun Evening

Since the next day, Monday the 5th, is a holiday for most people, I hope that many will stay to the end of the Symposium

and enjoy the show. With world class art museums, the Smithsonian Institute, tour buses pulling up to the hotel and dozens of attractions-- it makes a nice vacation destination for the whole family!

Confirmed Speakers to date:  
Thomas "Eddie" Bullard, PhD  
Kelly Cahill  
Joseph Firmage  
Stanton Friedman  
Richard Hall  
Budd Hopkins  
Eve Frances Lorgen  
Betty Andreasson Luca  
Bruce Maccabee, PhD  
Jenny Randles  
S. Peter Resta, PhD  
Robert Swiatek  
Beverly Trout

A great line-up is taking shape!

#### FUFOR Brunch

The MUFON Symposium will break for brunch from 11:00am until 1:00pm on Sunday, July 4th. Attendees are invited to join the Fund for UFO Research (FUFOR) for a special breakfast brunch and presentation by KELLY CAHILL and local area abductees. You will enjoy a buffet brunch at the hotel while listening to BRUCE MACCABEE at the piano. A discussion is to follow that will compare US abduction experiences with Australian cases. This will be a more intimate venue with Kelly and a generous time will be allowed for Q & A. The price of this breakfast brunch is \$25.00 and includes a copy of Kelly's book, Encounter, which details her experiences up until '96. This well-written book is not available in this country and is one of the best first-person abductee books ever written.

Join FUFOR for this fundraiser brunch whose proceeds will be used to defray the travel expenses of our lovely guest from down-under. --Support UFO Research -- --Enjoy a Fine Brunch -- --Meet Kelly -- --Seating is LIMITED! Advance registration is mandatory--

Please mail \$25.00 check or money order made out to FUFOR to the same registration address as for the MUFON Symposium:

MUFON '99 International UFO Symposium FUFOR Brunch  
7873 Heritage Dr. Suite 574  
Annandale, VA 22003

MUFON SYMPOSIUM THEME FOR 1999  
"Transcending Politics & Comfort Zones in Ufology"

Susan L. Swiatek  
Coordinator of the MUFON 30th Anniversary  
Symposium

We find ourselves nearly at the end of the second millenium, after studying the phenomenon of UFOs in excess of 50 years. And we must ask ourselves how far we have progressed in our studies: What have we really learned as a civilization about this at once ephemeral yet pervasively physical mystery?

We must admit that though some progress has been made, overall it has been somewhat slow. In fact there is very little information about UFOs that is universally agreed upon by those of us in ufology, let alone the society in general. There are still more questions than answers: Who is/are the intelligence(s) behind the saucers? Where do they come from? And just why are they invading our skies and our psyches?

Our governments have not been forthcoming with answers. We are not absolutely certain that they know a great deal more than we do. Even with rumors of black budgets seemingly without limit, our governments may find that they face another kind of limit--a somewhat self-imposed limit symptomatic of our very humanness.

Humans are much more comfortable being firmly in the middle of the pack, not making waves or straying too far from the herd.

The politics of what is acceptable define our comfort zones of thought. In addition to allowing others to define what is politically correct and therefore comfortable, we sometimes find within ourselves our own zones that we steadfastly refuse to broach. How many among us think that it is irrefutable that UFOs are real objects that course about our skies on a regular basis, but that the notion of alien beings disembarking and taking humans on board is flat out impossible?

Or we may say, "An alien intelligence of some kind is likely abducting people onto their craft. But scenarios of sexual examinations, sperm and ova being taken and possible hybridization experiments are too far out to even consider." Some luminaries in the UFO field have said as much. My argument here is not that aliens are real and doing this or that. My argument is that the careful study and open-minded weighing of all the data is what is needed. To do good science we don't have the luxury of a wholesale dismissal of evidence that is "too far out to even consider." We must consider all the evidence that may be politically incorrect or indeed even challenges our personal comfort zones.

It is a fruitful exercise to look back upon your own education and development within ufology. You weren't born knowing that UFOs constitute a real phenomenon. At some point in time you heard or read something that made you sit up and take notice of a subject that previously made you snicker or simply look away. Some of you can recount startling first-hand sightings or experiences that made all the difference. But the vast majority of us learn about and form conclusions about UFOs the same way we do about any subject. We take in the available information and draw reasonable conclusions.

What did you hear or read that awakened your curiosity, that made you want to read and know more? What finally upset the apple-cart of what you had been told all your life about UFOs? What obliterated your previously well-maintained intellectual comfort zones? What emboldened you to stray from the herd of colleagues and peers?

The answers to these questions will help us grow and explore our own self-imposed limits as well as deepen our commitment to consider all of the data. And our insights will help us nudge others--ufologists, scientists, academics and officials alike--to boldly eschew political hamstringing, consider the data and finally transcend old discarded comfort zones.

Contact Susan Swiatek [swiman@pop.dn.net](mailto:swiman@pop.dn.net)  
Hostess of MUFON's 30th Anniversary Symposium -1999 for further information.

back to Virginia MUFON Homepage  
[http://dc.jones.com/~laurafo/laura\\_mufon1.htm](http://dc.jones.com/~laurafo/laura_mufon1.htm)

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-  
Mars Surface Anomaly Analysis  
Possible artifacts on Mars  
<http://www.mufo.org/ares/>

The M-TRAC Project  
A private, unmanned mission to Mars  
<http://www.mufo.org/mtrac/>

Please support this mailing list by sending \$1  
to Malta UFO Research, PO Box 14, Rabat RBT 01, Malta  
or if you want to buy any books from Amazon.com use  
the links and search engine at <http://www.mufo.org/store.html>  
from which we earn a small commission. Thanks!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Greer Joins The Prophets Conference Visiting

From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 03:49:56 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 12:47:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Greer Joins The Prophets Conference Visiting

>From: [prophets@maui.net](mailto:prophets@maui.net)  
>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 19:53:04 -1000  
>To: [axiom@greatmystery.org](mailto:axiom@greatmystery.org)  
>Subject: Greer Joins The Prophets Conference Visiting Faculty

>DR. STEVEN M. GREER, CSETI founder and International Director,  
>joins THE PROPHEETS CONFERENCE ~ PORT TOWNSEND, WA, August 27-29

>Dr. Greer is widely regarded as the world's foremost authority  
>on the subject of extraterrestrial intelligence (ETI),

<snip>

Huh?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## 'Angel Hair' Again Falls From The Sky In OZ

From: Diane Harrison <[tkbnetw@fan.net.au](mailto:tkbnetw@fan.net.au)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 23:29:00 +1000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 13:01:02 -0400  
Subject: 'Angel Hair' Again Falls From The Sky In OZ

The Keith Basterfield Network Australasia  
E-Mail [tkbnetw@fan.net.au](mailto:tkbnetw@fan.net.au)  
<http://www.fan.net.au/~tkbnetw>

\*\*\*\*\*  
UFO Australian Research Network Hot Line Number  
1800 77 22 88 Free Call  
\*\*\*\*\*

>From Perth , Angel Hair falls from the Sky again In OZ

Hi Di

Very important report from the Esperance area, WA. Yesterday 9th June 1999 a man witnessed tonnes of white filamentous threads falling from the sky over a 90 kilometre area or more. Paddocks, hedges, trees were covered with the stuff and it hung off power lines in great shrouds with lengths up to thirty feet long.

Apparently the sky was thick with it up to a thousand feet or more. There was no wind. The threads fell from 10am to 3pm. All the paddocks in the area had a 'sheen' caused by layers of the stuff. Peter, the witness, picked up some of the 'hair' to try and get it analysed. A Cessna aircraft was flying around as low as 200ft through the falling threads. Three contrails were stationary much higher, one with a spiral in it. Channel 9 put out a report (tonight) that the same stuff was used in Yugoslavia to put out electrical power supplies (generators) but we all know that was a classified carbon based substance totally unrelated to 'Angel Hair'!

Ciao for now,  
Brian

Still under investigation

Regard Diane Harrison

Australian Skywatch Director  
Co Director Australian UFO Research Network

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Return of Orange UFOs To OZ East Coast

From: Diane Harrison <[tkbnetw@fan.net.au](mailto:tkbnetw@fan.net.au)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 23:42:49 +1000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 13:04:54 -0400  
Subject: Return of Orange UFOs To OZ East Coast

The Keith Basterfield Network Australasia  
E-Mail [tkbnetw@fan.net.au](mailto:tkbnetw@fan.net.au)  
<http://www.fan.net.au/~tkbnetw>

\*\*\*\*\*  
UFO Australian Research Network Hot Line Number  
1800 77 22 88 Free Call  
\*\*\*\*\*

Australia UFO researchers - <http://www.flex.com.au/~eagle1>

Hi list,

Friday 11th June.

Return of the Orange UFO's to the East Coast.

A total of six (6) orange UFOs slowly flew over Grafton, all heading towards the North East.

The first at 6.50pm, a second at 9.45pm, following the same flight path. At 10.10pm, one object approached from the West (S.W.) and headed towards the N.E. about 1 klm . to the north of town. Then at 10.25pm, an amazing sight as one by one, three (3) orange UFO's emerged from behind a tree line, and slowly flew in the same flight path as the previous one. The two leading objects were one slightly behind the other at the same altitude. The third was trailing approx. 300 metres behind, and about the same altitude of the first two. Altitude estimated at around 1,500ft. When the group was to the north of my position, the centre object appeared to almost stop. The leading object continued to move on alone, blinked a few times then went out. The trailing object then caught up, then overtook the stationery centre one. After it had passed, these two began slowly blinking on-and-off in perfect unison. They then faded out together.

With the 10.10pm sighting, at one stage a 'meteor' (without a tail) streaked through the field of view when looking through the video camera. Not sure what it was, but it was fast. A total of 23 minutes of video taken of these sightings.

I hear, (but did not see), that there was a News report of UFO activity on Prime T.V. Did anyone hear anything on the News???

So get yourselves together and Skywatch. Now is your best chance to see them for yourselves.

Regards,

Barry Taylor.

bye @Oo.?

e-mail [stingray@nor.com.au](mailto:stingray@nor.com.au)  
Personal U.F.O. Home Page URL <http://www.nor.com.au/users/stingray/>

\*\*\*\*\*  
See Latest UFO Images on the "Latest Sightings" Link.



\*\*\*\*\*

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 11:51:41 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 13:31:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 99 14:20:16 PDT

>Incidentally, let me put in a plug for that terrific book  
>you and Hilary Evans put together. It's one of the few UFO  
>books of this decade that people will want to read (or  
>reread) in decades to come. It's also one of the relative  
>handful of 1990s UFOs book not to insult one's intelligence.  
>You have every right to be proud of it. I know I'm proud  
>to be a contributor to it.

>Jerry Clark

Jerry,

Thanks! We probably need explore no further to explain its failure to find an American publisher.

For the record, skimpy as it is, it was reprinted in Australia as A World History of UFOs and reissued in a paperback edition by the original English publisher, John Brown, as The UFO Mystery. It also appeared as a hardback in Japan.

I still have a personal stash of the original English hardback edition and must sell, oh, gee, two or three copies a year.

Next time, if there is one, I'll know to pick a better title, preferably one with a few more potent keywords in it, perhaps "alien reptiles," "scalpel," "mutilation" "abduction," or possibly all the above. My personal preference, although this could change: "Alien Reptiles From Roswell: A True Personal Account."

I should point out that no reputations or personalities were (irreparably) harmed by the publication of "UFOs 1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers." It goes without saying that no great personal fortune was accumulated, either.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## New CD-ROM Publication From CUFOS

From: **Steven W. Kaeser** <[steve@konsulting.com](mailto:steve@konsulting.com)>  
Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 21:27:45 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 08:13:06 -0400  
Subject: New CD-ROM Publication From CUFOS

A number of research reports into the UFO phenomenon have been mentioned on this (and other) "lists" that have been out of print for a number of years and very difficult to obtain. I have been working with the Center for UFO Studies to scan a number of them and make them available on CD-ROM, and the first of a small series of CD-ROMs has now been finalized and prepared for sale. This CD contains three classic reports from the CUFOS archives:

"UFO Reports Involving Vehicle Inteference" by Mark Rodeghier

"Physical Trace Associated with UFO Sightings" by Ted Phillips  
(and)

"1973-Year of the Humanoids" by Dave Webb

These reports have been scanned into .PDF format, and for further information on how it may be ordered, please visit the CUFOS web site at <http://www.cufos.org/mmenu.htm>

These reports are a part of the historical record into the investigation into UFOs, and it is priced very reasonably. BTW, the profits will help CUFOS at a time when they face serious financial difficulties.

Several other projects along this line are already in the queue, but if there are specific recommendations for future offerings, I'd be interested in your thoughts.

Steve Kaeser

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 15:08:56 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 13:14:10 -0400  
Subject: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

Hi,

All this stuff about Max Burns brings up a critical issue about UFO credibility and the way we present ourselves in public. Surely that ID the issue here. It is what BUFORA utterly failed to read. They did the same thing with the fawning over the Santilli autopsy fiasco. Although I dare say they might - not unreasonably - cast back the point against various Sheffield events that, for instance, the IUN invited the likes of Budd Hopkins - when he is (without medical qualification) regressing five year old children and promoting the image of nasty grays raping humans. Somehow there is not a lot of difference here. Both are apparently honest ufologists expressing a view that most of us consider not only fundamentally wrong but potentially destructive. We may hate these opinions but can we honourably suppress them all?

My argument here is not that BUFORA were right. I don't think they were. Free speech is no substitute for allowing nonsense to be set before the public in your name. But the point is one that requires deeper consideration as to a degree we all do the same thing without probably being aware of that fact. So - perhaps, a general consensus that we could agree and issue as a proclamation about is what we need to emerge from this mess. If we agree to abide by this working practice we would set an example to Ufology.

What example? Let us all take the decision here and now that any public event we organise involve the invitation only of serious researchers who can put forward hard evidence with a demonstrably scientific basis and who do not endorse patently absurd, unscientific ideas without support. Nor that we should invite anyone who sets before the public a scenario that has damaging moral or ethical repercussions. As these things require common sense and someone to make a value judgement we don't want to set ourselves up as the thought police. So I suggest we agree a second principle, if we make a value judgement and yet someone whom we invite still clearly offends the sensitivities of people out there - such responsible criticism should be heeded. If it is apparent there is concern over an invite then a free vote is offered over the net - a simple yes/no to whether that person should be considered suitable for invite and that the decision to run with that lecturer or to cancel the invite be abided by whatever the outcome of this vote.

Otherwise we face the question of setting ourselves up to make moral choices about who should be empowered to speak and who should not. I don't see how we can fairly do that. For the record I would certainly have voted no to Max Burns - except had there been a two way lecture (i.e. Max versus David so the audience could judge the case side by side). This is exactly what I proposed to BUFORA Council over the Santilli farce - that he be allowed a platform at Sheffield in 1995 only if the alternative perspective was simultaneously offered to allow free debate and let the audience make fair judgement. As you know BUFORA scuppered that plan and left themselves open to what are therefore utterly justified criticism to this day over the way they aided and abetted the autopsy promo.

So when it came to Max Burns, I did not scream and shout at BUFORA - I protested quietly by declining to promote the lecture and by not accepting an invite to lecture to BUFORA during the next 12 months. My point was thus, I trust, made without fanfare.

Rather than us now argue over a lecture that happened and which, frankly, by trying to stop probably made it seem more interesting to some than it deserved to be, lets stop blaming some and shouting at others and do something positive instead. Let us agree a declaration like I have just set out (that obviously needs fine tuning) and those of us who accept it - on behalf of ourselves and groups we represent - then issue it as a proclamation to the UFO world ASAP encouraging other UFO groups to sign up to the initiative. The plan would be to demonstrate globally that we are voluntarily setting standards as regards to the people we invite to give our public lectures - even if it means not inviting some whose dramatic claims and media stardom would attract audiences and put money into our coffers. We are putting the principle of only promoting good, serious, defensible research and theorising first and any personal gain second. This will send a small message that we do care about self policing ufology and making efforts to do the right thing by educating the public - surely one of our primary aims.

To me doing this is a positive outcome from the Santilli and Max Burns affair. We will be turning it on its head and taking a step forward on behalf of Ufology. So why not? Lets stop fretting over a lecture that's been and gone and use it as a springboard to agree a simple, straightforward but constructive policy initiative for ufology.

Comments please.

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Van Den Broeck's Paper On 'Warp' Drive

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 03:09:51 +0200 (MET DST)  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 12:14:37 -0400  
Subject: Van Den Broeck's Paper On 'Warp' Drive

Van Den Broeck's paper on his 'warp' drive is posted on Los Alamos National Laboratories' web site. Go to

<http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/gr-qc/9905084>

for the various formats. Links are preceded by an asterisk.

You'll need Adobe's Acrobat Reader 3.01 or better for the version that I have attached to this email.

Stig

\*\*\*

General Relativity and Quantum Cosmology, abstract  
gr-qc/9905084

From: Chris Van Den Broeck \* <[chris.vandenbroeck@fys.kuleuven.ac.be](mailto:chris.vandenbroeck@fys.kuleuven.ac.be)>  
Date (\*v1): Fri, 21 May 1999 12:50:59 GMT (8kb)  
Date (revised v2): Tue, 1 Jun 1999 14:25:26 GMT (9kb)

A 'warp drive' with reasonable total energy requirements

Authors: \*Chris Van Den Broeck

Comments: 9 pages, 1 figure; minor modifications; typos corrected

Report-no: KUL-TF-99/18

I show how a minor modification of the Alcubierre geometry can dramatically improve the total energy requirements for a 'warp bubble' that can be used to transport macroscopic objects. A spacetime is presented for which the total negative mass needed is only in the order of grams, accompanied by a negligible amount of positive energy. This constitutes a reduction of the absolute value of the energy by 65 orders of magnitude. The new geometry satisfies the quantum inequality concerning WEC violations and exhibits the same advantages as the original Alcubierre spacetime.

Paper: \*Source (9kb), \*PostScript, or \*Other formats

(\*N.B.: delivery types and potential problems)

refers \*to , cited \*by

Links to: \*xxx, \*gr-qc, /\*find, /\*abs (\*-/\*+), /\*9905, ?

\*<http://www-admin@xxx.lanl.gov>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: **Tim Matthews** <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 20:22:28 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 13:40:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 15:08:56 +0100

As usual Jenny makes some important and valuable points. Various problems arise and I'm sure she will see the dilemma.

Lancashire UFO Society is not the only group to hold meetings and Conferences. Although we all put our hand in our probably more than we should have to (people will spend £20 on a crappy Area 51 video that tells them nothing new and which trivialises the issues surrounding its' non-existence and baulk at paying £3 to hear a speaker at a meeting who will tell them infinitely more) there would be no meetings or Conferences - and hence very little (or no) money for local groups -if we did not invite speakers with whom we (occasionally violently) disagree and who promote an unscientific and largely fantastic view of the subject material.

It is simply not the case that UFO researchers are going to fund each other - so what do we do?

If I organise Conferences and meeting featuring those of an overly skeptical bent (our "Countdown to the Millennium" event last February being an interesting case in point; 4 skeptics and one believer - sorry Jerry!) then very few people will attend. This is a fact. Even the IUN used to invite Friedman, Moulton-Howe and a host of others (William MJ-12 faker Moore too!!) to Conferences and I suggest that those events would not have been as successful without them.

Perhaps the only thing to do is to try and strike a balance and as I have learned through trying to do this it is a road littered with obstacles. At the February event several people were thrilled by the balance I struck whereas some people were horrified and I doubt that they will ever come to another UFO event. Nevertheless, a handful of complaints from an audience of 125 is not bad.

At our regular events throughout the North West it is true to say that long-term members and supporters (or consumers if you're making money from Ufology) have been educated away from an overly "believer" stance through the introduction of skeptical material at our meetings.

It's also amazing to see how gullible others are....

I am interested to hear others people's views on this. At the end of the day I think we need more extreme skepticism from people like Kevin McClure because people's wild beliefs need a constant challenge. In the case of "Abduction Watch" Kevin and I disagree on several things but it is true to say that other researchers have backed down and/or modified their views (the Fife Incident, use of hypnosis/regression, aliens 'abducting' people, 'alien' implants) as a result of his work.

I know that others have changed their views of flying discs and



triangles as a result of my research. This has put several people's noses to of joint - and I am very happy about this.

At the end of the day it's down to a few individuals - people reading this - to have the courage of their convictions and be prepared to take on the lunatics in Ufology and challenge them EVERY time they put their garbage into the public domain.

In opposition to this, of course, is the realization that the 'skeptics' could all be entirely wrong and themselves victims of a UFO cover-up!!!

In the meantime I'm open to suggestions as to how we proceed.....

Tim Matthews.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies

From: John Hayes <[jhayes@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cableinet.co.uk)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 21:30:58 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 13:41:44 -0400  
Subject: European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies

Dear Errol & List Members,

I am forwarding a message from Craig Roberts, editor of the European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies that he asked me to put on the UFOINFO web site:

He is sending a final reminder that the European Journal of UFO and Abduction Studies (EJUFOAS) is looking for submissions for the launch issue in September 1999.

There is only limited space left so be quick with your submissions. This would be greatly appreciated.

Craig Roberts,  
Editor of EJUFOAS,  
OCN Ufology Course Director,  
TRUTH UK.

Chris can be contacted by e-mail at: <[ejufaoas@totton.ac.uk](mailto:ejufaoas@totton.ac.uk)>

Please note that the following information is available on the UFOINFO site:

EJUFOAS Submissions Guidelines at:  
<http://ufoinfo.com/magazines/ejufoas2.html>

Information about EJUFOAS at:  
<http://ufoinfo.com/magazines/uk.shtml#ejufaoas>

Regards,

John Hayes

[jhayes@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cableinet.co.uk)  
[webmaster@ufoinfo.com](mailto:webmaster@ufoinfo.com)

UFOINFO:- <http://ufoinfo.com>  
UFO Roundup:- <http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>  
Filer's Files:- <http://ufoinfo.com/filer/>  
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences:-  
<http://ufoinfo.com/ufoicq/>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 21:24:13 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 13:45:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 99 14:20:16 PDT

>>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 16:12:05 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

<snip>

>My choice: full access to everything Arnold had. The reality:  
>virtually all of it got burned up by the late Mrs. Arnold years  
>ago. I am not the guy, by the way, to lecture to on this matter,  
>since some years ago I tried very hard to get access to  
>everything, including the film, before one of Arnold's daughters  
>finally told me that the stuff no longer existed.

Now we know. Much indebted. Still a point of some curiosity:  
What happened to the film at the time? Surely Arnold wasn't a  
disgruntled distancer in 1952?

>>The last time I looked, historians had an obligation to the  
>>truth as it can best be determined, not to choosing sides in a  
>>perceived squabble.

>Well, I'm all in favor of truth, which often forces one to take  
>sides. If you think historians don't take sides and pot shots  
>at each other, you're a lot less intellectually sophisticated  
>than in fact I know you are.

<snip>

>Jerry Clark

I was, admittedly, referring to some sort of abstract ideal of  
history and historians, just as you not infrequently remind us  
that, somewhere out there, there must exist a similarly abstract  
ideal of ufology and ufologists.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: **Mendoza** <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:30:48 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 13:55:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: Beyond the Blunderdome

With the compliments of the Duke of Mendoza (for it is he):

On Sat, 12 Jun 1999 15:08:56 +0100, Jenny Randles wrote:

>All this stuff about Max Burns brings up a critical issue  
>about UFO credibility and the way we present ourselves in  
>public. Surely that ids the issue here. It is what BUFORA  
>utterly failed to read. They did the same thing with the  
>fawning over the Santilli autopsy fiasco. Although I dare  
>say they might - not unreasonably - cast back the point  
>against various Sheffield events that, for instance, the IUN  
>invited the likes of Budd Hopkins - when he is (without  
>medical qualification) regressing five year old children and  
>promoting the image of nasty grays raping humans. Somehow  
>there is not a lot of difference here. Both are apparently  
>honest UFOlogists expressing a view that most of us consider  
>not only fundamentally wrong but potentially destructive. We  
>may hate these opinions but can we honourably suppress them  
>all?

I believe I was among if not the first to express some outrage in public at Budd Hopkins's regression of small children, in a review in "Fortean Times" of an IUN Sheffield conference in approximately 1993. In his presentations (which I taped, but I write from memory) he actually admitted the children were as young as two and a half.

I don't think Hopkins is honest, although he may be sincere in his own peculiar way. Nor do I think Mad Max is honest. In neither case, however, do I think there is any question of deliberate misrepresentation or hucksterism. But it surely is self-deception, which I've called intellectual dishonesty (see UFO UpDates, passim), and for which I've been most vehemently reprimanded, most often by people who I'd naively expected would know better. That the strongest detractors are citizens of the United States is not, I think, entirely coincidental.

Pleasant as it is to talk about oneself, I am actually also pointing these couple of things out for an impartial & (I think) disinterested purpose. I imagine most people receiving this de facto discussion list also know I've sounded off at length at Max & the BUFORA clowns in attempts to get them to see the difference between free speech and promoting claptrap. Thus far Jenny and I have no argument.

But I would caution that this recommendation (a) goes too far as a matter of principle and (b) is unenforceable in practice:

>Let us all take the decision here and now that  
>any public event we organise involve the invitation only of  
>serious researchers who can put forward hard evidence with a  
>demonstrably scientific basis and who do not endorse  
>patently absurd, unscientific ideas without support. Nor  
>that we should invite anyone who sets before the public a  
>scenario that has damaging moral or ethical repercussions.

Taking the second point (b) first, does anyone really think that the Birdsall brothers - for example - will wash their

hands of the likes of Stan Friedman, Linda Mouldy Cowe, Hopkins and his neophytes, Tony Dodd, Harry Harris, Nick Pope, Tim Good - all of whom strike me as unhinged in varying degrees - et al? The Birdsalls are in business as conference impresarios, not in the business of promoting objective analyses of ostensibly anomalous phenomena. Ergo they will promote the proponents of the more sensational claims, to put bums on seats. No more, come to that, will the likes of Alice Earle and Jame Watkins at John Brown suddenly begin to shrink from inviting the likes of Hopkins, Graham Hancock, Philip Mantle & c & c, to FT UnConventions.

But between the Birdsall approach and FT's lies an important difference, and one that we might take as a more practical approach to the problem of "seriousness" (as in those cant & much abused phrases "serious ufologists" and "serious researchers"). The FT UnCons never fail to lay on a fine array of skeptics and debunkers to balance the mental diet. Hopkins, for example, had to contend with the presence of Hilary Evans, and even (aaiieeee!) the dread Phil Klass at a recent UnCon, and made a right pratt of himself, earning several well-deserved hisses and boos, by refusing to appear on the same stage as Klass for a panel discussion.

So, rather than leave these matters to the vagaries of some kind of ad hoc democracy, as in--

>As these things require common sense and someone to make a  
>value judgement we dont want to set ourselves up as the  
>thought police. So I suggest we agree a second principle,  
>if we make a value judgement and yet someone whom we invite  
>still clearly offends the sensitivities of people out there  
>- such responsible criticism should be heeded. If it is  
>apparent there is concern over an invite then a free vote is  
>offered over the net - a simple yes/no to whether that  
>person should be considered suitable for invite and that the  
>decision to run with that lecturer or to cancel the invite  
>be abided by whatever the outcome of this vote.

--I'd commend all and sundry to invite whom they like, barking as they may be, to their conferences, but to ensure that a rational and balanced voice is on the same programme to present the qualifying point of view. Even the Birdsalls could rise to that, though they seem to do so rarely. (What they have yet to learn is that skeptics and curmudgeons like Hilary Evans, Andy Roberts, Ian Ridpath and I visibly pack any hall as thoroughly as the most devout of True Believers, \*and\* we get bigger laughs besides. The Birdsalls' real mistake - which you could divine from the arrogant tone of their dreadful magazine - is to underestimate the intelligence and the tolerance of their market.)

Presenting a balanced list of speakers at least would satisfy this point from Jenny--

>Otherwise we face the question of setting ourselves up to  
>make moral choices about who should be empowered to speak  
>and who should not. I dont see how we can fairly do that.

And nor do I, for what that's worth. I don't see how "we", whichever actual "we" is at issue, can do it with a straight face, either. But that isn't quite the point I want to make - which is in (a) above, that (in effect) censoring the lunatic fringe - some of whom, like David Jacobs, are regarded as mainstream geniuses, of course, such is the oddity of the field - is wrong in principle. The principle \*isn't\* free speech, because any nutter can get an audience one way or another (Mark Pilkington charges very reasonable rates to set up a website), but simply dissemination of information. It's in the interests of the sane to know what the loopy are promoting. And the sane, I have to harp a bit, are every bit as much in the audiences as they are on the stand. It's also surely in the interests of the sane to have the opportunity to haul the loopy across the coals, either in public Q&A sessions or in the bar or over breakfast, God forbid, or dinner.

The presentation of conferences could be rethought a trifle too. Ever since the FT UnCons began Lynn Picknett and I have been muttering, to absolutely no avail, at the organizers - I use the term loosely - to set up dialogues instead of those wondrously unproductive "panel discussions" they lay on. Lynn

thought it would be good theatre and informative to boot for her to discuss the Turin Shroud, one-to-one, with Ian Wilson (you bet it would be!). I suggested Colin Andrews talking to/with/at Rob Irving. We can all, I'm sure, think of similar oppositions - Jerry Clark versus Tony Dodd on animal mutilations would be a nice one. John Rimmer versus the editor of Hall's Rules for Printers and Compositors would make an especially ripe affair. So that's a wheeze some of you in the conference biz may like to ponder a bit.

>Let us agree a declaration like I have  
>just set out (that obviously needs fine tuning) and those of  
>us who accept it - on behalf of ourselves and groups we  
>represent -then issue it as a proclamation to the UFO world  
>ASAP encouraging other UFO groups to sign up to the  
>initiative. The plan would be to demonstrate globally that  
>we are voluntarily setting standards as regards to the  
>people we invite to give our public lectures - even if it  
>means not inviting some whose dramatic claims and media  
>stardom would attract audiences and put money into our  
>coffers. We are putting the principle of only promoting  
>good, serious, defensible research and theorising first and  
>any personal gain second. This will send a small message  
>that we do care about self policing UFology and making  
>efforts to do the right thing by educating the public -  
>surely one of our primary aims.

By all means make a declaration, though I also enquire if you've ever heard of the Haslemere Declaration and the Port Huron Statement and know what they said, and if you haven't & don't I shouldn't be at all surprised, because such things tend to acquire a mantle of obscurity with some alacrity. Certainly make plain your standards (with which, so far, I'm not quibbling). But do bear in mind the practicalities, which includes dragging in the punters and even making a profit, and the principle of information. Better to set things up so that you can expose, in all senses of the word, the woofiness of a Max Burns or a David Jacobs than to appear prim and puritanical and actually be censorious. It's surely not that hard to make it clear you think such characters are bonkers - well, that you disagree with their general drift and the basis of their thinking, let's say - even while letting them say their piece. Censorship, however it's dressed up, is an admission of fear and insecurity. And the Brits ought to be last people to indulge in censorship. Better debate the opposition openly. Better, in other words, a public hanging than a furtive assassination.

best wishes  
Peter B

PS: On Sat, 12 Jun 1999 20:22:28 +0100 Tim Matthews wrote:

>It is simply not the case that UFO researchers are going  
>to fund each other - so what do we do?

A hostage to fortune, this remark, if ever I saw one. Maybe UFO researchers can't pay one another's wages, but one thing Tim Matthews could at least do is extract his tardy digit and pay my expenses for getting to and from his LUFOS conference a mere 18 months ago. Since LUFOS is plainly not a not-for-profit organization, you'd think that the tax advantages of paying debts would be sufficient incentive to keep the books straight. Let other would-be speakers at Matthews's conferences be warned by my tiresome experience.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**





# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:52:03 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 14:26:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 16:04:15 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 18:05:01 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes.

>>>Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 11:21:11 -0400  
>>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto >[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>>>Date: Wed, 09 Jun 1999 23:40:42 -0500  
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto >[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>>From: Dennis Stacy >[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>>.Parchment Parachutes

<snip>

Aside: Am I the only person on this list who knows how to snip,  
ie, delete, stuff?

>If you read Arnold's letter to the Air Force you will see that  
>he thought he was doing no more than any pilot would do. He says  
>pilots are interested in speeds...and s he thought he would  
>clock the speed.

Read it? Hell, given that it was part of the public record, I  
published it! Now where is the evidence of Arnold's same  
meticulous interest in speed in his other six reported  
sightings?

<snip>

>He said the flying was so smooth he simply trimmed out  
>the plane on its flight toward Yakima (set adjustments for  
>speed, altitude) and let it fly itself while he enjoyed the  
>scenery.

>He did this BEFORE the sighting began.

>Hence by the  
>time of th sighting (a few minutes or so after he trimmed out  
>his plane heading toward Yakima, according to the letter to the  
>Air Force) it was not necessary for him to pay 100% attention to  
>flying th airplane.

>He could do other things such as wonder about those strange  
>airplanes way over there flying so close to Mt. Rainier in an  
>odd echelon arrangement and he could wonder us how fast these  
>new Army jets could go..... etc.

>

Yes, but at some point he tells us he not only rolled down his  
left window but turned his plane parallel to the perceived path  
of the objects, neither of which is necessarily cruise control

stuff. And when Arnold says, in 1947, that he trimmed out his plane, that doesn't mean he switched on automatic pilot, since there was no such thing at the time. So during the less than two minute sighting time he's not only timing the objects, but observing their flight path and distant geographical features while rolling down one of his windows (and he certainly didn't have power windows then, either), and turning his plane parallel to the objects' path. Still pretty busy stuff for a casual observation of something else's speed. It also seems to start instantaneously. Not thirty seconds or so later and that looks interesting, but immediately. He says the sighting lasted two minutes or less and yet claims to have clocked it for one minute 42 seconds of that time. Pretty damn quick response time if you ask me!

Have you ever given any thought as to how long it would take to turn a Callair traveling at 100mph or so a full 90 degrees, that is, from east to south, while rolling down his window? Doesn't sound "trimmed out" to me. The beginning and end of the clock time per se I have no problem with. But a helluva lot of observational stuff is allegedly happening within that very short time frame (perceived distance between mountain peaks, flight patterns, behavior, and so on) while Arnold says he is simultaneously rolling his window down and turning left (south). During this same time period, don't forget, he's also compared his cowling tool, which he had to retrieve from a pants' pocket, to a distant DC-4 and then to the distant objects. That's a pretty damn busy 1:42 anyway you cut it.

Try whipping your cowling tool out of your pocket (while in flight) and making two comparisons with two distant objects in two different directions while manually rolling down your left window and turning your "trimmed" plane south, and then tell me if you can do all the above in a 1947 airplane within two minutes' time or less. I don't think so.

Although I'm equally convinced you'll find a way. And that if you can't, Rudiak can.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Larry Hatch Is Back

From: **Larry Hatch** <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 23:54:37 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 14:27:39 -0400  
Subject: Larry Hatch Is Back

Dear EBK and list.

I'm back from Vermont, and can resume  
correspondence .. after I sift thru a huge  
backlog of emails of course.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 00:29:27 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 14:29:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much

>Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 11:07:48 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)  
>From: Nick Balaskas <[nikolaos@YorkU.CA](mailto:nikolaos@YorkU.CA)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Elements 116 And 118 Discovered - So Much For Lazar?

>Hi everyone.

>The discovery of these two isotopes of elements 116 and 118 (see  
>below) which have very short life spans strongly suggests that  
>the predicted "island of stability" for elements higher than 114  
>may not exist. If these elements (and other isotopes of 116 and  
>118) do have such short life spans as reported, then it would be  
>very unlikely that Robert Lazar's element 115 is a stable  
>element - one that has a life long enough for practical  
>applications.

>Nick Balaskas

>-----

>PHYSICS NEWS UPDATE  
>The American Institute of Physics Bulletin of Physics News  
>Number 432 June 7, 1999 by Phillip F. Schewe and Ben Stein

>ELEMENTS 118 AND 116 have been discovered at Lawrence Berkeley  
>Lab by crashing a beam of krypton atoms into lead atoms. The  
>three detectable atoms of element 118 have nuclei possessing 118  
>protons and 175 neutrons for a mass total of 293. The new  
>elements are even further along in the Periodic Table than  
>element 114, whose existence was announced back in January 1999  
>by scientists in Russia (see Update 412), and further into the  
>"island of stability," the supposed nuclear regime in which  
>certain combinations of neutrons and protons lead to a  
>relatively long life. For all that, the atoms of element 118  
>still decay after less than a millisecond into element 116 plus  
>an alpha particle. Element 116 then promptly decays into element  
>114 plus another alpha particle. Ken Gregorich (510-486-7860)  
>led the LBL group that discovered the new nuclei. Four of the  
>team members are German nationals, which prompted DOE secretary  
>Bill Richardson to emphasize the continuing value of  
>international scientists working at US national labs.

><snip>

Hello Nick:

I suppose the keyword here is "relative".

Elements 116 and 118 might last for milliseconds, but that is  
interesting enough if neighboring elements only last  
microseconds... 3 orders of magnitude difference.

Again, (and unless I'm off-base here) the even numbered elements  
seem more stable than the odd numbered ones for some sort of  
geometric or numerical reason.

This in turn, makes element 115 an unfortunate choice for Bob  
Lazar's dog-and-pony show.

I wish it were otherwise. At least we might have had something solid to play with.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

= = = = = =

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Seti@home 'Failure'?

From: John Tenney <[mainorg@yahoo.com](mailto:mainorg@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 23:11:53 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 14:42:43 -0400  
Subject: Seti@home 'Failure'?

When I joined the SETI@home project (downloaded the program and began running it on my computer) I was close to 100% sure that I would not detect an "alien intelligence" on my \$1200.00 computer. I was interested in being involved in a project wherein hundreds of thousands of like-minded individuals could cooperate together with a single goal, (no unimpressive feat, you usually can't get two people to agree on which movie they'd like to rent). As a matter of fact over the course of the past 20 days I realized that I do belong to a minority of people involved with the SETI@home project.

My computer is on and running 24 hours a day everyday, and before SETI@home the majority of the time when I wasn't using for research it just sat idle literally "doing nothing." But after I downloaded the program for SETI@home my computer was no longer a \$1200 paperweight, it was doing something, whether it was doing correctly or as predicted did not matter to me, at least it was doing something.

Now when I read newspaper articles about the "failures" of the SETI@home project, how disenchanted people are with it, how much of a waste of time and energy it is, I'm left wondering a few questions.

1. Did everyone expect to find "extraterrestrial intelligence" on his or her computers?
2. Was there something else more "important" that your computer could have been doing while it ran it's screensaver SETI program?
3. Is a project a failure when it unites 500,000 people from all over the world to achieve a common goal?
4. So is that it does everyone give up because we still haven't found "Extraterrestrial Intelligence?"

I agree with some of the critics points such as, SETI@home should have been more up front about the trouble that they were experiencing; but none the less I'm still glad that they tried and will continue trying. I support them in their effort and applauded them for the success they and WE have already achieved.

Thank you  
Rev. John E.L. Tenney  
Co-Founder Michigan Anomalous Information Network  
<http://members.tripod.com/~mainorg>

UFO UpDates has a SETI@home team, visit their webpages at:  
<http://memebrs.tripod.com/~ufoseti>  
and  
<http://www.spookyfox.freeuk.com>

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [seti](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 00:41:32 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 14:47:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

>From: Richard G Brown <[rgbrown@web.net](mailto:rgbrown@web.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99  
>Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 03:46:00 -0700

>>From: Rense E-News <[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)>  
>>To: Rense E-News <[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)>  
>>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:40:01 -0600  
>>Subject: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

>>-----  
>>Jeff Rense Weekly E-News  
>>-----

><snip>

>> \* From Jeff's Desk \*

<snip>

>>>From Robert Collins, 6-4-99, <[LesMiserable@sprintmail.com](mailto:LesMiserable@sprintmail.com)>:

>>The following is an account of the meeting I (the source) was  
>>involved in with EBE-2.

>>On March 5, 1983, I was at Los Alamos National Laboratories  
>>conducting business on a counterintelligence project. During

><snip>

>>EBE-2 explained the weather of it's planet which was dry,  
>>varying temperature between 65-90 degrees. There was 35  
>>hours of constant sunshine and three hours of darkness

>I know I'm going to regret this... But how can a planet have  
>such vastly unequal periods of day and night? 35 hours to 3!?!?  
>Shouldn't they be relatively equal?

>Even in a binary system it couldn't be consistant enough to be  
>35 and 3 every day could it?

>- Confused in Canada

Dear Confused in Canada:

I'm suffering from jet-lag and brown beer, and I can only think  
of one solution.

'EBE-2" is describing a planet with two suns, i.e. somehow  
involved in an unlikely dance with a double-star system.

The only alternative would be a planet with a wildly variable  
period of rotation!

I cannot imagine a living thing on such a world.

In short, [to borrow a phrase from Bruce Maccabee]

" Sounds like a crock to me. "

Very best wishes

- Larry Hatch

PS: Someday I will learn how to spell Macabbee.

= = = = =

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:26:14 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 14:45:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 99 11:49:54 PDT

>>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 13:50:47 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>>Date: Thu, 03 Jun 99 08:26:28 PDT

>Hi, Dennis and listfolk:

>>Arnold may well have been aware of the writings of the people  
>>you mention. But judging from his own writings, he based his  
>>belief that UFOs were some type of living organism on his own  
>>experiences. See the following, for example:

<snip>

>From time to time (though fairly rarely), UFO witnesses have  
>reported the sensation that what they were observing was a  
>living object. On June 1, 1933, a mountain climber on Everest  
>told of seeing winged objects which "seemed to pulsate in and  
>out as though they were breathing."

Jerry: I have only one source for that event, Phenomena  
Spatiaux (the defunct quarterly) issue #25 from decades ago.

That account indicated some unknown day in May of 1933. Do you  
have a better source which firms up the June first date for  
1933?

If so, I would like to use that date since it is more precise.

Incidentally, the PS account described two black sausage shapes  
which hovered in the wind, expanding and contracting as if  
breathing. [ All of this on the assumption that I translated  
properly of course. ] If there were wings attached, they  
didn't get into my highly abbreviated listing.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## **UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 02:30:41 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 15:08:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 10:59:56 -0500 (CDT)  
>From: Brian Cuthbertson <[brianc@freeseide.fc.net](mailto:brianc@freeseide.fc.net)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 08:53:27 -0500  
>>From: Ron Decker <[decker@wt.net](mailto:decker@wt.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>...

>>If memory serves, I recall reading years ago an account of  
>>seemingly living UFOs in Brad Steiger's book, "The Gods of  
>>Aquarius" (I'm working from memory here so don't hold my feet  
>>to the fire on the author and title).

<snip>

>Based on the rapid evolution of our own technology, is it really  
>so surprising that an incredibly advanced technology might not  
>manifest machines that have attributes of living things?

>Even today NASA is experimenting with craft that modify their  
>own missions. And we've had the lightbulb what, 100 years?

>-Brian

Dear Brian:

I have been toying with exactly that idea lately.

Namely, an advanced (but comfort loving) society, or 10, or 100  
or thousands of them. If they are the least bit like us, they  
will want to learn more and more, for less and less.

The most efficient way to do this is with very very intelligent  
probes.

Such probes (endowed presumably with high logical intelligence)  
could spread outward at high speeds, reporting back at light  
speed say, and still satisfy the needs of societies with a  
longer life-spans and attention-spans than we typically see  
here.

Specimen gathering and analysis does more than suggest itself,  
it literally falls of its own weight .. perhaps even explaining  
a few human abductions, not the millions that some might  
suggest.

We are not insects by any means, but neither are baboons.

We do things to monkeys that they must find frightening, all in  
the name of science.

A colony of starfish might also be interesting to such probes,  
but starfish cannot make UFO reports.

We cannot predict what will be important to advanced societies,

but my bet is that they will have some sort of scientific curiosity.

People in the 1600s, asked to predict the future, might dream wistfully about more accurate clocks, gate hinges that don't squeak and clothing that is easier to wash.

A precious few of them were hard at work making better telescopes, even back then.

In short, I think Brian may have suggested something far more likely than EBES. How about EIPs? (Extraordinarily Intelligent Probes) i.e. devices so smart, robust and mobile that we cannot distinguish them from living beings?

Maybe they short out once in a while just to reset their circuits.

Here's a question:

Lets assume that our own technology advances at today's dizzy rate (instead of exponentially accelerating as in fact presently obtains!)

Will we do anything much differently than what I just described above?

Are we indeed alone in the universe? Of course not.

Then, what's so silly about hypothesizing long-lived, infinitely patient intelligent machines peeking and poking around a planet as biologically interesting as this one?

Please consider the opposite hypothesis.

Its even sillier.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold's Sighting [was: Re: Voyager

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 03:43:29 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 15:01:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold's Sighting [was: Re: Voyager

From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 21:47:16 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:25:25 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold's Sighting [was: Re: Voyager

Regarding:

>Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 01:10:18 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>Bruce,

>In your 'Complete Sighting...' report, you refer to the  
>following extract from Arnold's letter to the Air Force:

>"There was a DC-4 to the left and to the rear of me  
>approximately fifteen miles distance, and I should judge, at  
>14,000 ft. elevation".

>"I knew they [the objects] must be very large to observe their  
>shape at that distance, even on as clear a day as it was that  
>Tuesday. In fact I compared a zeus fastener or cowling tool I  
>had in my pocket - holding it up on them and holding it up on  
>the DC- 4 - that I could observe at quite a distance to my left,  
>and they seemed smaller than the DC-4; but I should judge their  
>span would have been as wide as the furthest engines on each  
>side of the DC-4".

>You then comment:

>"Arnold provided an estimate of size in an indirect way: he  
>stated that they appeared to be comparable to the spacing of the  
>engines on a DC-4 (4 engine propeller driven, 117 ft wingspan, 94  
>ft length, 27 ft height) which he had seen at a distance which he  
>estimated as 15 miles. He estimated the engine spacing to be 45 -  
>50 ft, although 60 ft would have been a better estimate. By this  
>means he was essentially providing an angular size for the  
>objects: the equivalent of about 60 ft at 15 miles. He reported  
>the size of the objects as 45 - 50 ft by comparison with the  
>airplane as if the plane had been at the same distance as the  
>objects. However, the plane was not at the same distance, so a  
>correction for the distance difference is necessary.

>It is possible to make an estimate of the size of the objects  
>assuming his estimate of the distance to the DC-4, 15 miles, was  
>(approximately) correct. (Here comes some math and geometry, so  
>if you are squeamish about such subjects, skip over the next four  
>sentences.) Using the outer engine spacing as 60 ft, the angular  
>size at his estimated distance is  $60 / (15 \times 5280) = 0.00076$   
>radians or about 2.6 minutes of arc (1 degree = 60 minutes =  
>0.0174 radians). Projecting this angle to 20 miles, the rough  
>distance of the objects, would yield a size of about  $(20 \times 5280 \times$   
> $0.00076 = )$  80 ft. Had he overestimated the distance to the DC-4  
>(if it had been less than 15 miles away) the calculated angular

>size, and hence the calculated object size would increase. If he  
>underestimated the distance to the DC-4, then the calculated size  
>would decrease. My own suspicion is that he overestimated the  
>distance and that therefore the objects were larger than 80 ft in  
>length. Unfortunately no investigator pursued this size estimate  
>at the time and with Arnold's death many years ago it is no  
>longer possible to improve the size estimate".

There's another way to estimate the size based on his observations when the objects were passing in front of the Mt. Rainier snowfields. He said that when seen edge on, they almost disappeared and seemed to be a long dark line about 20 times longer than thick.

Retinal cones are about 0.4 minarc in size at the center of our vision, where our acuity is best. Image blur because of diffraction through our pupils also limits the retinal image width of any arbitrarily thin line imaged by our eyes to about 0.4 minarc. (Likely this is no coincidence, but an example of evolution converging to an optimal value.)

What this means is that we can detect isolated high contrast dark lines against bright backgrounds (like Arnold's objects in profile) considerably less than .4 minarc (down to 2 \_seconds\_ of arc, believe it or not, under controlled laboratory conditions), but the image of the line will always be perceived to be at least 0.4 minarc thick.

The closer the very thin line is to 0.4 minarc, the darker it will appear, which again seems to be the case with Arnold's sighting. 0.4 minarc at Arnold's estimated 23 miles (based on the subpeak of Rainier Arnold said they disappeared behind), is about 14 feet thick, give or take. If we accept Arnold's 20 to 1 length to thickness estimate on face value, this would place the length at around 280 feet (again give or take). This would be about the size of a 747.

If, on the other hand, Arnold was off on his length-thickness ratio by a factor of 2, which is quite possible (and close to the way he drew it in his letter to AF intelligence), then the length would be half that, or about 140 feet. This is around 737 size.

I will compare this estimate with that immediately below, based on Arnold's comparison with a distant DC-4.

>In your paper, 'Still in Default' - 'Originally Published in the  
>Proceedings of the 1986 MUFON International Symposium. Updates  
>to 1998 in square parentheses', you wrote:

>[Note: a very complete analysis of Arnold's sighting has been  
>published in the Proceedings of the International Conference of  
>the Mutual UFO Network, 1997. In that much longer paper I point  
>out that Arnold compared the apparent size of the UFO to the  
>spacing between engines on DC-4 aircraft - 117ft wingspan, 94 ft  
>long, 23 ft fuselage height - which he thought was about 15 miles  
>away.

>The point is that since Arnold could see the engines on the  
>aircraft at 15 miles - or even if it was only at 10 miles - then  
>he had better than average visual acuity.

This is a tricky point. I don't know the exact dimensions for wing thickness and engine size, and Arnold was also looking from underneath by maybe 4 or 5 degrees and getting a projection. Let's say the wings were 2.5 feet thick and the engines 5 feet from Arnold's perspective. That would be close. The cabin would be about 10 feet across. What would Arnold see from 15 miles?

The engine cross-section would subtend about 0.2 minarc, the wings about 0.1 minarc, and the cabin about 0.4 minarc. Notice the same 0.4 minarc threshold mentioned above. We can detect isolated elements (dots, lines) this thickness or thinner, but they will all appear to be equally thick. However, they will not appear to be equally dark.

So if Arnold could detect this at 15 miles, what he would probably see would be a long thin line of uneven darkness. There would be a dark spot where the cabin was (and maybe a



faint vertical line for the tail), not-so-dark spots for the engines, and a faint, almost invisible line for the wing proper. This is a difficult detection task, but certainly possible.

Another visual acuity task is our ability to detect separations between nearby objects instead of objects in isolation. This is the standard eyechart acuity test in the doctor's office with which most people are familiar. 20/20 English acuity (6/6 metric) means the eyechart letters are designed to be 5 minarc high and made of lines and gaps 1/5th of this, or 1 minarc. Therefore 20/20 acuity means the person can just resolve lines separated by 1 minarc.

Probably close to half of the healthy adult population has corrected visual acuity of 20/15 or slightly better. Mine, e.g., has been tested down to 20/12 under controlled laboratory conditions. Better acuities than this are known, but rare. 20/8, or .4 minarc acuity seems to be the absolute limit, and again is related to retinal cone and diffraction image size.

This introduction to letter-type acuity tasks relates to the spacing between such things as the engines and the cabin on the DC-4. Are they resolvable at 15 miles? The spacing between the cabin and the inner engines would be about 20 feet, and at 15 miles this corresponds to about .85 minarc, or 20/17 acuity, right smack in the middle of the expected best acuity for a normal population. So the answer is yes. At 15 miles Arnold could make out these things if he had perfectly normal acuity and no significant uncorrected eye blur. Judging by what he reported, it seems that Arnold's eyes had no need for any optical correction.

Arnold's detection task would obviously have been even easier if the plane were closer, say 10 miles instead of 15 miles. The engines would now look like fairly dark spots, and easily separable from the cabin. It is certainly possible he overestimated the planes distance by this amount since he was eyeballing the distance in this case with no landmarks for comparison.

>Since the engines were about 60 ft apart and since the UFOs were  
>farther away than the airplane the estimated size of the UFOs  
>would be 80 - 120 feet.])  
[End]

A 10 mile distance would also gives us size estimates for the unknown objects close to those derived from the other visual observations of Arnold outlined above.

60 feet at 10 miles scales to 138 feet at 23 miles. Compare that to the estimated 140 feet based on the length/thickness ratio.

Let's not put too fine a point on the exact numbers given the obvious uncertainties and assumptions. But the objects, if they were at 23 miles, were comparable in size to conventional jetliners of today like the 737.

These sizes are not "huge" (as Easton put it in another post). Dr. Alan Hynek, who apparently knew little of measures of human acuity, claimed that Arnold could not have seen something thinner than 3.0 minarc, instead of the actual value 0.4 minarc. (Hynek confused acuity measures and also didn't understand that the 3 minarc value he used referred to the overall size of a letter acuity target, not the lines and gaps that made it up.) This threw off his estimates of size by a factor of 7.5. As a result, he came up with the absurd numbers that the objects would have had to be over 100 feet thick and 2000 feet long. This would indeed be "huge" for an aircraft, but it was grossly in error.

Hynek used this nonsensical calculation to dismiss Arnold's sighting, even after he left the Air Force as a consultant. Instead Hynek proposed that Arnold probably saw a formation of jets 6 miles distance. However, if you scale to 6 miles and use Hynek's erroneous figures, the "jets" would have had to be 25 thick thick and 500 feet in length. Hynek never seemed to see the absurdity of his own arguments.

Interestingly if you read Ruppelt, he notes that Blue Book, using similar acuity argumentation to mine and assuming Arnold

had the distance about right, placed the size in the 210 to 280 foot range. (Some other AF consultant was apparently much better informed than Hynek on such matters.) I think it was about half that figure if Arnold's two separate observations were to be internally inconsistent.

>When considering all the probabilities, should your above point  
>be taken into account?

>Is it being accepted that Arnold claims to have seen the DC-4s  
>engines at 15 miles, i.e., sufficiently that he could use this  
>observation in a rough calculation?

If Arnold had normal visual acuity and no significant optical blur, then he could have just seen the positions of the engines at 15 miles.

>If the DC-4 was 15 miles distant as Arnold claimed, how do we  
>quantify "better than average visual acuity" then; would it be  
>above average, exceptional or incredible?

See above arguments. 20/20 is considered "average," 20/15 somewhat above average (and very common), and something like 20/12 or better would be considered exceptional to incredible (like 20/8). Based on sighting details like his ability to detect the objects as a thin line and his ability to resolve details on the DC-4, Arnold's acuity was at least in the average to above average range, maybe better, even without a corrective prescription.

>In his letter to the Air Force, Arnold also wrote:

>"I observed the chain of these objects passing another snow-  
>covered ridge in between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams, and as the  
>first one was passing the south crest of this ridge the last  
>object was entering the northern crest of the ridge. As I was  
>flying in the direction of this particular ridge, I measured it  
>and found it to be approximately five miles so I could safely  
>assume that the chain of these saucer like objects were at least  
>five miles long".

>You have referenced this 'five mile' chain in the 'Complete  
>Sighting...' paper, i.e., "Since the length of the 'chain' of  
>objects was about 5 miles (paragraph H [as] above), the leading  
>object was about 5 miles south of Mt. Adams when the last object  
>passed Mt. Adams".

>What Arnold doesn't explain here is that he DID NOT measure this  
>ridge at the time.

What possible difference does it make?

>At least according to the details in his book, when he writes,  
>"Between Mount Rainier and Mount Adams there is a very high  
>plateau with quite definite north and south edges. Part of this  
>chain-like formation traveled above this plateau towards Mount  
>Adams, while part of the formation actually dipped below the  
>near edge. As the first unit of these craft cleared the  
>southernmost edge of this background, the last of the formation  
>was just entering the northern ridge.

>I later flew over this plateau in my plane and came to a close  
>approximation that this whole formation of craft, whatever they  
>were, formed a chain in the neighbourhood of five miles long".

>So, the 'five miles' estimate wasn't in fact made until later,  
>quite different from the impression given in his Air force  
>letter.

>Would you agree that seems to be correct?

Again, what difference does it make? At some point he flew over the ridge and measured it.

Like his clocking of flight time between Mt. Rainier and Mt. Adams, this was an objective measurement and gives us some idea of how spread out the objects were. (It's also another indication of how methodical Arnold seemed to be.) If the ridge was 25 miles from his position, then the objects subtended an angle of about  $5/25 = .2$  radian or 11 degrees. You can scale for various distances to get the approximate distance between

objects.

Say they were those giant American White Pelicans (AWPs) only 1 mile away. The linear formation would have been spread over a distance 1/25th of 5 miles or about 1000 feet, each AWP separated by about 125 from the one in front. Unfortunately flocking birds flying in formation have to be within a few feet of one another to get the energy saving benefits of flocking. So even at a distance of only 1 mile, the distance between objects would be far too great to have been birds in formation.

If you try to salvage the situation by bringing the "pelicans" ten times closer to only 500 feet and 12 foot separation, only somebody flying with a white cane could fail to see them for what they were. If Arnold could make out the engines of a DC-3 at 10-15 miles, as indeed he could with normal visual acuity, he could easily have made out the large pelicans at 1 mile, much less 500 feet.

We still await Easton's explanations to all the fatal objections that have been raised to his bird theory. To repeat:

1. How to AWPs (or any bird) flash brightly in plain daylight against a snow field background?
2. How can AWPs outfly Arnold's plane on a parallel course?
3. How could the linear formation of objects subtend the angle reported by Arnold and still be flocking AWPs.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Fwd: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

From: Philip Mantle - QUEST <[pmquest@dial.pipex.com](mailto:pmquest@dial.pipex.com)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 15:40:16 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 15:46:21 -0400  
Subject: Fwd: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

From: Tim Matthews <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
To: Philip Mantle - QUEST <[pmquest@dial.pipex.com](mailto:pmquest@dial.pipex.com)>  
Subject: URGENT NEWSFLASH - BELGIUM 1989/90  
Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 23:09:01 +0100

URGENT NEWSFLASH

Dear All,

Important News!

Eric Morris, Director of the British UFO Studies Centre, who works with me and others to expose the truth behind an important element of the UFO cover-up since 1945, made a potentially very important discovery today at the International Air Show at Woodford (British Aerospace), near Manchester.

In long and casual conversation with a Belgian Air Force pilot Eric encouraged him to talk about the Belgian "UFO" incidents of 1989/90. Amongst other things, Eric claimed not to be able to remember the name of the Belgian Colonel who made official public statements on this matter but the pilot volunteered the name 'De Brouwer' in any case.

The pilot made a categorical statement that what, in fact, had happened was a cover-up whereby misleading statements had been put out to both press and public. He claimed that the REAL TRUTH OF THE MATTER was that a military delta-planform aircraft had been operating at the time of the sightings. He added that the Belgian Air Force wanted to divert attention AWAY from any suggestion that advanced military hardware had been seen.

And what better cover than the (tried and tested) aliens-in-our-midst disinformation.....? One might well ask the question; was the UFO community a more than willing accomplice to this official lie?

This is, arguably, an excellent example of the little-known but highly relevant "Federal Hypothesis" which, bluntly stated, argues that "some UFOs are controlled not so much by an Intelligence as by an Intelligence Agency."

This is an intriguing story to say the least and I recommend that people read Chapter 9 of my book "UFO Revelation - The Secret Technology Exposed?" (Blandford 1999, pp.102-113) for a better explanation of what took place ten years ago. It is highly likely that the aircraft flew from a facility in the South-West of England.

We believe that recent sightings of a similar low-speed aircraft are evidence of a highly advanced triangular Lighter-Than-Air (LTA) hybrid vehicle with inherent stealth ability - the result of its' construction from a Kevlar-based composite materials. (This aircraft is not dissimilar to those proposed by the Aereon Corporation of Princeton, New Jersey from the late 1960s onwards.)

The near-silent "humming" associated with these aircraft may be little more than airship propulsion technology in action. On the other hand US maverick scientist Michael Walden, whose own LTA technology was tested by the military at Nellis AFB in 1976/7 and which remains classified to this day, believes that an advanced "ionic propulsion" system is in use - which might help explain the blue coronal discharges seen by witnesses on occasions - and the unusual burning 'electrical smell' reported in some cases.

During the much-reported Burmarsh Incident (Kent) of early 1997 (see Jerry Anderson/UFOMEKs excellent report on this) a triangular aircraft was seen near the Lydd Army ranges (other sightings have taken place near military facilities - Larkhill, DTEO West Freugh, RAF Boscombe Down, RNAS Yeovilton and Warton British Aerospace being the most obvious). Given that the British ARMY is developing new types of UAV and reconnaissance platforms we believe that it is they who are testing these aircraft, in the UK at least.

No wonder "government insiders" like Nick Pope want us all to believe that the military doesn't have this type of technology. No wonder it is so easy, on the odd occasion, for the military to operate these advanced aircraft over the heads of an as-yet-unsuspecting public who are repeatedly told, by glossy UFO publications, UFO personalities and by sources associated with the military/industrial complex, that these are 'alien vehicles' and/or "evidence" of 'recovered alien technology'.

Tim Matthews

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## BWW Media Alert 19990613

From: **Bufo Calvin** <[BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 10:21:55 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 16:02:45 -0400  
Subject: BWW Media Alert 19990613

Bufo Calvin  
P O Box 5231, Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Internet: [BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com)  
Website: <A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>"><http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>  
</A>  
<A HREF="<http://www.onelist.com/subscribe/bwnl>">Bufo's WEIRD NEWS LINKS</A>  
<A  
HREF="<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/redirect-home/bufosweirdworld>">Link  
to Amazon.com  
</A>

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED (permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this edition of Bufo's WEIRD WORLD provided that attribution is made to <http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>. It is good etiquette to check with strangers before you e-mail them something. If you forward this, please make sure it is clear that you are forwarding it).

June 13, 1999

Kind of a slow week...

As usual, let me know what you think at <A HREF="mailto:[bufocalvin@aol.com](mailto:bufocalvin@aol.com)">BufoCalvin@aol.com  
</A>.

On to the listings: Times are generally Pacific.

LIVE EVENTS (Lectures, conferences, etc.)

WHAT: 20th anniversary ROCKY MOUNTAIN UFO CONFERENCE (one of the major annual conferences). Speakers include: Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle; Marilyn J. Sprinkle; John Carpenter, UFO Abductions at Home and Abroad; Cristianne Quiros, Alien-Human hybrids on Earth; Jack "Kewaunee" Lapseritis, the BIGFOOT/ET/UFO Connection; Ann Druffel, How to Defend Yourself Against Alien Abduction; Lyssa Royal, Lloyd Pye, Our Alien Ancestors; Richard Haines, CE-5: Close Encounters of the Fifth Kind  
WHEN: June 16 through June 20  
WHERE: UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING  
HOW MUCH: \$85, plus workshop fees  
CONTACT: 1-800-448-7801 ext. 2

WHAT: Workshop with psychic Tricia McCannon on CLAIMING THE POWER WITHIN  
WHEN: Saturday, June 19, 10:00 AM and Sunday June 20, 2:00 PM  
WHERE: Redwood City Womans Club 149 Clinton St., Redwood City, California  
HOW MUCH: \$133  
CONTACT: Charles Grotzky at 650 343-5202

WHAT: Lecture by Dr. Steven Greer of CSETI on ET Contact  
WHEN: Thursday, June 24, 7:30 PM  
WHERE: Berkeley Fellowship of Unitarian Universalists. 1924 Cedar St. (@ Bonita). Berkeley. California  
HOW MUCH: \$10  
CONTACT: Global View Communications, 510-540-6143

RADIO

Eddie Middleton's very popular show in the South, Nightsearch, has a website at

<A HREF="<http://listen.to/nightsearch>"><http://listen.to/nightsearch></A>.  
Starting soon, the new website at  
<A HREF="<http://www.nightsearch.net/>"><http://www.nightsearch.net/></A>.  
Unfortunately, no streaming audio. Sundays from 2:00 to 4:00 PM (Pacific).  
The call-in line is 901-365-1430.

Don Ecker, of UFO MAGAZINE, hosts STRANGE DAZE on the Liberty Works. It can be heard on streaming Real Audio at  
<A HREF="<http://www.broadcast.com/radio/talk/lwrn>"><http://www.broadcast.com/radio/talk/lwrn></A>.

Mike Jarmus, REALITY AND BEYOND, 7:00 PM Sundays,  
<A HREF="<http://spectrum.orn.com/omega.ram>"><http://spectrum.orn.com/omega.ram></A>. Streaming audio available

Sunday, June 13, Joanne Lauck, author of The Voice of the Infinite in the Small: Revisioning the Human-Insect Connection

ART BELL - DREAMLAND  
Currently, the most popular talk show on this area.  
<A HREF="<http://www.artbell.com/>"><http://www.artbell.com/></A>. Live streaming audio (and video) available.

JEFF RENSE - SIGHTINGS  
Jeff is well-versed on the topics, but likes to let the guests speak, resulting in one of the best radio shows on these topics. You can hear Real Audio of the show, and there are archives as well. Go to  
<A HREF="<http://www.sightings.com/>"><http://www.sightings.com/></A> for more information. The show is on at 7:00 PM Pacific Monday through Friday, and 8:00 PM Pacific on Sunday. You can hear it anywhere through your computer. Please note that Jeff also often covers topics which I do not consider relevant to this list. To subscribe to the Jeff Rense Weekly E-news (which includes articles and a complete guest listing), e-mail (subject: Subscribe)  
<A HREF="mailto:[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)">mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net</A>.

Sunday, June 13, 8:00 PM, Rayelan (Russbacher) Allan: an Amazing Life  
Wednesday, June 9, 7:00 PM, Michael Lindemann, Weekly UFO/World report  
Thursday, June 10, 7:00 PM, Dr. Louis Turi on Nostradamus Divine Astrology readings  
Friday, June 18, 7:00 PM, Kevin Randle and Russ Estes on alien abductions

PAUL WILLIAMS & SCOTT CARR: UFO DESK  
This New York show has been around for years, but is now available on streaming audio. The website is  
<A HREF="<http://www.escape.com/~paulw/ufodesk.html>"><http://www.escape.com/~paulw/ufodesk.html></A>. It runs at 8:00 PM (Pacific) on Sundays.

JEFF MISHLOVE AND THE VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY  
Webcast every weekday at 8:00 PM for two hours, with a repeat at 10:00 PM.  
Webcast at  
<A HREF="<http://www.wisdomradio.com/>"><http://www.wisdomradio.com/></A>.

#### TELEVISION

##### A&E (USA)

Wednesday, June 16, 4:00 AM, EXTRATERRESTRIALS (UFOs)  
Friday, June 18, 4:00 AM, ALIEN ABDUCTIONS

##### THE DISCOVERY CHANNEL (Europe)

Tuesday, June 16, 3:00 PM (GMT+1), SECRETS OF THE PSYCHICS (James "The Amazing" Randi debunks people claiming paranormal powers)

##### THE DISCOVERY CHANNEL (USA)

Monday, June 14, 9:00 PM, ROSWELL  
Tuesday, June 15, 12:00 AM, ROSWELL

##### THE HISTORY CHANNEL (USA)

Sunday, June 13, 10:00 AM, HAUNTED HISTORY: NEW ORLEANS  
Sunday, June 13, 11:00 AM, HAUNTED HISTORY: NEW ENGLAND  
Next Tuesday, June 22, 5:00 PM, ANCIENT ALIENS (ancient astronaut evidence)  
Next Tuesday, June 22, 9:00 PM, ANCIENT ALIENS (ancient astronaut evidence)  
Next Wednesday, June 23, 1:00 AM, ANCIENT ALIENS (ancient astronaut evidence)

THE LEARNING CHANNEL (USA)

Next Thursday, June 24, 6:00 PM, BIGFOOT (John Waters)  
Next Thursday, June 24, 9:00 PM, BIGFOOT (John Waters)

LOCAL CABLE (USA)

BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED (I'm short on time this week, so I'm going to list it the way it was sent to me...trimmed down for dates only):

SUNDAY CH 56 1:30 AM MANHATTAN NEIGHBORHOOD NETWORK NY  
JUNE13,1999 JENNY SMEDLEY AUTHOR #1 BESTSELLER IN THE UK "RIPPLES"  
Jenny speaks about her past life with Garth Brooks then known as Ryan Fitzgerald

JUNE20,1999 BETTY,BOB,BECKY ANDREASSON LUCA A four part series on how there family survived multiple abduction experiences. They are the family that many books have been written on there experience such as The Andreasson Legacy, also The Andreasson Affair. 'AWESOME SHOWS' DON'T MISS"  
JUNE 27.1999 \*PART 2 OF THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY

SUNDAY CH35/80/96 930PM CABLEVISION OF WOODBURY NY  
JUNE13,1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PART 1 ABDUCTIONS

MONDAY CH27 10AM CABLEVISION OF RIVERHEAD NY  
JUNE 14.1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PART 2 ABDUCTIONS

MONDAY CH 59/37 11PM CABLEVISION OF YONKERS NY  
JUNE 14.1999 ABDUCTIONS PART 2

TUESDAY CH 34 830PM CABLEVISION OF YORKTOWN HEIGHTS NY  
JUNE 15, 1999 ABDUCTIONS PART 2

TUESDAY CH 6 830 PM COMMUNITY TV OF SANTE FE, NEW MEXICO  
JUNE 15, 1999 MARIA FIX SPIRIT COMMUNICATION

TUESDAY,  
JUNE QUEENS QPTV CH 56 10PM JENNY SMEDLEY AUTHOR "RIPPLES"

WEDNESDAY CH 12 830PM GATEWAY ACCESS 12 SPRING CREEK NY  
JUNE 16, 1999 LOUIS TEA LEAF READER

WEDNESDAY PAC 8 OF LOS ALAMOS NEW MEXICO CH 8 4PM  
JUNE 16, 1999 SAME AS ABOVE DATES

WEDNESDAY CH12 MINNESOTA CABLE ACCESS TRAC 12 4PM & 1130PM  
JUNE 16.1999 ABDUCTIONS PART 3

THURSDAY CH 25 5PM CABLEVISION OF HAUPPAGUE NY  
JUNE 17, 1999 LOUIS HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

THURSDAY CH 27 10 AM LTV OF EASTHAMPTON NY  
JUNE 17, 1999 ABDUCTIONS PT 3

FRIDAYS CH 8 9PM PAC 8 TV OF LOS ALAMOS NEW MEXICO  
JUNE 18, 1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PT 2 ABDUCTIONS

FRIDAYS CH 99 930PM CABLEVISION OF BROOKHAVEN NY  
JUNE 18, 1999 BILL MARSHALL "ASTROLOGER " PART 2

TO CONTACT JANET OR TO BE A GUEST ON HER TV SHOW  
WRITE TO: BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED  
JANET RUSSELL  
POB 311  
MEDFORD NY 11763  
EMAIL: [Rosebuds6@aol.com](mailto:Rosebuds6@aol.com)  
Website: <http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
Beyond The Unexplained with Janet Russell

MTV (USA)

Monday, June 14, 1:30 PM, ROAD RULES: AUSTRALIA (includes "haunted hotel")

THE SCIENCE CHANNEL

New schedule again, since March 29.  
Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 9:00 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE (don't know which one)  
Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 9:30 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE  
Weekdays, 10:00 AM, STRANGE BUT TRUE?  
Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 5:00 PM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE  
Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 5:30 PM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE  
Weekdays,6:00 PM, STRANGE BUT TRUE?  
Every day but Monday and Sunday, 1:00 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE



Every day but Monday and Sunday, 1:30 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE  
Tuesdays through Saturdays, 2:00 AM, STRANGE BUT TRUE?  
Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, 9:00 AM and 9:30 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE'S  
MYSTERIOUS UNIVERSE  
Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, 5:00 PM and 5:30 PM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE'S  
MYSTERIOUS UNIVERSE  
Saturdays, OUT OF THIS WORLD all day long

THE SCI-FI CHANNEL (US Feed)

Tuesday, June 8, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #3024 (Israeli UFOs; near-death experiences; Bigfoot; "UFO defense manual")  
Wednesday, June 9, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #3025 (Hangar 18, UFOs and the Air Force; psychic detective; reincarnation; alien abductions; life on Mars)  
Thursday, June 10, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #3026 (UFO technology; trauma-induced ESP; Bahamian Obeah rituals; Mexican UFOs; intuitive healing)  
Friday, June 11, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4027 (UFO tape; psychic detective; alien autopsy; Bigfoot)  
Monday, June 14, 11:00 AM SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4028 (psychic detective; Queen Mary ghosts)  
Tuesday, June 15, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4029 (haunted farm; Israeli UFOs; premonition of plane crash)  
Wednesday, June 16, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4030 (Martian life; Colorado haunting; Iranian UFOs)  
Thursday, June 17, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4031 (multigeneration alien contact; blind echolocators; Bigfoot museum; faith healing; spirits in Peru)  
Friday, June 18, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4032 (Georgia UFO; psychic detective; dreams; haunting)  
Tuesday, June 22, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4033  
Wednesday, June 23, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4034  
Thursday, June 24, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4035  
Friday, June 25, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4036

SPACE (Canada)

Sunday, June 13, 7:30 AM, MYSTERIOUS FORCES BEYOND (psychic healing)  
Sunday, June 13, 12:30 PM (time zone unknown), ANIMAL X-FILES (Jersey Devil; Howick Falls monster in South Africa)  
Sunday, June 13, 5:30 PM, IN ADVANCE OF THE LANDING (a well-respected examination of UFO beliefs ((pre Heaven's Gate...from 1991)

---

This is Bufo saying, "If =everything= seemed normal, that =would= be weird!"

---

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [bufocalvin](#) | [jocelyn](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same

From: Donnie Shevlin <[donnies@codamc.com](mailto:donnies@codamc.com)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 11:47:09 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 15:57:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same

>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 02:02:41  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>Subject: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same Packets Of Data

Hi all, EBK, Stig...

Well now, finally something right up my alley. Being a project manager over software development, I feel his pain. I understand exactly what is happening there. Low end computers, short on availability of computers and overwhelming demand from the end user, I've been there too many times to count.

What I don't understand is why they only converted days 1/7/99 and 1/8/99. I know the data is large for a full day, but why only the two days? The size of the work\_unit.txt file is only 384K. And how many seconds of data in a work file, 107 seconds? So that would be;

$((48\text{hrs} \times 60\text{min}) \times 60\text{sec}) / 107\text{sec} = \text{roughly } 1600 \text{ files@}384\text{K}$

Now 1600 files at 384K is just little over 600 megabytes of data. In these days of cheap high capacity hard drives, that's not a lot of data.

Secondly, the 'parceling the raw data' process should be fairly easy. The files are small so the process must be quick. I have written applications that can turn 200 megabytes of processed data out over a 6 hour period. So they could easily have turned out plenty of data over a two week plus period. So why only two days? Are there problems in the raw data files? I hope not.

Why didn't they just tell us there was a problem and to hold on processing until the problem was corrected? Anyone who deals with software would know that the end users time is valuable. To waste their time will make them unruly and question your ability to deliver.

I always whip my unruly end users.. :)

Donnie Shevlin

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [seti](#) | [files](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Crosses Atlantic

From: David Clarke <[crazydiamonds@compuserve.com](mailto:crazydiamonds@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 14:29:12 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 16:01:39 -0400  
Subject: Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Crosses Atlantic

This story will be released to the UK Media on 14.6.99:

Unmanned Aerial Vehicle sparks UFO Scare

by David Clarke

A MINIATURE robot aircraft survived a 2,000 kilometre trans-Atlantic test flight guided only by remote control to a missile range on a remote Scottish island.

The US-Navy funded UAV (unmanned aerial vehicle) landed safely at the British Army's testing range on the island of Benbecula following a record-breaking flight.

Three other tiny drones - just ten foot long with a ten foot wingspan - crashed and disappeared over the choppy north Atlantic seas during the secret operation last November, And the strange-looking aircraft - called the Aerosonde - triggered a string of UFO sightings to the Scottish Coastguard stations as it was guided in to land at the remote military base in the Outer Hebrides.

A British Army spokesman said: "It's a very small robot aircraft and its amazing that it managed to fly that distance and land safely." The UAV used a satellite guidance system to navigate and was programmed to avoid the worst of the North Atlantic weather. Once it came within range of Benbecula it circled until a US pilot on the ground was able to guide it slowly in to land at the missile testing range.

A spokesman for Stornoway Coastguard on the Isle of Lewis said: "All the coastguard stations in this area were warned by the Army to keep a look out for these drones coming in from the North Atlantic, especially in case they triggered UFO sightings.

"There were a number of people ringing in reporting having seen UFOs at the time, one of them even said it had flown over Stornoway."

Defence chiefs are now hailing the UAV as the strategic weapon of the future after the successful test flight of the Aerosonde, which is designed for "long range environmental monitoring."

Already the Royal Australian Air Force has invested 30 million dollars into the development of a long-range UAV called Global Hawk to carry out surveillance of neighbouring countries in southeast Asia.

The Global Hawk, developed by Teledyne Ryan, is capable of 20 hour endurance flights of more than 5,000 km before having to return to base.

And British Army experience who are developing their own sophisticated unmanned aircraft say the remotely piloted drones could be widely used on future battlefields.

UAVs are known to have played a large role in the recent NATO campaign in Kosovo and Serbia.

Major Roy Denton of the British Army Hebrides said: "We are involved in the development and testing of a number of unmanned aerial vehicles.

"It's cheaper and safer than putting a serviceman into a dangerous battlefield."

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 14:36:02 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 16:05:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 15:08:56 +0100

>All this stuff about Max Burns brings up a critical issue about  
>UFO credibility and the way we present ourselves in public.  
>Surely that ID the issue here. It is what BUFORA utterly failed  
>to read. They did the same thing with the fawning over the  
>Santilli autopsy fiasco. Although I dare say they might - not  
>unreasonably - cast back the point against various Sheffield  
>events that, for instance, the IUN invited the likes of Budd  
>Hopkins - when he is (without medical qualification) regressing  
>five year old children and promoting the image of nasty grays  
>raping humans. Somehow there is not a lot of difference here.  
>Both are apparently honest ufologists expressing a view that  
>most of us consider not only fundamentally wrong but potentially  
>destructive. We may hate these opinions but can we honourably  
>suppress them all?

Interesting set of words ... that of Burns and Hopkins being  
alike (" ... not a lot of difference here"). And further, " ...  
honest ufologists expressing a view that \_most of us\_ consider  
... wrong and offensive." And finally, "...can we ... suppress  
them all?"

Burns and Hopkins are not alike, except in that place which is  
occupied by the opinions of some men (and women). Whose  
opinions certainly may not be valid, as it is with many  
opinions. Name those features of each man which appear to you to  
be alike... one at a time.

And expression of opinion that \_most of us consider wrong\_ is  
another good set of words. Who, pray tell, is MOST of US? Is  
that a group of serious researchers the likes of which \_the rest  
of us\_ have not heard of as yet? Ah, the MOU-fon group? Most  
Of Us Group? Never heard of 'em. I even aksed Gesundt.

And finally, why would one wish to suppress anyone, let alone  
suppress them all? I thought they outlawed the practice of  
suppressive communism in the west.

Personally, and as a witness to the good which Mr. Hopkins has  
done during his lifetime, I find your telling of it offensive.  
It is obvious that your opinion regarding hypnosis is not  
favorable, however the reasons I've heard are inadequate to form  
the solid level of belief some embrace. That many, including  
psychologists and psychiatrists, differ as to the efficacy of  
hypnosis, should be a warning sign to those who "believe as well  
as disbelieve." The verdict is not in, Mam. (That's an  
American-ism...)

To quote Fr. Balducci, "Generalized denial stems from illogical  
fanaticism..." The opinions expressed often on this list,  
regarding hypnosis as well as many subjects, sound too much like  
Balducci's observation to me. Total skepticism is completely  
unjustified in this case as well.

>My argument here is not that BUFORA were right. I don't think  
>they were. Free speech is no substitute for allowing nonsense to  
>be set before the public in your name. But the point is one that  
>requires deeper consideration as to a degree we all do the same  
>thing without probably being aware of that fact. So - perhaps, a  
>general consensus that we could agree and issue as a  
>proclamation about is what we need to emerge from this mess. If  
>we agree to abide by this working practice we would set an  
>example to Ufology.

What you appear to be attempting to verbalize, is that there is  
a requirement that anyone with an opinion practice a reasonable  
level of responsibility in the effort. Please, that'd be nice.  
And unexpected.

Your desire for a consensus, in my opinion at least, will not  
work. First, ufology is not as yet prepared for the level of  
responsible expression you and many of us, desire. The proof of  
this are various and sundry opinions expressed right here as  
\_fact\_, opinions so diverse as to be oxymoronic. Oh me of  
little faith.

>What example? Let us all take the decision here and now that any  
>public event we organise involve the invitation only of serious  
>researchers who can put forward hard evidence with a  
>demonstrably scientific basis and who do not endorse patently  
>absurd, unscientific ideas without support. Nor that we should  
>invite anyone who sets before the public a scenario that has  
>damaging moral or ethical repercussions. As these things require  
>common sense and someone to make a value judgement we don't want  
>to set ourselves up as the thought police. So I suggest we  
>agree a second principle, if we make a value judgement and yet  
>someone whom we invite still clearly offends the sensitivities  
>of people out there - such responsible criticism should be  
>heeded. If it is apparent there is concern over an invite then a  
>free vote is offered over the net - a simple yes/no to whether  
>that person should be considered suitable for invite and that  
>the decision to run with that lecturer or to cancel the invite  
>be abided by whatever the outcome of this vote.

Oh my Gawd! Have you ever been involved with more than  
yourself, in setting up a conference of any kind, let alone  
\_THIS\_ subject? Huh? What you are asking for is the ideal. See  
my previous para on idealism.

However I do have several questions...

- 1) Who chooses those "serious researchers" to whom you  
referred?
- 2) Please, define that "hard evidence" you spoke about!
- 3) And about those sensibilities you referred to, whose  
sensibilities are you speaking of?
- 4) Have you ever been to a Chinese fire drill?

> Respectfully snipped

>Comments please.

OK, how about "Oy veh ist mir!?"

Jim Mortellaro

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: John Heptonstall <[john@mac-tcm.demon.co.uk](mailto:john@mac-tcm.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 19:41:26 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 17:06:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 15:08:56 +0100

>All this stuff about Max Burns brings up a critical issue about  
>UFO credibility and the way we present ourselves in public.  
>Surely that ID the issue here. It is what BUFORA utterly failed  
>to read. They did the same thing with the fawning over the  
>Santilli autopsy fiasco. Although I dare say they might - not  
>unreasonably - cast back the point against various Sheffield  
>events that, for instance, the IUN invited the likes of Budd  
>Hopkins - when he is (without medical qualification) regressing  
>five year old children and promoting the image of nasty grays  
>raping humans. Somehow there is not a lot of difference here.  
>Both are apparently honest ufologists expressing a view that  
>most of us consider not only fundamentally wrong but potentially  
>destructive. We may hate these opinions but can we honourably  
>suppress them all?

<snip>

>Comments please.

>Jenny Randles

I think the fundamental test for any 'theory' has to be that it has sufficient direct evidence to warrant reasonable discussion. Evidence can be witness testimony, flight logs, police data, and any other materially significant information that an objective reasonable person would accept as valid, or that creates room for sensible debate.

It may be that some of this evidence has been obtained by, what some feel is, 'dubious' means such as 'regressive hypnosis' but that should not exclude the evidence as long as it is not the sole basis for a theory - there has to be some material/direct or witness recall (without recourse to hypnotherapeutic techniques) data from which the theory can be derived.

Mouton Howe, Good, Lear, Lazar, Warren, Hopkins and numerous others have been criticised by some UFologists - it appears to me - more because of their 'findings' than the fact that they cannot supply evidence that can be debated. That's not objective reasoning. I also have reservations about 'regressing children' but it may ultimately be found to be a relatively safe, and effective, means to find out what is going on - especially if there is an ET dimension to their experiences, and that the only way to identify the scope and depth of the problem is to provide such a modality in a safe, properly controlled, way. Yet we have detractors, such as Kevin McLure, who would deny the right of both investigator and witness to that modality - not from a scientific or legal base, despite his weak arguments to the contrary that have been easily shot down ( and not reported as so by him ).

We have to extract subjective opinion from the arguments and stick to objectivity; if say the IUN decides to publish a



theoretical argument that does not sit well with many of it's members - tough shit - as long as the argument has supportive evidence, as opposed to opinion, it will find it's level; those who cannot take objectivity because it flies in the face of their scepticism, that's their problem and they should be seen as not capable of accepting a reasoned argument. It's not long since Jacques Benveniste was part of a debate on TV about his 'proof' of 'the memory of water. One of the debaters, Jonathan .... ( forgot his name, doctor and theatrical personality ) tried to argue against the theory which flies in the face of current chemical understanding, and in the end he said he 'would not believe it if he saw it with his own eyes'. We seem to have more that one or two such sceptics in UFOlogy - we can do without this, let them support their own point evidentially before having their views widely published.

BUFORA made the fatal mistake with Max ( and regularly do ) of failing to require supporting evidence before they entertain a 'speaker' or 'author'. The IUN must hold better standards but have to be ready to publish views that may not be popular. BUFORA have done that!

Unless criticism is supported by objective reasoning and evidence, it should not be entertained; when one reads professional magazines, it is common to find that articles, and 'letters', will not be published if they are not supported with reasoned argument. This must become part of UFOlogy, it is not at the moment and that detracts from the subject enormously.

This must also go for criticism of another's work, or point of view; if the latter is based on sound evidence, then it goes without saying that any criticism or opposing view must be required to be accompanied by sound theoretical argument. I hope we are all able to take criticism of our points of view - but we should not have deal with 'emotional' outbursts which have no evidential base.

Regards

John.

--

John Heptonstall

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [john](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## 'Strange Days...Indeed' - Tonight: Dennis Stacy

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 18:10:57 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 18:10:57 -0400  
Subject: 'Strange Days...Indeed' - Tonight: Dennis Stacy

From: UFO UpDates - Toronto

On 'Strange Days... Indeed' tonight, Dennis Stacy, co-editor of The Anomalist, former editor of The MUFON Journal and a man not afraid to call a crock "a crock".

Join co-host Jonn Kares and I on 'Strange Days...Indeed' as we discuss with Dennis various aspects of UFO phenomena - the good, the bad and the just plain damn-dumb.

The program starts at 11:00pm EST on  
1010 CFRB AM - 50,000 watts 'Clear-Channel'  
6070khz Shortwave

and you can listen via Media Player at:

[www.cfrb.com/](http://www.cfrb.com/)

You'll need to access the site using Internet Explorer since Media Player seems to choke using any version of Netscape - thanks Mr. Bill!

To call the program 'live', dial:

On-Air 416-872-1010  
1-800-561-CFRB [all over North America]  
\*TALK [local mobiles]

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 22:13:18 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 19:28:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

>From: Joe Murgia <[Ufojoel@aol.com](mailto:Ufojoel@aol.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:11:14 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>If only one person showed up, that has nothing to do with how  
>good or bad the lecture was. I've been to incredible lectures  
>with only 15 people in attendance and I've been to awful  
>lectures with over 200 people in attendance.

>Review the lecture in detail if you're going to knock it.

Hi Joe,

I would agree with you 100% but I think the point to get across here is, that Max is a marked man I dont think this will change for a long time to come, I'm sure Max is aware of this.

Roy..

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 18:34:00 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 20:31:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting  
>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 99 20:06:44 PDT

<snip>

>The point remains. You said there is no corroboration for  
>Arnold's account, beyond his own -- to most of us who don't  
>quack like anti-UFO ducks -- impressive testimony. You were  
>wrong. Johnson was at the right time and the right to place to  
>see Arnold's UFOs. He thought that he saw Arnold's UFOs, and an  
>FBI interviewer characterized him as "a very reliable  
>individual." (No doubt you know better and will let us know  
>what a fruitcake and/or sociopath the man was.) The rest of you  
>may be interested in a useful discussion of the relationship of  
>Johnson's testimony to Arnold's; see Bruce Maccabee's article in  
>IUR, May/June 1995.  
>

Jerry,

Again, you're a post short. I've already retracted, qualified, amended, however you want to put it, any previous statement of mine which you continue to interpret as my calling Arnold a fruitcake. The original statement was made in the context of: one does not necessarily know when one is dealing with a fruitcake or not. Now you're adding sociopath to what I said.

But here's the point: no journalist or historian would say "Johnson was at the right time and the right to place to see Arnold's UFOs," unless they were present with him at the time. They would say Johnson said, stated, claimed, declared, insisted, allowed, alleged, vowed, vouchsafed, or whatever. However much you might wish it otherwise, Johnson's letter and FBI interview are ultimately evidence of just that -- not the claimed contents. They are two different and distinct things.

Before you get on your indignant high horse again, that's not to say, ipso facto, the contents of any statement are false by definition, as you seem to think (and persist in claiming that) I'm always saying. It's simply to say that an allegation of events is not the event itself. Never has been, never will be.

That said, Johnson said the objects passed over him at a thousand feet. I'd like to see you put a telescope on an object a thousand feet overhead going 1200 mph (or more) an hour. As with your own UFO Encyclopedia article, Maccabee's IUR article is also replete with its fair share of qualifiers as to the number of objects Johnson reported, their size, etc.

Yes, the FBI interviewer characterized Johnson "as a very reliable individual." But based on what? A 30-minute telling of his story? Again, the FBI statement is a subjective assessment, not a God-given or determined fact. But since you grant the FBI inviolate objectivity (and higher authority) in this case, presumably that means you support all other recorded FBI statements regarding the UFO phenomenon and its many witnesses? Or is it just a case of the ones you support?

>>Moreover, ufology is replete with cautionary tales.

>Ufology is also replete with puzzling, well-investigated cases  
>which continue to resist explanation. One of them is Arnold's.  
>The sorts of stories you cite below are notable in being so  
>rare, if one puts them in the context of UFO-reporting  
>generally. On the other hand, if one considers that they are  
>both photographic cases -- which long experience has taught us  
>are far more likely to be bogus than other sorts of UFO reports,  
>where hoaxing is relatively infrequent -- they're not rare at  
>all. To the contrary, the negative resolution of these claims  
>should not surprise any sophisticated observer.

You overlook one significant fact: photographic cases are much easier to disprove than anecdotal ones. In fact, it's extremely difficult to disprove an individual anecdote.

<snip>

>>Does this mean, ipso facto, that Arnold is in the same league?  
>>Of course not. Does it mean that he could be? I'll leave that  
>>up to you to decide.

>Let's get this straight. First you were intimating that Arnold  
>was a fruitcake (or that this is a reasonable possibility). Now  
>you're intimating that he's a hoaxer (or that this is a  
>reasonable possibility). Which is it?

You're still a post short. But here's my answer: Neither of us  
\_knows\_ whether Arnold is a hoaxer or not, just as we don't  
\_know\_ how much (or whether) he may have exaggerated his first  
sighting (without hoaxing). Point is, you can't eliminate either  
possibility with absolute certainty, as you seem to think you  
can. You're the one that's always arguing we have to turn away  
from a b&w world and confront ambiguity. Well, here's your  
chance.

>>By the same token, there's no compelling reason, granted Clark's  
>>exalted UFO theology (in which witnesses are never confused  
>>about anything, but always spot on), to argue that Arnold  
>>shouldn't ascend to ufological sainthood post haste. Hey, the  
>>guy was only human.

>For those of you who need a translation of the above:

>If you don't subscribe to the doctrine that UFO witnesses exist  
>to be trashed, however speciously, you're a theologian. One  
>might call this the New New Ufology, or maybe just quack logic.

Here's a better translation. For the greater part of its  
existence, ufology has always been, more often than not, at the  
mercy of the individual anecdote. That doesn't mean every  
account and individual that comes our way is automatically  
suspect and therefore (to put words in my mouth) sociopathic. It  
does mean you have to live with the possibility that any witness  
can be seriously mistaken and/or misleading, for a variety of  
reasons.

That's not an anti-UFO bias on my part, but a simple statement  
of fact.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Rose Hargrove <[PRIESTESSE@aol.com](mailto:PRIESTESSE@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 20:19:22 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 21:01:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 15:08:56 +0100

> All this stuff about Max Burns brings up a critical issue about  
>UFO credibility and the way we present ourselves in public.  
>Surely that ID the issue here. It is what BUFORA utterly failed  
>to read. They did the same thing with the fawning over the  
>Santilli autopsy fiasco. Although I dare say they might - not  
>unreasonably - cast back the point against various Sheffield  
>events that, for instance, the IUN invited the likes of Budd  
>Hopkins - when he is (without medical qualification) regressing  
>five year old children and promoting the image of nasty grays  
>raping humans. Somehow there is not a lot of difference here.  
>Both are apparently honest ufologists expressing a view that  
>most of us consider not only fundamentally wrong but potentially  
>destructive. We may hate these opinions but can we honourably  
>suppress them all?

Here we go again, can we suppress all opinions that do not fit  
our view of how ufology should unfold? As far as Budd not having  
a medical degree is ufology taught in medical school and must  
the grays be represented as spiritual teachers of mankind for  
the story to be believed. I believe Dr. Mack who has a  
transformational bent to his version of the gray agenda has a  
medical degree but not a degree in theology. Budd has done good  
honest research and I do not believe if one reviews the numerous  
cases he and others have researched that the conclusion that the  
grays are here to further our spiritual or ecological needs can  
easily be reached.

>My argument here is not that BUFORA were right. I don't think  
>they were. Free speech is no substitute for allowing nonsense to  
>be set before the public in your name. But the point is one that  
>requires deeper consideration as to a degree we all do the same  
>thing without probably being aware of that fact. So - perhaps, a  
>general consensus that we could agree and issue as a  
>proclamation about is what we need to emerge from this mess. If  
>we agree to abide by this working practice we would set an  
>example to Ufology.

Who is going to sit on the committee that decides who may speak  
and who must remain silent because their views do not align with  
the majority. I believe we must be careful in our approach and  
not allow irrational arguments to air in the name of ufology  
however we at the same time cannot censure those viewpoints that  
do not fit our own conception of what ufology should be. We risk  
returning to the mindset of the good churchmen of the  
Inquisition.

>What example? Let us all take the decision here and now that any  
>public event we organise involve the invitation only of serious  
>researchers who can put forward hard evidence with a  
>demonstrably scientific basis and who do not endorse patently  
>absurd, unscientific ideas without support. Nor that we should  
>invite anyone who sets before the public a scenario that has  
>damaging moral or ethical repercussions. As these things require  
>common sense and someone to make a value judgement we don't want

>to set ourselves up as the thought police. So I suggest we  
>agree a second principle, if we make a value judgement and yet  
>someone whom we invite still clearly offends the sensitivities  
>of people out there - such responsible criticism should be  
>heeded. If it is apparent there is concern over an invite then a  
>free vote is offered over the net - a simple yes/no to whether  
>that person should be considered suitable for invite and that  
>the decision to run with that lecturer or to cancel the invite  
>be abided by whatever the outcome of this vote.

I agree that we must be responsible and police our own but at the same time we must not attack our fellow ufologists merely because their conclusions do not match ours and especially if the work presented is based on years of honest research. We must support one another as far as we are able as there are too many who would attack us with no real provocation as a fringe element.

>Otherwise we face the question of setting ourselves up to make  
>moral choices about who should be empowered to speak and who  
>should not. I don't see how we can fairly do that. For the record  
>I would certainly have voted no to Max Burns - except had there  
>been a two way lecture (i.e. Max versus David so the audience  
>could judge the case side by side). This is exactly what I  
>proposed to BUFORA Council over the Santilli farce - that he be  
>allowed a platform at Sheffield in 1995 only if the alternative  
>perspective was simultaneously offered to allow free debate and  
>let the audience make fair judgement. As you know BUFORA  
>scuppered that plan and left themselves open to what are  
>therefore utterly justified criticism to this day over the way  
>they aided and abetted the autopsy promo.

I agree that Mr. Santilli put on a performance first and foremost however there remain serious researchers like Mr. Hopkins out there. I personally do not like to consider the picture of technologically advanced beings with less than positive intent toward humanity abducting parts of our populace but sadly it may be a conclusion that we may reach at the end of the day. I hope it is not however covering our eyes and ears will not make it go away.

>So when it came to Max Burns, I did not scream and shout at  
>BUFORA - I protested quietly by declining to promote the lecture  
>and by not accepting an invite to lecture to BUFORA during the  
>next 12 months. My point was thus, I trust, made without  
>fanfare.

>Rather than us now argue over a lecture that happened and which,  
>frankly, by trying to stop probably made it seem more  
>interesting to some than it deserved to be, lets stop blaming  
>some and shouting at others and do something positive instead.  
>Let us agree a declaration like I have just set out (that  
>obviously needs fine tuning) and those of us who accept it - on  
>behalf of ourselves and groups we represent -then issue it as a  
>proclamation to the UFO world ASAP encouraging other UFO groups  
>to sign up to the initiative. The plan would be to demonstrate  
>globally that we are voluntarily setting standards as regards to  
>the people we invite to give our public lectures - even if it  
>means not inviting some whose dramatic claims and media stardom  
>would attract audiences and put money into our coffers. We are  
>putting the principle of only promoting good, serious,  
>defensible research and theorising first and any personal gain  
>second. This will send a small message that we do care about  
>self policing ufology and making efforts to do the right thing  
>by educating the public - surely one of our primary aims.

>To me doing this is a positive outcome from the Santilli and Max  
>Burns affair. We will be turning it on its head and taking a  
>step forward on behalf of Ufology. So why not? Lets stop  
>fretting over a lecture that's been and gone and use it as a  
>springboard to agree a simple, straightforward but constructive  
>policy initiative for ufology.

We must I conclude be careful not to take a giant step backward and begin to silence our own ranks. While we are busy fighting amongst ourselves our detractors our even busier in attempting to eliminate the issue altogether and all of us as well.

Respectfully,

Rose Hargrove

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 17:14:23 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 19:37:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

>From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 16:30:47 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

<snip>

>Arnold's first sighting had very little to do with his later  
>one. His first one was prolonged, approximately 3 minutes,  
>plenty of time for Arnold to carefully observe and think about  
>what he might be seeing. The comes through clearly in the many  
>details recounted later, which, among other things, show how  
>Arnold was going through a mental checklist of conventional  
>explanations and doing his best to test them. Opening his  
>window to check for reflections and timing the objects between  
>two prominent landmarks were among these.

>The second sighting seemingly lasted only a few seconds. I've  
>sometimes been puzzled by things I've observed flying when I  
>first see them, but given 30 seconds, or a minute or two of  
>observation have been able to figure them out. That's the  
>difference between a brief glimpse and a fast first impression  
>vs. more prolonged observation.

<giant snip>

David,

Arnold said in his letter to the Air Force that "my complete  
observation of these objects...was around two and one-half or  
three minutes." At 1200 mph they would have covered some 60  
miles in that time (three minutes); at 1700 mph, some 85 miles.

Of his second sighting, it's difficult to determine its duration  
because Arnold is so vague, although it was undoubtedly brief.  
Here's his account, from "The Maury Island Episode" article:

"As I was letting down into LaGrande valley, I saw far off on my  
left and a little lower than my plane an Empire Airlines (now  
Air West) Boeing transport. It was an old plane but faster than  
mine. Suddenly, as I continued to lose altitude, I was  
confronted by a flock of what looked like ducks. I knew they  
weren't ducks because they were brassy-colored and large -- at  
least three feet across or possibly four or five. There were a  
couple of dozen of them, possibly more, and they were bunched  
and coming right at me. Eventually they swerved away -- and  
because they had the flight characteristics of the first flying  
saucers I decided to take after them. When I dived into the  
cluster, these things, whatever they were, soared away as if I  
were standing still."

Arnold says they swerved away and that he then gave pursuit,  
diving into the cluster. Even if they hadn't completely passed  
behind him at this point, this would seem to indicate a duration  
of 30 seconds or more as opposed, say, to a "flash" duration of  
ten seconds or less. It also indicates that he was able to catch  
up with the cluster and dive into it, which would, again,  
seemingly require at least 30 seconds or more in a plane with an  
airspeed of 100 mph or so.

It's also hard to know what Arnold means when he says the cluster (or the objects comprising it) had the same flight characteristics as the first flying saucers, as the former were strung out in a long line.

Does anyone know if Arnold supplies more detail on his second sighting in his book? This was about 6:30 A.M. on July 29, 1947, just over a month after his June 24 sighting.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 13](#)

## Re: Fwd: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

From: Henny van der Pluijm <[hvdp@worldonline.nl](mailto:hvdp@worldonline.nl)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 03:13:11 +0200 (MET DST)  
Fwd Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 21:53:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Fwd: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 15:40:16 +0000  
>From: Philip Mantle - QUEST <[pmquest@dial.pipex.com](mailto:pmquest@dial.pipex.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

>From: Tim Matthews <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
>To: Philip Mantle - QUEST <[pmquest@dial.pipex.com](mailto:pmquest@dial.pipex.com)>  
>Subject: URGENT NEWSFLASH - BELGIUM 1989/90  
>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 23:09:01 +0100

Hello Tim and all,

>We believe that recent sightings of a similar low-speed aircraft  
>are evidence of a highly advanced triangular Lighter-Than-Air  
>(LTA) hybrid vehicle with inherent stealth ability - the result  
>of its' construction from a Kevlar-based composite materials.  
>(This aircraft is not dissimilar to those proposed by the Aereon  
>Corporation of Princeton, New Jersey from the late 1960s  
>onwards.)

During a rather lengthy debate on this list some one and a half  
year ago I discussed the Belgian UFO flap. Then and later one  
after another explanation has been offered that proposed a  
terrestrial origin. To this date, no terrestrial explanation for  
the flap has come up that fitted all the facts.

As far as this hypothesis is concerned, the unknown craft of the  
Belgian flap were not low speed aircraft and did not have  
stealth capability.

/ Met vriendelijke groet/Best wishes \  
Henny van der Pluijm  
[hvdp@worldonline.nl](mailto:hvdp@worldonline.nl)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

**Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan, 7 July 1989?**

From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 02:26:10 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 16:50:02 -0400  
Subject: Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan, 7 July 1989?

Hi All,

Can anyone help me in finding a copy of a piece of video footage which was taken at Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan, 7 July 1989?

A photographer (Yasuhiko Hamazaki) took the film and apparently also managed to get some real close up shot's of the UFO.

The object looked like a Saturn-Shaped white object with a prominent ring encircling it in the horizontal plane.

Any help would be appreciated.

Regards,

Roy..

Find The Lost Haven @ <http://freespace.virgin.net/roy.hale/index.html>

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?

From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 02:35:47 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 16:51:50 -0400  
Subject: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?

Hi All,

Does anyone have any more information on the following sighting?

On the 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary, four large Spherical, bright orange objects, approx. fifty meters in diameter were spotted by Meteorologists.

One of the objects was reported to have flown at 2,625 m.p.h.

I also understand the local military airbase sent up a pilot, who subsequently located four objects at an altitude of about four miles.

Any help would be appreciated.

Regards,

Roy..

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 14](#)

## Humanoid Allegedly Found In Mason, MI, In Spring

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 04:22:24  
Fwd Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 16:55:49 -0400  
Subject: Humanoid Allegedly Found In Mason, MI, In Spring

Source: UFO Sightings in New Mexico and the World,

<http://members.xoom.com/ufosnmw/reports/cover.html>

The Lansing State Journal is real and was chosen as the 1998 Michigan Press Association newspaper of the year. Homepage:

<http://www.lansingstatejournal.com>

Stig

\*\*\*

To: [ufosnw@rt66.com](mailto:ufosnw@rt66.com)  
From: ()  
Subject: UFO Sighting Reports

Below is the result of your feedback form.

It was submitted by () on Wednesday, January 7, 1998 at 06:42:49

\*\*

Location: Mason, Michigan

Date: Spring 1996

time: unknown

Sighting: In the early spring of 1996 (?), The Lansing (MI) State Journal and at least one of Lansing's (state capitol) three television stations reported that the unclothed body of a small, thin, silvery skinned, humanoid being had been discovered in the yard of a Mason resident when the property owners were raking leaves. The partially decomposed body was (to the best of my recollection) reported as being less than four feet tall and having a larger than human head. The media reported that the body in question was transported by authorities to the campus of Michigan State University in East Lansing, some ten miles north of Mason, for study.

The story was printed and aired the day following the discovery of the "being" but was never again mentioned in the local media, something unusual for the local news "pro's" (term used "lightly") who typically report mundane events "tabloid style" ad nauseum, for days and even weeks after the fact.

I had been told by an acquaintance that the "being" had been either photographed or videotaped and that those images had appeared in either the newspaper or on the local television newscast(s), but I can not personally substantiate if pictures were, indeed, taken.

Nearly two years have passed since the mysterious discovery, and there has been no media follow-up on this story that the media dropped like a hot rock. It seems that this substantiated find, too, was quickly and purposely covered up by someone with enough influence and or coercive power to make the media comply, unquestioningly and without protest, to their agenda of silence.

{UFO Sightings in New Mexico and the World}  
{<http://members.xoom.com/ufosnmw>}  
{[ufosnw@rt66.com](mailto:ufosnw@rt66.com)}

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Nathan Ranger <[netrangr@ufo.net](mailto:netrangr@ufo.net)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 22:42:40 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 12:23:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 15:08:56 +0100

>Hi,

>All this stuff about Max Burns brings up a critical issue about  
>UFO credibility and the way we present ourselves in public.  
>Surely that ID the issue here. It is what BUFORA utterly failed  
>to read. They did the same thing with the fawning over the  
>Santilli autopsy fiasco. Although I dare say they might - not  
>unreasonably - cast back the point against various Sheffield  
>events that, for instance, the IUN invited the likes of Budd  
>Hopkins - when he is (without medical qualification) regressing  
>five year old children and promoting the image of nasty grays  
>raping humans. Somehow there is not a lot of difference here.  
>Both are apparently honest ufologists expressing a view that  
>most of us consider not only fundamentally wrong but potentially  
>destructive. We may hate these opinions but can we honourably  
>suppress them all?

[Swish...]

[Engage Soapbox Mode]

Hey! Get a clue people.

Here we have the problem: Jenny Randles, prominent UFO  
researcher and author, comes up with rules of "engagement". Her  
rules. What she thinks is right. Sure. (No offense intended,  
Jenny. You just happened to be standing in line during this  
"fit". :) )

See people, the whole problem with ufology is the fact that  
everybody wants it to be what they want it to be so they can say  
"See! I told you so!" in order to get that big \_\_\_\_\_ deal.  
[Fill in the blank with whatever you want.] Nobody gives a \_damn\_  
about what it (it, meaning the UFO mystery) really is, except a  
few \_and\_ those few get the \_crap\_ ridiculed out of them for  
following some sort of scientific reasoning.

Shake a leg! Yeah, I'm talking to \_all\_ of you! Get serious with  
this stuff instead of worrying about filling your pockets and  
your speaking schedule and pushing your \_pet\_ theories. Don't  
try to "message" the data so it will look like your pet theory.  
Don't claim other researchers are "messaging" the data unless  
you have real proof.

I've witnessed some of Budd Hopkins 'Nasty Gray = child-raper'  
regression sessions. Pardon me, Jenny, but does Budd get the  
right to call your theories damaging and misleading? You're  
right that its damaging. However, its only damaging because  
people like you refuse to \_really\_ understand how Budd does his  
research. It doesn't fit your pet theory so Budd is a fraud, an  
imprecise buffoon of a researcher. Keep saying it, I'm sure if  
you and he get into a tussle, both your book sales will go  
up. (Incidentally, I agree with many of Jenny's theories. I just  
don't like namecalling in ufology. Its unprofessional and



witless.)

All researchers have their weak points. They have their areas that give them navigation trouble. Instead of namecalling, we should offer help. But, that doesn't happen. That might keep Budd from selling some books or keep Jenny from keeping her speaking schedule full.

See, thats why they call it "fringe" science. In real science things like this happen a lot less and there is a cohesive structure to keep all the data together rather than a bunch of profit motivated pirahnas trying to tear each other's data apart, devour it and poop out golden oportunities to make more profit. What if we went at atomic energy or space flight or computer engineering this way, the world would be a FUBARed mess! Get a clue people.

Who needs government disinformation agents? Just paint a little blood on all the sharks and watch them eat each other! Ufological politics is more stupid than US Government politics. At least with government politics, there is usually a clear objective: get elected.

Its it any wonder people look at us funny and think: "crackpot" when they hear about us?

NetRanger  
mailto:[netrangr@ufo.net](mailto:netrangr@ufo.net)  
<http://www.ufo.net>

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same

From: **Christine Fernandes** <[pumpkin@netfly.com.br](mailto:pumpkin@netfly.com.br)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 23:35:42 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 11:07:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same

>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 23:09:36 -0600  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Don Allen <[dona@amigo.net](mailto:dona@amigo.net)>  
>Subject: Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same Packets Of Data

>>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 02:02:41  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>>Subject: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same Packets Of Data

>>Computer users who are contributing to the SETI (search for  
>>alien life) project are inadvertently wasting CPU cycles by  
>>processing data that has already been scanned.

>>Due to failures in coping with the overwhelming response from  
>>volunteers, the SETI@home project has been erroneously sending  
>>the same packets of radio data to its 500,000 participants.

>Thanks for posting this article. It explains why I've been  
>processing the same packet from a few days ago and also why my  
>processed units stats haven't been getting updated. I was just  
>about ready to delete Seti off my machine.

Well, since that problem is occurring now with the SETI  
participants, should I still go ahead and download it on my  
computer or would be more advisable to wait and see how it  
unfolds? Thx for the time, Christine.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [seti](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Housekeeping

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 11:06:49 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 11:06:49 -0400  
Subject: Housekeeping

It seems that the posting problems I've been having for the past week might be resolved.

A bizarreness occurred with Eudora's nndbase file here. It somehow had a portion of a 'bounce' notification dumped into it, in September of last year. I traced it back over many back-ups. The problem that caused didn't start to manifest until last week. Several of us are still scratching our heads...

In trying to re-build the address file from past versions and Sub/Un-Sub requests, some names were inadvertently overlooked and a few subscribers haven't received mail at all for the past few days - to them, apologies. They've been re-added.

Fingers, eyes, ears, nose and toes crossed,

ebk

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## FYI: Possible UFO Mis-Reports

From: **Leanne Martin** <[leanne\\_martin@hotmail.com](mailto:leanne_martin@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 21:04:36 PDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 13:32:05 -0400  
Subject: FYI: Possible UFO Mis-Reports

G'day all,

Over this long weekend in Sydney (Oz) there has a 'soccer spectacular' at the new olympic games site at Homebush.

This has involved the use of search lights and the Whitmans Chocolates illuminated LTA observation craft in the skies of the Western suburbs.

As a result there may be the odd call-in of UFOs over Sydney.

Cheers,  
Leanne ];-)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Seti@home 'Failure'?

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <[ufoman@ican.net](mailto:ufoman@ican.net)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 02:41:17 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 13:37:45 -0400  
Subject: Re: Seti@home 'Failure'?

>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 23:11:53 -0700 (PDT)  
>From: John Tenney <[mainorg@yahoo.com](mailto:mainorg@yahoo.com)>  
>Subject: Seti@home 'Failure'? hmm  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>When I joined the SETI@home project (downloaded the program and  
>began running it on my computer) I was close to 100% sure that I  
>would not detect an "alien intelligence" on my \$1200.00  
>computer. I was interested in being involved in a project  
>wherein hundreds of thousands of like-minded individuals could  
>cooperate together with a single goal, (no unimpressive feat,  
>you usually can't get two people to agree on which movie they'd  
>like to rent). As a matter of fact over the course of the past  
>20 days I realized that I do belong to a minority of people  
>involved with the SETI@home project.

>My computer is on and running 24 hours a day everyday, and  
>before SETI@home the majority of the time when I wasn't using  
>for research it just sat idle literally "doing nothing." But  
>after I downloaded the program for SETI@home my computer was no  
>longer a \$1200 paperweight, it was doing something, whether it  
>was doing correctly or as predicted did not matter to me, at  
>least it was doing something.

>Now when I read newspaper articles about the "failures" of the  
>SETI@home project, how disenchanted people are with it, how much  
>of a waste of time and energy it is, I'm left wondering a few  
>questions.

<snip>

To whom it may concern,

Good luck trying to locate an alien intelligence with the use of SETI.  
Contact has already been made. Humanoids from other planets have already  
been (and are still coming) here by way of structured spacecraft. SETI is a  
waste of time and money, and NASA realized it earlier on. Perhaps they know  
more about this than the public is led to believe.

Save your energy, use your computer in a more constructive way, and don't  
let yourself be taken in by what SETI followers are telling you about  
extraterrestrial intelligence. They don't know anything.

Cordially,

Someone who knows

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [seti](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 23:52:07 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 13:34:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Rose Hargrove <[PRIESTESSE@aol.com](mailto:PRIESTESSE@aol.com)>  
>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 20:19:22 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

<snip>

>Here we go again, can we suppress all opinions that do not fit  
>our view of how ufology should unfold? As far as Budd not having  
>a medical degree is ufology taught in medical school and must  
>the grays be represented as spiritual teachers of mankind for  
>the story to be believed. I believe Dr. Mack who has a  
>transformational bent to his version of the gray agenda has a  
>medical degree but not a degree in theology. Budd has done good  
>honest research and I do not believe if one reviews the numerous  
>cases he and others have researched that the conclusion that the  
>grays are here to further our spiritual or ecological needs can  
>easily be reached.

<snip>

Well, then, you should take this idea up with Mr. Mack, who  
apparently believes just that. And he's the one with the degree.

Research into abduction cases is virtually nonexistent these  
days, unless by research you refer to repeated regressive  
hypnosis sessions, which seem to be the preferred approach. Name  
me a single abduction case that Mr. Mack has ever investigated  
above and beyond a resort to hypnosis. Name me a single case  
that Mr. Hopkins is presently actively investigating above and  
beyond the use of regressive hypnosis. Ditto for Dr. Jacobs.

Retrieving an account of something under hypnosis is not an  
investigation, but a poor cousin of same. In fact, it  
substitutes hypnotic recall in place of any actual  
investigation.

Sorry to be the messenger...

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## UFO, Paranormal, New Age Etc. Address List?

From: Philip Mantle - QUEST <[pmquest@dial.pipex.com](mailto:pmquest@dial.pipex.com)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 09:47:13 +0000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 14:10:31 -0400  
Subject: UFO, Paranormal, New Age Etc. Address List?

Dear colleagues,

I am trying to put together an address list (snail mail, e-mail, phone and fax) of as many groups operating in the field of UFO research, the paranormal, new age, earth mysteries, fortean studies, etc, etc, as I possibly can, from anywhere in the world.

If you can help supply such a list, recommend a web site where I can locate them, or if you are a member of such a group, then please contact me direct at: [pmquest@dial.pipex.com](mailto:pmquest@dial.pipex.com)

Thank you for your cooperation with this request and please forward this message onto any interested parties.

Regards,

Philip Mantle.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same

From: Jacques Poulet <[jpoulet@chucara.com](mailto:jpoulet@chucara.com)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 06:52:34 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 14:13:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 11:47:09 -0500  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: Donnie Shevlin <[donnies@codamc.com](mailto:donnies@codamc.com)>  
>Subject: Re: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same Packets

>>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 02:02:41  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>>Subject: SETI@home Project Erroneously Sending Same Packets Of Data

>Hi all, EBK, Stig...

>Well now, finally something right up my alley. Being a project  
>manager over software development, I feel his pain. I understand  
>exactly what is happening there. Low end computers, short on  
>availability of computers and overwhelming demand from the end  
>user, I've been there too many times to count.

>What I don't understand is why they only converted days 1/7/99  
>and 1/8/99. I know the data is large for a full day, but why  
>only the two days? The size of the work\_unit.txt file is only  
>384K. And how may seconds of data in a work file, 107 seconds?  
>So that would be;

>((48hrs x 60min)x60sec) / 107sec = roughly 1600 files@384K

I think you should go to the seti@home site and read carefully  
the process involved. the 107 seconds you get is for a 10KHz  
bandwidth. I don't remember the exact figures but there are  
quite a few 10KHz bandwidth "packets" for every 107 second  
period. So you're too low by a factor of 100 or so...

>Now 1600 files at 384K is just little over 600 megabytes of  
>data. In these days of cheap high capacity hard drives, that's  
>not a lot of data.

>Secondly, the 'parceling the raw data' process should be fairly  
>easy. The files are small so the process must be quick. I have  
>written applications that can turn 200 megabytes of processed  
>data out over a 6 hour period. So they could easily had turned  
>out plenty of data over a two week plus period. So why only two  
>days? Are there problems in the raw data files? I hope not.

The amount of calculation involved is not only a matter of data  
processing per say, it's a matter of calculating all  
possibilities. A rather bigger task.

>Why didn't they just tell us there was a problem and to hold on  
>processing until the problem was corrected? Anyone who deals  
>with software would know that the end users time is valuable. To  
>waste their time will make them unruly and question your ability  
>to deliver.

I can agree on this one.

Bye

Jacques Poulet  
Phone: (514) 913-0274

<http://www.chucara.com/>

Fortean Files CDROM <http://members.tripod.com/jpoulet/>

CHUCARA  
Box 61  
La Prairie, Qc  
Canada J5R 3Y1

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [seti](#) | [files](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: [Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 09:32:18 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 14:17:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 02:30:41 -0700  
>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 10:59:56 -0500 (CDT)  
>>From: Brian Cuthbertson <[brianc@freeside.fc.net](mailto:brianc@freeside.fc.net)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 08:53:27 -0500  
>>>From: Ron Decker <[decker@wt.net](mailto:decker@wt.net)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

<snip>

>Are we indeed alone in the universe? Of course not.

>Then, what's so silly about hypothesizing long-lived,  
>infinitely patient intelligent machines peeking and poking  
>around a planet as biologically interesting as this one?

>Please consider the opposite hypothesis.

>Its even sillier.

>Best wishes

>- Larry Hatch

After reading an article on Jeff Rense's site, in Scientific American and elsewhere, the concept of autonomous biological entities is not silly, neither is it untenable ... even for us.

Biological entities which are able to make on the spot decisions are being studied as we sip our Grip. The idea is to be able to avoid having to communicate long distances, and therefore long time periods, in order to garner a decision from the Capo di Tutti Probas. The probe can make the decision all by it's self.

It's a bit like the Mars Rover probe. It was able to decided when to go around a rock rather than try to roll into it. Consider the alternative, Grays which walk into walls and get stuck in 'em. Or mantis-like critters which devour their abductees. Or how about an alien with a case of the giggles? That'd get your attention pretty quick!

Jim

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## **UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

From: **Mike Wootten** <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 11:49:31 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 14:21:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

>From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture  
>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 22:13:18 +0100

>>From: Joe Murgia <[Ufojoel@aol.com](mailto:Ufojoel@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:11:14 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>If only one person showed up, that has nothing to do with how  
>>good or bad the lecture was. I've been to incredible lectures  
>>with only 15 people in attendance and I've been to awful  
>>lectures with over 200 people in attendance.

>>Review the lecture in detail if you're going to knock it.

>Hi Joe,

>I would agree with you 100% but I think the point to get across  
>here is, that Max is a marked man I dont think this will change  
>for a long time to come, I'm sure Max is aware of this.

Roy,

Its not a question of whether Max is a marked man or not. His  
research of the Sheffield Incident is bunk and BUFORA should not  
be supporting bunk. The case is solved with plenty of evidence  
to prove it. It is only the gullible that can't see that.

Mike Wootten

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 16:45:43 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 14:30:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

Hi,

Thanks for all the messages that flooded in over the weekend. To be honest I had not even noticed that UFO UpDates was on the cc list of the original Robert Moore and I thought I was only talking to a few UK UFOlogists. I was quite surprised to see my 'spooF' went global. But no matter, it was an interesting exercise.

Let me qualify 'spooF'. This was not really trickery. Rather it was a deliberate exercise in taking an idea to its natural extreme. Many people in the UK have been furious over the Max Burns lecture saying BUFORA lost the plot by inviting him. There were demands for mass walk outs over the issue.

My response drew people onward and some, it appears, did not stop to think. As I correctly noted we all appear with people whom we don't necessarily agree with. We also all use these people to promote our conferences. Some of those speaking out most vociferously against Max Burns had themselves done much the same inviting as lecturer's people who offer ideas that they presumably have just as much mistrust about. I wanted them to see that.

Moreover, the knee jerk reaction to what was an ill-advised lecture in my view takes us to the terrible extreme of self censorship that some responders recognised without being aware that this was the very problem I wanted to illuminate.

For the record, I dont think it is either practical or desirable that we issue a proclamation to ban lecturers we personally dont like. I was perputrating a very British trait - irony - in a way that is easily misconstrued, so I apologise to those who did misconstrue it. Such a ban would not work, would provoke images of big brother and UFO censorship and suppress ideas we personally dont agree with. None of these things are what we need. But as my 'suggestion' made apparent they were the consequence of over-reacting to this lecture at which only 35 people showed up.

I did have a deeper intention though. My arguments about how we present ourselves to the world were valid. I feel we need to portray a more responsible image in that regard.

More fundamentally I think the concept of UFO conferences is outmoded. What are they after all? In the UK they comprise a few lecturers trotting around the country to this library or that local group giving similar lectures to a small group of mostly already converted listeners. They have their advantages - eg in public education (which is why I always freely lecture to educational and library sources when requested). They can raise money for groups and I dont balk at that. But in terms of contributing to UFO progress they are limited.

Far more beneficial, in my view, was the MIT style symposium that has never been repeated - largely as it required a large donation to avoid the need to charge entrance fees to those taking part. In the absence of rich folk wanting to give us money (er like a certain Mr Rockefeller) this should not be

perceived as an insurmountable barrier. I feel we should re-invent the UFO conference forthwith.

I would like to see (as well as - I am not talking about banning MUFON or BUFORA style conferences but adding to the mix) a global series of themed events. Choosing, as MIT did, a set topic, inviting participation months in advance from not just UFOlogists but researchers in related relevant fields (from physics to psychology or whatever suits the topic). Those invited are urged to do first hand research to try to answer one of, say, five questions set in advance by the organisers of the conference. They are invited to present their original findings at the event itself.

For example, if we set the topic 'car stop cases' we could define a series of questions up front. Such as: what is the statistical frequency by date, time, location, etc of car stop cases? What physical forces can cause a car engine to stall? what physical evidence should be sought in the wake of a car stop? etc etc. These questions then go out to UFOlogists and mechanics and physicists etc and they are encouraged to do real, new research around a chosen question and submit a summary of their work - the results of which they will offer up at the event. The event itself is then organised and - being a working conference not a public event (although the public need not be excluded) even the lecturers will be asked to contribute to the costs if running the conference.

I believe that a core of contributors (who knows how many - 20, 30, 50, 100?) will be willing to pay to attend such events if the costs are kept in check. They would do so to take part in a real conference that is organised in such a way as to further progress not just to offer up random lectures on topics we all know a lot about anyway.

If a dozen such conferences on various topics were held worldwide every year I believe we would make more progress in a couple of years of such events (and their published findings) than 50 years of random conferences that contribute very little to real research.

Its a simple step to take - creating working conferences aimed at doing ufology and involving outside participants with things to contribute on very specialised themes. It would be a true test of ufology's resolve to make actual progress rather than just talk shop to one another and go around and around in circles. I think once we started to do this instead of just concentrating on attracting star names to sell out conferences in Puddlewick Town Hall then science would soon begin to take us seriously instead of laugh at us.

This is not a spoof. Its what I really believe we should be doing as opposed to issuing proclamations that we wont invite so and so to our next conference. On this basis anyone willing to do real original research will have a contribution to make, regardless of who they are or what we think of them. That should be the only criterion.

Is there anyone out there who agrees with this idea enough to set in motion a wave of real UFO conferences for the 21st century?

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**





# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

From: Nick Balaskas <[nikolaos@YorkU.CA](mailto:nikolaos@YorkU.CA)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 14:20:03 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 14:37:16 -0400  
Subject: Re: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 15:40:16 +0000  
>From: Philip Mantle - QUEST <[pmquest@dial.pipex.com](mailto:pmquest@dial.pipex.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

>From: Tim Matthews <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
>To: Philip Mantle - QUEST <[pmquest@dial.pipex.com](mailto:pmquest@dial.pipex.com)>  
>Subject: URGENT NEWSFLASH - BELGIUM 1989/90  
>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 23:09:01 +0100

>URGENT NEWSFLASH

<snip>

>...important discovery today at the International Air Show at  
>Woodford (British Aerospace), near Manchester.

>In long and casual conversation with a Belgian Air Force pilot  
>Eric encouraged him to talk about the Belgian "UFO" incidents of  
>1989/90. Amongst other things, Eric claimed not to be able to  
>remember...

<snip>

Hi Philip, Hi Tim.

Yesterday I drove out to the Quinte International Air Show at  
Canadian Forces Base Trenton (about 200 km. east of Toronto).

I spoke with several of the pilots of our CF-18 fighter jets and  
asked them if it was true that Canada would soon be retiring the  
CF-18s because they were all close to the end of their useful  
lives. One of them told me that that these are just one of many  
rumours going around and implied that the CF-18s were in great  
shape. Never-the-less two other CF-18 pilots (Captains 'Pepe'  
Prevost and Mike Mirza) presented me with a personalized signed  
CF-18 poster promoting Boeing, Northrop Grumman, GE Aircraft  
Engines and Hughes - several companies that would make many  
hundreds of millions of dollars through the sale of any new  
fighter aircraft to Canada.

What is the point in my above reply? Well, just because this  
Canadian pilot expressed his views, it doesn't mean they were  
correct or true or even reflected official Canadian government  
plans. Also, even if UFOs were not extraterrestrial in origin,  
would there be any good reasons for our pilots, Belgian or  
Canadian, to be filled in on the truth about top secret projects  
or plans, even when they had encounters with these 'UFOs',  
especially when they can and do talk to the public (me)?

Even with the supportive(?) evidence that was included in Tim's  
post to try and make this interview with the Belgian pilot more  
important than it really was, to me Tim actually strengthened  
the case that the Belgian UFO sightings were truly unknowns.  
Maybe Tim is now willing to consider the possibility that some  
UFOs which cannot simply be explained as top secret terrestrial  
projects may be of E.T. origin.

Nick Balaskas

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Research Institute on Anomalous Phenomena,

From: Alexander Beletsky <[riap777@chat.ru](mailto:riap777@chat.ru)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 00:50:32 +0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 22:14:38 -0400  
Subject: Research Institute on Anomalous Phenomena,

[Non Subscriber Post]

Dear Colleague,

My name is Alexander Beletsky. I am Vice-Director of Research Institute on Anomalous Phenomena (RIAP) - an independent scientific- research body, established in Kharkov (Ukraine) a few years ago. We aim at scientific studies in the fields of the UFO problem and the SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence) question. The Institute makes its investigations in close collaboration with the CIS Academy of Cosmonautics and Russian Academy of Sciences. Please find here attached (as Appendix I) a RIAP Information Leaflet, describing the Institute's research programs in some detail.

To inform the international ufological community about the results of investigations that are conducted by RIAP specialists and other scientists in the territory of the former Soviet Union, we started, in 1994, a special periodical: newsletter RIAP Bulletin (RB). It is the ONLY serious anomalistic periodical in the Commonwealth of Independent States published IN ENGLISH. There appear in RB research articles, short communications, book reviews, letters to the Editor, etc.

RB Vol. 1, Nos. 1-4 - Vol. 4, Nos. 1-4 have been printed and sent to subscribers. They contain, in particular, the papers "Post-Soviet Ufology: a View from Inside" and "Alternative Science?", by V.V.Rubtsov; "UFOs as Objects of Study by Terrestrial Physics", by V.A.Buerakov; "Search for Alien Artifacts on the Moon: A Justification", by A.V.Arkipov; "UFOs: a Possible Mechanism of Formation, Behavior and Environmental Impact", by V.I.Mazhuga; "The Petrozavodsk Phenomenon", by L.M.Gindilis & Y.K.Kolpakov; "The Black Ball: a Supposed Extraterrestrial Artifact", by V.N.Fomenko; "A Second UFO Landing on the River Mzha", by a group of RIAP scientists, and others. We have also published the first really comprehensive survey of anomalous features of the famous Tunguska explosion ("The Tunguska Meteorite: A Dead-Lock or the Start of a New Stage of Inquiry?"), written by the leading Russian specialist in this problem - Nikolay V. Vasilyev, Member of Academy.

RIAP Bulletin is published four times per year. Subscription rates: a life-long subscription - \$100; 12 issues (three years) - \$50; 8 issues (two years) - \$35; 4 issues (one year) - \$20. Airmail postage included. Back issues are still available in limited quantities (\$5 per issue, \$55 a whole set - eleven issues).

If you are interested in subscribing to RIAP Bulletin, please let me know. I and my colleagues would be happy to inform you about advances and prospects of ufological studies in this part of the world. There will appear in the next RB issues, in particular, the following papers: "A Possible Genetic Trace of the Tunguska Catastrophe of 1908", by Y.G.Rychkov; "UFOs: False and Genuine", by the Russian academic UFO expert Y.V.Platov; "Did the Maori Know About the Rings of Jupiter?", by Y.N.Morozov, and many others.

With all my best wishes and warmest regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours, Alexander V. Beletsky, M.A., Vice-Director,  
RIAP

=====

## Appendix I

RESEARCH INSTITUTE ON ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA, Kharkov, Ukraine

The principal trends of researches of the institute in the UFO field are as follows: creation of an efficient system of reconstruction of a real anomalous event on the basis of witnesses' testimonies; formation of a unified CIS UFO data base (in collaboration with the Expert Group on Anomalous Atmospheric Phenomena of the Russian Academy of Sciences) and a computer expert system to identify genuine UFOs (GUFOS); development of physical models of GUFOS; monitoring of a place of recurrent UFO landings on the river Mzha, near Kharkov; studies in the hidden history of Soviet ufology.

In the SETI field, there was realized, under the guidance of Alexey V. Arkhipov, phase I of the program "Search for Alien Artifacts on the Moon" (SAAM) and its results were presented on the pages of RIAP Bulletin. Besides, we have been examining some enigmatic finds that can be considered candidate extraterrestrial artifacts (ancient, or not so ancient). These are the so-called "Kassimov ball" - a small (diameter some 4.5 cm) black ball of unknown origin, found in Central Russia in 1983 on the depth 7 meters, in a layer of pure red clay, - and the remains of a strange object that obviously originated from space and fell down near Kharkov in 1994 (judging from its chemical composition, it is neither a meteorite, nor terrestrial space junk).

The institute pays considerable attention to the problem of the Tunguska explosion of 1908. We are studying statistical parameters of the forest fall area, as well as the biogeochemical elemental and isotopic anomalies and population-genetic effects, revealed in the area of the catastrophe. A state-of-the-art collection of research papers on the Tunguska problem is now under preparation.

The Scientific Council and Advisory Board of the Institute include such Russian and Ukrainian specialists in the UFO problem and SETI field as Dr. E.A.Ermilov (specialist in radio detection of aerial anomalous phenomena), Dr. V.N.Fomenko (investigator of the famous Vashka find, as well as other supposed ET artifacts), Y.A.Fomin (doyen of UFO studies in Russia), Dr. L.M.Gindilis (astronomer and SETI expert), Dr. Y.V.Platov (Vice-Chairman of the Academic UFO Study Group), Dr. V.K.Zhuravlev (investigator of the Tunguska explosion), and others. The Advisory Board comprehends also a group of well-known Western scientists, scholars and engineers - V.-J.Ballester Olmos (Spain), Dr. T.E.Bullard (USA), Dr. R.F.Haines (USA), Dr. A.Meessen (Belgium), et al. Dr. Vladimr V. Rubtsov, Full Member of the CIS Academy of Cosmonautics and one of pioneers of ufological studies in the former USSR, is Director of RIAP.

Institute mailing address:

RIAP, P.O.Box 4684, 310022 Kharkov-22, Ukraine.

Internet e-mail address:

<[riap777@chat.ru](mailto:riap777@chat.ru)>;

Website: <http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Starship/1527/>

=====

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## **UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 15](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 23:32:16 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 23:53:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Rose Hargrove <[PRIESTESSE@aol.com](mailto:PRIESTESSE@aol.com)>  
>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 20:19:22 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>I agree that we must be responsible and police our own but at  
>the same time we must not attack our fellow ufologists merely  
>because their conclusions do not match ours and especially if  
>the work presented is based on years of honest research. We must  
>support one another as far as we are able as there are too many  
>who would attack us with no real provocation as a fringe element.

This seems to be a basic problem in the attitude of many ufologists, perhaps caused by too much use of the phrase "the ufological community". I would challenge this assumption that there is a common "ufological community" which shares a basic set of values and assumptions, and which should be preserved at all costs from attacks by ill-defined groups of outsiders. Yes, I'm against ad-hominem attacks on individual researchers (OK, there are a few exceptions, no names no pack-drill), but I see no reason why I should not vigorously dispute the conclusions of "fellow ufologists" if I think they are wrong, no matter how many decades of misguided research they have put into it. The idea that we should all keep shtumm about the nonsense which is often paraded in the guise of ufology, just because some nasty bogey-man out there wants to denounce us as a fringe element, is absurd.

Police work is tough.

My conclusions, "based on years of honest research" do not match those of Jerome Clark, but I don't think anyone would seriously suggest that he gives up attacking them just to support some sort of vague idea of a united "UFO Community" circling its waggons against a hostile outside world.

>We must I conclude be careful not to take a giant step back  
>ward and begin to silence our own ranks. While we are busy  
>fighting amongst ourselves our detractors our even busier in  
>attempting to eliminate the issue altogether and all of us as  
>well.

These sinister "detractors" would find their job even easier if some ufologists did not make themselves unpopular by doing such public-spirited acts as pointing out what a load of tosh people like Max Burns are spouting. The one saving grace of the UFO world as it is presently constituted is that there is at least some internal criticism and system of checks and balances to keep the barmier elements in check, or at least to show that someone is marking their card. This will impress critics more than a Pollyanna-like love-in with everyone patting each others' back and congratulating everyone of their "sincerity".

>Respectfully,

>Rose Hargrove

--

John Rimmer

[www.magonia.demon.co.uk](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk)

Official Sponsors of the 1999 Solar Eclipse

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 19:58:49 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:13:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:52:03 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 16:04:15 -0400  
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>If you read Arnold's letter to the Air Force you will see that  
>>he thought he was doing no more than any pilot would do. He says  
>>pilots are interested in speeds...and s he thought he would  
>>clock the speed.

>Read it? Hell, given that it was part of the public record, I  
>published it! Now where is the evidence of Arnold's same  
>meticulous interest in speed in his other six reported  
>sightings?

Apparently lost forever (see post by Jerry Clark). But, there is  
a question of relevance here which, I am certain, is obvious to  
many if not most readers of this series of exchanges.

>>He said the flying was so smooth he simply trimmed out  
>>the plane on its flight toward Yakima (set adjustments for  
>>speed, altitude) and let it fly itself while he enjoyed the  
>>scenery.

>>He did this BEFORE the sighting began.

>>Hence by the  
>>time of th sighting (a few minutes or so after he trimmed out  
>>his plane heading toward Yakima, according to the letter to the  
>>Air Force) it was not necessary for him to pay 100% attention to  
>>flying th airplane.

>>He could do other things such as wonder about those strange  
>>airplanes way over there flying so close to Mt. Rainier in an  
>>odd echelon arrangement and he could wonder us how fast these  
>>new Army jets could go..... etc.

>Yes, but at some point he tells us he not only rolled down his  
>left window but turned his plane parallel to the perceived path  
>of the objects, neither of which is necessarily cruise control  
>stuff. And when Arnold says, in 1947, that he trimmed out his  
>plane, that doesn't mean he switched on automatic pilot, since  
>there was no such thing at the time. So during the less than two  
>observing their flight path and distant geographical features  
>while rolling down one of his windows (and he certainly didn't  
>have power windows then, either), and turning his plane parallel  
>to the objects' path. Still pretty busy stuff for a casual  
>observation of something else's speed. It also seems to start  
>instantaneously. Not thirty seconds or so later and that looks  
>interesting, but immediately. He says the sighting lasted two  
>minutes or less and yet claims to have clocked it for one minute  
>42 seconds of that time. Pretty damn quick response time if you



>ask me!>

Two minutes or less? Don't know where you got this. Says in his AF letter 2 1/2 to 3 minutes.

>Have you ever given any thought as to how long it would take to >turn a Callair traveling at 100mph or so a full 90 degrees, that >is, from east to south, while rolling down his window? Doesn't >sound "trimmed out" to me. The beginning and end of the clock >time per se I have no problem with. But a helluva lot of >observational stuff is allegedly happening within that very >short time frame (perceived distance between mountain peaks, >flight patterns, behavior, and so on) while Arnold says he is >simultaneously rolling his window down and turning left (south). >During this same time period, don't forget, he's also compared >his cowling tool, which he had to retrieve from a pants' pocket, >o a distant DC-4 and \_then\_ to the distant objects. That's a >pretty damn busy 1:42 anyway you cut it.>

>Try whipping your cowling tool out of your pocket (while in >flight) and making two comparisons with two distant objects in >two different directions while manually rolling down your left >window and turning your "trimmed" plane south, and then tell me >if you can do all the above in a 1947 airplane within two >minutes' time or less. I don't think so.

Better ask a pilot how long it takes to turn 90 deg (perhaps abot 20 seconds?). Would he be able to (a) use a cowling tool for size estimate, (b) turn his plane, (c) roll down the window in about 2 minutes time? I bet he would be able to. Pilot's out there want to comment? How much bank angle could Arnold safely get for a reasonably rapid but not panic turn?

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 19:58:43 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:07:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold

>From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 16:30:47 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Kenneth Arnold  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>>Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1999 23:18:12 -0400  
>>Fwd Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 05:22:39 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Regarding:

>>Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 21:29:44 -0300  
>>From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>I've been a bit put off by the impression being floated, by  
>>>some, that Arnold was some kind of dolt who was frittering  
>>>around the mountains with no particular idea of where he was,  
>>>didn't know birds from jets, couldn't estimate distances or work  
>>>out a speed/time problem, despite the fact that he would have  
>>>done them dozens of times during each flight.>

>>Very much appreciated. It doesn't follow that Kenneth Arnold was  
>>an idiot if he made an exited, two minute, error of judgement.>

>Typical Easton vagueness. What errors of judgment? Explain IN  
>DETAIL (not handwaving) how such errors of judgment allow birds  
>to explain the sighting.>

>Since Arnold was MOVING at 100 mph+, for anything to fly past  
>him on a parallel course they have to be flying faster than  
>his. Even extremely gross errors in distance estimates or  
>altitude don't affect this fundamental fact, something Easton  
>apparently can't get through his head.>

>So for Arnold to have thought that "pelicans" were flying  
>forward of his position instead of falling behind him, as they  
>would have to because of lesser air speed, he would indeed have  
>been an idiot.

A comment on Rudiak's long post/respose:

David codesn't come right out and say it, but he probably realizes that the approach taken by Easton, Brookesmith, etc., which involves (a) inventing a theory which seems to agree with PART of the sighting description and (b) ignoring or "arguing-away" all descriptive data which conflicts with the suggested theory, is (1) a scientific approach when one with care and respect for the witness description or (2) Classic Debunking when little respect is shown for details which stand out as likely to be well reported.

For example, Arnold's description of these things "flashing" as

would a metallic surface is concompatible with birds. Rudiak's comment that to see them flashing against Rainier would require reflectors much "brighter than white" (the "color" of snow) is well taken. Birds at a mile or more, even if at Arnold's altitude (which I doubt) would not be seen in their optimum reflectivity, and, even if they were, they aren't "whiter than snow." Hence they would appear as dark objects or dots (depending upon how far away).

In response to this, Easton appeals to bird experts who, apparently, aren't really aware of the conditions of Arnold's experiment. But, anyway, the bottom line here is that birds seen against a white background...white haze of the atmosphere or white snow on a mountain...are not going to appear bright compared to the background.

In a previous post I pointed out that a mirror reflection is like looking at a piece of the sun (if the mirror is smaller in angular size than the angular size of th sun). Hence a small metallic object COULD give appear much brighter than the background sky or white snow.

With regard to 2 above, let me once again bring up the speed problem. I posted a message in which I invited interested parties to reconstruct in some manner Arnold's sighting as if it had been birds at some initial distance and some initial starting direction. Whether Easton did this or not, I do not know. What he did was avoid the consequences of this reconstruction... In some reconstructions the birds don't even get as far as Arnold's path eastward before he passes them.

In the reconstructions where they do pass his path, if he turned to follow them he would realize immediately (a) that they were close (by observing the parallax relative to distant peaks...and if you don' understand this, better gve up trying to analyze Arnold's sighting) and (b) he would realize very shortly that he was catching up with them.

I presume that Easton wouldn't categorize himself as a debunker but rather as a very careful skeptic. However, there are "limits to rational skepticism".

When I discovered how the "experts" explained sightings years ago (e.g., Hynek...before his apostasy, Menzel who was never publicaly an apostate and Klass ...) I became skeptical of the skeptics.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 19:58:57 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:15:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 00:41:32 -0700  
>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99

>>From: Richard G Brown <[rgbrown@web.net](mailto:rgbrown@web.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Jeff Rense Weekly E-News 6-4-99  
>>Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 03:46:00 -0700

>>>EBE-2 explained the weather of it's planet which was dry,  
>>>varying temperature between 65-90 degrees. There was 35  
>>>hours of constant sunshine and three hours of darkness

>>I know I'm going to regret this... But how can a planet have  
>>such vastly unequal periods of day and night? 35 hours to 3?!?  
>>Shouldn't they be relatively equal?

>>Even in a binary system it couldn't be consistant enough to be  
>>35 and 3 every day could it?

>>- Confused in Canada

>Dear Confused in Canada:

>I'm suffering from jet-lag and brown beer, and I can only think  
>of one solution.

>'EBE-2" is describing a planet with two suns, i.e. somehow  
>involved in an unlikely dance with a double-star system.>

>The only alternative would be a planet with a wildly variable  
>period of rotation!

>I cannot imagine a living thing on such a world.>

>In short, [to borrow a phrase from Bruce Maccabee]

>" Sounds like a crock to me. "

>Very best wishes

>- Larry Hatch

PS: Someday I will learn how to spell Macabbee.

HA HA HA,

well, you got it right at least once!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Humanoid Allegedly Found In Mason, MI, In

From: Jeff Westover <[frequentflier66@yahoo.com](mailto:frequentflier66@yahoo.com)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 17:49:40 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:19:58 -0400  
Subject: Re: Humanoid Allegedly Found In Mason, MI, In

>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 04:22:24  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>Subject: Humanoid Allegedly Found In Mason, MI, In  
>Spring 1996

>Location: Mason, Michigan

>Date: Spring 1996

I recall the aforementioned "news story" quite well. It ran on  
April Fool's Day of that particular year (1996 I believe).

Jeffrey S. Westover

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:23:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

Off the list, Bruce has helpfully clarified some details which have explained the full context of Arnold's letter to the Air Force.

Confirmed is my contention that Arnold was in fact still searching for the missing C-46 marine transporter when his sighting occurred.

It did not take place afterwards, when Arnold was en route to Yakima.

I'm sure we can now conclude the debatable points as much as they ever can be.

Bruce,

In his report for the Air Force, Arnold wrote, in full:

"I had made one sweep of this high plateau to the westward, searching all of the various ridges for this marine ship and flew to the west down and near the ridge side of the canyon where Ashford, Washington, is located.

Unable to see anything that looked like the lost ship, I made a 360 degree turn to the right and above the little city of Mineral, starting again toward Rainer. I climbed back up to an altitude of about 9,200 ft.

The air was so smooth that day that it was a real pleasure flying and, as most pilots do, I trimmed out my airplane in the direction of Yakima, which was almost directly east of my position and simply sat in my plane observing the sky and terrain".

Ashford is to the north-east of Mineral and if he made a "360 degree turn to the right" and was "starting again toward Rainer", which is also north-east of Ashford, I'm not sure how he was also travelling in the direction of Yakima.

The account in his later book is also different, making no mention of 'heading towards Yakima' and stating, "It was during this search and \*\*while making a turn of 180 degrees over Mineral\*\*, Washington, at approximately 9200 feet altitude" when he first noticed a 'bright flash'

The direction he was actually travelling in relation to the objects is crucial and I would have to be dubious about his 'perfect' sighting conditions, as outlined in the Air Force report.

That aside, whether Arnold was coming out of a 180/360 degree turn, or 'cruising' due east, he was still in 'search' mode, so what was his airspeed likely to have been?

Would he be undertaking a search at close to maximum speed, in treacherous terrain, or would his airspeed be much less, giving him time to hopefully spot the missing aircraft and earn an

instant ten thousand dollar fortune?

Which was, after all, why he was there in the first place.

Some further comments re the respective figures you had quoted:

Altitude: As you may have noticed, I mentioned to Don Ledger that I had seen a reference to pelicans being known to migrate at over 14,000 feet, considerably higher than your estimate (although it maybe makes no difference).

Visibility: I'm not sure if I've highlighted this before. Glider pilot Mike Havener, who wrote an article 'Soaring with Pelicans' describing his extraordinary experiences being joined in flight by these gregarious birds, was asked if he could offer an experienced opinion on this point. He replied,

"Visibility depends on several factors. The one having the most effect of course is how much 'haze' or other particulate matter is in the air (i.e. smog, smoke). At low altitudes, visibility is lowered because of this.

Myself, (a pilot with average eyesight) I can distinguish the basic shape (a body with wings) of these pelicans from about 4 miles when flying above the haze. From 4 to maybe 6 miles they become small dots. Beyond that, I'd say they would probably not be distinguishable other than some sort of relative motion that may catch your eye".

Presumably we keep in mind that Arnold noted how perfect the visibility was that day.

Speed: It might be a mistake to underestimate just how fast these birds can fly. Although awkward on the ground, with that 10 feet wingspan they are majestic in the air and I've already provided wonderful evidence from Mike Havener that a flock of pelicans were comfortably flying with him at 52 m.p.h. Mike also writes in his article that, "I reluctantly sped up to 80 m.p.h. to put some distance between us".

There's maybe another factor to consider. If any formation of birds observed a larger object flying towards them, it seems reasonable that they're likely to accelerate and get out of the way, possibly reaching their top speed if necessary.

So what if - and we are only considering 'what if' calculations:

Arnold's airspeed was closer to 60 m.p.h. and our conceivable birds were travelling at 30 m.p.h., or some identical ratio where Arnold's speed is twice as fast - say, 80/40.

Plus, the 'objects' are first sighted four miles away

At 60 m.p.h., Arnold's approaching them at 1 mile per minute.

After 1 minute, if said birds remained stationary, they are still three miles away.

Except that they are moving towards Arnold's flight path at 5 mile per minute.

At what angle though?

Anyway, at some point, they theoretically pass Arnold's flight path, heading in the approximate direction of Mt Adams.

They're also still heading away from Arnold and if he turns his airplane \*\*due south\*\*, they will continue to travel further away.

Arnold will eventually make some headway towards them, however, if he has already decided these objects are much further than they truly are, there's no point in him pursuing them.

So far as I can see, there's no evidence that he did.

We do know that after one minute and forty seconds, he's



determined they are already at Mt Adams and distant, hardly visible objects.

Does this scenario allow the possibility that these were not distant 'objects' - only some 4 miles away, yet sufficiently far and moving fast enough to always be illusory against the snow covered mountains?

If not, for the sake of a best/worst scenario, let's finish off the discussion by upping the bird's airspeed to 50 m.p.h. - which they can do - drop Arnold's "coming out of turn and searching" to 60 and put the 'objects', in 'perfect visibility', initially five miles away.

Do you reckon it's still an untenable (if unpalatable) possibility?

James.  
E-mail: [voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## The Millennium Project News - June 14, 1999

From: Paul Anderson - TMP/CPR-Canada <[psa@direct.ca](mailto:psa@direct.ca)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 20:12:00 -0800  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:26:09 -0400  
Subject: The Millennium Project News - June 14, 1999

The Millennium Project News  
News and Updates from The Millennium Project

<http://persweb.direct.ca/psa>

June 14, 1999

---

### WEEKLY BRIEFING

A busy week on many fronts. Incredible new crop circle formations appearing in England this year, including a stunning new 700' formation in the famous East Field which incorporates many design elements from past years and a huge "serpent" companion formation in the same field, both found the morning of June 12. Many other reports coming in as well from England, as well as Holland and Germany.

On June 11, a number of the "mystery contrails" were seen again here in Vancouver, including parallel and "dashed line" formations, Xs and a perfect ellipse or three-quarters ring. There is also a link to a report by Linda Moulton Howe on her new Earthfiles web site about a contrail photographed in Michigan in April, making a 90 degree turn. This is very similar to the "L" and "Z" shaped contrails seen here in Vancouver on May 21 and 26 respectively by myself. Similar bizarre geometric types of contrails are being reported elsewhere now as well (in addition to the already unusual Xs, grids and parallel lines). As there can, based on my own observations included, be some overlap in the characteristics / behaviour of "normal" contrails and the "chemtrails", it is prudent and necessary to exercise some caution when observing what is happening in the sky above us. Not every contrail is a chemtrail. However, some of what we have observed here over the past few weeks does seem to fit with what many hundreds of other people are now reporting (indeed, as I was preparing this briefing, I recieved a call this morning from the Environmental Protection Agency in Seattle, Washington, regarding who they could pass on reports to, as they are now getting flooded with them) from across the US and Canada. Something else does seem to be going on besides regular air traffic. The question is what, and why.

Due to an ever-increasing number of submissions and reports (thank you!) for both the contrails and radar anomalies, the Special Research Projects section of the web site is being revamped. Because of limited web site space and time (due to other commitments), the number of reports and submissions is now too great, more than expected. The archive sections will be replaced with new reports focusing on key aspects of special interest regarding these phenomena, as well as sample pages of both contrail photos and radar / satellite images. Links to other web sites, which specialize as central report and archive listings for both the contrails and radar anomalies will be provided (ie. archives of now hundreds of reports and photographs regarding the contrails and extensive image archives of the radar). These sites are recommended for anyone that is

interested in keeping track of the many latest reports and images, and also to submit your own reports and findings. Your reports and information are still very much welcome, but not everything can be posted. The web site, and indeed this whole project, is very much a work-in-progress.

One last reminder that the next Fields of Dreams crop circle presentation is June 21 in Vancouver, BC at the Barlay Manor House. Advance registration is recommended. Details on web site.

See below for complete listing of this week's news and updates. Please note also that the links below take you to the relevant sections of the web site, for quick access. The main site itself (URL at the top of this e-mail) is a frames environment, and viewing a page independently on its own may affect its appearance / layout, depending also on the browser you are using.

Wishing a good week to all of you.

Paul Anderson  
Director  
The Millennium Project

---

#### NEWS AND REPORTS

<http://persweb.direct.ca/psa/news.html>

- \* How Would Humans React If ET Landed? - NIDS Roper Poll
- \* Filer's Files #23 - June 11, 1999
- \* The UFO Community on MSN Stages World Wide Watch
- \* Interview with Monsignor Corrado Balducci: "Other Intelligent Beings Exist"
- \* Latest Crop Circle Reports from England
- \* New: Crop Circle Live Update '99 from England
- \* Two Crop Circles Reported Witnessed Being Made by Hovering Light in Holland
- \* DA Investigating Mysterious Cow Deaths In New Mexico
- \* Cydonia Analysis Update from Mark Carlotto
- \* Evidence Mars Had Vast Seas And Big Rivers Mounting Quickly
- \* "Villa" on Mars
- \* Astronomers Discover Moon Has Thin Comet-Like Tail
- \* Mapping of Human Genome Sequence to be Nearly Complete by 2000

#### SPECIAL RESEARCH PROJECTS

<http://persweb.direct.ca/psa/srp.html>

#### Mystery Contrails:

- \* Contrail Update from Vancouver, BC - June 11, 1999
- \* Witness Photographs Contrail Making 90 Degree Turn
- \* "Angel Hair", Contrails in Australia

#### THE MILLENNIUM FORUM

<http://persweb.direct.ca/psa/forum.html>

- \* Next Fields of Dreams Crop Circle Presentation  
June 21 in Vancouver, BC

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Possibilities

From: Judith Dale <[judithdale@earthlink.net](mailto:judithdale@earthlink.net)>  
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:25:14 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:31:49 -0400  
Subject: Possibilities

Greetings All,

I've been reading all UFO UpDate posts as they hit my email. Except in a very few instances, I see the same old nitpicking go on and on. I came across these quotes recently:

"The more important fundamental laws and facts of physical science have all been discovered, and these are now so firmly established that the possibility of their ever being supplanted in consequence of new discoveries is exceedingly remote.... Our future discoveries must be looked for in the sixth place of decimals."

- physicist Albert. A. Michelson, 1894

and:

"..so many centuries after the Creation it is unlikely that anyone could find hitherto unknown lands of any value."

- committee advising Ferdinand and Isabella regarding Columbus' proposal, 1486

Just thought I'd pass them along, perhaps as a reminder that; 1) we don't know everything, and 2) Let's not allow our eyes to be blinded by what we think we know exists, or is possible.

Whilst some nitpick, the barn still burns and the sightings continue.

My thanks to all who persist in their research to discover the truth, present their findings, and don't just spin their wheels debating for the sake of debate.

Blessings,

Judith Dale

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Survey: 'UFO Technology' Among Top

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 06:55:38  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:52:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Survey: 'UFO Technology' Among Top

[List only]

Source: Business Wire.

Stig

\*\*\*

Computer, TV And Refrigerator Top Technologies Of 20th Century,  
Public Survey Shows

01:02 p.m Jun 14, 1999 Eastern

WASHINGTON--(BUSINESS WIRE)--June 14, 1999--Americans feel that the invention of the computer, television, and refrigerator were the top technological achievements of the 20th century - and most feel that technology has made life more comfortable and has added to the nation's economy -- according to an independent public survey released today.

The survey -- commissioned by Harris Corporation, with support from the University of Florida -- found that 40 percent of the 1,000 people questioned felt that the computer was the top technological achievement of the century, followed by the television (12%) and refrigerator (12%). Rounding out the top five were medical advances (6%) and the Internet (5%). Other answers ranged from such areas as "UFO technology" to video games.

When respondents were asked what 20th century technology was most important in their everyday lives, the computer (34%), television (17%) and refrigerator (10%) again were ranked in the top three, while the microwave oven (5%) came in at number four, followed by the washing machine (3%) at number five.

An overwhelming ninety percent said that technology has made their quality of life better, and more than half (58%) said they could not live comfortably without 20th century technology. In addition, a vast majority (79%) said that technologies developed this century have created more economic opportunities and jobs.

People were most apt to say surgical advancements (38%) and the development of antibiotics (35%) were the top inventions that have saved more lives during the 20th century. A little more than one in ten (11%) said seat belts in cars.

When it came to choosing which country has been the technology leader of the 20th century, more than half (60%) said the United States, followed by Japan (35%) and Germany (2%). However, nearly two-thirds (64%) of the respondents felt strongly that there should be more science- and technology-based courses in U.S. schools.

While most technologies were viewed as positive achievements, some were not. When asked which 20th century technologies people wished were not developed, weapons of mass destruction came in as the top choice (59%), followed by credit cards (10%) and genetic engineering (9%) at a distant second and third.

An analysis of the survey findings showed some significant differences of opinion based on various factors, such as gender, age, and geography. Gender

Men seem a little more interested in mechanical or technological achievements while women indicated they have more interest in biological or medical accomplishments. When asked what they thought might be the top achievements in the 21st century - three times as many men said time travel or placing a human on Mars, and nearly twice as many said an advanced automobile engine that doesn't require fuel. Women were more apt to pick a cure for cancer or AIDS (62% vs. 47%), or human cloning (57% vs. 43%). Generations

Age seemed to play an interesting role in some of the questions. For example, when asked which technology they wished was not developed during the 20th century, 70% of the teenaged respondents said weapons of mass destruction, while 50% of senior citizens gave that answer. Additionally, more than half (55%) of the teens polled felt the computer was the most important technological achievement of the 20th century, while only about a quarter (26%) of senior citizens felt that way. Geography

People in California seem to be less enthused about technology than people in the rest of the country. More than half (52%) of the Californians surveyed said they could live comfortably without 20th century technology, compared with 41% for the rest of the nation. Additionally, more than a quarter (27%) of the Californians surveyed felt that 20th century technology has created fewer economic opportunities and jobs, while only about a fifth (21%) of the respondents in the rest of the country felt that way. The Next Century

While the survey focused on 20th century technologies, it also asked respondents what they felt would be the most important technological achievements of the next century. More than half (54%) felt that a cure for cancer or AIDS would be the top accomplishment during the 21st century, while a fifth (19%) felt that solving world hunger through advanced agriculture would be the top achievement. How The Survey Was Conducted

The telephone survey was conducted May 24-27, 1999 by Systems Research Corporation of Rochelle Park, New Jersey. SRC asked 1,000 randomly-selected consumers their feelings on 20th century technologies. The margin of error was +/- 3%. Demographics -- Gender evenly split. -- Mean age was 41 years old. (11% were 15-18 yrs.old, 19% 19-29, 16%

30-39, 17% 40-49, 13% 50-59, 24% 60+). -- Mean household income was \$44,525 (35% were \$30K or below, 29 %

\$31K-\$50K, 20% \$51K-\$75K, 8% \$76K-\$100K, 8% \$100K+). -- Of those surveyed, more than half (52%) said they owned a

cellular phone, 59 percent said they owned a personal computer.

Also most respondents (77%) had two or more televisions in their home, and 93 percent said they owned a VCR. University of Florida

The University of Florida is a public, land-grant research university, with one of the most comprehensive programs in the nation. Twenty-one colleges and schools offer more than 100 undergraduate majors. The graduate school coordinates almost 200 graduate programs. UF is the largest of the state's 10 public universities, and the ninth largest university in the nation, and has, to date, awarded 246,000 degrees. Harris Corporation

Harris Corporation has been a leader in the development of technological innovations for more than 100 years, in areas ranging from television and wireless communications to digital electronics and software engineering. Harris actually started out as a printing equipment company, and a Harris printer - the first commercial offset lithographic press - today resides at the Smithsonian Institution.

Harris Corporation (NYSE:HRS) is an international communications equipment company focused on providing product, system, and service solutions that take its customers to the next level. The

company provides a wide range of products and services for commercial and government communications markets such as wireless, broadcast, government systems, and network support. The company has sales and service facilities in nearly 90 countries.

Editor's note: A photograph of today's press conference is available via the Associated Press Photo Network and on the Internet (newscom.com). For further information on the survey or a graphical breakdown of the results, contact Jim Burke at 407/727-9126 or [jburke@harris.com](mailto:jburke@harris.com) or Neal Stein at 407/727-9608 or [nstein@harris.com](mailto:nstein@harris.com). Additional information on Harris is also available on the Internet : <http://www.harris.com/>

#### Technology Timeline

- 1903 The Wright brothers fly the first airplane. The flight lasted for 12 seconds and 120 feet.
- 1910 The first electrically powered washing machine was invented by Alva J. Fisher.
- 1916 Frigidaire invents the first electric refrigerator.
- 1923 Dr. Vladimir Zworkin demonstrates an early television prototype.
- 1939 John Atanasoff constructed the first semi-electric digital computing device.
- 1946 Raytheon invents the microwave oven.
- 1951 UNIVAC (Universal Automatic Computer) becomes the first computer to handle both numeric and alphabetical data.
- 1954 Jonas Salk tested the first effective polio vaccine. Color television broadcasts begin.
- 1969 Neil Armstrong becomes the first human to walk on the moon.
- 1975 First consumer VCR introduced.
- 1977 First personal computer (Apple) introduced.
- 1978 The first modern, public cellular phone network is tested.
- 1985 Dr. Jack Copeland implants a Jarvik-7 artificial heart into Michael Drummond.
- 1994 Consumer Internet usage takes off.
- 1996 First digital television broadcast by a commercial television station in the United States.
- 1998 John Glenn rides a shuttle back into space, three decades after his first historic flight. The launch is broadcast live in digital HDTV by Harris Corporation.

Copyright 1999, Business Wire

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpDatesList.Com](http://UFOUpDatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan, 7 July

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 02:13:24 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 02:06:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan, 7 July

>From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan, 7 July 1989?  
>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 02:26:10 +0100

>Can anyone help me in finding a copy of a piece of video footage  
>which was taken at Kanazawa, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan, 7 July  
>1989?

>A photographer (Yasuhiko Hamazaki) took the film and apparently  
>also managed to get some real close up shot's of the UFO.

>The object looked like a Saturn-Shaped white object with a  
>prominent ring encircling it in the horizontal plane.

>Any help would be appreciated.

Dear Roy:

I have never seen the film, and don't know who has. At best I  
might provide a starting point.

I have the Kanazawa affair dated as 1900 hours ( local time ) on  
the 6th of July, 1989. 3 observers saw a silver-white ovoid with  
a red stripe pass. One J. Takanashi, presumably a ufologist  
there, opined that it was possibly a plane headed for Osaka.

My source is the Mufon UFO Journal, issue # 265.

I hope this helps a little.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

<http://www.jps.net/larryhat>

= = = = =

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 02:18:14 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 02:21:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?

>From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?  
>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 02:35:47 +0100

>Does anyone have any more information on the following sighting?

>On the 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary, four large Spherical,  
>bright orange objects , approx. fifty meters in diameter were  
>spotted by Meteorologists.

>One of the objects was reported to have flown at 2,625 m.p.h.

>I also understand the local military airbase sent up a pilot,  
>who subsequently located four objects at an altitude of about  
>four miles.

>Any help would be appreciated.

Hello Roy:

My source is very likely the same as yours, to wit:

Timothy Good; The UFO Report (1991) page 234.

I returned the book so I cannot quote it, but I believe there was mention of a radar confirmation for this sighting.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

-----  
From Tim's book, cited above by Larry:

"24 November 1989: Papa, Hungary

Meteorologists sighted four large, spherical, bright orange objects, approximately fifty metres in diameter. Guyla Bazso, from a meteorological station in Papa, western Hungary, reported that one of the objects flew at 2,625 m.p.h. He contacted the local military airbase which sent up a pilot, who located four objects at an altitude of about four miles. All the objects disappeared shortly after 2:00 a.m. on 25 November. (Shropshire Star, Wellington, 27 Nov. 1989"

No mention of radar --ebk

-----  
[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

From: David Clarke <[crazydiamonds@compuserve.com](mailto:crazydiamonds@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 05:23:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 02:32:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture

>From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns BUFORA Lecture  
>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 22:13:18 +0100

>Hi Joe,

>I would agree with you 100% but I think the point to get across  
>here is, that Max is a marked man I dont think this will change  
>for a long time to come, I'm sure Max is aware of this.

>Roy..

If Max is a "marked man" it is through his own making, and no one else's.

If someone persists in making patently ludicrous claims in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, they should expect those claims to be independently questioned and scrutinised.

If that scrutiny does not exist inside the subject itself, what will the outside world make of our standards?

But Max appears to think his material is sacrosanct, and we should just accept his word without question. Well tough.

At no stage during the last two years has he took a step down from his arrogant standpoint, or accepted on one single occasion that the evidence for his stance over this case does not stand up. On at least three occasions of which I have recorded evidence, Max has told witnesses and investigators not to share information and data about the case with me - and this is the man who is claiming there is a cover-up over this case!

Not only that, but he continues using testimony on a public platform that has been completely discredited.

It is his insistance on carrying on with this charade, ever more ludicrous now in the face of general disbelief even amongst hardcore believers, that has placed him in the position that he finds himself at the moment.

Ask yourself this Roy: What will it take for Max to accept he is wrong about his interpretation of this case?

He has built it up to such a level of absurdity that he stands to lose face and reputation (if he has any left) if he compromises on any of his claims.

This situation has been created by the man himself - any other objective ufologist would by now have looked at the evidence once again and found it wanting or changed their opinion.

That is the important lesson of this whole saga: namely, ufoLOGY needs skeptics.

The UFO community should be grateful that there are people out there who are willing and able to investigate claims in a rigorous, objective fashion and accept the often unpalatable conclusion that "nothing happened."

Skepticism for its own sake is equally unhelpful; but open minds are fine as long as they are not so open the brain dribbles out! Belief-driven investigators like Max Burns simply cannot function in this objective way, which is what leads to the subject having such a bad reputation.

Ufologists are continually moaning that the outside world refuses to take it seriously, but is it any small wonder in a subject so full of loony claims, credulity and lack of objective investigation?

If it were not for my efforts to get to the bottom of this case, even further ridicule would no doubt be visited upon the reputation of British Ufology.

If we can't be honest and open about our own material, how can we expect anyone out there to take anything we have to say seriously?

I believe there are enough real mysteries - and yes, unexplained aerial phenomena too - without making up new ones out of imagination and wishful thinking.

It's time some of the true believers started getting their house in order too, and facing the facts.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 20:08:31 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 11:33:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 22:42:40 -0400  
>From: Nathan Ranger <[netrangr@ufo.net](mailto:netrangr@ufo.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 15:08:56 +0100

>>Hi,

>>All this stuff about Max Burns brings up a critical issue about  
>>UFO credibility and the way we present ourselves in public.  
>>Surely that ID the issue here. It is what BUFORA utterly failed  
>>to read. They did the same thing with the fawning over the  
>>Santilli autopsy fiasco. Although I dare say they might - not  
>>unreasonably - cast back the point against various Sheffield  
>>events that, for instance, the IUN invited the likes of Budd  
>>Hopkins - when he is (without medical qualification) regressing  
>>five year old children and promoting the image of nasty grays  
>>raping humans. Somehow there is not a lot of difference here.  
>>Both are apparently honest ufologists expressing a view that  
>>most of us consider not only fundamentally wrong but potentially  
>>destructive. We may hate these opinions but can we honourably  
>>suppress them all?

>[Swish...]

>[Engage Soapbox Mode]

>Hey! Get a clue people.

>Here we have the problem: Jenny Randles, prominent UFO  
>researcher and author, comes up with rules of "engagement". Her  
>rules. What she thinks is right. Sure. (No offense intended,  
>Jenny. You just happened to be standing in line during this  
>"fit". :) )

>See people, the whole problem with ufology is the fact that  
>everybody wants it to be what they want it to be so they can say  
>"See! I told you so!" in order to get that big \_\_\_\_\_ deal.  
>[Fill in the blank with whatever you want.] Nobody gives a damn  
>about what it (it, meaning the UFO mystery) really is, except a  
>few and those few get the crap ridiculed out of them for  
>following some sort of scientific reasoning.

>Shake a leg! Yeah, I'm talking to all of you! Get serious with  
>this stuff instead of worrying about filling your pockets and  
>your speaking schedule and pushing your pet theories. Don't  
>try to "message" the data so it will look like your pet theory.  
>Don't claim other researchers are "messaging" the data unless  
>you have real proof.

>I've witnessed some of Budd Hopkins 'Nasty Gray = child-raper'  
>regression sessions. Pardon me, Jenny, but does Budd get the  
>right to call your theories damaging and misleading? You're  
>right that its damaging. However, its only damaging because  
>people like you refuse to really understand how Budd does his

>research. It doesn't fit your pet theory so Budd is a fraud, an  
>imprecise buffoon of a researcher. Keep saying it, I'm sure if  
>you and he get into a tussle, both your book sales will go  
>up.(Incidentally, I agree with many of Jenny's theories. I just  
>don't like namecalling in ufology. Its unprofessional and  
>witless.)

>All researchers have their weak points. They have their areas  
>that give them navigation trouble. Instead of namecalling, we  
>should offer help. But, that doesn't happen. That might keep  
>Budd from selling some books or keep Jenny from keeping her  
>speaking schedule full.

>See, thats why they call it "fringe" science. In real science  
>things like this happen a lot less and there is a cohesive  
>structure to keep all the data together rather than a bunch of  
>profit motivated pirahnas trying to tear each other's data  
>apart, devour it and poop out golden oportunities to make more  
>profit. What if we went at atomic energy or space flight or  
>computer engineering this way, the world would be a FUBARed  
>mess! Get a clue people.

>Who needs government disinformation agents? Just paint a little  
>blood on all the sharks and watch them eat each other!  
>Ufological politics is more stupid than US Government politics.  
>At least with government politics, there is usually a clear  
>objective: get elected.

>Its it any wonder people look at us funny and think: "crackpot"  
>when they hear about us?

Hi,

Not sure if you saw my 'sequel' message where I made clear that  
my first posting was deliberately incitive to make a point.

Also not sure where you get the impression I am calling Budd  
nasty names. Im not. I like Budd very much and am absolutely  
sure he is sincere. I dont for one moment think his ideas should  
not be given full consideration and I have on several occasions  
happily shared a platform with him. I have not contemplated  
'banning' him.

However, we disagree on many things and I am totally opposed to  
the use of regression hypnosis and particularly on children. I  
make no apologies for regarding this as dangerous and it has  
nothing whatsoever to do with the skill and compassion I am  
fully aware that Budd displays with his witnesses. It has all to  
do with the risks hypnosis creates of leaving long term  
psychological damage to a yoinng mind.

I dont see any of this as name calling - merely expressing  
reasonable doubts about a technique. Budd is completely free to  
say the same about my research and I would listen to any such  
criticism with an open mind. I might well find useful things  
from this to alter the direction of my work. Thats how UFOlogy  
should develop. None of us are perfect - certainly not me.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 99 10:19:15 PDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 11:04:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 18:34:00 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting  
>>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 99 20:06:44 PDT

Dennis,

>>The point remains. You said there is no corroboration for  
>>Arnold's account, beyond his own -- to most of us who don't  
>>quack like anti-UFO ducks -- impressive testimony. You were  
>>wrong. Johnson was at the right time and the right to place to  
>>see Arnold's UFOs. He thought that he saw Arnold's UFOs, and an  
>>FBI interviewer characterized him as "a very reliable  
>>individual." (No doubt you know better and will let us know  
>>what a fruitcake and/or sociopath the man was.) The rest of you  
>>may be interested in a useful discussion of the relationship of  
>>Johnson's testimony to Arnold's; see Bruce Maccabee's article in  
>>IUR, May/June 1995.

>Again, you're a post short. I've already retracted, qualified,  
>amended, however you want to put it, any previous statement of  
>mine which you continue to interpret as my calling Arnold a  
>fruitcake. The original statement was made in the context of:  
>one does not necessarily know when one is dealing with a  
>fruitcake or not. Now you're adding sociopath to what I said.

Arnold would have been lying about an incident that would make a  
mark in history (probably an even larger one than we can know  
now) and that would adversely affect his family, which suffered  
mightily because of the resulting notoriety and controversy. He  
stuck to this lie all his life, so that nobody, including  
friends, family, and associates, ever suspected he was telling  
it. He wrote a book about it. He spoke over time in any number  
of public forums about it. This sounds more like a sociopath  
than a prankster to me. I'll take your word for it that you  
haven't thought through the implications of what you're saying,  
but I don't think my paraphrase is inaccurate or unfair.

>But here's the point: no journalist or historian would say  
>"Johnson was at the right time and the right to place to see  
>Arnold's UFOs," unless they were present with him at the time.  
>They would say Johnson said, stated, claimed, declared,  
>insisted, allowed, alleged, vowed, vouchsafed, or whatever.  
>However much you might wish it otherwise, Johnson's letter and  
>FBI interview are ultimately evidence of just that -- not the  
>claimed contents. They are two different and distinct things.

Of course, if a reporter had been right next to Johnson at the  
time he was watching Arnold's UFOs, that reporter's testimony  
would be dismissed as merely anecdotal, and likely mistaken  
besides. Or maybe we'd hear speculation to the effect that the  
guy was lying, and those who doubted the accusation would be  
challenged to prove otherwise. Anybody who needed a conventional



explanation for the incident would revise the reporter's testimony so that it fit whatever conventional explanation the would-be debunker was proposing. Just like what's being done to Arnold himself right now, and for that matter to thousands of other witnesses over the long, sorry history of the UFO controversy.

>Before you get on your indignant high horse again, that's not to  
>say, ipso facto, the contents of any statement are false by  
>definition, as you seem to think (and persist in claiming that)  
>I'm always saying. It's simply to say that an allegation of  
>events is not the event itself. Never has been, never will be.

>That said, Johnson said the objects passed over him at a  
>thousand feet. I'd like to see you put a telescope on an object  
>a thousand feet overhead going 1200 mph (or more) an hour. As  
>with your own UFO Encyclopedia article, Maccabee's IUR article  
>is also replete with its fair share of qualifiers as to the  
>number of objects Johnson reported, their size, etc.

Apparently you're reading something into what I wrote that, as far as I can see (after two rereadings, one just now), I didn't put there. The fact remains that you claimed there is no independent verification for Arnold's sighting. There is. (There is also, of course, the huge summer 1947 that was building around the time Arnold saw his UFOs. It's not as if [as one who didn't know better might think reading the discussion on this list] Arnold's experience occurred in a vacuum.) You may not like it, but it's time to admit that you were mistaken. Not the worst thing in the world to do. We're all wrong from time to time (remember, I once was a true believer in psychosocial ufology), and none of us will think the less of you for it.

>Yes, the FBI interviewer characterized Johnson "as a very  
>reliable individual." But based on what? A 30-minute telling of  
>his story? Again, the FBI statement is a subjective assessment,  
>not a God-given or determined fact. But since you grant the FBI  
>inviolable objectivity (and higher authority) in this case,  
>presumably that means you support all other recorded FBI  
>statements regarding the UFO phenomenon and its many  
>witnesses? Or is it just a case of the ones you support?

I have no idea what you're talking about, unless it's your desire to dismiss any testimony you don't want to hear. I have not the least doubt that if the FBI interviewer, based on an interview with Johnson, had judged him dishonest, you would consider that the final word on the subject. And, ironically, I suspect that I'd feel the same way.

>>>Moreover, ufology is replete with cautionary tales.

>>Ufology is also replete with puzzling, well-investigated cases  
>>which continue to resist explanation. One of them is Arnold's.  
>>The sorts of stories you cite below are notable in being so  
>>rare, if one puts them in the context of UFO-reporting  
>>generally. On the other hand, if one considers that they are  
>>both photographic cases -- which long experience has taught us  
>>are far more likely to be bogus than other sorts of UFO reports,  
>>where hoaxing is relatively infrequent -- they're not rare at  
>>all. To the contrary, the negative resolution of these claims  
>>should not surprise any sophisticated observer.

>You overlook one significant fact: photographic cases are much  
>easier to disprove than anecdotal ones. In fact, it's extremely  
>difficult to disprove an individual anecdote.

Let's see now. You've gone beyond implying that Arnold was a liar to intimating that hoaxing may be some significant part of UFO-reporting. Not even Blue Book would have agreed with you there. One thing ufologists ought to have learned five decades into the game is that while hoaxing certainly occurs, it is a still relatively infrequent cause of UFO reports. I can't believe we're having to have a discussion like this in 1999.

So many "UFO" photos are hoaxes for some simple, obvious reasons: (1) they're easy to do and (2) they attract attention in a way that few nonphotographic cases do. Perhaps you could add a third reason: they seem to add authenticity to the testimony. And there's a fourth, if the hoaxer is smart enough

to look ahead: you can keep making money at it for years as the photo gets recopied in magazines, books, and TV shows.

>You're still a post short. But here's my answer: Neither of us  
>\_knows\_ whether Arnold is a hoaxer or not, just as we don't  
>\_know\_ how much (or whether) he may have exaggerated his first  
>sighting (without hoaxing). Point is, you can't eliminate either  
>possibility with absolute certainty, as you seem to think you  
>can. You're the one that's always arguing we have to turn away  
>from a b&w world and confront ambiguity. Well, here's your  
>chance.

And I can't eliminate with absolute certainty the possibility that in your private life you're a serial killer, and you can't prove I'm not one either. Or anybody reading this. The simple fact of the matter is that not an iota of evidence has emerged since June 24, 1947, to suggest that Ken Arnold was a hoaxer. Nothing ambiguous about that.

Why are we even discussing this?

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: **Martin Phillips** <[mphillips@btinternet.com](mailto:mphillips@btinternet.com)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 20:26:47 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 11:44:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 22:42:40 -0400  
>From: Nathan Ranger <[netrangr@ufo.net](mailto:netrangr@ufo.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>See people, the whole problem with ufology is the fact that  
>everybody wants it to be what they want it to be so they can say  
>"See! I told you so!" in order to get that big deal.  
>[Fill in the blank with whatever you want.] Nobody gives a damn  
>about what it (it, meaning the UFO mystery) really is, except a  
>few and those few get the crap ridiculed out of them for  
>following some sort of scientific reasoning.

Amen - I've been a subscriber to this List for a year. I'm not a researcher (pompous title?), just a very interested member of the public. I can't believe how quickly any debate turns into a swapping of insults and selective snipping of evidence to back up ideas.

>I just  
>don't like namecalling in ufology. Its unprofessional and  
>witless.)

Damn right.

>All researchers have their weak points. They have their areas  
>that give them navigation trouble. Instead of namecalling, we  
>should offer help. But, that doesn't happen.

>See, thats why they call it "fringe" science. In real science  
>things like this happen a lot less and there is a cohesive  
>structure to keep all the data together rather than a bunch of  
>profit motivated pirahnas trying to tear each other's data  
>apart, devour it and poop out golden oportunities to make more  
>profit. What if we went at atomic energy or space flight or  
>computer engineering this way, the world would be a FUBARed  
>mess! Get a clue people.

I was with you all the way until there. This kind of behaviour happens in the 'real' science world too - it's just that you don't see it unless you look for it.

>Who needs government disinformation agents? Just paint a little  
>blood on all the sharks and watch them eat each other!  
>Ufological politics is more stupid than US Government politics.  
>At least with government politics, there is usually a clear  
>objective: get elected.

I can't see the field of UFO research being taken seriously when the level of debate is similar to the arguments that my daughter used to have with her friends a few years ago (and she's only nine now).

Isn't it time to stop for just a minute and think about controlling the temper tantrums and egos? Well, I can dream.

Martin Phillips

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: **Jerome Clark** <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 99 12:42:35 PDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 11:47:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:26:14 -0700  
>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>Date: Sat, 05 Jun 99 11:49:54 PDT

>>>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 13:50:47 -0500  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>>>Date: Thu, 03 Jun 99 08:26:28 PDT

>>From time to time (though fairly rarely), UFO witnesses have  
>>reported the sensation that what they were observing was a  
>>living object. On June 1, 1933, a mountain climber on Everest  
>>told of seeing winged objects which "seemed to pulsate in and  
>>out as though they were breathing."

>Jerry: I have only one source for that event, Phenomena  
>Spatiaux (the defunct quarterly) issue #25 from decades ago.

>That account indicated some unknown day in May of 1933. Do you  
>have a better source which firms up the June first date for  
>1933?

>If so, I would like to use that date since it is more precise.

Hi, Larry. I looked up my source, cited in my encyclopedia  
entry on "Space Animals," since I'd forgotten it. The source  
follows:

Smythe, Frank. Camp Six. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.

Hope this helps.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 12:51:14 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 11:49:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: [Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)  
>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 09:32:18 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 02:30:41 -0700  
>>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 10:59:56 -0500 (CDT)  
>>>From: Brian Cuthbertson <[brianc@freeseid.fc.net](mailto:brianc@freeseid.fc.net)>  
>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>>>Date: Sun, 06 Jun 1999 08:53:27 -0500  
>>>>From: Ron Decker <[decker@wt.net](mailto:decker@wt.net)>  
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

><snip>

>>Are we indeed alone in the universe? Of course not.

>>Then, what's so silly about hypothesizing long-lived,  
>>infinitely patient intelligent machines peeking and poking  
>>around a planet as biologically interesting as this one?

>>Please consider the opposite hypothesis.

>>Its even sillier.

>>Best wishes

>>- Larry Hatch

>After reading an article on Jeff Rense's site, in Scientific  
>American and elsewhere, the concept of autonomous biological  
>entities is not silly, neither is it untenable ... even for us.

>Biological entities which are able to make on the spot decisions  
>are being studied as we sip our Grip. The idea is to be able to  
>avoid having to communicate long distances, and therefore long  
>time periods, in order to garner a decision from the Capo di  
>Tutti Probas. The probe can make the decision all by it's self.

>It's a bit like the Mars Rover probe. It was able to decided  
>when to go around a rock rather than try to roll into it.  
>Consider the alternative, Grays which walk into walls and get  
>stuck in 'em. Or mantis-like critters which devour their  
>abductees. Or how about an alien with a case of the giggles?  
>That'd get your attention pretty quick!

>Jim

Dear Jim:

By the "opposite hypothesis" I meant sending no probes out at  
all, regardless of their type.

Given the likelihood of numerous intelligent societies within this same galaxy, I would expect them to send very intelligent probes in all promising directions.

It may well be that bio-engineered "entities" are more useful than complete robots, but I fear that a bio-critter would be more troublesome.

What do they do on weekends?

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 17:19:53 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 11:55:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 23:52:07 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>>From: Rose Hargrove <[PRIESTESSE@aol.com](mailto:PRIESTESSE@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 20:19:22 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

><snip>

>>Here we go again, can we suppress all opinions that do not fit  
>>our view of how ufology should unfold? As far as Budd not having  
>>a medical degree is ufology taught in medical school and must  
>>the grays be represented as spiritual teachers of mankind for  
>>the story to be believed. I believe Dr. Mack who has a  
>>transformational bent to his version of the gray agenda has a  
>>medical degree but not a degree in theology. Budd has done good  
>>honest research and I do not believe if one reviews the numerous  
>>cases he and others have researched that the conclusion that the  
>>grays are here to further our spiritual or ecological needs can  
>>easily be reached.

><snip>

>Well, then, you should take this idea up with Mr. Mack, who  
>apparently believes just that. And he's the one with the degree.

>Research into abduction cases is virtually nonexistent these  
>days, unless by research you refer to repeated regressive  
>hypnosis sessions, which seem to be the preferred approach. Name  
>me a single abduction case that Mr. Mack has ever investigated  
>above and beyond a resort to hypnosis. Name me a single case  
>that Mr. Hopkins is presently actively investigating above and  
>beyond the use of regressive hypnosis. Ditto for Dr. Jacobs.

>Retrieving an account of something under hypnosis is not an  
>investigation, but a poor cousin of same. In fact, it  
>substitutes hypnotic recall in place of any actual  
>investigation.

>Sorry to be the messenger...

>Dennis

Hi Dennis,

No, I'm not here to "defend" Budd. I am here as a witness.  
"Above and beyond hypnosis" (which doesn't happen in every case  
contrary to popular belief) Budd makes calls, interviews  
witnesses, does 'on site' inspections, and he even interviews  
neighbors with the permission of the person reporting if it is  
called for. I know he has spoken to police and to government  
agencies while 'checking things out.' As witness, I can attest  
to the fact that Budd is a lot more thorough than many,  
(yourself included) ever give him credit for. So Dennis,

"Sorry to be the messenger"

but you're dead wrong about Budd. He may not be the best of "investigators," (and I agree that hypnosis is being -way-overused) but, he's an intelligent and thoughtful man that goes about his business in an intelligent and thoughtful manner.

Making unfounded statements like the ones you made, ie;

>Research into abduction cases is virtually nonexistent these days, unless by research you refer to repeated regressive hypnosis sessions, which seem to be the preferred approach.

>Name me a single case that Mr. Hopkins is presently actively investigating above and beyond the use of regressive hypnosis.  
>Ditto for Dr. Jacobs.

Blanket statements such as these are meant to be dismissive and 'I assume' hopefully accepted as unquestioned fact. I'm not sure which, but you must think that folks take on 'facts' by osmosis (constantly hearing the same mantra over and over) or by mere proclamation. Not so Dennis. Because you say so don't -make it so.-

Without pulling him into anything, you should ask Greg Sandow about how Budd "investigates" a case. He's spent a lot of time watching him and discussing this very topic with him.

I'm with you BTW, I think that Budd and David, and John Mack could all do a much better job. But I draw a line at sitting idly by while people spread made up lies and malicious inaccuracies. Or, in not speaking up when someone else does.

Again, this is just my witness testimony. I'm not "jumping on you because you jumped on Budd" or any such sophomoric nonsense. I speak from having worked in close quarters with Budd for 6 years Dennis. If you knew the man the way that I know him, you'd never say an unkind word about him. No BS.

Besides, the guy has never claimed to be a "scientific researcher" and holding him 'by force' to those standards doesn't alter the fact that the guy is just an author/investigator. Not an 'academic' out there as a "scientific expert." John Mack is a different story. He's out there as an academic. It is rightful to expect him to live up to, (abide by if you will) academic/scientific standards. You've just got Budd pidgeonholed into the wrong catagory. Round peg in square hole.

If you're going to critique Budd's (or anybody elses) "methods" it would be nice if you familiarize yourself with them first. Fair is fair Dennis. Never say stuff -about anyone- that you cannot prove.

Peace,

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 99 13:14:02 PDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 11:52:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Beyond the Blunderdome

>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:30:48 -0400  
>From: Mendoza - Peter Brookesmith <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>To: To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

Peter,

>I believe I was among if not the first to express some outrage  
>in public at Budd Hopkins's regression of small children, in a  
>review in "Fortean Times" of an IUN Sheffield conference in  
>approximately 1993. In his presentations (which I taped, but I  
>write from memory) he actually admitted the children were as  
>young as two and a half.

Since this is a very serious allegation, I think we need more  
than your memory here. Could we have an exact quote from this  
tape?

>I don't think Hopkins is honest, although he may be sincere in  
>his own peculiar way.

Interestingly, I've more than once heard the same said of you,  
for whatever it's worth.

>Nor do I think Mad Max is honest. In  
>neither case, however, do I think there is any question of  
>deliberate misrepresentation or hucksterism. But it surely is  
>self-deception, which I've called intellectual dishonesty (see  
>UFO UpDates, passim), and for which I've been most vehemently  
>reprimanded, most often by people who I'd naively expected  
>would know better. That the strongest detractors are citizens  
>of the United States is not, I think, entirely coincidental.

Please explain what this last sentence is supposed to mean. That  
it is rendered by a citizen of the United Kingdom is not, I  
think, entirely coincidental. (Or something like that.)

Cheers,

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## 'UFO Research: Cincinnati' Site Revision/update

From: **Kenny Young** <[ufo@fuse.net](mailto:ufo@fuse.net)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 17:45:54 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 11:58:32 -0400  
Subject: 'UFO Research: Cincinnati' Site Revision/update

The UFO Research: Cincinnati! website has a new look. Please bookmark its location at:

<http://home.fuse.net/ufo/>

In addition to the recent revision, a most interesting news article and follow-up report is also available from there, regarding an alleged BIGFOOT BURIAL GROUND identified in Ohio [as per recent mention from a Portsmouth, Ohio newspaper].

If broken images or links are found anywhere at the site, please advise.

Thanks for your attention,

Kenny Young

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: **Mark Cashman** <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 19:02:23 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 14:00:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:08:20 PDT

>Mr. Budd Hopkins has demonstrated throughout the past twenty  
>years that he is not - I repeat, NOT - a UFO investigator [or  
>researcher]. He is basically a UFO reporter. And for those such  
>as Jerome Clark, Mark Cashman and yourself who do not like that  
>because you are friends with Budd Hopkins -- TOO BAD.

I've only met and spoken to Mr Hopkins once.

I have my problems with some of his work, but I think it is best  
to frame such objections dispassionately and with careful  
attention to what is attainable in this field.

I am currently at work on a critique of the problems I see in  
abduction research, and I will do my best to address those  
problems without reference to personalities. That's how science  
should be done.

-----  
Mark Cashman, creator of The Temporal Doorway at  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com>  
- Original digital art, writing, music and UFO research -  
UFO cases, analysis, classification systems, and more...  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/index.htm>  
-----

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedma

From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 19:15:56 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 14:09:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedma

>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:18:23 PDT

>>From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
>>Date: Mon, 3 May 1999 17:41:05 -0400  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>>Even if Walters and Strieber are the charlatans that Black  
>>claims, stridency is not the way to alter their impact on  
>>ufology. In regard to the Gulf Breeze case, if Mr. Black would  
>>like to demonstrate with appropriate science, and in a  
>>reasonable, objective tone, how to account for the following, he  
>>will be doing us all a service:

>>1) How the obscuration of the object in Photo 1 and Photo 7 has  
>>been accomplished. Double exposure, even with the Hyzer method,  
>>has been experimentally discredited.

etc snipped.

>Also, your remarks about Gulf Breeze are well taken. I will be  
>making a final report on Gulf Breeze in which I will show you  
>and any objective person that all the pictures that were taken  
>by Mr. Ed Walters could have -and were- taken by him in a hoaxed  
>manner.

I look forward to such an analysis, which I assume will address  
not only photo 19 which you mention repeatedly below, but the  
stereo photos and the Nimslo photos, and the various other of  
the 13 points I raised above.

>Don't you find it  
>unusual that Sainio can assert this while Hyzer cannot detect  
>this using the most sophisticated equipment that is the best in  
>the business?

What I have seen of the Hyzer report does not seem to deal with  
the issues raised by most of the photos I mention above (points  
1-13, especially those about the stereo photos).

In addition, Hyzer failed to perform the test which Sanio did  
to determine whether his attribution of special double exposure  
properties required to fake photos where the object was  
occluded by the bush were actually present in the camera /  
film combination used by Walters. This does not generate  
a lot of confidence in me relative to his thoroughness.

>You sir, have to determine who is telling the  
>truth and who is not. Who has an ax to grind, and who doesn't,  
>Mr. Cashman.

I'm not interested in axes or assertions. I'm interested in the  
meat of the debate, which, as I've said, is, for me, in the  
points I listed above, none of which have been addressed  
in your response. I hope they will be addressed in your  
forthcoming analysis, which I will be glad to read and add

to my collection of material on this case.

>If you would like to call me sir, I can go over some of these  
>issues privately with you and have no problem with that, and  
>would more than happy to do that for you Mr. Cashman

As much as I appreciate your offer, it would be contrary to the principles of good scientific debate for your information to be kept from the rest of the community. Please, I encourage you to share your technical material with all of us for debate and comment.

I apologize for the delay in this response, but my professional activities are interfering with my ability to keep up with my e-mail for the moment.

-----  
Mark Cashman, creator of The Temporal Doorway at  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com>  
- Original digital art, writing, music and UFO research -  
UFO cases, analysis, classification systems, and more...  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/index.htm>  
-----

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 19:25:49 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 14:20:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 23:52:07 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>>From: Rose Hargrove <[PRIESTESSE@aol.com](mailto:PRIESTESSE@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 20:19:22 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

><snip>

>>Here we go again, can we suppress all opinions that do not fit  
>>our view of how ufology should unfold? As far as Budd not having  
>>a medical degree is ufology taught in medical school and must  
>>the grays be represented as spiritual teachers of mankind for  
>>the story to be believed. I believe Dr. Mack who has a  
>>transformational bent to his version of the gray agenda has a  
>>medical degree but not a degree in theology. Budd has done good  
>>honest research and I do not believe if one reviews the numerous  
>>cases he and others have researched that the conclusion that the  
>>grays are here to further our spiritual or ecological needs can  
>>easily be reached.

><snip>

>Well, then, you should take this idea up with Mr. Mack, who  
>apparently believes just that. And he's the one with the degree.

>Research into abduction cases is virtually nonexistent these  
>days, unless by research you refer to repeated regressive  
>hypnosis sessions, which seem to be the preferred approach. Name  
>me a single abduction case that Mr. Mack has ever investigated  
>above and beyond a resort to hypnosis. Name me a single case  
>that Mr. Hopkins is presently actively investigating above and  
>beyond the use of regressive hypnosis. Ditto for Dr. Jacobs.

>Retrieving an account of something under hypnosis is not an  
>investigation, but a poor cousin of same. In fact, it  
>substitutes hypnotic recall in place of any actual  
>investigation.

>Sorry to be the messenger...

>Dennis

I'll see your "name me one case" and raise you this one.... name  
me those cases which had no basis in memory recall prior to  
hypnosis. You and others like you with closed minds on this and  
other subjects regarding the abduction phenom, forget that many  
if not most cases investigated by Hopkins and many by Dr. Mack,  
have a firm basis in direct memory recall.

Like for example my own memories.

There is nothing in this world worse than a closed mind, except  
perhaps, no mind at all.



Jim

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## RUFOS, JFK, and Richard Belzer

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:07:24  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 14:47:51 -0400  
Subject: RUFOS, JFK, and Richard Belzer

Source: The Village Voice,

<http://www.villagevoice.com/features/9924/vest.shtml>

Stig

\*\*\*

June 16 - 22, 1999

Stand-Up Conspiracist

UFOS, JFK, and Richard Belzer

by

Jason Vest

\*

Washington- The baby looked utterly horrified upon beholding the approaching man in a dark suit and even darker glasses .

And who could blame him? Even if his cognizance of the shadowy world of conspiracy theories couldn't be articulated, the infant seemed to instinctively know that a visit from a man in black does not portend pleasantness. Forget the fact I'm strapped to mom's chest and in the middle of a bookstore, his terror-stricken face seemed to say. This dude is bad news.

The refrain seemed to frighten the baby even more, and Richard Belzer gave up, handing him back to his mother. "Whip out the breast, babe, because I don't want him crying when I read," he snapped, and made his way to the podium surrounded by a deluge of Homicide fans and conspiracy buffs, all assembled to hear the actor-comedian riff off his book, UFOs, JFK, and Elvis: Conspiracies You Don't Have To Be Crazy To Believe. According to some, you do indeed have to be crazy to believe what Belzer serves up; in the book, he unabashedly worships at the altar of Jim Marrs, a Texas journalist whose book on the Kennedy assassination, Crossfire, is regarded by many serious researchers with skepticism, and whose recent offering, Alien Agenda, is, well, out there. And the format of Belzer's book- short chapters, lots of sidebars and boxes, no footnotes- doesn't exactly buttress the jacket's claim that "the truth is in here."

But, as Belzer explains, the book is better read as provocation, not as Revealed Truth. "What I really want to do is goose people's imaginations," he says. "It's clear I believe there was a conspiracy involved in the murder of the president, but I make clear what I believe and what is theory. This is stuff I've wanted to get off my chest and brain for a long time."

Blend the personification of "just because you ain't paranoid don't mean they ain't out to get you" with the sensibilities of a latter-day chautauquan gone cynical and you have Belzer in a nutshell. He rues the stratified oligarchy that he sees being constructed on the somniferous ruins of democracy. Like the

Homicide character Detective John Munch, he believes that if people have an opportunity to take advantage of others, they will. Given this view of human nature, the word "conspiracy" has no stigma for Belzer; as he points out, its Latin root simply means "to breathe together," and, to him, conspiracies are as natural as breathing. If a conspiracy led by a drunk, out-of-work actor could kill a president over 100 years ago, he asks, is it so ridiculous to believe more sophisticated people in power can't execute any number of nefarious plots? Is it so absurd to entertain notions that involve ulterior motives and hidden agendas?

"One of my purposes is, I want to convert people to looking at things in a different way— there's a lot out there that's not blaring across the front page, but people can find out for themselves," he says. "There's more going on than we ever suspected. I mean, look at all the tourists who come to Washington. It seems that Washington is really beautiful. But what it really is is a beautifully wrapped package with maggots and shit inside." Which was part of the reason, he says, that he revealed in the Homicide Law & Order crossover episodes set in Washington last season in which the shows' characters found themselves overwhelmed by a maze of lies and abuses of power. "I loved those episodes because they showed what people with power can do and how people and information can be manipulated."

This theme is one that has held Belzer's interest most of his adult life; working in Connecticut as a reporter at his hometown Bridgeport Post in the late '60s, he keenly recalls his latent anti-authoritarian notions being stoked by a sense of revulsion at what he saw covering courts and cops. "Hearing these people talk, I was like, these aren't the pristine authority figures I had grown up believing to be always right— I didn't realize how sinister and cavalier people in power are until I really got to be around them," he says. "I remember hearing the police commissioner talking about people in this kind of patronizing— I don't want to say racist [way], but let's say he showed contempt for certain kinds of people— and this really, really disturbed me."

Leaving Connecticut journalism to move to New York, Belzer was further radicalized by alternative media. Ever the voracious reader, he still dives into books and devours at least five newspapers a day. He used to think of himself as a stand-up journalist, and to some extent, it's still the best description for what Belzer does best. As Belzer continually emerged like a town crier from his trailer on the set of Homicide after hours of news and conspiracy research, the show's writers began to integrate his political rants into scripts, which fit nicely with his Detective Munch character. A '60s-era pothead alternative journalist who, because of a love for the slick TV detective shows of his youth, ends up using his bullshit detection skills in the service of The Man, who he clearly doesn't trust. Indeed, Munch may be the only TV cop who isn't down with the War on Drugs because he knows the conspiratorial history of marijuana criminalization. "It was true, so [NBC] really couldn't censor it," he says. "And I liked it because it showed there are people who work for the state who aren't happy with the state."

That said, though, discerning readers might wonder if Belzer, in his zeal to inspire political vigilance, has let his ardor trump his intellect. According to a veteran conspiracy researcher and fan of Belzer's, by relying on the work of Jim Marrs— who, among other things, asserts that the moon moves not in an ellipse but in an almost precise circular orbit, and thus was placed off earth by aliens— Belzer does his intellectual reputation a disservice. "He's so much smarter than that!" says the researcher. But Belzer's not fazed. "Friends of mine say, 'You're crazy' or 'You're making that up,' and I just say I'm a messenger. That's why I include a bibliography. I just want people to look deeper."

Take Rudy Giuliani's New York, he says. "It seems like all the homeless people are literally disappearing. I had a cabbie tell me last year, 'It's great, but where are they?' Curious how the undesirable people disappear as things start gentrifying, isn't it?" It may be a phenomenon Detective Munch can investigate this fall; despite Homicide's cancellation, it looks like Belzer will return as the conspiracy-spouting investigator on the new Law & Order spinoff. Though it's hard to picture a cop who sounds like

Richard Belzer lasting long on Howard Safir's NYPD if he voices anything like what Belzer believes: "I think you can have a clean, civil city without being so heavy-handed and mean-spirited."

Tell us what you think.

[editor@villagevoice.com](mailto:editor@villagevoice.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## U.S. Military Designation System [AN\---]

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:54:36  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 14:58:39 -0400  
Subject: U.S. Military Designation System [AN\---]

Forwarded from 'alt.alien.visitors'.

Stig

\*\*\*

From: [twitchb@worldnet.att.net](mailto:twitchb@worldnet.att.net)  
Newsgroups: sci.skeptic,alt.alien.visitors,alt.alien.research  
Subject: U.S. Military designation System (AN\---)  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 20:53:36 GMT

Anyone doing any reading or investigating into military systems has probably come across the mil-std-96 classification system. (Also known as the AN/ designation system.)

Most military systems are known by one of two classifications systems, the first is the Mark/Mod system, which I will ignore. The other is a designation which allows you to understand the purpose of the military equipment which it designates. And example is the AN/SQS-26. Someone who knows this designation system will quickly figure out that it is a surface ship sonar system used primarily for the search function.

Or the AN/PRC-9. The prick 9 is clearly a portable radio communications system.

Many UFO reports or other reports refer to military systems. Most of these are designated by the AN/ designation system. You can figure out a certain amount of the capability of the system if you know how the AN/ designations work.

The order of the letters is important. The same letter in a different position may mean something different. (e.g., SQS-26. The first S means Water. (Or really normally shipboard). The second letter Q means sonar or underwater sound. The third letter, S, means detecting and/or range and bearing, search.)

The use will quickly become obvious to most of you. If some one claims to have picked up and tracked a UFO on a SPS-21, you will have every reason to question him. This is a search radar and most likely can't track a target. If he claims to have detected a UFO on a SPG-53, don't trust this person, this is a tracking radar and cannot be used to search.

Some of these are simple and some not so simple but all are intended to assist. I used Mil-Std-96C to generate this list, so some topics have been removed and some are probably not here because it is quite old. For instance the letter B in the second place is not listed. This used to stand for carrier pigeon.

Thus an AN/BBB-1 would be an underwater pigeon bomber. (Needless to say, not all combinations have merit!)

Try to figure out what a UYK-43 is!

If you want to keep this list, please print it out.

Installation (1st letter)

- A - piloted aircraft
- B - Underwater mobile, submarine
- D - Pilotless carrier
- F - Fixed ground
- G - General ground use
- K - Amphibious
- M - Ground mobile
- P - Portable
- S - Water
- T - Ground, transportable
- U - General utility
- V - Ground vehicular
- W - Water surface and underwater combination
- Z - Piloted and pilotless airborne vehicle combination

Type of Equipment (2nd letter)

- A - Invisible light, heat radiation
- C - Carrier
- D - Radiac
- G - Telegraph or teletype
- I - Interphone and public address
- J - Electromechanical
- K - Telemetry
- L - Countermeasures
- M - Meteorological
- N - Sound in air
- P - Radar
- Q - Sonar and underwater sound
- R - Radio
- S - Special types
- T - telephone (wire)
- V - Visual and visible light
- W - Armament
- X - Facsimile or television
- Y - data processing

Purpose (3rd letter)

- B - Bombing
- C - Communications (receiving and transmitting)
- D - Direction finder reconnaissance and/or Surveillance
- E - Ejection and/or release

G - Fire control, or searchlight directing

H - Recording and/or reproducing (graphic meteorological and sound)

K - computing

M - Maintenance and/or test assemblies (including tools)

N - Navigational aids (including altimeters, beacons, compasses, racons, depth, sounding, approach, and landing)

Q - Special or combination of purposes

R - Receiving, passive detecting

S - Detecting and/or range and bearing, search

T - Transmitting

W - Automatic flight or remote control

X - Identification and response

Misc. Identification letters following letter # 3

X,Y,Z - changes in voltage, phase, or frequency

T - training

(V) - Variable grouping

Hope this helps.

Obviously, some older pieces of equipment (e.g., SCR-584) aren't under this system.

It may be that the race is not always to the swift nor the battle to the strong - but that is the way to bet.

Damon Runyon

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## The Stonedisks of Baian-Kara-Ula

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:45:48  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 14:55:45 -0400  
Subject: The Stonedisks of Baian-Kara-Ula

:  
:

Source: In Search Of,

[http://www.in-search-of.com/frames/stonedisk/stonedisk\\_nf.shtml](http://www.in-search-of.com/frames/stonedisk/stonedisk_nf.shtml)

Excerpt below.

Stig

\*\*\*

Good afternoon.

It is Tuesday, June 15, 1999 at 3:29 PM

The Stonedisks of Baian-Kara-Ula

Disclaimer:

This report is based on the work written by Mr. J. Dendl and Mr. H. Hausdorf of the Ancient Astronaut Society. The information presented herein has been thoroughly researched but does not claim to be complete or accurate. All pictures are courtesy of Ancient Astronaut Society. Best viewed with Netscape Navigator 3.0 or IE 3.0

Contents:

- \*1937: The discovery of the Stonedisks
- \*1947: Dr. Karyl Robin-Evans' expedition
- \*1968: W. Saitsew & Prof. Tsum Um Nui
- \*1995: Ethnological evidence?

1937: The discovery of the Stonedisks

During an expedition to the hardly accessible mountainrange of Baian-Kara-Ula which lies on the borderland between Tibet and China, the chinese archeologist Chi Pu Tei discovered several cave burial sites which contained strange, only about 4 feet 4 inches tall skeletons, whose heads were oversized in relation to their otherwise slender frame. In each of the total of 716 graves he found a stonedisk with a diameter of about 1 foot and a thickness of a third of an inch. These disks were engraved with inscriptions of so far unkwon origin. Chi Pu Tei published his findings stating that the skeletons were those of montain gorillas and that the disks were added by later cultures, which lead to him being ridiculed by the chinese archeologist community.

1947: Dr. Karyl Robin-Evans' expedition



The report :

Shortly after World War II the polish professor Lolladoff showed a strange stonedisk to the english scientist Dr. Karyl Robin-Evans. Lolladoff claims to have bought the disk in Mussorie (Northern India) and that it is supposed to be from a mysterious people called the "Dzopa" who had used it for religious rituals.

<snip>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

From: Henny van der Pluijm <[hvdp@worldonline.nl](mailto:hvdp@worldonline.nl)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 04:08:09 +0200 (MET DST)  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 15:37:23 -0400  
Subject: Re: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 14:20:03 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)  
>From: Nick Balaskas <[nikolaos@YorkU.CA](mailto:nikolaos@YorkU.CA)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: URGENT NEWSFLASH - Belgium 1989/90

>What is the point in my above reply? Well, just because this  
>Canadian pilot expressed his views, it doesn't mean they were  
>correct or true or even reflected official Canadian government  
>plans.

Hi Nick, Tim and others,

You are right that the comments by the Belgian F16 pilot were not the official government line. By coincidence I got a request from another researcher this week for info on the flap. He informed me that the official conclusion of the Belgian Air Force is still that they had encountered an unknown phenomenon.

/ Met vriendelijke groet/Best wishes \  
Henny van der Pluijm  
[hvdp@worldonline.nl](mailto:hvdp@worldonline.nl)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## US Feds: No Implant In 'Mobster's' Butt

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 02:15:10  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 15:40:35 -0400  
Subject: US Feds: No Implant In 'Mobster's' Butt

Source: AP via Yahoo News,

[http://dailynews.yahoo.com/headlines/ap/ap\\_us/story.html?s=v/ap/19990615/us/bugged\\_3.html](http://dailynews.yahoo.com/headlines/ap/ap_us/story.html?s=v/ap/19990615/us/bugged_3.html)

Stig

\*\*\*

Yahoo! News

AP Headlines

Tuesday June 15 5:52 PM ET

Feds: No Bug in 'Mobster's' Butt

\*\*

WORCESTER, Mass. (AP) - There's no bug in a reputed mobster's buttocks, the government says.

For years, Vincent "Gigi Portalla" Marino claims, a federal drug agent had told him that a tracking device was inserted in Marino's rear end when he underwent surgery to remove a bullet.

This week, a federal judge ordered authorities to say whether they did, in fact, implant such a device.

"We can confirm that the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration did not implant a tracking device in defendant Vincent M. `Gigi Portalla' Marino's buttocks," U.S. Attorney Donald K. Stern said in a statement. "But we cannot speak, however, for any extraterrestrial beings."

Marino had claimed that he was once asked by a DEA agent to sign a form so the government could remove the device from his body.

On Monday, U.S. District Judge Nathaniel M. Gorton said the situation "sounds like some DEA agent trying to be funny," but he granted Marino's request to force the government to tell him the truth.

Gorton's order came during a hearing in preparation for a racketeering trial scheduled to start in the fall. Marino and six other defendants are accused of waging a murderous battle to seize control of the New England Mafia. Marino is in prison awaiting trial.

In 1996, Marino was caught in a hail of gunfire at a club in Revere. He was shot in the buttocks.

A legal expert said it is highly unlikely the government could legally implant a device in a person's body.

"Theoretically, if you wanted to put a tracking device in someone's body you would have to have court authority to do that, and I imagine the courts would be reluctant to do that,"

said Randy Chapman, former head of the Massachusetts Bar Association's criminal justice division.

Copyright © 1999 The Associated Press. All rights reserved.

The information contained in the AP News report may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed without the prior written authority of The Associated Press.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 22:19:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 15:41:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 00:47:07 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Mark Cashman, who I greatly respect, recently revealed in IUR that  
>the 1965 (?) Beaver, Pennsylvania, photos were unaltered  
>fakes. Until that time, however, he had the photo(s) on his web  
>page, subject to all sorts of luminosity analysis and other  
>"corroborative" evidence. The only problem, in the end, was that  
>the original account didn't match up with the phenomenon. In  
>fact, there was no phenomenon.

Dennis, please - I appreciate the respect, but your  
mischaracterization of the content of my web pages is hardly  
appropriate.

The material on the page which referred to the Beaver photos  
simply \*described\* the features of the photos next to close ups  
of the described sections of the images. There is a section of  
my site which discusses luminosity. In its prior form I pointed  
out that the Beaver photo displayed a frequently reported UFO  
feature - the ventral cone of luminosity. The same feature, BTW,  
appears in the Spaur case. Since the discovery of the falsity of  
the Beaver photos, references to them have been removed, as is  
appropriate.

I did not do any sort of luminosity "analysis" of the photos,  
except to indicate features which I thought were interesting and  
potentially suggestive. That does not qualify as analysis in my  
book. Nor did I offer any "corroborative" evidence in regard  
to the photo - indeed, I have no idea to what you refer. The  
only corroboration to the case comes from the witnesses as  
mentioned in Fuller's book.

I had planned on doing some more detailed work that  
mentioned Beaver, and it was in the course of attempting to  
validate the case prior to the work that I obtained the  
admission of the hoax.

So please, calm down and check your facts more carefully  
before making patently untrue claims about someone's handling  
or presentation of a case.

-----  
Mark Cashman, creator of The Temporal Doorway at  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com>  
- Original digital art, writing, music and UFO research -

UFO cases, analysis, classification systems, and more...  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/index.htm>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## John Mack, M.D. Joins The Prophets Conference

From: [prophets@maui.net](mailto:prophets@maui.net)  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 18:09:13 -1000  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 15:46:25 -0400  
Subject: John Mack, M.D. Joins The Prophets Conference

JOHN MACK,MD joins THE PROPHETS CONFERENCE ~ PORT TOWNSEND, WA,  
August 27-29

Dr. John Mack tells The Prophets Conference "a story of one man's determination to bear witness to cosmic mysteries with extraordinary implications for the human future..."

An esteemed professor of psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, and a Pulitzer Prize-winning biographer, Dr. John Mack never intended to become an expert in the controversial study of alien abductees. But after investigating over 60 cases of alien abduction through hundreds of hours of interviews and treatment, Dr. Mack now presents the mesmerizing tales of alien encounters revealed by his patients-- none of whom are mentally ill-- and the profound, surprising and at times deeply spiritual impact these experiences have had on their lives. Providing details of alien encounters never before reported or depicted on the screen, the men and women whose experiences are related here in unforgettably vivid detail are not extremists recounting dreams or hallucinations. Rather, as Dr. Mack reports, they are survivors of harrowing, real-life experiences that challenge the most basic assumptions that make up our understanding of our existence and our role in the universe.

He has written the gripping and fascinating book *Abduction: Human Encounters with Aliens*, in which the accounts of self-reported abductees led Dr. Mack to make other connections--between abductions, near-death experiences and 'past-life regressions.' All of these experiences are, Dr. Mack suggests, vehicles for recovering perennial wisdom. He places emphasis on spiritual transformation as the nexus of the abduction experience, even likening it to a shamanic expansion of consciousness.

Dr. Mack won the 1977 Pulitzer Prize for "A Prince of Our Disorder." His new book, "Passport to the Cosmos," will be available later this summer.

During The Prophets Conference Port Townsend, Dr. John Mack will join the powerful panel "The UFO: Anomaly, Reality, Implications" along with panelists Joe Firmage, Dr. Robert Anton Wilson, Dr. Edgar Mitchell and Dr. Steven Greer. He will also be presenting an individual workshop.

The 21st Century Mind: Opening to the Possible is the vision for The Prophets Conference ~ Port Townsend. This special gathering continues the compelling adventure into sacred vision and the realization of meaning. The Prophets Conferences are unparalleled events constantly manifesting the edge of ideas which call for nothing less than the Re-envisioning and Reconfiguration of Reality.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Physics Of UFO Data

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 01:07:31  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 15:17:44 -0400  
Subject: Physics Of UFO Data

Forwarded from 'alt.paranet.ufo'.

Stig

\*\*\*

From: [labanti@iol.it](mailto:labanti@iol.it) (Roberto Labanti)  
Newsgroups: alt.paranet.ufo,sci.skeptic  
Subject: Physics of UFO data  
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 11:49:12 GMT

-----  
Physics from UFO Data

Article by Massimo Teodorani, Ph.D. - Astronomer

### Abstract

A research project on the UFO phenomenon is proposed in which UFO targets are treated on a par with astronomical objects having no fixed coordinates. Specifically oriented monitoring techniques and strategies involving small telescopes which are connected to CCD detectors, spectrographs and photon-counting photometers are presented. Expected exposure-times for acquiring a good S/N ratio of the target using all the proposed instruments is also evaluated. Finally, physical informations which are expected to come out from data analysis are presented and discussed in detail.

-----  
The entire article is disponible at the URL

[http://www.ufodatanet.org/report/ufophys\\_e.htm](http://www.ufodatanet.org/report/ufophys_e.htm)

Best regards,

Roberto Labanti

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 03:34:57 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:02:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

<snip>

>Do you reckon it's still an untenable (if unpalatable)  
>possibility?

>James.  
>E-mail: [voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)

James, I believe that the bird hypothesis is untenable due to the evidence presented in posts that would require large reflective birds shaped like pie pans with a piece cut out. It would be untenable even if the reflective birds had a supersonic tailwind. Then again, perhaps this was the first sighting of Big Bird and the rest of the family.

Perhaps, as the Sasquatch is claimed to be on the ground in that part of the country, Sasbirds fly fast at a high altitude up yonder. I think this once again has been an epic adventure ride of getting down to the nitty-gritty of the Arnold Experience. I know that I rode it while imagining I was flying his Callair. I've been a pilot but I've never flown up there. I just take in Arnold's words and I can't see (with his methodical reporting) how he would ever come to the conclusion that what he saw was a flight of birds. I'm willing to say it's an unsolved mystery in an unsolved case, many decades after his experience and his methodical reporting. I hope that we don't pick too many more nits on this question unless we have new evidence. It's been a fun ride but has it been answered? <g>I just go by what Arnold said. It's good enough for me.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Perry Mick <[perrym@teleport.com](mailto:perrym@teleport.com)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 03:23:34 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:00:03 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 19:58:49 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>Better ask a pilot how long it takes to turn 90 deg (perhaps  
>abot 20 seconds?). Would he be able to (a) use a cowling tool  
>for size estimate, (b) turn his plane, (c) roll down the window  
>in about 2 minutes time? I bet he would be able to. Pilot's out  
>there want to comment? How much bank angle could Arnold safely  
>get for a reasonably rapid but not panic turn?

I'm a pilot. A standard instrument in small planes is the turn  
and bank indicator or turn coordinator. These are calibrated  
for what is called a standard rate turn, or a 2-minute turn. The  
bank angle for this rate of turn is usually much less than 30  
degrees, but depends on airspeed. It shows the bank angle you  
have to hold to turn 360 degrees in 2 minutes. It is also the  
rate of turn one should use in flying the pattern to takeoff and  
land.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 10:03:35 -0300  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:11:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>Off the list, Bruce has helpfully clarified some details which  
>have explained the full context of Arnold's letter to the Air  
>Force.

>Confirmed is my contention that Arnold was in fact still  
>searching for the missing C-46 marine transporter when his  
>sighting occurred.

>It did not take place afterwards, when Arnold was en route to  
>Yakima.

>I'm sure we can now conclude the debatable points as much as  
>they ever can be.

<snip>

Hi James,

At 60 MPH The Callair would have been about ready to fall out of the sky. Certainly if he had turned, upping his wing-stall speed he would have entered an incipient spin, then a full spin. The Call air cruised at about 100-120 MPH and with its short wing span had a higher stall speed than say a J-3 Cub, Aeronca or Taylorcraft [the latter, a high wing was the plane they used to represent Arnold's plane in the movie UFO. Real attention to detail there]. As search planes go, the Callair was a poor choice. His wings would have covered hundreds of square miles below him.

Having been [and still am] a volunteer search and rescue pilot, I can attest to just how hard it is to spot a downed aircraft at high altitudes [or low for that matter. Usually you find them due to other clues such as tree tops being clipped off, a swath being cut into low brush or the trees, or the plane's own reflectivity. In Arnold's case he was likely looking for an aircraft that could have been at a variety of altitudes and which likely buried itself in the snow or was covered over by same. We search with four aboard [pilot, navigator and two spotters in the back seat] using high wing aircraft [C-172s, 182s or 180s, etc. all of which have 36 foot wing spans] at 700-1000 feet with flaps on, cruising at about 90 miles per hour to prevent a wing stall during turns. Even then they are shallow turns. Arnold's Callair had a wing span of about 26 feet and no flaps and were low as I mentioned before. I doubt if he was flying at a speed of any less than 90 MPH or perhaps even 100. It would make no difference at the altitude he was searching. This would have had him looking ahead of the left wing and down with the occasional glance behind his wing in case reflectivity might have indicated the crash site due the angle change.

I don't know if any of this helps put your head in Arnold's Callair James. It's just like anything else though, there are many misconceptions about piloting an airplane, more than a few of which I have mentioned during this thread. You mentioned that

your friend sped away from the pelicans at 80 MPH. If that was a pure sail plane the only way he could have done that was by diving away from them to gain speed, unless it was a motor-glider. It doesn't say.

Your glider friend also mentions visibility factors, such as haze. All true, but Arnold is on record as saying it was a beautiful day for flying with the air very stable and clear. I've been up on days like that and it is a joy to behold. You can see 75 miles-plus once you get up to a mile or so. Whenever you get air that clear, it's because it's very stable and cold with no convection currents to whip dust, smoke and other pollutants into the upper atmosphere. Despite this being the air age, the general public's knowledge about flying is very poor with many misconceptions fostered by the entertainment industry.

Hope this helps.

Don Ledger

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

From: **Asgeir W. Skavhaug** <[asge-s@online.no](mailto:asge-s@online.no)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 18:42:04 +0200  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:17:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
>Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:23:10 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>Off the list, Bruce has helpfully clarified some details which  
>have explained the full context of Arnold's letter to the AirForce.  
>Confirmed is my contention that Arnold was in fact still  
>searching for the missing C-46 marine transporter when his  
>sighting occurred. It did not take place afterwards, when Arnold  
>was en route to Yakima. I'm sure we can now conclude the  
>debatable points as much as they ever can be.

>Bruce,

>In his report for the Air Force, Arnold wrote, in full:  
>"I had made one sweep of this high plateau to the westward,  
>searching all of the various ridges for this marine ship and  
>lew to the west down and near the ridge side of the canyon  
>where Ashford, Washington, is located.  
>Unable to see anything that looked like the lost ship, I made a  
>360 degree turn to the right and above the little city of  
>Mineral, starting again toward Rainer. I climbed back up to an  
>altitude of about 9,200 ft.

<snip>

>James.

James & List,

Much has been said and written about Arnold's sighting(s) during  
the years.

In order to (try to) solve the mystery once and for all -  
hopefully during this year (!!) - we can, for instance, also  
take a look at what happened on the ground, that is, provide some  
info. from the Web on the crash of the Curtiss C-45

<http://www.airartnw.com/flyingthehump.htm>  
<http://www.robins.af.mil/museum/aircraft/c-46.htm>

marine transport plane, along with some other interesting  
Arnold

<http://www.nwmyst.com/images/nwmyst-ufo-0022-2.jpg>

stuff from the Web.

The following URLs are referred to in this respect:

<http://www.nps.gov/mora/PressRel/PRplanecrash.htm> , with the  
following excerpts:

"The plane was transporting servicemen from San Diego to Sand  
Point Naval Air Station in Seattle."

"Park Ranger Bill Butler spent many off-duty hours monitoring

snow levels and climbing conditions. As the snow started to melt, he began looking for evidence of the plane crash.

On July 21, 1947, Bill spotted a gleam of metal on the South Tahoma Glacier, but he could not reach the site from his position on the Success Cleaver. After the discovery was reported, a search party made up of rangers and mountain guide Dee Molenaar was formed. On July 24, Bill Butler and his party reached the plane tail section at the 8,500' level of the glacier. No bodies were found.

A month later enough snow had melted to expose the nose section. Bill and his party later reached the crash site near the glacier's 10,000' level. The bulk of the broken plane was wedged into a crevasse. Bodies of the Marines were found, most encased by ice. Evacuation would have been extremely dangerous. It was decided, with the concurrence of families of the victims, that the Marines would be left buried in the glacier."

<http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/9575/1946.htm>

(There seems to be no info. on the marine plane here....)

<http://www.geocities.com/~pjctsign/LagIV.htm>

"I immediately changed my mind and decided that there was a bunch of new jet planes in formation."

"They seem to kind of weave in and out right above the mountain tops. And I would say, that they even went down into the canyons in several instances...oh, probably a hundred feet."

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/pauljones3/kenneth.htm>

<http://www.nwmyst.com/nwmyst-ufo-0022.html>

"The objects had flown so fast, so strangely, but bore such unforgettable aerodynamic details, that he kept trying to convince himself that what he had seen was an advanced form of jet (still in their infancy in 1947), or Russian guided missiles."

"...the Cold War was being born; perhaps the objects were foreign communist aerial invaders."

<http://www.nwmyst.com/images/nwmyst-ufo-0022-3.jpg>

This aircraft bears much resemblance to the Horten Ho 229, i.e.:  
<http://www.danford.net/horten.htm>.

<http://www.nwmyst.com/nwmyst-ufo-0023.html>

<http://www.nwmyst.com/images/nwmyst-ufo-0022-4.jpg>

Some other questions which might be raised, are:

- The formation of craft were, according to Arnold, also close to the ground. Were they searching for something? Maybe the crashed C-46? Were they part of the Navy's search team? With new technology to search for metallic materials on the ground? (Alternatively, for others: The \$5, 000 reward was no small sum of money in those days.)

- Or, could the planes have paid some interest to the volcanoes, and to the volcanic activity in this area? (Check out: [http://www.nps.gov/mora/MORA\\_Photos/summit.jpg](http://www.nps.gov/mora/MORA_Photos/summit.jpg) ) (Many UFOs are seen close to volcanoes.)

- One of the planes were different from the others. Not much attention has been paid to this

- Could the Americans have 9 of these planes in 1947? Or, maybe the Russians were in possession of the blueprints/construction drawings, and one of the Horten brothers? And, did they really manage to fly these newly developed and constructed planes from Soviet to America in July 1947?

The planes were aerodynamically unstable, and most likely difficult to fly in formation - due to the missing tail. Today,

these types of planes, like the B-2s

[http://www.af.mil/news/factsheets/B\\_2\\_Spirit.html](http://www.af.mil/news/factsheets/B_2_Spirit.html)

are fitted with pressure sensors and the stability is controlled by computers.

Because I cannot suggest any answers to these questions right now, the readers of the List must make up their own conclusions about this, and maybe provide their results on the List.

Best regards,  
Asgeir

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Possibilities

From: **Stephen Bassett** <[SGBList2@aol.com](mailto:SGBList2@aol.com)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 13:08:17 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:20:16 -0400  
Subject: Re: Possibilities

>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:25:14 -0700  
>From: Judith Dale <[judithdale@earthlink.net](mailto:judithdale@earthlink.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Possibilities

>I've been reading all UFO UpDate posts as they hit my email.  
>Except in a very few instances, I see the same old nitpicking go  
>on and on. I came across these quotes recently:

>"The more important fundamental laws and facts of physical  
>science have all been discovered, and these are now so firmly  
>established that the possibility of their ever being supplanted  
>in consequence of new discoveries is exceedingly remote.. Our  
>future discoveries must be looked for in the sixth place of decimals."  
> - physicist Albert. A. Michelson, 1894

>and:

>"..so many centuries after the Creation it is unlikely that  
>anyone could find hitherto unknown lands of any value."  
> - committee advising Ferdinand and Isabella  
> regarding Columbus' proposal, 1486

>Just thought I'd pass them along, perhaps as a reminder that; 1)  
>we don't know everything, and 2) Let's not allow our eyes to be  
>blinded by what we think we know exists, or is possible.

>Whilst some nitpick, the barn still burns and the sightings continue.

>My thanks to all who persist in their research to discover the  
>truth, present their findings, and don't just spin their wheels  
>debating for the sake of debate.

Judith,

So very nicely stated. Science, like politics, is only just emerging from thousands of years of male dominance and all that accompanied it - the arrogance of certainty, abuses of power, territoriality, win-lose, zero sum, greed, pride, envy, secrecy, and above all, control.

The 50-year study of UFO/ET phenomena, coming as it has in the middle of a profound transition away from male dominance shows both signs of the old as well as the new. The influence of women and their collective world view on both science and politics is mitigating against the toxic downside of the old order now passing into history.

We not only don't know everything, we don't even know the outlines of what we don't know.

As to the larger picture to which you allude: the UFO/ET research and activist community will either come together in a more focused coalition, circumscribed by comity, tolerance, cooperation and mutual support, or, all its efforts and contributions will be swept away by the state as the government moves to assert its privileges and control in a post-disclosure, post-paradigm world.

The greatest event in human history will become just another spun agenda of our military-industrial complex, the world's citizens just spectators to be entertained with post-paradigm propaganda, the UFO/ET researchers and activists just buzzing flies about the head of an awakened beast to be brushed aside or expunged.

There will be no true citizen-government partnership regarding the extraterrestrial presence until we exert collective action in our common interests.

Be assured that agent provocateurs are able and ready to prevent such a coalition from forming and ensure that all policies, laws and acts regarding extraterrestrials are influenced only by unelected careerists inside the stone block buildings along the Potomac River.

Regards,

Stephen Bassett

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 14:50:36 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:23:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO Updates  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 16:45:43 +0100

>Thanks for all the messages that flooded in over the weekend. To  
>be honest I had not even noticed that UFO UpDates was on the cc  
>list of the original Robert Moore and I thought I was only  
>talking to a few UK UFOlogists. I was quite surprised to see my  
>'spooof' went global. But no matter, it was an interesting  
>exercise.

>Let me qualify 'spooof'. This was not really trickery. Rather it  
>was a deliberate exercise in taking an idea to its natural  
>extreme. Many people in the UK have been furious over the Max  
>Burns lecture saying BUFORA lost the plot by inviting him. There  
>were demands for mass walk outs over the issue.  
>Snipped

Boy, did you put one over on us. Whew! We all thought you  
were serious. What a bunch of maroons we are!

However, I do understand how this can happen. On more than one  
occasion, I have attempted, thru hummers, uh, thru HUMOR, to  
yell at somebody or other for saying something which I  
originally thought was out of line while in reality, I was out  
of line all along.

Just one last question, and I do not expect you to answer it as  
I am without portfolio, have not published anything (on UFOs)  
and am not a recognized researcher... nor am I an unrecognized  
researcher. Having said all that, I expect nothing from anyone,  
except either a chuckle, or a chuckle and some personal  
recognition that the offende, not the offender (that'd be me)  
got the message. So my question is, based on your more recent  
admission that you were merely joshing, my question is, Dear Ms.  
Offende, what is the temperature of the sand?

Jim Gesundt & Jaime Mortellaro, UFO Research without portfolio  
but a lot of Moxie... we mix it with our Gripple and rhubarb  
wine.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Irwin Weider Query

From: **Andy Roberts** <[Brigantia@compuserve.com](mailto:Brigantia@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 15:19:38 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:24:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Irwin Weider Query

Hi,

Does anyone know where I can contact Irwin Weider, the guy who replicated the Willamette Pass photo and proved it was a hoax.

Any ideas gratefully accepted.

Happy Trails

Andy

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins [was: Mad Maxad Max: Beyond the

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 99 14:50:04 PDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:27:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins [was: Mad Maxad Max: Beyond the

>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 17:19:53 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 23:52:07 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>>>From: Rose Hargrove <[PRIESTESSE@aol.com](mailto:PRIESTESSE@aol.com)>  
>>>Date: Sun, 13 Jun 1999 20:19:22 EDT  
>>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

Hi, John,

>No, I'm not here to "defend" Budd. I am here as a witness.  
>"Above and beyond hypnosis" (which doesn't happen in every case  
>contrary to popular belief) Budd makes calls, interviews  
>witnesses, does 'on site' inspections, and he even interviews  
>neighbors with the permission of the person reporting if it is  
>called for. I know he has spoken to police and to government  
>agencies while 'checking things out.' As witness, I can attest  
>to the fact that Budd is a lot more thorough than many,  
>(yourself included) ever give him credit for. So Dennis,

>you're dead wrong about Budd. He may not be the best of  
>"investigators," (and I agree that hypnosis is being -way-  
>overused) but, he's an intelligent and thoughtful man who goes  
>about his business in an intelligent and thoughtful manner.

>I speak from having worked in close quarters with Budd for 6  
>years, Dennis. If you knew the man the way that I know him, you'd  
>never say an unkind word about him. No BS.

Excellent points, my friend. Budd Hopkins is as decent a guy as they come, with more compassion in his little fingernail than most of us (including most of us ufologists) possess in all our bodies. He and I don't agree on everything, but I always listen with great respect and interest to what he has to say, because Budd is worth listening to, which is more than I can say for some of his critics.

It sickens me to see how often Budd's good name is trashed, on this list and elsewhere, by persons who barely know him, or who don't know him at all. The implicit assumption beyond the slurs seems to be that anybody making radical claims must be a bad human being. It's not enough, one gathers, simply to argue, as civilized discourse would have it, that the man's ideas are misguided. Greg Sandow has tried to insert notes of sanity, accuracy, and proportion into the discussion from time to time, to no apparent effect. And while I'm listing Budd's virtues, let me add one more: courage.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: US Feds: No Implant In 'Mobster's' Butt

From: [Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:51:15 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 19:08:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: US Feds: No Implant In 'Mobster's' Butt

>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 02:15:10  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>Subject: US Feds: No Implant In 'Mobster's' Butt

>Source: AP via Yahoo News,

[http://dailynews.yahoo.com/headlines/ap/ap\\_us/story.html?s=v/ap/19990615/us/bugged\\_3.html](http://dailynews.yahoo.com/headlines/ap/ap_us/story.html?s=v/ap/19990615/us/bugged_3.html)

>Stig

>\*\*\*

>Yahoo! News

>AP Headlines

>Tuesday June 15 5:52 PM ET

>Feds: No Bug in 'Mobster's' Butt

>\*\*

>WORCESTER, Mass. (AP) - There's no bug in a reputed mobster's buttocks, the government says.

>For years, Vincent "Gigi Portalla" Marino claims, a federal drug agent had told him that a tracking device was inserted in Marino's rear end when he underwent surgery to remove a bullet.

>This week, a federal judge ordered authorities to say whether they did, in fact, implant such a device.

>"We can confirm that the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration did not implant a tracking device in defendant Vincent M. `Gigi Portalla' Marino's buttocks," U.S. Attorney Donald K. Stern said in a statement. "But we cannot speak, however, for any extraterrestrial beings."

<snip>

Dear Stig, Listfolk, Witness Protection Program and Aliens Lurking;

WRONG!

If an alien wanted to implant a tracking device in the butt of a Made Member's member or for that matter, any portion of the member's anatomy, that alien will do so. I can hear them tuning up their debunking tools now. Cup your hand to your ears. Hear it?

You want proof? OK, you got proof. Right here on my butt! I, who shall remain nameless because I AM in the witness protection program, have an alien tracking device in my butt. However I will not have it checked, removed or otherwise fiddled with by any but Pia Zadora. So, alls you gotta do to prove me wrong is contact that lady and have her examine my ... uh, bottom. It

Re: US Feds: No Implant In 'Mobster's' Butt

must be done \_just right\_ however. I've been waiting for this moment for years.

Dr. Jaime Ges.... I mean, Jamey "The Doc" Gambini  
Witness Protection Program  
Canal Street Division  
c/o Gesundt's Freshly Made Members

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:55:33 EDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 19:20:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins [was: Mad Maxad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome]  
>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 99 14:50:04 PDT

>>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 17:19:53 -0400  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>Hi, John,

>>No, I'm not here to "defend" Budd. I am here as a witness.  
>>"Above and beyond hypnosis" (which doesn't happen in every case  
>>contrary to popular belief) Budd makes calls, interviews  
>>witnesses, does 'on site' inspections, and he even interviews  
>>neighbors with the permission of the person reporting if it is  
>>called for. I know he has spoken to police and to government  
>>agencies while 'checking things out.' As witness, I can attest  
>>to the fact that Budd is a lot more thorough than many,  
>>(yourself included) ever give him credit for. So Dennis,

<snip>

>Excellent points, my friend. Budd Hopkins is as decent a guy as  
>they come, with more compassion in his little fingernail than  
>most of us (including most of us ufologists) possess in all our  
>bodies. He and I don't agree on everything, but I always listen  
>with great respect and interest to what he has to say, because  
>Budd is worth listening to, which is more than I can say for  
>some of his critics.

>It sickens me to see how often Budd's good name is trashed, on  
>this list and elsewhere, by persons who barely know him, or who  
>don't know him at all. The implicit assumption beyond the slurs  
>seems to be that anybody making radical claims must be a bad  
>human being. It's not enough, one gathers, simply to argue, as  
>civilized discourse would have it, that the man's ideas are  
>misguided. Greg Sandow has tried to insert notes of sanity,  
>accuracy, and proportion into the discussion from time to time,  
>to no apparent effect. And while I'm listing Budd's virtues,  
>let me add one more: courage.

You forgot one Jerry, Dignity.

Jim Mortellaro

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

From: **Dennis Stacy** <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 17:14:26 -0500  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 19:36:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting  
>From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 22:19:11 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

<snip>

>So please, calm down and check your facts more carefully  
>before making patently untrue claims about someone's handling  
>or presentation of a case.

>-----  
>Mark Cashman

Mark,

My comments were indeed based on my (admittedly fallible) memory of visiting your site. If I erred, I apologize. Point was, the Beaver pictures were posted as possibly corroborative of your overall luminosity analysis of various UFOs in general.

I credited you for laying the hoax to rest, once and for all. (Without raising the question of whether it should have ever been on your web page in the first place, given that Hartmann, in the 1969 Condon Report, had already cast serious doubts as to its validity. See p. 457 for an illustration of how it was done.)

If you want to discuss specifics, please e-mail me copies of your deleted pages pertaining to the Beaver pictures and I'll comment further. I'm sure you kept a file copy somewhere. Or maybe I did.

TIA

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:14:41 -0500  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 19:31:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 17:19:53 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

<snip>

>If you're going to critique Budd's (or anybody elses) "methods"  
>it would be nice if you familiarize yourself with them first.  
>Fair is fair Dennis. Never say stuff -about anyone- that you  
>cannot prove.

>Peace,

>John Velez

John, you have to much to say that is good regarding people,  
whereas I often don't. Am I getting cynical in middle age?

Actually, I had an article lined up by Budd for inclusion in  
UFOs 1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers. Some of you may  
have seen it, most of you haven't. It was called "Sane Citizen  
Sees UFO" and originally appeared in The Village Voce for March  
1, 1976. It was a classic example of an investigation of a  
single case, that of George O'Barski, who ran a liquor store in  
Chelsea where Budd routinely bought his dinner wine.

I particularly wanted to use it because it was a damn good case,  
and I thought it would somewhat recast the public perception of  
Hopkins B.A. -- Before Abductions. Off the top of my head, I  
can't remember why it didn't make the final edit, but if memory  
serves (and often it doesn't in my case), I think the Village  
Voice was late in granting reprint rights, which they eventually  
did.

In any event, it demonstrates that, prior to researching  
abduction cases in the main, Budd was an excellent foot soldier  
when it came to investigating UFO cases per se.

To the best of my knowledge, however, Budd declined to  
participate in the MUFON Abduction Transcription project, for  
reasons only he can fully delineate. In a somewhat similar vein,  
I've not heard much of late about the attempt to have his  
collected alien writing samples analyzed by outside parties. In  
the meantime, Mario Pazzaglini, who might have made a  
significant contribution to same, unfortunately passed away in  
November of last year.

This is Budd's material and he is of course perfectly free to do  
what he wants with it, even if that extends to withholding it  
from the scientific and ufological community (until the next  
popular book is published), while continuing to publish  
broadsides against Carl Sagan and NOVA for not treating the  
abduction phenomenon seriously and scientifically.

The question remains: is Budd himself scientific or not? That  
is, is his approach to the abduction phenomenon that of a  
scientist or that of a concerned human and therapist, or  
something of both? Does he keep anything even remotely

resembling statistics from his own investigations? (Not much, according to Sandow himself.) Does he routinely publish his findings for other researchers to peer review, comment upon, and (god forbid the possibility!) criticize? A quick glance through recent issues of the MUFON Journal, IUR, and JUFOS doesn't turn up too many case investigations with his name on them.

An article in the Intruders Foundation newsletter remarked on the fact that the aliens never expressed interest in the human heart; until I pointed out that one of the Allagash abductees drew a picture of aliens opening a human chest cavity and hauling out the heart. (See the cover of the April, 1993, MUFON UFO Journal for same, or Fowler's book on the case.)

I've met Budd on several occasions, and like nearly everyone else, found him an imminently likeable guy. By most accounts I've read, so was Sagan.

If likeability were the issue, there wouldn't be any issue. But it isn't.

Budd is heading down a long, dark tunnel with no headlights on. It may not happen tomorrow, it may not happen the day after tomorrow, but it will happen. Sooner or later, one of his "patients" (or their families) is going to file a serious lawsuit against Hopkins over his use of hypnosis and there will be all sorts of hell to pay. One of his friends ought to take him aside and warn him of its inevitability.

Contrary to what you (and others) might think, I wouldn't like to see it happen to such a nice guy. But Budd is playing with fire. Not necessarily Boylan fire, but fire, nonetheless.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 16](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 18:35:25 -0500  
Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 19:57:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins [was: Mad Maxad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome]  
>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 99 14:50:04 PDT

<snip>

>It's not enough, one gathers, simply to argue, as  
>civilized discourse would have it, that the man's  
>[Budd Hopkins's] ideas are misguided.

<snip>

>Jerry Clark

OK, let's argue that, and just that alone. The man's ideas are misguided. Now, you'll want to know why. You can start with his indefensible support of the Roper Report numbers. Or, if you choose, you can support the Roper Report numbers yourself, thus explaining why Budd's ideas aren't misguided.

So, let's ask this: do you support the Roper Report numbers as anywhere near an accurate reflection of the number of Americans abducted by ET UFOs annually? If not, does this indicate that Hopkins is simply misguided (or something else) in this particular area?

Note that both questions can be answered by a simple Yes or No.

Let's go no further for now: Is Hopkins misguided in his touting of the Roper Report numbers or not?

If you think he is misguided in terms of the Roper Report numbers, would you please explain why, knowing Budd as well as you do? And if he's misguided in this particular regard, is it conceivable that he's misguided in other areas, as well, and possibly irresponsible in one or two?

Or is that something none of us should consider -- because, after all, Budd really is a nice guy and I'm not?

I think all of ufology is justified in saying that Sagan was defied by skeptics and scientists alike. My problem is that I see Hopkins being treated in the same fashion by believers and ufologists. But Hopkins is only as good as his evidence, and there is absolutely nothing in his evidence (or Jacobs's or Mack's) to support the Roper Report numbers, nothing, absolutely nothing, and it is irresponsible in the extreme of Hopkins to continue to claim, suggest, or declare otherwise to the American public.

I'm glad that Jerry has confessed to his past sins and errors, i.e., his book supporting a paranormal, psycho-social explanation of the UFO phenomenon. If everyone on this thread is lucky, maybe I'll confess to a few sins of my own. But not until Budd Hopkins does.

On the other hand, maybe Budd's never wrong about anything.

Re: Budd Hopkins

Maybe 3.7 million Americans were abducted last year. And the year before that, and so on. But, somehow, I don't think so.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: **Jerome Clark** <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 99 20:17:40 PDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 10:53:16 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 18:35:25 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins [was: Mad Maxad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome]  
>>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 99 14:50:04 PDT

>>It's not enough, one gathers, simply to argue, as  
>>civilized discourse would have it, that the man's  
>>[Budd Hopkins's] ideas are misguided.

>OK, let's argue that, and just that alone. The man's ideas are  
>misguided. Now, you'll want to know why. You can start with his  
>indefensible support of the Roper Report numbers. Or, if you  
>choose, you can support the Roper Report numbers yourself, thus  
>explaining why Budd's ideas aren't misguided.

I think I've committed what some consider the ultimate heresy:  
speaking well of Budd Hopkins. Sorry, Dennis. You know my views  
on the Roper poll.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## UFOs Around The World...A Lot Of Them

From: **Thiago Ticchetti** <[thiagolt@opengate.com.br](mailto:thiagolt@opengate.com.br)>  
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 22:43:06 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 10:56:09 -0400  
Subject: UFOs Around The World...A Lot Of Them

ATTENTION, HOT NEWS, VERY IMPORTANT.

NOTÍCIAS POPULARES Newspaper

Flying Saucer appeared in 10 countries

A Spaceship size of a Football field would have landed in Brazil

Suprise in the skies of the Americas. UFOs were seen in at least 10 countries, including Brazil, during the afternoon of Monday and dawn of Tuesday.

One of the objects would have landed in Goias, Brazil's state.

There's several reports, all very similar, from residents of the cities of Chapadão do Sul, in Mato Grosso and Chapadão do Céu, Goiás.

The phenomenon would have been seen in Bolivia, Colômbia, Argentina, Costa Rica, Panamá, México, Peru and Venezuela.

The main report came from Francisco Fetter, a tributary fiscal. He was at work and around 06:00PM, he looked to the sky and saw a strange thing.

The thing looked a cover pot. The size was about a football field, had lights and became red before disappear. He saw the UFO for 3 minutes.

Then he called to another office, far 80 km. There, when got the call, Mozar Menezes said that he was seeing the object. "It was a spectacular light, wonderful", said Francisco.

The housewife's Ema Helena Schilick children, said that they saw a strange object in the sky.

Eunice Claudia, 17, and Ernane Emerson, 14, were at the bus stop when the UFO appeared.

They said that it was a round object, enormous, and was very slow.

Besides them, 4 tourists that were in the Parque Nacional das Emas tell the same story.

"This thing is "burning'", said the Revista UFO editor, A.J. Gevaerd

"We received dozens of reports, spoke with some professionals from other countries that assured that they saw the same phenomenon in the Latin America".

Gevaerd are going to Chapadão do Sul today - "I gonna interview some witnesses. usually when it happens there's some abduction case".

There's rumors also that a aircraft took off from the Anápolis

Air Force Base, in Goiás, to check out, and some informations about a land and a crash of something.

We are still getting informations.

THIAGO LUIZ TICCHETTI  
Diretor Do Departamento de Publicação e Tradução Especializadas ( DEPTE -  
EBE-ET / Brasilia-Brasil)  
Director of the Publication Department and Specialized Translation  
ICQ - 35119615  
\*\*\*\*\* SE VOCÊ NÃO É POLÍCIA NÃO USE ARMAS \*\*\*\*\*

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 00:28:33 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:10:37 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 03:23:34 -0700  
>From: Perry Mick <[perrym@teleport.com](mailto:perrym@teleport.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 19:58:49 -0400  
>>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>Better ask a pilot how long it takes to turn 90 deg (perhaps  
>>abot 20 seconds?). Would he be able to (a) use a cowling tool  
>>for size estimate, (b) turn his plane, (c) roll down the window  
>>in about 2 minutes time? I bet he would be able to. Pilot's out  
>>there want to comment? How much bank angle could Arnold safely  
>>get for a reasonably rapid but not panic turn?

>I'm a pilot. A standard instrument in small planes is the turn  
>and bank indicator or turn coordinator. These are calibrated  
>for what is called a standard rate turn, or a 2-minute turn. The  
>bank angle for this rate of turn is usually much less than 30  
>degrees, but depends on airspeed. It shows the bank angle you  
>have to hold to turn 360 degrees in 2 minutes. It is also the  
>rate of turn one should use in flying the pattern to takeoff and  
>land.

Thanks for the info.

I gather that 30 seconds for 90 degrees is a "standard turn  
rate." Presumably Arnold could turn faster if he wanted to and  
the was no interference from bad weather/wind.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 00:28:23 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:06:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>Off the list, Bruce has helpfully clarified some details which  
>have explained the full context of Arnold's letter to the Air  
>Force.

>Confirmed is my contention that Arnold was in fact still  
>searching for the missing C-46 marine transporter when his  
>sighting occurred.

Well, it would appear from his Air Force letter, quoted below  
that he was at a lower unstated altitude while searching because  
he mentions climbing to 9,200 ft (give or take 1,000 if air  
pressure setting not correct...etc.). He climbed to a higher  
altitude and trimmed his plane out (adjusted control settings to  
fly steadily at a constant altitude and speed.... pilots want to  
comment?) and "settled down" to enjoy the view as he flew toward  
Yakima.

This says to me his searching was over by the time the sighting  
began.

>It did not take place afterwards, when Arnold was en route to  
>Yakima.

>I'm sure we can now conclude the debatable points as much as  
>they ever can be.

>Bruce,

>In his report for the Air Force, Arnold wrote, in full:

>"I had made one sweep of this high plateau to the westward,  
>searching all of the various ridges for this marine ship and  
>flew to the west down and near the ridge side of the canyon  
>where Ashford, Washington, is located.

>Unable to see anything that looked like the lost ship, I made a  
>360 degree turn to the right and above the little city of  
>Mineral, starting again toward Rainer. I climbed back up to an  
>altitude of about 9,200 ft.>

>The air was so smooth that day that it was a real pleasure  
>flying and, as most pilots do, I trimmed out my airplane in the  
>direction of Yakima, which was almost directly east of my  
>position and simply sat in my plane observing the sky and  
>terrain".

>Ashford is to the north-east of Mineral and if he made a "360  
>degree turn to the right" and was "starting again toward  
>Rainer", which is also north-east of Ashford, I'm not sure how  
>he was also travelling in the direction of Yakima.

It would appear that Arnold, that bad boy(!) hasn't told us \_every\_ second by second detail of exactly what directions, speeds and altitudes he flew his plane near the end of his search for the downed military transport. Perhaps he thought the Air Force would be bored to learn how many zigs and zags \ he m,ade and exactly which direction is aircraft was pointing at a particular time. He realed making a turn over Mineral after being over a ridge near Ashord...and so what? What counts is what happened after he trimmed out his plane to head toward Yakima. At that point the flight path was not complicated....easy to remember...and likely to be correct.

>The account in his later book is also different, making no >mention of 'heading towards Yakima' and stating, "It was during t>his search and \*\*while making a turn of 180 degrees over >Mineral\*\*, Washington, at approximately 9200 feet altitude" when >he first noticed a 'bright flash'>

>The direction he was actually travelling in relation to the >objects is crucial and I would have to be dubious about his >'perfect' sighting conditions, as outlined in the Air Force >report.

As I said above, after all the maneuvering to carry out the search he climbed in altitude and set the plane on a simple straight course for Yakima.,...very likely to be correct!\

>That aside, whether Arnold was coming out of a 180/360 degree >turn, or 'cruising' due east, he was still in 'search' mode, so >what was his airspeed likely to have been?  
Above 80 mph "Crash Speed."

>Would he be undertaking a search at close to maximum speed, in >treacherous terrain, or would his airspeed be much less, giving >him time to hopefully spot the missing aircraft and earn an >instant ten thousand dollar fortune?

He would be traveling AT LEAST fast enough to avoid stall. Ity is my recollection that stall speed is around 80 mph, although for some lightweight craft it might go down to 60. HOwever, his aircraft was not that lightweight. I would bet his speed toward Yakima was higher than the search speed, probably over 100 mph.

>Some further comments re the respective figures you had quoted:

>Altitude: As you may have noticed, I mentioned to Don Ledger >that I had seen a reference to pelicans being known to migrate >at over 14,000 feet, considerably higher than your estimate >(although it maybe makes no difference).

I have analyzed the bird situation assuming the they were at the same altitude.

>Visibility: I'm not sure if I've highlighted this before. Glider >pilot Mike Havener, who wrote an article 'Soaring with Pelicans' >describing his extraordinary experiences being joined in flight >by these gregarious birds, was asked if he could offer an >experienced opinion on this point. He replied, >

>"Visibility depends on several factors. The one having the most >effect of course is how much 'haze' or other particulate matter >is in the air (i.e. smog, smoke). At low altitudes, visibility >is lowered because of this.

>Myself, (a pilot with average eyesight) I can distinguish the >basic shape (a body with wings) of these pelicans from about 4 >miles when flying above the haze. From 4 to maybe 6 miles they >become small dots. Beyond that, I'd say they would probably not >be distinguishable other than some sort of relative motion that >may catch your eye".

>Presumably we keep in mind that Arnold noted how perfect the >visibility was that day.

Yes... but it would be nice to know what the background was like when Mr. Havener saw the pelicans at up to 6 miles (did he measure the distance? How does he know it wasn't 3 or 7?). Did he see them against snow?

>Speed: It might be a mistake to underestimate just how fast

>these birds can fly. Although awkward on the ground, with that  
>10 feet wingspan they are majestic in the air and I've already  
>provided wonderful evidence from Mike Havener that a flock of  
>pelicans were comfortably flying with him at 52 m.p.h. Mike also  
>writes in his article that, "I reluctantly sped up to 80 m.p.h.  
>to put some distance between us".>>

One wonders how long and at what altitude they can maintain 52  
mph or thereabouts.

>>There's maybe another factor to consider. If any formation of  
>>birds observed a larger object flying towards them, it seems  
>>>way, possibly reaching their top speed if necessary.>

In this case, if they were approaching Arnold's track at his  
altitude, they might swerve away.

>So what if - and we are only considering 'what if' calculations:

>Arnold's airspeed was closer to 60 m.p.h. and our conceivable  
>birds were travelling at 30 m.p.h., or some identical ratio  
>where Arnold's speed is twice as fast - say, 80/40.>

Better make it 80/40 to be on the safe (for Arnold) side.

>Plus, the 'objects' are first sighted four miles away

OK, but not directly ahead. They are seen to the left. Note  
that from Mineral, Mt. Rainier is to the left and the objects  
were first seen to the left of Rainier.

Hence a complete specification requires a radial distance from  
Arnold, say 4 miles, and a distance north of his (almost) direct  
track to the east.

>At 60 m.p.h., Arnold's approaching them at 1 mile per minute.

and the birds are doing 30 mph, 1/2 mile/minute .....and  
Arnold's plane goes into a stall and he crashes....

>After 1 minute, if said birds remained stationary, they are  
>still three miles away.  
You've moved Arnold 1 mile along his path toward the east...

>Except that they are moving towards Arnold's flight path at 5  
>mile per minute.

HUH? I presume they are not 300 mph birds, but rather that you  
meant they are traveling 0.5 miles per minute. They are flying  
south.

And, unless they started only 1/2 mile north of his path (or  
less than 1/2 miles) they have not yet reached his path.

If they started 1 mile north of his track, by the time they get  
to his track, ..and are directly ahead of the, Arnold is closer to  
them than 2 miles (in fact they are about 1.9 miles ahead of  
him... Reference Pythagoras and the assumption that they are  
1 miles north of his track when they are 4 miles away from him.)

If they were 2 miles north of his track when he first saw them  
(at an angle northward of about 30 degrees), then it took them  
4 minutes (at 30 mph) to reach his track and at that time.... he  
was there too. They crashed!

>At what angle though?

I gave possible angle above.  
and in a in a previous post.... and PELICAN PARTISANS  
see below....

>Anyway, at some point, they theoretically pass Arnold's flight  
>path, heading in the approximate direction of Mt Adams.

Yes. Has Arnold passed them yet?

>They're also still heading away from Arnold and if he turns his  
>airplane \*\*due south\*\*, they will continue to travel further  
>away.

Well..... they continue south, with Arnold on their tails, more or less...and going twice as fast as they...

>Arnold will eventually make some headway towards them, however,  
>if he has already decided these objects are much further than  
>they truly are, there's no point in him pursuing them. Come on!

If they are close, as they would have been if birds (within a couple of miles at most) he would realize it by the parallax effect... the rate of rotation of his sighting line as he flies along at twice their speed and observes the sighting direction from him to them with respect to numerous background reference points (mountains). Yeah, there's no point in pursuing them because he realizes he is catching up with.... birds!

>So far as I can see, there's no evidence that he did.  
Yup.... he couldn't catch up with objects doing 1,700 mph.

>We do know that after one minute and forty seconds, he's  
>determined they are already at Mt Adams and distant, hardly  
>visible objects.  
Yup..... Super Pelicans

>Does this scenario allow the possibility that these were not  
>distant 'objects' - only some 4 miles away, yet sufficiently far  
>and moving fast enough to always be illusory against the snow  
>covered mountains?

Huh? ALWAYS illusory against the snow covered mountains? Arnold would have to be a complete novice to flying to think that objects at 4 miles or less, going more slowly than he, were at much greater distances and going much much faster than he... especially after his crucial "bird plucker" test of flying in the same direction as the objects.

>If not, for the sake of a best/worst scenario, let's finish off  
>the discussion by upping the bird's airspeed to 50 m.p.h. -  
>which they can do - drop Arnold's "coming out of turn and  
>searching" to 60 and put the 'objects', in 'perfect visibility',  
>initially five miles away.

>Do you reckon it's still an untenable (if unpalatable)  
>possibility?

I'll accept 50 mph for the birds and even 5 miles for a "setup" as long as you accept 100 mph for Arnold's plane. But...before accepting 60 mph for Arnold you have better get permission from a knowledgeable pilot as to whether or not Arnold would be likely to trim out his plane at a snails-pace 60 mph (assuming he could go that slowly!).

.....

#### PELICANS

For Pelican Partisans Only:  
(MODIFIED from the original presentation a week or so ago)

Let's forget the claim of going in and out of the mountains for the moment and simply concentrate on the directions to the objects (a) when first seen, (b) when passing Mt. Rainier, (c) when in the direction of Mt. Adams. Assume Arnold was close to Mineral, Washington, about 25 miles radially from Rainier; more specifically, 23 miles west and 10 miles south of Rainier. That puts Rainier at 23 degrees north of due east of Arnold or at azimuth  $90-23 = 67$  degrees (north is azimuth 0 degrees).

OK, get yourself some graph paper with 1" squares (or larger) and let 1" = a mile (or some other convenient square size on the graph paper).

At the left side of the paper near the middle place a point. That is Arnold's starting position. Let north be "up" on the graph paper. Draw a line from Arnold's starting position at an azimuth of 15 degrees. This is approximately the direction to Mt. Baker.

Draw another line with azimuth 67 degrees. This is the direction to Mt. Rainier (about 25 miles away.... it will not appear on your graph paper unless you have BIG paper or squares

smaller than 1"). Draw another line at azimuth 95 deg. This is Arnold's track toward Yakima. Draw a final line at azimuth 136 deg. This is the direction to Mt. Adams over 50 miles away. Now let's construct a diagram of ARNOLD vs the PELICANS.

So let's characterize Pelicans this way:

wingspan - 10 ft  
length - 3 ft (? a bit much?)  
TOP speed - 50 mph or 0.83 miles/min or 73 ft/sec  
TOP altitude - 14,000? ft.  
Flight Direction: 170 azimuth (could be 180 or 160...won't make much difference to this disaster)

Let us charactersize Arnold by  
altitude - 9,200 ft  
speed - 100 mph or 1.67 mi/min or 147 ft/sec

Note that this estimate of Arnold's speed is probably low. We also characterize this reconstruction by the overall time of the observation. Arnold said 2.5 - 3 minutes. Let's pick 2.5 (as being advantageous to the P hypothesis) In that time birds fly  $2.5 \times .83 = 2.1$  miles In that time Arnold flies 4.2 mi

Now go to your finely executed graph paper with the radial lines emanating from Arnold's starting position and follow me. Mark 4 miles along the 15 deg azimuth radial. This is the assumed initial distance of the pelicans. At this distance they would appear as dots against the sky...or mountainous background (Ignore observation by of arnold about metallic-like bright flashes).

What do we find at the start of the sighting? -angular size (birds seen nearly head on, flying south) at same altitude, and 4 miles away angular size =  $\arctan(10 \text{ ft}/4 \text{ miles}) = 0.47 \text{ mr} = 0.027 \text{ degrees}$  (mr = milliradians)... detectable; no shape ON his horizon because we have assume the same height as Arnold

Now draw a line from this initial bird position along the 170 azimuth direction. Make the line 2.1 miles long, the distance the birds flew during the 2.5 minute sighting and see where it ends. Amusing.

On my diagram it ends about 2 miles north of Arnold's path. But by this time Arnold would be 4.2 miles along his path, and the pelicans would be about 3.5 miles behind him and to his left. This means that at all times they would have been to his left and the sighting line to them would rotate from ahead-left to behind-left. Please keep in mind that this is a DYNAMIC situation: Arnold and the pelicans are moving. If one is clever one can find a point of closest approach by marking off time intervals and measuring the distance between th plane and birds at the various interval positions. Try 15 second intervals.. At APPROXIMATELY 90 seconds they are closest... a distance of about 3 miles.

But.....

Arnold has already crossed the path of the oncoming pelicans and they are at an angle of about 115 degrees to the right of the direction Anold is heading.

One can hardly imagine Arnold describing this situation as saying that the "saucers" flew down the hogback chain of mountains toward Mt. Adams.

(pluck, pluck.... do I see falling birdfeathers?)

Oh Pluck, says Easton! Let's try another scenario

Ignore Arnold's claim that the objects flew over the mountains south of Rainier and ignore his claim that they were last seen in the direction of Mt. Adams.. Now you can accept the Pelicans. Right?

If Arnold turned his plane under these circumstances it would have been a turn to the left and he would have been flying northward, opposite to their direction of flight.

Now, as an alternatives assume the initial sighting azimuth was not 15 degrees. Try something more "realistic." Assume Arnold



was wrong in saying he first saw the objects north of Rainier. IGNORE THIS OBSERVATION OF ARNOLD. Instead, assume he first saw them in the direction of Rainier. SO, mark off 4 miles along the 67 degree azimuth.

Now draw a line 2.1 miles long along the 170 azimuth of the bird track and note the following AMUSING result:

the birds reach Arnold's path at about the time he would arrive.... in fact, if my drawing is correct they pass about 0.1 miles in front of him at 2 minutes and 22.5 seconds (give or take a few seconds) after the beginning of the sighting.

Hence to accept this birdbrained hypothesis we must assume he couldn't realize they were birds from a distance less than 1000 ft....although other experienced flyers could not only realize they were birds but even identify them as pelicans from a distance of several miles!

There is another slight problem..... Arnold wouldn't have seen these birds silhouetted against Mt. Rainier until that last half minute of his sighting. Therefore he coul not have timed their flight "from Mt. Rainier to Mt. Adams" over a duration of 102 s seconds.

Therefore to keep pelicans in the running...oops, flying... we must assume Arnold did not see them crossing Mt. Rainier until the end' of the sighting and then he had about 5 seconds to time them flying apparently from near Mt. Rainier to Mt Adams (which would result in a calculated speed of about 17,000 mph for pelicans). ALSO, we assume he did not turn his plane to fly along with them because the 2.5 minutes were over within seconds after they flew past (and he then left them behind and far to his right).

Anyway, I invite Pelican Partisans to invent their own reconstructions and prove that the objects could have been pelicans. Please be specific as to which of Arnold's sighting details we no longer need to accept as accurate in order to accept the pelican hypothesis as accurate.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 00:28:38 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:12:45 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 10:03:35 -0300  
>From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
>>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>At 60 MPH The Callair would have been about ready to fall out of  
>the sky. Certainly if he had turned, upping his wing-stall speed  
>he would have entered an incipient spin, then a full spin. The  
>Call air cruised at about 100-120 MPH and with its short wing  
>span had a higher stall speed than say a J-3 Cub, Aeronca or  
>Taylorcraft [the latter, a high wing was the plane they used to  
>represent Arnold's plane in the movie UFO. Real attention to  
>detail there]. As search planes go, the Callair was a poor  
>choice. His wings would have covered hundreds of square miles  
>below him.

Well, I guess this shoots down James "ideal scenario" of  
pelicans at 50 mph and Arnold at 60 mph. Back to the 2:1 ratio  
with Arnold at 100 mph (or more).

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 01:04:03 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:22:18 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 16:14:41 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 17:19:53 -0400  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

><snip>

>>If you're going to critique Budd's (or anybody elses) "methods"  
>>it would be nice if you familiarize yourself with them first.  
>>Fair is fair Dennis. Never say stuff -about anyone- that you  
>>cannot prove.

>>Peace,

>>John Velez

>John, you have to much to say that is good regarding people,  
>whereas I often don't. Am I getting cynical in middle age?

Can't speak for you Sasquatch, but I'm getting 'cantankerous!'

>Actually, I had an article lined up by Budd for inclusion in  
>UFOs 1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers. Some of you may  
>have seen it, most of you haven't. It was called "Sane Citizen  
>Sees UFO" and originally appeared in The Village Voce for March  
>1, 1976. It was a classic example of an investigation of a  
>single case, that of George O'Barski, who ran a liquor store in  
>Chelsea where Budd routinely bought his dinner wine.

Shame it didn't make it. It is a good case study and Budd did  
an admirable job for an amateur.

>In any event, it demonstrates that, prior to researching  
>abduction cases in the main, Budd was an excellent foot soldier  
>when it came to investigating UFO cases per se.

You imply that he somehow changed when he began to investigate  
abduction cases. Or changed his methods anyway. In fact, the only  
thing that changed was 'what' he was investigating not 'how.'

>To the best of my knowledge, however, Budd declined to  
>participate in the MUFON Abduction Transcription project, for  
>reasons only he can fully delineate.

Yep. That's a question to put to Budd directly.

>I've not heard much of late about the attempt to have his  
>collected alien writing samples analyzed by outside parties.

As far as I know, Dennis, they were forwarded to Stewart Appelle  
at Cornell several months ago. I have asked about this myself  
on several occasions but haven't been able to get any new info

Re: Budd Hopkins

as to progress - if any. Aside from the 'science', I've got a 'vested' curiosity in the analysis because one of the samples that was submitted came from me.

>In the meantime, Mario Pazzaglini, who might have made a >significant contribution to same, unfortunately passed away in >November of last year.

Yes, I'm familiar with him. He sent me some writing samples awhile back and asked me to compare them to what I had seen. Some of it was pretty dead on and some not so. That's what I reported to him and I never heard from him again. Sorry to hear that he's passed on. If the news was published on UpDates I must have missed it, I didn't know.

>This is Budd's material and he is of course perfectly free to do >what he wants with it, even if that extends to withholding it >from the scientific and ufological community (until the next >popular book is published), while continuing to publish >broad-sides against Carl Sagan and NOVA for not treating the >abduction phenomenon seriously and scientifically.

"Withholding material"? "Broad-siding Carl Sagan"? Gimme a sec to compose myself, that was genuinely funny!

What Budd has, in terms of 'material' is pretty much all 'out there' already. Reports, photo's, some lab results on ground trace evidence, and let's not forget the much maligned independant witness testimony. I don't see how anything Budd has qualifies as being labelled "withheld." Read the books. Whatever he has is there.

Re: "Broad-siding Sagan and NOVA"

It was the astronomer Carl Sagan that presumed to 'diagnose' all abductees as suffering from "hallucinations". What an 'astronomer' was doing rendering 'psychological opinions' on a program that purports to report on science is one best left to the conspiracy buffs.

As for NOVA; I personally gave them an opportunity to check me out in any way they chose to and using experts of their own choosing. Dennis I asked them for everything from a polygraph to a complete medical and psychological workup. You'd think that they'd jump on an opportunity like that. No dice. Instead they trotted out the same old lineup of 'suspects' who had no interest other than pitching their own pet theories. They analyzed us (on air) without ever having as much as spoken to any of us. Or even requesting something as basic as copies of what it was we were reporting! It was a sham, and a hatchet job and a half. They blew a good opportunity to do a little honest investigating and reporting. They were much more interested in sensationalism and ratings. You're defending them to the wrong guy with me, Sasquatch. I know what the real deal is with that bunch of Hollygollywood wahoos.

>The question remains: is Budd himself scientific or not? That >is, is his approach to the abduction phenomenon that of a >scientist or that of a concerned human and therapist, or >something of both?

Again something that should be asked of Budd directly. I don't think it's fair or proper to use the same ruler on Budd that you would a trained scientist. He is not that and he has never claimed to be. (Although John Mack should be whupped with that ruler!)

>Budd is playing with fire. Not necessarily Boylan fire, but fire, >nonetheless.

Maybe so Dennis, but it won't be me filing the suit. He helped me and mine. Also, wouldn't you think that if he was really the villain that you paint him to be that someone would have sued his pants off by now? After 20 + YEARS! Twenty years, over 600 people and no law suits\_.

Hmmm, what do dat tell you Andy? <g>

And, putting those two names in the same sentence (Budd & Boylan) takes the same stretch of creativity it would take to put say Ghandi and Joey Buttafuccho together in the same line! :)

Re: Budd Hopkins

Take care till next Sasquatch.

Peace,

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 17](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:37:44 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 15:59:47 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From Dennis Stacy

>John, you have to much to say that is good regarding people,  
>whereas I often don't. Am I getting cynical in middle age?

>Actually, I had an article lined up by Budd for inclusion in  
>UFOs 1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers. Some of you may  
>have seen it, most of you haven't. It was called "Sane Citizen  
>Sees UFO" and originally appeared in The Village Voce for March  
>1, 1976. It was a classic example of an investigation of a  
>single case, that of George O'Barski, who ran a liquor store in  
>Chelsea where Budd routinely bought his dinner wine.

>I particularly wanted to use it because it was a damn good case,  
>and I thought it would somewhat recast the public perception of  
>Hopkins B.A. -- Before Abductions. Off the top of my head, I  
>can't remember why it didn't make the final edit, but if memory  
>serves (and often it doesn't in my case), I think the Village  
>Voice was late in granting reprint rights, which they eventually  
>did.

>In any event, it demonstrates that, prior to researching  
>abduction cases in the main, Budd was an excellent foot soldier  
>when it came to investigating UFO cases per se.

>To the best of my knowledge, however, Budd declined to  
>participate in the MUFON Abduction Transcription project, for  
>reasons only he can fully delineate. In a somewhat similar vein,  
>I've not heard much of late about the attempt to have his  
>collected alien writing samples analyzed by outside parties. In  
>the meantime, Mario Pazzaglini, who might have made a  
>significant contribution to same, unfortunately passed away in  
>November of last year.

>This is Budd's material and he is of course perfectly free to do  
>what he wants with it, even if that extends to withholding it  
>from the scientific and ufological community (until the next  
>popular book is published), while continuing to publish  
>broadsides against Carl Sagan and NOVA for not treating the  
>abduction phenomenon seriously and scientifically.

>The question remains: is Budd himself scientific or not? That  
>is, is his approach to the abduction phenomenon that of a  
>scientist or that of a concerned human and therapist, or  
>something of both? Does he keep anything even remotely  
>resembling statistics from his own investigations? (Not much,  
>according to Sandow himself.) Does he routinely publish his  
>findings for other researchers to peer review, comment upon, and  
>(god forbid the possibility!) criticize? A quick glance through  
>recent issues of the MUFON Journal, IUR, and JUFOS doesn't turn  
>up too many case investigations with his name on them.

>An article in the Intruders Foundation newsletter remarked on  
>the fact that the aliens never expressed interest in the human  
>heart; until I pointed out that one of the Allagash abductees  
>drew a picture of aliens opening a human chest cavity and  
>hauling out the heart. (See the cover of the April, 1993, MUFON  
>UFO Journal for same, or Fowler's book on the case.)

>  
>I've met Budd on several occasions, and like nearly everyone  
>else, found him an imminently likeable guy. By most accounts  
>I've read, so was Sagan.  
  
>If likeability were the issue, there wouldn't be any issue. But  
>it isn't.  
  
>Budd is heading down a long, dark tunnel with no headlights on.  
>It may not happen tomorrow, it may not happen the day after  
>tomorrow, but it will happen. Sooner or later, one of his  
>"patients" (or their families) is going to file a serious  
>lawsuit against Hopkins over his use of hypnosis and there will  
>be all sorts of hell to pay. One of his friends ought to take  
>him aside and warn him of its inevitability.  
  
>Contrary to what you (and others) might think, I wouldn't like  
>to see it happen to such a nice guy. But Budd is playing with  
>fire. Not necessarily Boylan fire, but fire, nonetheless.

Hi,

I want to support all that Dennis says here. I like Budd a great deal. I respect him because - whilst I strongly disagree with both his methods and conclusions - I think he is genuinely doing what he believes is right. That makes it all the more important to make him see why he is not, because Dennis and I (and surely others) can see the road he is travelling all too well. And we don't want that to happen to him.

But there is a broader issue - if hypnosis has a long term detrimental effect on ufology. I am absolutely certain the latter is the case. Why? Not some arbitrary guesstimate that's for sure. I base my conclusion on three things.

1: That data without hypnosis is as useful as data with it.

2: That a frightening number of abductees have spontaneously told me (and many more agreed when I actually asked them away from the therapists and ufologists who had hounded them into regression) that hypnosis was not a help and left them more uncertain than ever as to what was real.

3: Because I have personally been regressed on several occasions and therefore seen it unfold first hand. I know how tempting it is to see images and presume their reality status. My UFO encounter consisted of 50% stuff I could check and 50% stuff I never could. The stuff I could check was as much fantasy as actual memory. I wrongly reported basic facts in the order of the day of the week, etc. With such a track record it would obviously be foolish to base opinions on ufology on the uncheckable data that emerges via hypnosis because this test proves to me that a good portion of it is certain to be fantasy and possibly all of it is.

I know the counter argument. Ufologists do not rely on hypnosis testimony as the judge of truth. If a case matches another case then this proves hypnosis has contributed to the quest for knowledge. Sadly not. In my tests I also uncovered clear signs of cryptomnesia - a factor also noted by other researchers. The mind loses data on prior alien stories, stuff it has no idea it has recorded. These subconsciously incorporate themselves into the future hypnotic testimony creating an impression of matching prior cases that is an illusion. I learnt to look for what I call 'cultural tracking' - signs that storylines keep pace with our technology and the latest UFO fad. They are everywhere.

Incidentally, none of this is meant to infer that I reject the reality of an alien contact. I suspect this may well be occurring (although I am not convinced of it). There remain important puzzles, like what I call the 'Star Trek' effect. By this I mean compare the 1960's Star Trek with the 1990's versions. You will see why they had to set them years into the future fictional Star Trek universe. It was because the technology invented in the 1960's sci fi as being futuristic became old hat by the 1990s. Our own technology invented microchips and laser displays and various things that had not been imagined 30 years ago. So the supposedly fantastic earth future of Captain Kirk featured anachronistic images like clunking number counters. To overcome the dilemma they had to

update the science to be more in keeping with what we now have, which meant setting the story in the Star Trek future. Of course, its inevitable that 'Voyager' will look old hat to the watchers of 2029 because of then mundane science we dont yet have or can imagine.

My point is abductions from the 1960's to 1990's dont show the same technology erosion. We have accounts that were as magical then as they are magical now - indeed a relatively consistent magical technology with the signs of cultural tracking tweaking the storylines. This, to me, infers that there is a fundamental alien reality underpinning the evidence.

But, back to hypnosis. The problems with it clearly tell you that hypnosis is not the way to access this fundamental reality - just to read peoples dreams and fantasies. These may well be based on a fundamental reality but we would be very foolish indeed to base any conclusions about what this world is like simply by tabulating 1000 peoples dreams based upon it. But that is in effect exactly what we are doing.

Of course, the problems go deeper. It is not merely an academic question about whether hypnosis helps or hinders - such is the scientific debate there are serious reservations about long term effects on imposing a cultural nightmare onto the population (the idea of aliens kidnapping and xperimenting on us) when we have no proof this is real. Doing this on very young chgildren is a risk none of us should be supporting.

When Britain was doing regresssion we avoided that trap. I recall the Aveyley abduction (occurred 1974, investigated 1978/9) and Britains first serious CE 4. It remains one of the best cases world wide as it had no input from DNA grabbing 'grays' (they were unknown in the UK pre Hopkins and Strieber) and so shows both the similarities and differences with UK cases. The overlap between this case and an NDE is quite stunning. The witnesses even saw their own bodies below them during the on board alien visit. My point is our research pursued just the two adults. Three young children were witness too and had patchy recall. Much as I would have loved us to regress them at the time (when we still had a love affair with regression even here) we resisted the tempstion. It was not right to do this to kids.

As you know we had a proper debate in UK Ufology - such as has never occurred in the US - and took a voluntary decision to ban the use of regression hypnosis at BUFORA. I am very proud of this - I regard it as one of the most important things that happened during my 12 years as BUFORA Director of Investigations. Even since they tossed me on the streets (internecine warfare is rife here too!) I am pleased to say the investigation team (which in BUFORA has near total indepedence) has reinforced the move. It is seen to be the right thing to do.

I only wish that more if you understood why we chose this option. Because Dennis is absolutely right. The day when a genuine researcher gets into serious legal difficulties as a result of hypnotic regression is a racing certainty. It may not be Budd. It could be anyone. But it will happen and, I'm afraid, UFOlogy will be rightly hauled over the coals by the media for allowing it to get that far.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:35:26 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:32:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:52:03 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>Try whipping your cowling tool out of your pocket (while in  
>flight) and making two comparisons with two distant objects in  
>two different directions while manually rolling down your left  
>window and turning your "trimmed" plane south, and then tell me  
>if you can do all the above in a 1947 airplane within two  
>minutes' time or less. I don't think so.

There are a number of unwarranted assumptions in this.

1) That the cowling tool was difficult to access. But it is not a pipe wrench. It is more a thing the size of a pen and was probably carried in his shirt pocket. Thus it is easy to access within a fraction of a second. The comparison, likewise, would probably take under two seconds between the objects and the DC4. Try it at home.

2) That the window was "rolled down". However, the photo of Arnold by his aircraft indicates that the window slides back. This would drastically reduce difficulty in opening the window, and would reduce the time needed to under a second.

3) That making the turn would prevent other activities. While this is true for a car, it is not true for aircraft. Indeed, since Arnold was flying trimmed, he could turn with just the rudder, using his feet. Such a method, by the way, would probably cause the nose to drop slightly, while avoiding any important wing raise, thus reducing the low wing's interference with sight of the objects while the turn was underway. Arnold probably lost some altitude, but not much, during such a turn.

When people continue to present arguments against a sighting without doing basic homework to validate their hypotheses, it is difficult to take them seriously. All they end up doing is taking up bandwidth. Please, do what's needed before making claims.

The key to doing a good sighting analysis is, first, to expose any assumptions one is making, and to validate them against reality. There is no point in attempting any analysis until that step is complete. In the above, the assumptions were:

- a) Flying an airplane is like driving a car. Turning is hard, requires lots of concentration, and use of hands.
- b) Arnold had to roll down the window to open it.
- c) The cowling tool is large, clumsy and inaccessible.
- d) Size comparisons of two objects against a reference are difficult and time consuming.

None of these seem justified in the light of the evidence.

-----

Mark Cashman, creator of The Temporal Doorway at  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com>  
- Original digital art, writing, music and UFO research -  
UFO cases, analysis, classification systems, and more...  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/index.htm>  
-----

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 12:12:09 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:35:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 17:14:26 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold sighting

>I credited you for laying the hoax to rest, once and for all.  
>(Without raising the question of whether it should have ever  
>been on your web page in the first place, given that Hartmann,  
>in the 1969 Condon Report, had already cast serious doubts as to  
>its validity. See p. 457 for an illustration of how it was  
>done.)

Please actually read my IUR article for a detailed discussion of my knowledge and position re: Hartmann's attempts to reproduce the photo prior to uncovering the hoax.

I will reiterate some basic points here:

- 1) Reproduction of a photo, even a perfect reproduction (which Hartmann's was not) is insufficient to prove a hoax. The ability to reproduce natural phenomena in cinema, for instance, does not invalidate the existence of such natural phenomena.
- 2) Hartmann is the only photographer who looked at the photos who thought they were hoaxed. Local press photographers did not believe the photos were hoaxed. Hartmann did not offer specific photogrammetric evidence to demonstrate a hoax.
- 3) No character information suggesting a hoax had ever been previously offered.

I will also simply point out that UFO researchers will sometimes use data which later is determined to be false. There is no omniscience in this field, and it is also unwise to remain completely paralyzed so that no data can be used. Sure, it's a risk, but one needs to take risks to get something done in this field, so long as one is willing to modify conclusions should something be determined to be false or dubious.

As for the Beaver photos being used to corroborate my luminosity theories, again, I think you are overstating the case. While I no longer have the pages in their original form (the site consists of nearly 500 pages of material and I cannot afford to maintain old copies), I know what was on them.

The following represents the section of my luminosity comments taken from an article based on that page which was submitted to MUFON:

"Ventral emissions - are usually observed on objects in flight. The Beaver, PA case is an excellent example. In some cases, this "ventral cone" (point downward) is seen to point in the opposite direction from that in which the object is travelling. In other cases, most notably, Michel's "jellyfish object" class cases, these emissions are observed as a cylinder or truncated cone in a normal orientation. Another well known dorsal emission case is the Delphos case, where the emission appears to have caused a ground trace."

In the final version of this, it simply became:

"Ventral emissions - are usually observed on objects in flight. The Portage County case is an excellent example. In some cases, this "ventral cone" (point downward) is seen to point in the opposite direction from that in which the object is travelling. In other cases, most notably, Michel's "jellyfish object" class cases, these emissions are observed as a cylinder or truncated cone in a normal orientation. Another well known dorsal emission case is the Delphos case, where the emission appears to have caused a ground trace."

This, by the way, is but one of seven categories of luminosity descriptively characterized on that page. Again, descriptive characterization does not constitute analysis.

I hope this clears up some of your misconceptions concerning my work.

-----

Mark Cashman, creator of The Temporal Doorway at

<http://www.temporaldoorway.com>

- Original digital art, writing, music and UFO research -

UFO cases, analysis, classification systems, and more...

<http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/index.htm>

-----

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Moving Home

From: Sean Jones <[tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk](mailto:tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 19:17:02 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:40:33 -0400  
Subject: Re: Moving Home

Hi Errol

Due to a very bad litany of disasters my moving house took over six weeks! This has left me with somewhat of a backlog of emails, in fact I have over eight hundred just on UpDates to catch up on.

Please if anyone has emailed me privately I will get round to you soon.

-- In an infinite universe infinitely anything is possible.

Sean Jones

Homepage--<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Zone/1745/index.htm>  
UFO page--<http://www.tedric.demon.co.uk/>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena

'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

From: Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <[ufomiami@bellsouth.net](mailto:ufomiami@bellsouth.net)>

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 17:14:47 -0700

Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 01:08:28 -0400

Subject: Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

### Introduction

Toward the end of his life, Dr. J. Allen Hynek was a frequent visitor to my home, the last of such visits taking place from August 20 to August 31, 1985, when he finally left to have his first surgery on September 5, 1985. After that his health declined rapidly and unfortunately he died on April 27, 1986.

During his visits, Dr. Hynek did quite a bit of work using my computer which was quite similar to his own at home. At that time, his interest was centered on the Hudson Valley sightings

Time marched on, and after Dr. Hynek passed away, the work was completed by Bob Pratt and published in book form in 1987, under the title 'Night Siege'.

One day, revising my diskettes, I found a file labeled 'Imbrogno' which I did not recognize, When I opened it, it was a paper intended to be the Preface of the book, that undoubtedly by error Allen had saved on one of my diskettes (on August 30, 1985, just the day before he left my home). It is a remarkable piece, and once you read it it will be easy to understand why it was not used as initially intended. I think the time has come to release it through the internet so every one will see what Dr. Hynek's thoughts about these remarkable sightings really were. I strongly suggest that you compare 'The Roots Of Complacency' (as Hynek himself titled it) with the version that appeared in 'Night Siege'.

Dr. Willy Smith UNICAT PROJECT June 1999

-----  
The Roots Of Complacency

by

Dr. J. Allen Hynek

Something truly astonishing happened.... Not far from New York City, along the Hudson Valley, as hundreds of astonished people looked up, many driving along the Taconic Parkway, they saw something no one had ever seen before.

Some called it a "Space-ship from outer space" (for want of anything better) but it was generally described by numbers of competent, professional persons as startlingly brilliant lights, in the form of a "V", or Boomerang, silent, slowly-moving, and very large close-by object. It has often popularly been called the "Westchester (County) Boomerang".

The world has never known about this, even though the event happened not once but several times, and over the course of several years. To all intents and purposes, this was a non-event. The media across the world has remained dumb. Local papers, radios and TV's, it is true, did momentarily carry spots along with the daily news, but there the news just vanished.

How is it possible that in the United States, where even trivial events are often flashed across the world, only one TV and radio

network carried an account of this utterly astounding event?  
Far, far lesser stories are spewen forth across the world!

Could it possibly be that the whole thing just never happened?  
No: many times there was good, but extremely local, media coverage; many hundreds have personally attested to us, and to many others, that the "Westchester Boomerang" was most undeniably, very truly real to them. Furthermore, many witnesses at a given time, were geographically separate, and unknown to each other. Cars along the Taconic Parkway, a well traveled highway, stopped, and passengers looked in amazement, many frightened and bewildered at the spectacle.

Police department "blotters" proved that many calls came to several local police stations, and we have tape recordings of a number of the police involved. The Boomerang was undeniably real; it was not a chimera!

Yes, something truly and astonishing transpired, but was no one "minding the store", was everyone asleep at the switch? What about law enforcement agencies (whose duty is certainly to alert and assist when something amazing is afoot; what about civilian and military personnel?

When hundreds of largely professional, affluent people, in suburban areas, are astonished, awestruck, and many frightened by what they could only regard as a very bizarre event, would this not at least warrant and bring forth some comment from the nation's media? And what about law officers, government officials and... what of the FAA which supposedly monitors the airwaves over which the "Boomerang" repeatedly flew, and thus constituted a serious hazards, especially over the Taconic Parkway.

And what of scientists, to whom these events should have been of breathtaking scientific concern? But nothing...except, oh yes, a writer so inept at his task that not once did he checked, even briefly, the voluminous tapes and other material amassed by the present authors: a remarkable example of investigative reporting.

His conclusion: the Boomerang was caused by nothing more than a flight of small planes flying in formation, a totally untenable conclusion in view of the facts.

How, it would appear that we really have TWO astounding stories, rather than just one... different but related... and equally incomprehensible: the story of the low-flying luminous Boomerang (in itself which could rank high in the annals of science fiction... if it were science fiction! ) and the second, a totally unaccountable dereliction of duty (and there seem to be no other word for it), a complete superb and indifference to accountability.

It was a malady which appeared to plunge all who encountered it, EXCEPT the witnesses, into a deadly stupor. Such a malady, or perhaps a virulent virus of apathy and indifference to duty, could immobilize cities and a whole country. Of course, we don't know what the Boomerang was really about for:

---the Police and other law enforcement officers were derelict and failed in their duty to assist the many who called for fear and danger, as well as in awe and wonder.

---the FAA utterly failed to be concerned for air safety, flight rules, navigation lights, when told that some utterly strange and possibly menacing object was cruising close over streets and house.

---the Military was derelict by not attending to public safety and matters of National Defense (the country could have been subtly invaded!)

---the Scientists failed to uphold their "Hippocratic" oath of science: they were derelict in following the quest in following an outstanding mystery.

---the media, well, where were they? Truly derelict always avid news hounds, rushing to their typewriters or microphones to rush the news to the world (good, bad and trivial), but where were they? Hardly any of the 50 States heard the Boomerang story.

Why? Utterly indifferent and apathetic? If so, why?

Of the two stories, that of the Boomerang is by far the more directly told. Bizarre and fantastic though it may be (and is) it merely needs competent retelling. The facts are on record. From the hundreds of cassette tapes in the thousands of statements made by witnesses, the Boomerang is a matter of record. But the second story, well, that is another matter.

This story is not at all directly told. Here there are no cassette tapes, no clear cut descriptions, and no policeman, no scientist, no military man, no media person, no FAA has recorded why they were derelict. We can only infer, as one might infer from the pages of history. We can only deduce and play detective. And we must try, for this second story, more truly a puzzle, could be of utmost importance to finding out how we, as humans, act under stress, trauma, and fear..... for the Boomerang had all of these!

The puzzle has far more parts than the tale of the Boomerang.. It is, indeed, a part of a continuing story of mankind's pioneering search for adventure and meeting, but repeatedly dashed and frustrated by those who cannot look to the heights of the pioneer: by the "it will never fly" or "it can't be done" mentalities. These who always must say that "since it can't be done, there is no need to even thinking about it or even talking about it.

Therein lies the spawning ground of indifference, of apathy, and to dereliction of duty.

All those who didn't follow through on the Boomerang event were not willfully derelict: they were merely the thousands of "it will never fly" and "it can't be done" and so there is no need to think about it. The corollary is: "Since it can't be done, whatever said had been done, were simply deluded... they must have been mistaken, and so no need to look into it further". It is the failure to seek for the light of the tunnel because there could 't be a light.

Intellectual adventure is sterile when there is continual inability to seek answer to challenges, to seek ways out of the tunnel of indifference. In the story of the Boomerang, the FAA, the media, scientists, politicians, the military.... all may momentarily touch upon the mystery, but suddenly it appeared that apathy saps further energy to incentive, and in its stead is a great desire nothing... it becomes a hotbed of inertia... a great desire to do nothing, fobbing it all off in the guise of a handy solution, like "planes in formation".

It is not as from a seeming direct desire to be in duty, but it is more as though the call for duty has vanished, or as though some bad fairy had administered a sleeping potion, an apathy draught.

How else might one hold that otherwise responsible law enforcement, FAA, military, the media etc. would renege on their duties?

There is a more realistic answer than calling upon some bad fairy (though it would certainly fit the facts) and that is that it all lies in our human (mental) nature. A psychologist would express it more professionally, but it simply amounts to the fact that the human mind has definite limits for acceptance and accountability. In the history of science this syndrome has been seen many times and in many ages. For instance, how often has it occurred that totally revolutionary ideas, so novel at first as to be utterly neglected or discarded... a form of apathy and total indifference.

As a homely analogy, one might say that such a totally novel idea "overheats the mental human circuits" and the fuse blows (or the circuit-breaker cuts out) as a protective device for the mind. The time is not yet right for the age and the new idea might just as well not been there in the first place. Mankind was not yet able to handle it.

Thus when mankind is presented with a totally bizarre, shocking, traumatic event (the Boomerang?) a mental circuit cuts out. Instead of a challenge for action, there is a dead battery.



This is, of course, well known in individual cases of amnesia in, for example, "shell shock": could it be that a collective amnesia or apathy can come into play? If so, might it be possible that collectively people can react traumatically, as to the Westchester Boomerang, to a collective amnesia, whether they are policemen, media people, the FAA etc.?

Whatever be the case, the effect is real. Many instances in history.... and the Boomerang is its most recent and spectacular example... when the breaking point of the collective mind occurs, it must openly disregard patent evidence of the senses: it can no longer encompass them within their normal borders.

The Holocaust perpetrated by Hitler in WW II is another sample: people simply refused to accept, and were indifferent to the evidence, because their minds couldn't bring themselves to accept that such a Holocaust could possibly be, despite ample evidence. It was also a "mental circuit breaker" a general apathy and a will to indifference.

The Boomerang and the Holocaust are but striking samples of what happens when the collective mind willfully disregards evidence when "it can't take it". The entire modern UFO syndrome is another: here we have utterly ample evidence of the global nature of the UFO phenomenon. Thousands of instances and over many countries the evidence for the UFO phenomenon is clear, but those in position of policy and authority (FAA, educators, scientists etc) are deaf or purposely obtuse. Apathy goes hand in hand with the ability to accept even the most inane answers, anything whatever, just to stave off the necessity to think.

So we cannot at the moment expect to do little about the wealth of material collected on the Westchester Boomerang (or for the much more abundant wealth of UFO material). The circuits are closed; apathy holds sway. But history has shown that in time the information and questions dam breaks, sometimes cataclysmically, and later, why, low and behold, the pundits by a complete irrational turn of fact, will say, "oh, we knew this all the time!".

Editor's note:

As detailed in 'Night Siege', the first incident was reported on December 31, 1982, and the sightings continued until the date of publication of the book, with a concentration of incidents during the summer of 1984.

Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo

Miami UFO Reporter

For more on Dr. Hynek visit:

<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Corridor/1341/index.html>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Timothy Cooper's MJ-12 REPORT

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:25:42  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 01:23:25 -0400  
Subject: Timothy Cooper's MJ-12 REPORT

June 14, 1999, Jeroen Wierda, director of Picard UFO Research International (PUFORI), made this announcement on his website:

"Today I added 1 article/report that Timothy Cooper wrote for PUFORI on the \*articles/Mj-12 section. More will be added to this article soon, and it may be transferred to the Reports section as well. I also updated an article by Robert Collins in the Articles/General section (item #1)."

The article comments on the new series of MJ-12 documents, which were received by Timothy Cooper and later released by Stan Friedman, the Woods and Joe Firmage. The URL to the article is

[http://www.pufori.org/articles/mj12\\_cooper\\_mj12\\_report.htm](http://www.pufori.org/articles/mj12_cooper_mj12_report.htm)

but you should visit PUFORI's main MJ-12 site, too, at

[http://www.pufori.org/non\\_frames/mj12\\_nf.htm](http://www.pufori.org/non_frames/mj12_nf.htm)

There's also a 'frames' version.

Stig

\*\*\*

The MJ-12 Report

by Timothy Cooper

Posted with Author's Permission

Index

•Introduction •The UFO threat and the National Security Act of 1947 •UFO sightings in the United States •Unidentified Satellite Story •The CIA and Scientific Intelligence

"Space is ... where wars will be fought." --Barry Goldwater

INTRODUCTION

The controversy within the United States UFO community and to some degree, the United States government itself, is whether in the late 1940's a super-secret extraterrestrial technology intelligence collection and research and development program was created by a special classified executive order and whether such an entity exists today. One could say that the military attempted communications with extraterrestrials as early as 1924 with the Army's Signal Corps radio experiment documented in the archives of the National Security Agency when William F. Friedman, father of American cryptology, first reviewed graphs and images taken from a crude television recording device of what has been reported as coded transmissions and images from

the planet Mars.

Interest in extraterrestrial existence surfaced again when the sensational story of flying saucers and crash recoveries made headline news all around the world in July 1947. One year earlier, U.S. military intelligence had investigated the strange "ghost rocket" scare in Europe and kept their findings classified. In 1987, documents alleging crashed alien spacecraft and dead bodies captured the imaginations and consternation of UFO researchers and the federal government. For three years the controversy raged between advocates and debunkers alike. The center of the debate was the disclosure of a star chamber of military icons and distinguished scientists known as Majestic or MJ-12 who were assembled and tasked by President Harry S. Truman with providing answers for the UFO phenomenon that defied rational scientific explanation. Then in 1994 and again in 1998, new documents surfaced onto the world scene that for some, was conclusive proof that MJ-12 did exist and by extension, extraterrestrial visitation.

In the absence of verifiable physical evidence of crashed extraterrestrial spacecraft and dead bodies from another world, the actions of the United States Air Force and the CIA, and the NSA, and virtually every agency of the defense establishment who have released some UFO intelligence reports to the public, the real nature of UFO technology and their builders suggests that they are withholding critical information from the world. Excluding scanty circumstantial evidence in the form of artifacts and non-terrestrial manufacturing processes, the story told in the Majestic documents and the revelations of shadowy "insiders" and video and still pictures are our only source of information. Past efforts of noted researchers, journalists, and researchers when tracking down paper trails have largely produced very little in verifiable information that can be used in a court case against the United States intelligence community. Even law suits have been quashed in the efforts of one lawyer charging that the United States is under attack from the skies. Past efforts to attract the attention of the United Nations Security Council have failed to address the issue.

If the Majestic program existed in the time frame referenced in the new documents which this author came into possession of and if the acronym MAJIC was a code word for a multi-agency technology exploitation and replicating program, then the secrecy and security allegedly associated with it may explain the pains that the military and the private sector of industry have taken to conceal one of the greatest and most profound discovery since the invention of the wheel.

The report that follows reflects what has been learned by the author over the last six months and by the valiant efforts of others especially Dr. Robert M. Wood and Ryan S. Wood who undertook the challenge of finding verifiable confirmation of the information you are about to read. Though much work still lies ahead before it can be stated categorically that MJ-12 did exist, the data points presented in this first of several reports demonstrate the reliability and truthfulness of the Majestic documents as either professionally done disinformation--or calculated dissemination by "insiders" without official sanction from the agencies responsible for UFO and extraterrestrial intelligence collection.

#### THE UFO THREAT AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

In order to unravel the complexities attached to the Majestic documents and the whole issue of government secrecy regarding the modern UFO phenomenon, it is necessary to first examine the politics for the passage of the National Security Act of 1947 for in this document lay the beginnings of a secret government that has existed for over 50 years. It might also explain the basis for classified national security projects believed by some to be linked with technological advances associated with UFO studies conducted in classified laboratories and test installations in the United States, Australia, and the United Kingdom.

The catalyst that influenced President Truman and the Congress to abrogate the Constitution with this illegal instrument has always been somewhat of a mystery. The National Security Act of

1947 and the more recent Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1974 have allowed the U.S. intelligence community to engage in deception, cover-ups, gross violations of civil and constitutional rights of U.S. citizens and international law.

After World War II, fearing a intelligence monopoly by the military the Truman Administration sought to develop and perfect a reliable set of executive institutions to manage national security policy in light of the Pearl Harbor disaster. The National Security Act of July 26, 1947, created the National Security Council under chairmanship of the President, with the Secretaries of State and Defense as its key members, to coordinate foreign policy and defense policy, and to reconcile diplomatic and military commitments and requirements. This landmark piece of legislation provided for a revamping of the office of the Secretary of War and reconstituted it into several new institutions such as the Secretary of defense, a National Military Establishment, Central Intelligence Agency, and National Security Resources Board. Bearing in mind that this "revamping" took place in peacetime not war, the diplomatic and military leadership were quick to view that the NSC had been created to coordinate political and military questions (which would include the perceived UFO threat) quickly gave way to the understanding that the NSC existed to serve the President alone. This new situation allowed the NSC to assume the role of fostering cooperation among department heads and provided the means of successive Presidents the use of the Council as a means of controlling competing departments.

Shortly after Operation CROSSROAD the U.S. military's first atmospheric atomic bomb experiments at the Pacific proving ground at Bikini were conducted in July 1946, Europe began experiencing numerous UFO sightings. U.S. military intelligence investigated and forwarded dispatches to the War Department. Military Attaché's in State Department legations in Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Great Britain, Austria, Yugoslavia, Turkey, and North Africa dispatched over 800 sighting reports to the office of the Secretary of State. Scientists and air intelligence experts feared that the Soviet captured V-2 rockets and the Germans who designed the most advanced ballistic missile had somehow increased its effective range and were testing them over the skies of Europe in retaliation for the atomic bomb tests. Ignorance of Soviet atomic weapons development was another reason for worry by U.S. intelligence. By the end of July the State Department classified UFO sightings TOP SECRET and it can be assumed that the military did likewise.

Lack of reliable intelligence of Soviet intentions along the occupied borders of Allied controlled Eastern Europe, British and American defense establishments began considering restructuring as a way to face this new menace. According to CIA historian Arthur B. Darling, "American press carried dispatches from London, dated October 4, 1946, announcing that British Army, Navy, and Air Command had been brought under a Minister of Defense." This move by the British Government may have been spurred on by a report issued by the Swedish Defense Staff in that same month that stated that they had been unable after a four-month investigation to discover the "objects" and they "were not the V-type bombs used by the Germans." The May 29 accidental launching by the U.S. Army of an errant V-2 missile from White Sands, New Mexico, nearly killed many Mexican citizens near the town of Juarez set off an immediate investigation from the State Department and the Chief of Staff of the Army which may have given rise to the "ghost rocket" scare over Europe that summer.

Wishing to avoid another sneak attack, President Truman approved a joint recommendation signed by Secretaries Patterson and Forestal on January 16, 1947, which supported legislation establishing a council of national defense, a national security resources board, and a central intelligence agency.

As with the British Minister of Defense, Truman proposed a similar plan to restructure the defenses of the United States. As Darling noted in his historical work The Central Intelligence Agency (declassified in 1989) that a "drafting committee" composed of Charles F. Murphy, Administrative Assistant to the President, General Lauris Norstad of the Army, and Admiral Forrest Sherman of the Navy, wrote the details of the act for the National Defense Establishment and the National Security Council. The National Intelligence Authority (brainchild of

General William Donovan, Director of the Office of Strategic Services) whose members included the Secretaries of State, Army, and the Navy with the Chief of Staff to the Commander-in-Chief General Eisenhower constituted the National Intelligence Authority (NIA) came into being after the end of World War II. The National Intelligence Authority and the Joint Intelligence Committee composed of the intelligence chiefs of the military functioned as an illegal spy agency of the President. It was first exposed in a story by the Chicago Tribune and the Washington Times Herald but was overshadowed by the Yalta Conference and the story quickly died.

The NIA and JIC continued their illegal intelligence activities and in June 1946, President Truman appointed General Hoyt Vandenberg to head up a cover organization for the NIA and JIC called the Central Intelligence Group (some believe it was really the Counter Intelligence Group for the NIA and JIC) and one of its tasks was to collect as much intelligence on Soviet offensive capabilities and possibly determine if the UFO's sighted over Europe were part of the Soviet ballistic missile buildup (there are indications from other sources that military intelligence may have had the answers much earlier). Vandenberg pressed hard for the White House bill on intelligence in the Senate. On February 26, 1947, President Truman sent the bill for the National defense establishment to Congress. Appearing before the Senate's Committee on the Armed Services and the Committee of the House of Representatives on Expenditures in the Executive Departments were Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal, Generals Eisenhower and Spaatz, Admirals Nimitz and King, Dr. Vannevar Bush and General Donovan. During the hearings, representatives of the CIG assured Senators that the proposed Central Intelligence Agency would have no law enforcement powers, no subpoena powers, and no domestic intelligence activities.

#### UFO SIGHTINGS IN THE UNITED STATES

Alarm bells began to sound off and a sense of foreboding quickly took hold among the members of the NIA and JIC when reports from official intelligence channels that the same "rocket" phenomena had surfaced over the United States and its territories beginning in the spring of 1947. The Central Planning Staff of the CIG according to Darling was "soon loaded with orders for investigation and report of a variety of subjects that were intricate and sweeping." Admiral Sidney Sours, former Director of the CIG instructed the Central Planning Staff "to make abroad survey of all clandestine collection of foreign intelligence by agencies in the Government" by making a survey "of the coverage of the foreign language press in the United States." No doubt U.S. intelligence was concerned over the possibility that Soviet espionage agents were sending coded reports back to Moscow of this situation and this was accomplished through the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. Any information of this type was included in the Strategic Intelligence Digest which in turn was included in the Strategic Intelligence Estimate prepared for the President.

Unknown to U.S. intelligence, the Soviet espionage project ENORMOUS has successfully stolen the blueprints for America's atomic bomb program right out of Los Alamos through "moles" within the OSS and the State Department. What was more critical was the design for the FAT MAN implosion device that according to an alleged TOP SECRET/MAJIC document known as the WHITE HOT ASSESSMENT (released to the public in late 1998 by Dr. Robert M. Wood and Ryan S. Wood) the design for the plutonium implosion device was based on technical studies taken from a crashed space object recovered by the Army in 1941 that according to the document allowed the Army to "exploit" the secrets of the atom to "extend our technology beyond the threshold that we have achieved." That "threshold" was the MANHATTAN Project.

All the files that once was under the personal control of the MANHATTAN Project director General Leslie R. Groves have not been declassified and possibly the real story behind FAT MAN may ultimately resolve that question. It may not be coincidence that work on the shell design for FAT MAN began in the summer of 1942 before Los Alamos scientists could imagine how big the bomb would be. Nuclear physicists believed that separating isotopes was impossible. This did not stop the Army from producing

drawings for the implosion and shot gun bombs and in June 1942 with the appointment of Colonel Groves (retired a three star general in 1948) of the Army Corps of Engineers by General Brehon Somervell to head the MANHATTAN project. Only six Army personnel were permitted to study the spherical design of the nuclear power plant recovered in 1941. Two were of general rank and the other four were graduate students of lesser rank. Also unknown to the Los Alamos scientists was the fact that the shell for the implosion device was specifically designed to fit in the bomb bay of the B-29 Superfortress under development by the Boeing Aircraft Company.

On May 9, 1947, the Planning Committee authorized the CIG to establish the Intelligence Advisory Board whose members included Dr. Vannevar Bush, head of the Research and Development Board, Admiral John E. Gingrich of the Atomic Energy Commission, Admiral Thomas Inglis of the Office of Naval Intelligence, and General Stephen Chamberlin of Army Intelligence, all involved in collection of technical intelligence and scientific data produced by the CIG for UFO's and Soviet military capabilities. Admiral Souers, during his term as Director, Central Intelligence Group, recommended that the Atomic Energy Commission should have permanent membership in the Intelligence Advisory Board and would have "direct access" to other intelligence agencies to secure scientific and technological guidance in the event that items of interest regarding applications of nuclear energy for either new weapons development or for aircraft and missile propulsion should fall into U.S. hands.

According to unconfirmed sources there was a recovery of a "flying disc bomb" near Los Alamos, New Mexico, on March 25, 1947, and of another "disc-like object" on May 28 near the White Sands Proving Ground. The Armed Forces Special Weapons Project at Sandia Base reportedly had possession and this was not reported to David Lillienthal, Chairman of the AEC. General Groves had kept the President and the AEC in the dark regarding the status of the nation's nuclear arsenal. On April 3, 1947, AEC Commissioner David Lillienthal informed President Truman that the United States had "no stockpile...not a single operable atomic bomb." Truman was also told that a nuclear defense against UFO's or a Soviet invasion of Europe "did not exist" to which Truman replied, "What [do] we propose to do about it?" This discovery was so secret that it was never committed to paper.

By June the Army Air Force's Air Defense Command at Mitchell Field, New York, had compiled numerous UFO reports that were forwarded to the Air Intelligence Requirements Branch, Headquarters, Air Force Intelligence at the request of Brigadier General George Schulgen, head of the Requirements Branch. In Occupied Germany General Arthur G. Trudeau, head of the civil defense presented his assessment of the Soviet attack strategy to General Clay of the High Command. The 509th Composite Bombardment Group of the Eighth Air Force located at Roswell AAF, New Mexico, has less than twenty B-29's and crews that knew how to handle and deliver atomic weapons and this fact caused a heightened state of panic in Washington. Talk of World War III was privately being discussed among military leaders and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and, Army Air Force.

Fearing the worst, President Truman signed the instrument creating the National Security Council called Public Law 80-253 on July 26, 1947, as a general reorganization of the U.S. national security apparatus and thereby reconstructing the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC the forerunner of the NSC) which had been established in 1944. Acting on the advice of White House Counsel Clark Clifford who was dismayed by the disorder among the intelligence agencies, Truman hoped by establishing the NSC, institutional stability to national security would quickly come about.

The outcome of Public law 80-253 was the National Security Act of 1947 which in affect, established the sweeping power of the intelligence community to lie and deceive not only the Congress, but the American people regarding the UFO invasion issue. The act did not resolve the bickering and in-fighting that persisted among defense intelligence and hampered any real progress in addressing a growing suspicion that something was going on in the skies over the United States.

## UNIDENTIFIED SATELLITE STUDY

As the Army Air Force's "rocket" investigations began to paint a clearer picture of a real invasion over Europe, a crash study by the Army Air Force's RAND Project (REsearch ANd Development) was ordered by General Curtiss LeMay, Director of the Office of Research and Development, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, in April 1946. The study published as the May 2, 1946 Preliminary Design for an Experimental World Circling Spaceship was a 324-page analysis that concluded that it was possible for a spacecraft to remain in earth orbit and would be undetectable from then-existing radar systems. As early as 1945 the Army Air Force Scientific Advisory Group reported to General Arnold, Chief of the Air Staff, that a foreign power could position long-range rockets in space and that they could be launched from orbiting satellites.

James Lipp, who at that time was head of RAND's missile division produced a working paper in February 1947 in which, among other things, thought it feasible that such a satellite equipped with "television" and long-range optics could "be placed upon an oblique or north-south orbit so as to cover the entire surface of the earth." With no conclusive proof that the Soviets had made a breakthrough in rocket technology developed by the Germans and lacking reliable intelligence of Soviet intentions and capabilities, Army Air Force intelligence went on the assumption that the UFO sightings in Europe and reports coming in from reliable observers in the United States in May of that year, that satellites of unknown origin were as the alleged Oppenheimer-Einstein draft assessment states "are defacto." This is the earliest known reference to satellites prior to the Russian Sputnik satellite placed into orbit ten years later.

After the "flying saucer" invasion from June-August 1947 the Air Materiel Command issued the now famous September 23, 1947, Opinion letter written by General Nathan F. Twining to Headquarters, Army Air Force, in which Twining emphasized that the unidentified objects were "real" aircraft and that a classified project to investigate, collect, and disseminate all technical data was needed. Just two days later, the Air Staff instructed the Air Materiel Command to re-evaluate the RAND satellite studies. On December 13, 1948, James Lipp submitted a paper titled Possible Places of Origin to General Donald Putt, Director of Research and Development requested in February. RAND was tasked with producing requirements for component and techniques for a reconnaissance satellite based on "present knowledge" acquired through physical examination of crash remains recovered in the New Mexican desert.

Lipp had studied the possibility that since the "flying objects" sighted over the United States beginning in the Spring of 1947 after five atomic weapons were detonated could have been the result of an overhead, low altitude reconnaissance activity by foreign power. Lipp presented two possibilities: that the "spaceships" would arrive in a "group" for a "full-dress contact"; and that "numerous small craft might descend from a mother ship" or a orbiting "satellite" launching "rockets". Lipp also speculated that vertically descending "rockets" would appear as "a luminous disk" to a ground observer. He also observed from reports provided to him by the ATIC that the distribution of reports was "peculiar" in that it if an invasion was in progress, the sightings would be global in nature. Since the sightings were focused largely on the United States (particularly in New Mexico), the localization of the sightings, to his reasoning, suggested that some foreign power may have, in his words, "feeling out" U.S. defenses.

## THE CIA AND SCIENTIFIC INTELLIGENCE

During the "rocket" scare of 1946 Admiral Sidney Souers as Director of the CIG requested the services of Dr. H.P. Robertson to coordinate scientific intelligence with the Office of Scientific Research and Development after the Bikini atomic bomb tests were completed. On August 1, 1946, the newly formed Atomic Energy Commission took control of the Manhattan Engineer District from the War Department in which intelligence

activities of foreign atomic research would come under the jurisdiction of the CIG and later the CIA. Robertson became scientific consultant to the CIA on problems associated in the field of scientific intelligence.

On April 29, 1947, CIA Director Hillenkoetter received estimates from a subcommittee created by General Vandenberg before he left the CIG called the Special Studies and Evaluation (SSE). SSE had prepared a plan to deal with the possible surveillance of U.S. atomic weapons research installations by "foreign" satellite objects and how to deal with the growing anxiety that prevailed on the U.S. defense intelligence agencies that Spring. On September 30, 1947, SSE concluded that if war, or the threat of war was determined by the President, the Director of Psychological Warfare should control and direct an "authoritative" coordination. The SSE was operated by military intelligence and that by an "executive action" the President could establish the existence of a national emergency and "take steps to maintain national security" apart from the authority of Congress.

On September 24, 1947, prior to the first meeting of the NSC, CIA Director Hillenkoetter submitted a classified memorandum to Admiral Souers, Executive Secretary of the NSC Staff urging the NSC to take "immediate steps" to "centralize" an organization which would conduct "vitally needed psychological operations". This organization (possibly Majestic Twelve) would have "interdepartmental representation" at the "policy-forming level" under the "guidance" of the Council. Though Hillenkoetter's memo did not elaborate upon the "functions" of the CIA's participation in the "centralized organization" he later confided with his Assistant Director for Special Operations, Colonel Galloway, that he was personally opposed to involving the CIA in psychological warfare.

It would seem that the "centralized" organization composed of scientific intelligence and the propaganda machinery of the U.S. came together in the common goal of appraising the threat of war posed by the crisis of the "flying saucer" invasion and keeping the Soviets off balance as to what was occurring. It would appear that the alleged September 24, 1947 Truman memorandum to Secretary of Defense Forrestal authorizing the CIA to commence Operation Majestic Twelve may have relevance here in light of the above. It may also shed light on the alleged Special Operations Manual prepared for Majestic-12 teams that suggests that not only was collecting extraterrestrial technology of vital concern but maintaining security seems to be the overriding issue all of which will be discussed in Part Two.

\*\*\*\*\*

WWW design and text editing Copyrighted © 1996-1999 by Jeroen Wierda  
Picard UFO Research International

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:57:02 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:21:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 14:50:36 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>>To: UFO Updates  
>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 16:45:43 +0100

>>Thanks for all the messages that flooded in over the weekend. To  
>>be honest I had not even noticed that UFO UpDates was on the cc  
>>list of the original Robert Moore and I thought I was only  
>>talking to a few UK UFologists. I was quite surprised to see my  
>>'spooof' went global. But no matter, it was an interesting  
>>exercise.

>>Let me qualify 'spooof'. This was not really trickery. Rather it  
>>was a deliberate exercise in taking an idea to its natural  
>>extreme. Many people in the UK have been furious over the Max  
>>Burns lecture saying BUFORA lost the plot by inviting him. There  
>>were demands for mass walk outs over the issue.

>Boy, did you put one over on us. Whew! We all thought you  
>were serious. What a bunch of maroons we are!

>However, I do understand how this can happen. On more than one  
>occasion, I have attempted, thru hummers, uh, thru HUMOR, to  
>yell at somebody or other for saying something which I  
>originally thought was out of line while in reality, I was out  
>of line all along.

>Just one last question, and I do not expect you to answer it as  
>I am without portfolio, have not published anything (on UFOs)  
>and am not a recognized researcher... nor am I an unrecognized  
>researcher. Having said all that, I expect nothing from anyone,  
>except either a chuckle, or a chuckle and some personal  
>recognition that the offende, not the offender (that'd be me)  
>got the message. So my question is, based on your more recent  
>admission that you were merely joshing, my question is, Dear Ms.  
>Offende, what is the temperature of the sand?

>Jim Gesundt & Jaime Mortellaro, UFO Research without portfolio  
>but a lot of Moxie... we mix it with our Gripple and rhubarb  
>>wine.

Hi,

Er never very hot in Britain, if thats what you meant. Our  
summers and winters tend to blend into one season known  
colloquially as 'by eck its nippy' (see 'Northern dialect phrase  
book' by E By Gum for translation)

I have been quite amazed as a newcomer to this net thing (only  
six or seven weeks of it - seems like forever, but no matter)  
how what starts as a nice discussion degenerates rapidly into a  
brawl. Why? Can't we argue facts and theories minus  
personalities and accept other peoples views? I can.

The asrgument about Budd Hopkins is nothing to do with him as a man nor with his sincerity - both of which are above reproach as far as I have seen. It has all to do with the position he adopts on the evidence and, because he is so admired, the effect that has generally on the UFO community. He is, absolutely, entitled to hold his views and stand his corner defending them. But he has to appreciate that what he says is regarded very seriously by thousands of people simply because of who he is. For that reason people who have influence must be willing to have their views debated. But we must also do that in a civilised fashion, accepting that they can be right and we can be wrong.

The very same thing applies to Nick Pope - the MoD man in the UK. I like him too, but because he is taken so seriously by so many people he has to consider carefully what he does and says because many will perceive that as an endorsement. As such I was not happy with his decision to tell the story of the Florida tollbooth abduction without giving his readers a proper insight into the matter. But my being willing to answer questions on the issue to the London Times earlier this year (after much soul searching, three years of pleading with Nick to do it himself and when they asked me - rather than me approach them) had nothing to do with my wanting to get at Nick. Far from it. In fact it was all about doing the right thing by UFOlogy. We all have a right to do what we believe in, just as we all have a right to dispute those who feel differently. But this has to be done with compassion and moderation - not as cat calling and personal abuse.

Seems easy enough to me.

My response, by the way, was less a joke than an attempt to push an idea to a logical conclusion and see how people liked where we then were. This is known to science as developing an experimental model and its an acceptable way of trying things out without actually blowing up the planet in the course of ones mistakes.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Peter Brookesmith-Mendoza <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 10:28:56 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:27:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Beyond the Blunderdome

With the compliments of the Duke of Mendoza:

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 99 13:14:02 PDT

>>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:30:48 -0400  
>>From: Mendoza - Peter Brookesmith <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>>To: To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>Peter,

>>I believe I was among if not the first to express some outrage  
>>in public at Budd Hopkins's regression of small children, in a  
>>review in "Fortean Times" of an IUN Sheffield conference in  
>>approximately 1993. In his presentations (which I taped, but I  
>>write from memory) he actually admitted the children were as  
>>young as two and a half.

>Since this is a very serious allegation, I think we need more  
>than your memory here. Could we have an exact quote from this  
>tape?

Yes, but for me to give you chapter, verse and I context I need  
(a) a working cassette player, and all four of mine are currently  
on the blink, with a new one on order due in a couple of weeks (b)  
about three hours (max.) to listen to both Budd's presentations  
from that conference. So bear with me.

Meanwhile, if you look up Fortean Times #72 (1993) pp44-5, you  
will at least have a printed reference to Budd's statement and my  
reaction to it, written hard on the event, tape machines whirring  
and in good order.

>>I don't think Hopkins is honest, although he may be sincere in  
>>his own peculiar way.

>Interestingly, I've more than once heard the same said of you,  
>for whatever it's worth.

Worth not much. But, as yer man famously said, there is only one  
thing worse than being talked about, and that is not being  
talked about.

Otherwise, I can't currently do better than Dennis Stacy is  
doing to point out the problems with Hopkins' thinking. Know ye,  
there is wisdom among the sasquatches.

>>Nor do I think Mad Max is honest. In  
>>neither case, however, do I think is there is any question of  
>>deliberate misrepresentation or hucksterism. But it surely is  
>>self-deception, which I've called intellectual dishonesty (see  
>>UFO UpDates, passim), and for which I've been most vehemently  
>>reprimanded, most often by people who I'd naively expected  
>>would know better. That the strongest detractors are citizens

>>of the United States is not, I think, entirely coincidental.

>Please explain what this last sentence is supposed to mean.

The post you quote was (like Jenny Randles's wonderful satire on censorship) actually intended for distribution only to a bunch of British ufologists and observers of ufology who have been discussing this & that among ourselves, and like Jenny I didn't notice that UpDates (and Jeff Rense, I see) was on the CC: list. None of those in that sophisticated circle seems to have had any trouble understanding what I meant, most of them being somewhat skeptical (in the Truzzian sense), and every one a patriot (guffaw).

But the gloss is that of any random sample of American ufologists, I would predict that more were sympathetic to Budd Hopkins and his claims than you would find in a random sample of an equal number of British - or, indeed, European - ufologists. Thus, criticism of Hopkins might be expected to attract more detractors from the USA than from Britain and/or Europe.

>That it is rendered by a citizen of the United Kingdom is not, >I think, entirely coincidental. (Or something like that.)

My own think is that an informed Esquimaux ("in his skin canoe", ho ho) would not disagree with me. I haven't counted any more than you have, but you must surely have noticed how often exchanges that could broadly be called skeptic-versus-believer debates on this list divide between the Old World and the New. Given enough time but without too much trouble I could work up a psychosocial hypothesis for the reasons for this that would probably put you in a fine dudgeon: although I think the Esquimaux perspective would be preferable, as more impartial. It would likely be pretty dry about Sir John Franklin, too.

>Cheers,

And to you.

best wishes  
Palmreader D. Moonraking  
Bootleg Clairvoyant

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 15:41:40 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:59:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 01:04:03 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

<snip>

>>John, you have too much to say that is good regarding people,  
>>whereas I often don't. Am I getting cynical in middle age?

John,

There's one too many to in the above. I meant to say, "You have  
much to say that is good regarding people..."

<snip>

>>Actually, I had an article lined up by Budd for inclusion in  
>>UFOs 1947-1997: Fifty Years of Flying Saucers. Some of you may  
>>have seen it, most of you haven't. It was called "Sane Citizen  
>>Sees UFO" and originally appeared in The Village Voice for March  
>>1, 1976. It was a classic example of an investigation of a  
>>single case, that of George O'Barski, who ran a liquor store in  
>>Chelsea where Budd routinely bought his dinner wine.

>Shame it didn't make it. It is a good case study and Budd did  
>an admirable job for an amateur.

Agreed, as already stated.

>>In any event, it demonstrates that, prior to researching  
>>abduction cases in the main, Budd was an excellent foot soldier  
>>when it came to investigating UFO cases per se.

>You imply that he somehow changed when he began to investigate  
>abduction cases. Or changed his methods anyway. In fact, the only  
>thing that changed was 'what' he was investigating not 'how.'

Partially granted. His subject matter did change, but so did his  
method of investigation by introducing hypnosis into the  
equation. I hope it doesn't confirm my reputation as a UFO  
curmudgeon to point out that regressive hypnosis remains a  
matter of considerable controversy, even outside the UFO field.  
Hopkins came to a fork in the road and he took it. He could have  
said, since so many of these cases manifest conscious recall,  
I'll concentrate on those and eschew all the problems associated  
with hypnosis. But he didn't. Whether he chose the right path or  
opened a Pandora's can of worms is for history to decide. But  
his influence has been immense, in either event.

<snip>

>"Withholding material"? "Broadsiding Carl Sagan"? Gimme a sec  
>to compose myself, that was genuinely funny!

By mentioning Sagan & NOVA in the same breath doesn't mean that  
I'm defending either or both over and against Hopkins. Hopkins

has criticized them for their lack of science; I merely raised the issue of whether he might not be subject to the same criticism. Has anyone, for example, seen a follow up analysis of the sand samples from the Cortile case? Has anyone read the (justifiable, IMHO) criticisms of the Roper Report and compared them with Budd's statements re same?

<snip>

>>Budd is playing with fire. Not necessarily Boylan fire, but fire, >>nonetheless.

>Maybe so Dennis, but it won't be me filing the suit. He helped >me and mine. Also, wouldn't you think that if he was really the >villain that you paint him to be that someone would have sued >his pants off by now? After 20 + YEARS! Twenty years, over 600 >people and no law suits.

>Hmmm, what do dat tell you Andy? <g>

>And, putting those two names in the same sentence (Budd & >Boylan) takes the same stretch of creativity it would take to >put say Ghandi and Joey Buttafuccho together in the same line! :)

>Take care till next Sasquatch.

>Peace,

>John Velez

The mention of Boylan was not meant in any way to compare his personality or behavior with Budd's. It was meant to point out that we live in an increasingly litigious society. I've not yet been divorced, either, but that doesn't mean I won't be some day.

Peace, bro.

But in the meantime: GO SPURS!

SA Sasquatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Judith Jaafar <[judithjaafar@compuserve.com](mailto:judithjaafar@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 19:35:54 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:36:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

Dear Jenny,

I've been reading with interest the responses to the fact that Max Burns was "allowed" by BUFORA to present what he believes to be evidence in the disputed case of the Howden Moors Incident. There are a million and one things that I could say, but I'm not going to say them on this forum. From bitter experience I have learned that nothing of constructive value is ever accomplished over e-mail. In electronic communication, those who wish to distort and cause foment have an unchecked medium in which to do so.

I will say only one thing, although I'm probably wasting my time. BUFORA has never at any time proclaimed that it endorsed Max's point of view, nor any other speaker invited to lecture to BUFORA, for that matter. There is an incredibly important point of principle involved here, one which, since I'm writing to intelligent recipients, I don't presume I need to elucidate. Contrary to what some seem to think about the BUFORA membership, they too are intelligent, perceptive people and do not like being told to whom they can, or cannot, listen. Who will be blacklisted next? Margaret Fry, a veteran British ufologist of some thirty years standing, because she happens to disagree with Andy Roberts' explanation of the Berwyn Mountain case? Myself, because I dared to suggest that the Rendlesham Forest incident is anything but closed, contrary to the beliefs of the "experts" like Ian Ridpath who found it fitting to call me "an empty-minded airhead" without knowing anything about me, my research or my credentials? John Mack, a professor of psychiatry who presumably knows more about the workings of the human mind than anyone on this recipients' list, and yet is convinced of non-human intervention? (unless of course he's spreading disinformation for his CIA masters!) Jenny Randles, who had the courage to put pen to paper and write "Star Children", a little "off-the-wall" perhaps for some people's tastes? I could go on, and on, and on.

I understand fully, Jenny, your desire for this subject to be taken seriously, one that is shared by all committed researchers. But in our inordinate desire for our subject to be validated by the scientific and academic community we risk negating it as a truly astounding human experience ( minus the knowns , the misperceptions, the man-made technology ), something which is touching people's psyches, their consciousness, their visions of the future, their intellectual endeavours. Perhaps the close encounter experience cannot be subjected to scientific empiricism, may never be, no matter how far we advance. Maybe the reason we cannot find answers after 50yrs. is because we're asking the wrong questions - perhaps we need to take a side-step and look at the whole phenomenon from a different perspective, thereby leaving behind the clay-footed, unimaginative dinosaurs with which paranormal research is so heavily populated, hanging on for dear life to their god of science. If I may be pedantic here, science, we must always remember, is a Greek word "skientia", which simply means knowledge, with no mandatory recourse to physics, chemistry, biology or engineering. No scientific or philosophical breakthrough has ever been made without the gifts of courage and imagination, often at the great expense of the initiator. This is why I feel slightly

uncomfortable with your idea of placing so much importance on physicists and engineers and the like. Do we really need their approbation? Their co-operation, yes, but their control, no.

A symposium of "experts" is fatally flawed. There are no experts, only opinions and vested interests. What about the percipients, the experiencers (as the Americans like to call them)? Do they not have a hugely significant role to play? Without them it would be like studying zoology without any animals, botany without any plants, physics without any energy. The best you can do is guess, and dress it up as "science", or science as we would like it to be. If we cannot even define the vast parameters of our subject, how can it be subjected to scientific scrutiny? That doesn't mean that we shouldn't take objective empiricism as far as it can go, but then we have to take courage and use the greatest and most profound faculty we have, imagination, without which nothing would be known, nothing would come into existence.

I am put in mind of some of the greatest thinkers in history - Socrates, Copernicus, Galileo, Willhelm Reich (even), who were persecuted and even murdered for daring to fly in the face of conventional mores. It's not an easy stance to take, and one for which you will surely be vilified. What has been happening recently in British ufology resonates uneasily with the antics of the early Catholic Church - silencing and extirpation of all unacceptable belief systems, the Gnostics, the Cathars, the Albigenses etc., and I'm not alluding in particular to Max Burns, but to the whole ethos of "control" and censoring material for the masses, or at least denigrating "unscientific" theories. Do we have the right to mock and deride those who are inclined to believe in non-human intelligences? The ETHers may well yet have the last laugh ( and for the information of those ex-members of BUFORA Council who believe that BUFORA officials are muddled in some sort of New Age belief system, this is not so. There isn't one member of BUFORA Council who rates the ETH, apart from Malcolm Robinson, tentatively, and he may one day tell us all "I told you so!" Anyone who was involved with BUFORA and didn't know this must have had his head somewhere where the sun don't shine.)

Peter Brookesmith has made a plea for intellectual honesty, a laudable appeal ( and I really mean that ), but I am also making an equally heartfelt appeal for intellectual generosity. Retain one's views and opinions, but respect those of others. Wrong ideas will ultimately be exposed as such, in the natural order of things. Life is more profitably spent in enriching one's own life, than in destroying another's.

In the word's of William James, "A great many people think they are thinking when they are merely rearranging their prejudices".

Regards to all

Judith

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Firmage Returns To Lead New USWeb/CKS Venture

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 02:36:22  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:43:55 -0400  
Subject: Firmage Returns To Lead New USWeb/CKS Venture

Source: Tech Wire,

<http://www.techweb.com:80/wire/story/TWB19990616S0010>

Stig

\*\*\*

Technology News

Firmage Returns To Lead New USWeb/CKS Venture

(06/16/99, 2:49 p.m. ET)

By David Jastrow, Computer Reseller News

\*\*

USWeb/CKS co-founder Joe Firmage is returning to the spotlight to head the formation of a new company venture called Intend Change.

Firmage left USWeb in January to focus on leading the International Space Science Organization, a nonprofit group dedicated to exploring the possibility of extraterrestrial life.

At a press event held Tuesday at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, Firmage and USWeb/CKS president and co-founder Tobey Corey said Intend Change will provide venture capital funds, consulting, marketing, and organizational planning services for a small number of innovative Web-based start-up companies.

"Joe and I have had the opportunity during the last three and a half years to really eat, drink, and sleep the Internet," Corey said. "That's given us a very clear perspective to really see what we call the Internet economy as it begins to really evolve and take shape."

Intend Change will work with USWeb/CKS to provide end-to-end services that take new Internet-based businesses through the complete e-business cycle, from initial idea to full operation, Corey said.

In addition to USWeb/CKS, Intend Change has several major investors, including Softbank Technology Ventures, Crosspoint Venture Partners, Wheatley Partners, the Cutler Group, and Odeon Capital.

Corey said he plans to act as a liaison between USWeb/CKS and Intend Change and will serve as a principal with the new firm.

"Intend Change and USWeb/CKS provide complementary services designed to fuel the growth of breakthrough Internet businesses that will become the leading enterprises of the future," Corey said. "We have observed that this is a very new space with very new rules. And there are basically just a handful of individuals that have figured out how to successfully compete in the new economy."

Related Stories:

\*High Finance Becomes E-Finance -- The E-Channel Currency

\*Firmage To Launch New Consulting Business -- Former USWeb CEO Will Address The Critical Need For Internet Strategy Consulting

Copyright

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 20:04:55 -0500  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:46:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 99 20:17:40 PDT

>I think I've committed what some consider the ultimate heresy:  
>speaking well of Budd Hopkins. Sorry, Dennis. You know my views  
>on the Roper poll.

Jerry,

If you're a heretic, so am I. See my reply to John Velez for kind words about Budd.

That said, your feelings (and mine, as well as those of countless others) about the Roper poll "findings" (down, BTW, in the last reiteration of same) seem to hold little or no sway with Budd himself, who still considers it scientifically significant.

It's like one of those computer viruses you hear so much about. Budd gives it to Jacobs and Mack, and, before you know it, American society as a whole is infected with the bug: Millions of Americans are being routinely abducted by aliens on an annual basis (I read it in the Roper Report!), never mind that there isn't a shred of evidence for such a claim. (The numbers, not the phenomenon.) Pretty soon you get books like "The Threat" and Mack's forthcoming second contribution (and God only knows what its title will be, although The Threat will be hard to top. Maybe "The Promise"?).

Is it a meme, Memorex, myth, or reality?

Who knows?

But we do know who's responsible for promoting the Roper poll's so-called scientific stature, don't we? Even in the face of such friendly criticism as yours.

But I forget: Budd is above criticism. And to criticize would represent something resembling heresy, wouldn't it?

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Re: Budd Hopkins

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Einstein'S Brain Found To Be Anatomically Distinct

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 01:50:05  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:40:00 -0400  
Subject: Einstein'S Brain Found To Be Anatomically Distinct

Source: AP via the Nado Times,

<http://www.nandotimes.com/noframes/story/0,2107,61011-97084-692696-0,00.html>

Stig

\*\*\*

Einstein's brain found to be anatomically distinct

Copyright ©1999 Nando Media  
Copyright ©1999 Associated Press

By EMMA ROSS

LONDON (June 17, 1999 7:01 p.m. EDT <http://www.nandotimes.com>) - We always thought something must have made Albert Einstein smarter than the rest of us. Now, scientists have found that one part of his brain was indeed physically extraordinary.

In the only study ever conducted of the overall anatomy of Einstein's brain, scientists at McMaster University in Ontario, Canada, discovered that the part of the brain thought to be related to mathematical reasoning - the inferior parietal region - was 15 percent wider on both sides than normal.

Furthermore, they found that the groove that normally runs from the front of the brain to the back did not extend all the way in Einstein's case. That finding could have applications even to those with more pedestrian levels of intelligence.

"That kind of shape was not observed in any one of our brains and is not depicted in any atlas of the human brain," said Sandra Witelson, a neuroscientist who led the study, published in this week's issue of The Lancet, a British medical journal.

"But it shouldn't be seen as anatomy is destiny," she added. "We also know that environment has a very important role to play in learning and brain development. But what this is telling us is that environment isn't the only factor."

The findings may point to the importance of the inferior parietal region, Witelson said.

While the differences may be extraordinary between Einstein and everyone else, there may be more subtle, even microscopic, differences when the anatomies of the brains of people who don't fall into the genius category are compared with each other, she said.

The researchers compared the founder of the theory of relativity's brain with the preserved brains of 35 men and 56 women known to have normal intelligence when they died.

With the men's brains, they conducted two separate comparisons - first between Einstein's brain and all the men, and next between his brain and those of the eight men who were similar in age to Einstein when they died.

They found that, overall, Einstein's brain was the same weight and had the same measurements from front to back as all the other men, which Witelson said confirms the belief of many scientists that focusing on overall brain size as an indicator of intelligence is not the way to go.

Witelson theorized that the partial absence of the groove in Einstein's brain may be the key, because it might have allowed more neurons in this area to establish connections between each other and work together more easily.

She said it is likely that the groove, known as the sulcus, was always absent in that part of Einstein's brain, rather than shrinking away as a result of his intelligence, because, as one of the two or three landmarks in the human brain, it appears very early in life.

"We don't know if every brilliant physicist and mathematician will have this same anatomy," Witelson said. "It fits and it makes a compelling story, but it requires further proof."

John Gabrieli, an associate professor of psychology at Stanford University who was not connected with the study, said the finding relating to the groove and connections between the neurons in the brain may be the key.

"We don't have a clue, so anything that is suggested is interesting," he said. "There must have been something about his brain that made him so brilliant."

Brilliance of the kind Einstein possessed is so extreme, however, that although the findings may give a clue to the neurology of genius, whether they could apply to normal differences in intelligence is more doubtful, Gabrieli said.

Witelson said the next stage is to scan the brains of living mathematicians and look for minute differences.

Witelson and her team acquired Einstein's brain after they were contacted by its keeper, scientist John Harvey, who had read about the university's brain research.

Harvey was a pathologist working at a small hospital in Princeton, N.J., when Einstein died in 1955 at the age of 76. Harvey performed the autopsy, determined Einstein died of natural causes and took the brain home with him.

Some parts of the brain were given to scientists, but no major study was ever conducted, until now.

Copyright ©1999 Nando Media  
Copyright ©1999 Nando Media

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

From: [dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca) (Donald . Ledger)  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 19:58:04 -0300  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:42:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 00:28:38 -0400  
>From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 10:03:35 -0300  
>>From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>>>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
>>>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>At 60 MPH The Callair would have been about ready to fall out of  
>>the sky. Certainly if he had turned, upping his wing-stall speed  
>>he would have entered an incipient spin, then a full spin. The  
>>Call air cruised at about 100-120 MPH and with its short wing  
>>span had a higher stall speed than say a J-3 Cub, Aeronca or  
>>Taylorcraft [the latter, a high wing was the plane they used to  
>>represent Arnold's plane in the movie UFO. Real attention to  
>>detail there]. As search planes go, the Callair was a poor  
>>choice. His wings would have covered hundreds of square miles  
>>below him.

>Well, I guess this shoots down James "ideal scenario" of  
>pelicans at 50 mph and Arnold at 60 mph. Back to the 2:1 ratio  
>with Arnold at 100 mph (or more).

Hi Bruce,

That would be my guess from personal experience, though not with  
a Callair.

If he was going to be searching down low about 500 to 800 feet  
over the terrain, I could see him pulling back the power on that  
airplane to about 80 MPH but at 7,8 or 9,000 feet there would be  
no point because his apparent speed over the ground would slow  
appreciably.

Also, he's not going to be crazy enough to hug the terrain in  
the mountains because the winds and down drafts can ruin your  
whole day in a matter of seconds. He could have ended up being  
the hunted rather than the hunted. It is awesome how little your  
little plane feels when confronted by them.

To paraphrase an old lament of the fisherman, "Lord your  
mountains are so big and my airplane is so little."

Don Ledger

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 19:58:05 PDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:48:32 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:37:44 +0100

Jenny,

>But there is a broader issue - if hypnosis has a long term  
>detrimental effect on ufology. I am absolutely certain the  
>latter is the case. Why? Not some arbitrary guesstimate thats  
>for sure. I base my conclusion on three things.

>3: Because I have personally been regressed on several  
>occasions and therefore seen it unfold first hand. I know how  
>tempting it is to see images and presume their reality status.  
>My UFO encounter consisted of 50% stuff I could check and 50%  
>stuff I never could. The stuff I could check was as much fantasy  
>as actual memory. I wrongky reported basic facts in the order of  
>the day of the week, etc. With such a track record it would  
>obviously be foolish to base opinions on ufology on the  
>uncheckable data that emerges via hypnosis because this test  
>proves to me that a good portion of it is certain to be fantasy  
>and possibly all of it is.

Isn't yours what might be called, uh, anecdotal testimony? And  
didn't your experience confirm pretty much what you thought  
anyway? I don't say this disrespectfully -- as you know, I have  
immense respect for you -- but I'm simply pointing out that the  
argument you make here is effectively meaningless.

>I know the counter argument. Ufologists do not rely on hypnosis  
>testimony as the judge of truth. If a case matches another case  
>then this proves hypnosis has contributed to the quest for  
>knowledge. Sadly not.

I think you've overstated the argument, no doubt for rhetorical  
effect. I would urge you to read, or reread, Eddie Bullard's  
important paper on the apparent irrelevance of hypnosis to the  
content of abduction narratives. I don't know anybody we'd  
respect who'd be so incautious as to say this "\_proves\_ hypnosis  
has contributed to the quest for knowledge," but it does suggest  
that things are not simple and that the usual anti-hypnosis  
arguments are not entirely compelling and appear (so far anyway)  
empirically undemonstrated. Which is not to say, of course, that  
hypnosis should be used carelessly or thoughtlessly. We all  
prefer cases without it. It doesn't follow -- as the Hill case  
tells us -- that cases with it are ipso facto without merit.

>But, back to hypnosis. The problems with it clearly tell you  
>that hypnosis is not the way to access this fundamental reality  
>- just to read peoples dreams and fantasies. These may well be  
>based on a fundamental reality

Statements like these betray an unhelpful bias. I know at least  
three abductees on this list -- eminently sane, thoughtful,  
anything but crazy or suggestable -- who, I am sure, would  
resent your suggestion that their experiences are mere "dreams  
and fantasies." (How can they be, by the way, "dreams and

fantasies" and yet "a fundamental reality?") I think it would behoove us, when we discuss matters about which much remains unclear, to use neutral words like "narratives" to characterize abduction accounts, unless we have clear and specific reason to identify them as "dreams and fantasies" (or, for that matter, interactions with aliens).

>As you know we had a proper debate in UK Ufology - such as has  
>never occurred in the US -

You're wrong. The use of hypnosis in UFO investigations has been a subject of considerable debate here for many years, and it has produced a considerable paper trail. It seems to me what you're saying is that unless such a debate leads to a conclusion you agree with, it hasn't happened. In fact, at least from our perspective, the data bearing on the answer are sufficiently ambiguous to persuade many of us that the discussion should continue before possibly premature conclusions are reached. We may be right or wrong to feel that way, but ours is a perfectly respectable position. A sweeping statement such as the one you make here is not only false but unfair.

>I only wish that more if you understood why we chose this  
>option. Because Dennis is absolutely right. The day when a  
>genuine researcher gets into serious legal difficulties as a  
>result of hypnotic regression is a racing certainty. It may not  
>be Budd. It could be anyone. But it will happen and, I'm afraid,  
>UFOlogy will be rightly hauled over the coals by the media for  
>allowing it to get that far.

And ufology hasn't been hauled over the coals repeatedly already? It's naive to think that if ufologists behave perfectly, journalists (not to mention scientists) will automatically treat them with respect. Fifty years of history tells us that ufologists of all stripes, good, bad, and indifferent, get ridiculed pretty much indiscriminately. There are all kinds of good reasons for ufologists to conduct themselves with sanity and discipline. The expectation that when we do, the press and scientists will pat us on our collective head is not one of them.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 21:22:28 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:52:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 19:02:23 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>From: Jerry Black <[blackhole60@hotmail.com](mailto:blackhole60@hotmail.com)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>>Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 20:08:20 PDT

>>Mr. Budd Hopkins has demonstrated throughout the past twenty  
>>years that he is not - I repeat, NOT - a UFO investigator [or  
>>researcher]. He is basically a UFO reporter. And for those such  
>>as Jerome Clark, Mark Cashman and yourself who do not like that  
>>because you are friends with Budd Hopkins -- TOO BAD.

>I've only met and spoken to Mr Hopkins once.

>I have my problems with some of his work, but I think it is best  
>to frame such objections dispassionately and with careful  
>attention to what is attainable in this field.

Too often we resort to name calling and ignore dispassionate  
discourse.

>I am currently at work on a critique of the problems I see in  
>abduction research, and I will do my best to address those  
>problems without reference to personalities. That's how science  
>should be done.

I have just had my critique of the abduction research published  
by TOR (St. Martins), written with Russ Estes and Bill Cone.

KRandle, Ph.D.\*

Yes, I have now received my degree in psychology.

[Congratulations Dr. Kev --ebk]

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Ray Gun Freezes Victims Without Causing Injury

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 03:55:31  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 13:00:10 -0400  
Subject: Ray Gun Freezes Victims Without Causing Injury

Source: The (London) Times,

<http://www.the-times.co.uk/news/pages/sti/99/05/09/stiinnws02007.html?1902395>

Stig

\*\*\*

May 9 1999

INNOVATION

Defence

\*\*

The Ministry of Defence is looking at a new weapon that could immobilise gunmen.

Max Glaskin reports

\*\*

Ray gun freezes victims without causing injury

\*

SET your phasers to stun. The Ministry of Defence is looking at a "freeze ray" that may be able to stop people in their tracks without harming them.

[The text of this message has been removed per request of the copyright owner. 8/11/99 by webmaster@ufomind.com. Request made by "Allan, Isobel" ]

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [webmaster](#) | [isobel.allan](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 21:16:10 PDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 13:01:51 -0400  
Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

Listfolk:

Recently we have read charges on this list that Budd Hopkins hypnotizes children while pursuing research into UFO-abduction reports. I have had deep doubts about this very serious allegation, which runs contrary to everything I know and have observed about Budd's ethics, judgment, and sensitivity to others.

As some of you are aware, Budd does not have e-mail. I have, however, just heard from my friend David M. Jacobs, who does. Even more astonished than I to read these fantastic claims, he phoned Budd to ask about them. Jacobs informs me -- not surprisingly, to those of us who know Budd -- that Hopkins has never conducted hypnosis with children. Nor, for that matter, has Jacobs.

In other words, we've been at the receiving end of the Big Lie. Those who have passed it on, innocently if recklessly, owe Budd Hopkins an apology. Those who knew or suspected it was a lie but circulated it anyway are beyond redemption. The former are urged, in the name of common decency, to apologize publicly. This list would be a good place to do it.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: **Greg Sandow** <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 22:22:35 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 13:38:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 01:04:03 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>I've not heard much of late about the attempt to have his  
>>collected alien writing samples analyzed by outside parties.

>As far as I know, Dennis, they were forwarded to Stewart Appelle  
>at Cornell \_several\_ months ago. I have asked about this myself  
>on several occasions but haven't been able to get any new info  
>as to progress - if any. Aside from the 'science', I've got a  
>'vested' curiosity in the analysis because one of the  
>samples that was submitted came from me.

Yes, Budd sent his samples of alleged alien writing to Stewart Appelle, the editor of the Journal of UFO Studies (which, for those on this list who might not know, is the only peer-reviewed scientific journal in the UFO field).

Budd sent them nearly two years ago. JUFOS, however, is in serious financial trouble, and hasn't published an issue since 1996. Stewart had said he'd assemble a team to study the material, but I don't know if he ever did. If he didn't, I'd assume it was because JUFOS didn't seem likely to publish any time soon.

Greg Sandow

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:52:12 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 15:28:59 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
>Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:23:10 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>In his report for the Air Force, Arnold wrote, in full:

>"I had made one sweep of this high plateau to the westward,  
>searching all of the various ridges for this marine ship and  
>flew to the west down and near the ridge side of the canyon  
>where Ashford, Washington, is located.

>Unable to see anything that looked like the lost ship, I made a  
>360 degree turn to the right and above the little city of  
>Mineral, starting again toward Rainer. I climbed back up to an  
>altitude of about 9,200 ft.

>The air was so smooth that day that it was a real pleasure  
>flying and, as most pilots do, I trimmed out my airplane in the  
>direction of Yakima, which was almost directly east of my  
>position and simply sat in my plane observing the sky and  
>terrain".

>Ashford is to the north-east of Mineral and if he made a "360  
>degree turn to the right" and was "starting again toward  
>Rainer", which is also north-east of Ashford, I'm not sure how  
>he was also travelling in the direction of Yakima.

Rainier is a BIG mountain. To fly to Yakima, which was almost  
due east of his position (actually a little south of due east),  
Arnold would want to skirt the southern flank of Rainier by a  
few miles and pass over the much lower Tatoosh Range to  
Rainier's south.

As far as I can see, that's all Arnold meant by "starting again  
toward Rainier." Stop being so literal minded. What makes more  
sense: flying directly at the center of Rainier because he was  
suicidal and stupid, or flying in the general direction of  
Rainier and skirting it to the south on a course toward Yakima?

The 360 degree turn seems like a "slip of the tongue" by Arnold.  
What he obviously meant was a 180 degree turn. After searching  
in a westward direction, he reversed course by turning 180  
degrees and headed towards Yakima to the east.

>The account in his later book is also different, making no  
>mention of 'heading towards Yakima' and stating, "It was during  
>this search and **while** making a turn of 180 degrees over  
>Mineral", Washington, at approximately 9200 feet altitude" when  
>he first noticed a 'bright flash'

Only nitpickers have any problems with this. In his book he  
properly describes it as a 180 degree turn (a 360 turn makes no  
sense as it would simply bring him back on his original course  
to the west -- a pointless exercise). It was indeed "during  
this search." He had just finished searching westward down a  
canyon -- right? -- and then turned around. I've never seen  
anybody make such issues out of nothing.

>The direction he was actually travelling in relation to the  
>objects is crucial

Develop a little reading comprehension, use some logic and common sense, and its obvious from his own words and general context that he was definitely heading pretty close to due east and first saw the flashes north of his trajectory.

>and I would have to be dubious about his 'perfect' sighting  
>conditions, as outlined in the Air Force report.

Why is that? It seems you are arbitrarily dismissing this perfectly plausible detail for no other reason than debunking bias. Are you suggesting Arnold could not have seen anything 20 to 25 miles away?

For those of us who have actually been up in the Seattle area, both Rainier and the Cascades can be easily seen from ground level\_ on a clear day from 50 or 60 miles away.

>That aside, whether Arnold was coming out of a 180/360 degree  
>turn, or 'cruising' due east,

It's very simple. He had just completed a 180 degree turn and was flying east. Whether he was heading back to Yakima at that point or planning to continue his search doesn't even matter.

>he was still in 'search' mode, so what was his airspeed likely  
>to have been?

>Would he be undertaking a search at close to maximum speed, in  
>treacherous terrain, or would his airspeed be much less, giving  
>him time to hopefully spot the missing aircraft and earn an  
>instant ten thousand dollar fortune?

If he went too slow, he would stall his plane and go into a nosedive. Don Ledger is far more knowledgable than I on this, and if you read his post, he estimates that anything under 90 mph would have been dangerously slow for Arnold's plane, especially on turns.

Even so, stall speeds are still faster than "pelicans."

>Which was, after all, why he was there in the first place.

Yes, but not do die by diving into the ground or flying into Rainier.

>Some further comments re the respective figures you had quoted:

>Altitude: As you may have noticed, I mentioned to Don Ledger  
>that I had seen a reference to pelicans being known to migrate  
>at over 14,000 feet, considerably higher than your estimate  
>(although it maybe makes no difference).

Not really. Had "pelicans" really been that high (5000 feet above his altitude) and within only a few miles, they would have had an angular elevation well above Arnold's horizon. No way could Arnold have perceived them to be skimming the mountain tops, which would have placed them at a slight downward angle of about 2 degrees.

>Visibility: I'm not sure if I've highlighted this before. Glider  
>pilot Mike Havener, who wrote an article 'Soaring with Pelicans'  
>describing his extraordinary experiences being joined in flight  
>by these gregarious birds, was asked if he could offer an  
>experienced opinion on this point. He replied,

>"Visibility depends on several factors. The one having the most  
>effect of course is how much 'haze' or other particulate matter  
>is in the air (i.e. smog, smoke). At low altitudes, visibility  
>is lowered because of this.

>Myself, (a pilot with average eyesight) I can distinguish the  
>basic shape (a body with wings) of these pelicans from about 4  
>miles when flying above the haze.

A 10 foot wingspan at four miles subtends 1.7 minarc; a 4 foot body .7 minarc. These are just barely resolvable with normal vision of 20/15 to 20/20 acuity. (.75 minarc to 1.0 minarc gap acuity.



This is actually a very similar situation to Arnold saying he could see the motors on a DC-4 at 15 miles and make out the distance between them (insofar as comparing them with the size of the unknowns). In this case the space between the inner motors would be about 2.4 minarc, and between cabin and inner motors about .9 minarc. Arnold, like Havener, would be down near the limits of detectability.

You can't make out any details, just that something is there. In Havener's case, he would basically make out an ill-defined line (wings) with a thickening or darkening in the center, which he interprets as being the body. For Arnold's DC-4, he would see an ill-defined line (wings) and darkenings in the positions of the engines and cabin.

If you accept Havener's ability to make out such things, is there really any reason a priori to question Arnold's account (other than whether he may have had normal vision without a spectacle correction)?

> From 4 to maybe 6 miles they  
>become small dots. Beyond that, I'd say they would probably not  
>be distinguishable other than some sort of relative motion that  
>may catch your eye".

>Presumably we keep in mind that Arnold noted how perfect the  
>visibility was that day.

Your point???

>Speed: It might be a mistake to underestimate just how fast  
>these birds can fly.

Nobody's underestimating their speed, just noting that even at the upper range that you assume, it would still be much slower than Arnold's plane at any likely speed that he would be flying.

> Although awkward on the ground, with that  
>10 feet wingspan they are majestic in the air and I've already  
>provided wonderful evidence from Mike Havener that a flock of  
>pelicans were comfortably flying with him at 52 m.p.h. Mike also  
>writes in his article that, "I reluctantly sped up to 80 m.p.h.  
>to put some distance between us".

So at 80 Havener zips past them. But at 100+ mph, they zip past Arnold? Is that what you are saying.

>There's maybe another factor to consider. If any formation of  
>birds observed a larger object flying towards them, it seems  
>reasonable that they're likely to accelerate and get out of the  
>way, possibly reaching their top speed if necessary.

Maybe you think this is a factor, but you also seem to be arguing that the "pelicans" were several miles away so that Arnold couldn't clearly make them out. Why would they get spooked by Arnold at several miles?

>So what if - and we are only considering 'what if' calculations:

>Arnold's airspeed was closer to 60 m.p.h. and our conceivable  
>birds were travelling at 30 m.p.h., or some identical ratio  
>where Arnold's speed is twice as fast - say, 80/40.

According to Don Ledger, around stall speed. Arnold in nosedive. Boom!! No Kenneth Arnold report to debate 50 years later.

Besides, what difference does it make? Even with these extremely lowball "what if" numbers, Arnold is still flying twice as fast as the birds. Nothing has really changed.

>Plus, the 'objects' are first sighted four miles away

>At 60 m.p.h., Arnold's approaching them at 1 mile per minute  
>After 1 minute, if said birds remained stationary, they are  
>still three miles away.

>Except that they are moving towards Arnold's flight path at 5  
>mile per minute.

I think you mean 0.5 miles per minute. 5 miles per minute would be 300 mph.

>At what angle though?

Assume they are somewhere in direction of Rainier proper, as per Arnold's report, though it's kind of hard to understand how he could see white birds against a snow white background under such circumstances, especially as flashes of light. But never mind.

Rainier's peak was 10 miles north of Arnold's position, and to keep things simple mathematically, 24 miles away as the pelican flies. If the "pelicans" were 4 miles distant initially, then the scaling factor is  $24/4 = 6$ . Divide 10 miles by 6, and the birds would be 1.67 miles north of his position. To keep it simple and maximally advantageous to the pelican hypothesis, call it 1.5 miles. Similarly Arnold would be 3.6 miles from the intercept point if they were flying due south. Call it 3.5 mile for simplicity.

>Anyway, at some point, they theoretically pass Arnold's flight  
>path, heading in the approximate direction of Mt Adams.

Under your assumptions, Arnold would be practically right on top of them. Assume they are flying 30 mph and Arnold 60. It would take them 3 minutes to fly 1.5 miles south to the intercept point (the entirety of Arnold's sighting BTW with no time left for Arnold's 100 second timed observation afterwards). Arnold would have flown 3 miles east in this period, taking him within .5 miles of the pelicans when they flew past his course heading.

If Havener can recognize these pelicans at 4 miles as still being birds, do you think Arnold might have similar abilities at only 1/2 mile?

>They're also still heading away from Arnold and if he turns his  
>airplane \*\*due south\*\*, they will continue to travel further  
>away.

No they won't! Arnold is moving twice as fast as they are, isn't he? If he goes into an immediate 90 turn to the south to follow and to keep from flying right past their course within half a minute, he is going to continue to draw closer. Say it take him 30 seconds to make his turn. The birds have gone another 1/4 mile south. But Arnold has gone about another 1/4 mile east and 1/4 mile south since he is moving twice as fast. So by the time he completes his turn, they are due east and only 1/4 mile away

>Arnold will eventually make some headway towards them, however,  
>he can practically pluck out their pin feathers.

>if he has already decided these objects are much further than  
>they truly are, there's no point in him pursuing them.

I just see the usual Eastonian mathematical and logical witlessness at work here. Arnold is so close at this point, it's virtually impossible for him not to recognize them for what they are, even if they hypothetically spook and pick up speed. He will hardly perceive them as being way off in the distance. While they might appear to be dots at the very beginning of this scenario, they are clearly looming larger in size at every moment as they approach on an intercept course. Translation: Arnold sees that he is quickly getting closer to them all the time.

By the time they cross his path and Arnold turns on a parallel course, they are no longer dots but clearly defined objects full of details like beaks, flapping wings, and the like. At a quarter mile, their wings subtend an angle about equal to that of the full moon.

>So far as I can see, there's no evidence that he did.

Yawn. There's nothing to pursue. He's already flown past them and left them in his wake.

>We do know that after one minute and forty seconds, he's  
>determined they are already at Mt Adams and distant, hardly  
>visible objects.

No, no! What we DO know, under your stated assumptions, is that your pelicans would be on an intercept course with Arnold,

would be quickly growing in size and discernibility, and would be EASILY recognizable by the time they flew past his initial heading, even with the most generous of assumptions imaginable to the pelican hypothesis. He could hardly perceive them as being way off in the distance and getting further away.

Furthermore, when Arnold turned to follow, he would overtake them very quickly, in much less time than a minute and forty seconds, again even using extremely generous assumptions. After a minute and forty seconds, Arnold would have flown well past them. They would not be in front of him to the southeast in the direction of Mt. Adams, but in BACK OF HIM to the northeast somewhere.

>Does this scenario allow the possibility that these were not  
>distant 'objects' - only some 4 miles away, yet sufficiently far  
>and moving fast enough to always be illusory against the snow  
>covered mountains?

Nope, not even close.

>If not, for the sake of a best/worst scenario, let's finish off  
>the discussion by upping the bird's airspeed to 50 m.p.h. -  
>which they can do - drop Arnold's "coming out of turn and  
>searching" to 60 and put the 'objects', in 'perfect visibility',  
>initially five miles away.

>Do you reckon it's still an untenable (if unpalatable)  
>possibility?

Even if Arnold was going at a death-defying 60 mph and the pelicans sped up to 50 mph (after Arnold presumably spooked them by getting too CLOSE -- hint, hint), Arnold is going to see them rapidly looming up initially as he approaches their position. As they cross in front of him, about 1/2 mile away, and at all times thereafter, they will be easily recognizable. After his turn at only 60 mph (which, says Don Ledger, would actually send him crashing to earth) he will continue to catch up with them. These will not seem like objects continuing to move forward of his position and out of sight. They will start to move backward and continue to grow in size. Arnold will never lose sight of them at such close range.

James, the fact that you even have to pose such questions publicly, instead of just doing something simple like taking out a piece of graph paper and figuring out the plausibility of the scenario on your own, indicates that you have no idea what is involved here. Bruce Maccabee has tried to lead you through exactly such a scenario 2 or 3 times before, pointing out, as I have, that Arnold would fly right into any birds on the intercept course described, that he would get so close the birds would be easily recognizable, and that he would still zip right past them once he made his turn onto a parallel course.

Pelicans, geese, swans ... it doesn't matter. The bird hypothesis is completely untenable no matter how one tries to massage the numbers.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: John Heptonstall <[Heptonstall@mac-tcm.demon.co.uk](mailto:Heptonstall@mac-tcm.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 09:35:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 21:17:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: judith jaafar <[judithjaafar@compuserve.com](mailto:judithjaafar@compuserve.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: 18 June 1999 00:35

Hi Judith

I agree with much of your message but feel there's a relatively simple solution that consistently fails ( as with the Burns lecture to BUFORA ) to be adopted - before allowing a forum to ANY person, ensure that they have reasonable evidence to support their theory.

If you allow anyone to speak about anything without prior vetting and applying some simple rules you end up with the current unacceptable complex of 'theory' and 'conjecture'. I know we are often dealing with 'paranormal' and therefore by definition 'difficult to explain' phenomena but that cannot preclude expecting one to provide explanations based on reasonable scientific or anecdotal evidence.

Socrates, and yes even Reich, had reasonable evidence on which to base their theories. They ( especially Reich ) were met with a solid wall of disbelief, not because of lack of evidence but for 'political' reasons. That's often seen in UFOlogy in the form of extreme 'sceptics' who, despite workable evidence, continue to verbally criticise workable theories irrationally ( and sometimes through the provision of their own un-workable theories! ).

If Margaret Fry can produce a working hypothesis based on all evidence of Berwyn Mountain then that's fine; if she cannot she should accept her failings. Andy's theory appears to fit the evidence, he may ultimately be proved wrong ( as may Dave and the Derby's case ) but let's not entertain any old theorist who, without workable evidence, decides to contradict another.

Prejudice is another thing, and can be discounted amongst the objective group in favour of workable evidence.

Regards

John.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [heptonstall](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Lynda Matthews <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 07:40:05 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 21:16:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: judith jaafar <[judithjaafar@compuserve.com](mailto:judithjaafar@compuserve.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: 18 June 1999 00:35

Fatal flaws....

Everything is not relative - only a handful of researchers are able to make any intelligent comments about the UFO evidence - such as it is.

I actually agree that Margaret Fry should be banned in light of the quite extraordinary comments she made about Nick Pope and Timothy Good's superiority through breeding.

To say that BUFORA didn't 'endorse' Max Burns is a huge cop-out and will be noticed by all. It's never been a question of endorsement as such - and not one of so-called 'free speech' (something that none of us have access to, not even Rupert Murdoch) either.

The idea that everyone's opinion is equally valid is exactly why Ufology attracts so many crackpots.

Furthermore it is not the case that the scientific community has ignored evidence of what you call extraordinary human experience; it's just that science calls these things often by another name and doesn't come to the same belief-driven conclusions that we do. Having just read a rather interesting book by none other than "Dr." Armen Victorian on Mind Control ("The Mind Controllers", Vision Paperbacks 1999. It's actually surprisingly well-written and researched now you never thought you'd hear me say that) it becomes abundantly clear, through official (FOIA) material, that the CIA, DIA, USAF and many other agencies were and are interested in so-called 'paranormal' phenomena AND that there is some support within the scientific community for the idea that things like (for instance) Remote Viewing (RV) may be rather more than the work of hucksterdom...

That's just one small example.....

BUFORA is the organisation where certain Council members actively encouraged and participated in regression hypnosis at a time when it was banned. These things have probably gone on for ages but I don't think that BUFORA matters any more. The public would appear to agree. Lancashire UFO Society meetings appear to be better attended than BUFORA London lectures.....

Tim M.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 18](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: **Andy Roberts** <[Brigantia@compuserve.com](mailto:Brigantia@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 04:46:12 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 21:33:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: judith jaafar <[judithjaafar@compuserve.com](mailto:judithjaafar@compuserve.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome - The truth is out!  
>Date: 18 June 1999 00:35

Y'all,

Judith's now rare excursion onto a general email group was most interesting and I am, as you know, obliged by law to comment. Those easily bored should bugger off now.

>I will say only one thing, although I'm probably wasting my time.  
>BUFORA has never at any time proclaimed that it endorsed Max's  
>point of view, nor any other speaker invited to lecture to BUFORA,  
>for that matter.

I don't think BUFORA (who \*exactly\* are BUFORA anyway?) endorsement of most of their speakers was at issue. The problem was that BUFORA were promoting (and make no mistake about it when you put a speaker on you are promoting them, disclaimers or no) a man who has been factually disproved on many counts and has lied and distorted information to suit his own ends. Proof of this was provided on many occasions and can most recently be seen in Dr Dave Clarke's refutation of points raised by Max at the lecture.

That's the problem.

Now if BUFORA Council (or the few whioch run it) can in all conscience stand by this promotion of a liar and self-publicist, not to mention one who openly admitted to bribing a witness with illegal drugs, then I think BUFORAs general policy is there for all to see. Council's inability to understand the principles here only serve to underline their impotence in ufology today.

As an aside here, during the 'discussions' which preceded Max's ground breaking, reality altering talk (only 35 lucky people received enlightenment here, society's loss I venture to suggest) there was much twaddle talked about 'free speech'. Isn't it thus ironic that Max was forbidden to mention any other UFO researchers by name in his lecture? Ahh well, by their dichotomiies thy shall know them.....

>There is an incredibly important point of principle involved  
>here, one which, since I'm writing to intelligent recipients,  
>I don't presume I need to elucidate. Contrary to what some seem  
>to think about the BUFORA membership, they too are intelligent,  
>perceptive people

Really? Some certainly are - others are completely barking, many I have spoken to over the years have a slight grip on (if I dare use the word) 'reality'. Trying to pretend open membership UFO orgs comprise any form of intellectual elite is stretching the truth somewhat.

>and do not like being told to whom they can, or cannot, listen. Who  
>will be blacklisted next ? Margaret Fry, a veteran British ufologist  
>of some thirty years standing, because she happens to disagree with



>Andy Roberts' explanation of the Berwyn Mountain case?

Ok, seeing as I'm named I'll run with that. yes, I'd blacklist Margaret Fry. Why?

Firstly because of her racist statements - I'm sure we all work in companies who have and uphold an equal opportunities statement? Why doesn't BUFORA (and before you all get hot under the collar about it being an 'equal opportunity' for Max to speak you should take the time to understand what equal ops really means) have one? If it did then someone who made claims such as Margaret did wouldn't even be allowed one of your sad little memebership cards.

Secondly I would blacklist her because she is a crap researcher. OOO that nasty Andy Roberts how dare he say this about a little old lady. Listen carefully - I was criticising her \*research\* not \*her\*. Some facts - and they are facts because I have sat with Margaret and been told them by her:

- 1) Margaret has no coherent case file on the Berwyn case.
- 2) She does not tape interviews, preferring to reconstruct them from notes.
- 3) Two of the key witnesses to the Berwyn case were highly critical of her methods (I have their comments on tape for when they are needed). Pat Evans said she 'led her on' Huw Thomas said she started talking about bodies, crash retrievals etc \*at the very start of her interview\*. I could go on but you get the gist of it and I am not making this up. And that's the tame stuff.

BUFORA should not pander to people who cannot do their job. Just because someone has been interested in UFOs for a long time and has spoken to many witnesses \*does not\* make them a good researcher. It makes a mockery of the much-vaunted AI system and if I see certain researchers lauded as 'respected' in any more books and magazines I will gip. We stand or fall by what we can prove or disprove, not by the bonkersness of our theory or how old we are.

>Myself, because I dared to suggest that the Rendlesham Forest >incident is anything but closed, contrary to the beliefs of >the "experts" like Ian Ridpath who found it fitting to call me >"an empty-minded airhead" without knowing anything about me, >my research or my credentials?

Who would dare to stop you Judith! It would depend on what you were going to say and whether it was reasonable and backed up with evidence or not. BUFORA should peer review its speakers to see if they fill certain criteria, just basic stuff like having \*checkable\* evidence would do. Personally I think Rendlesham is a fantastic misperception case and as yet I have seen no evidence to the contrary.

>John Mack, a professor of psychiatry who presumably knows more >about the workings of the human mind than anyone on this >recipients' list,

That's a moot point Judith.

>and yet is convinced of non-human intervention? (unless of >course he's spreading disinformation for his CIA masters!)

If he's got the evidence let him roll! I didn't know he worked for C &A!

>Jenny Randles, who had the courage to put pen to paper and >write "Star Children", a little "off-the-wall" perhaps for some >people's tastes?

As above, if she can back her theories up, why not?

>I understand fully, Jenny, your desire for this subject to be >taken seriously, one that is shared by all committed >researchers. But in our inordinate desire for our subject to >be validated by the scientific and academic community we risk >negating it as a truly astounding human experience (minus the >knowns, the misperceptions, the man-made technology ), >something which is touching people's psyches, their

>consciousness, their visions of the future, their intellectual  
>endeavours.

C'mon Judith that doesn't make it \_separate\_ from the above, merely a cultural interpretation of same - at least it does at the moment in lieu of evidence to the contrary. The world and what exists in it and within the human mind is a far more interesting and exciting subject than any warped sci fi invented by ufologists. Read my demolition of the Big Grey Man of Ben McDhui in the latest Fortean Studies or Strange Daze - shows how the natural can become the supernatural but yet still 'sexy'.

>Perhaps the close encounter experience cannot be subjected to  
>scientific empiricism, may never be, no matter how far we  
>advance. Maybe the reason we cannot find answers after 50yrs.  
>is because we're asking the wrong questions

Why do people always say that when the answers look prosaic! ;-)

>- perhaps we need to take a side-step and look at the whole  
>phenomenon from a different perspective, thereby leaving  
>behind the clay-footed, unimaginative dinosaurs with which  
>paranormal research is so heavily populated, hanging on for dear  
>life to their god of science.

I just \_knew\_ the keen blade of science was due for some stick here! Just because something \*appears\* inexplicable doesn't mean it isn't. If you take the above attitude Judith you are stuck in the 17th century when people really believed in devils/fairies etc. In retrospect it all now seems rather sad, the psycho-social theories accounting for it all. When you are living in the heart of something it's easy to get lost in the hall of mirrors it presents. Take a step back, look at it from the perspective of anomalous phenomena in previous centuries, it all makes more sense. Hell, if you like your science imaginative and philosophical tinged read Abram's Spell of the Sensuous. Scientific explanations for 'anomalous' phenomena can be enormous fun.

>If I may be pedantic here, science, we must always remember, is  
>a Greek word "skientia", which simply means knowledge, with no  
>mandatory recourse to physics, chemistry, biology or  
>engineering. No scientific or philosophical breakthrough has  
>ever been made without the gifts of courage and imagination,  
>often at the great expense of the initiator.

But what was the Greek word rooted in? This really means little other than you disagree with one interpretation of the word science. Trying to imply martyrdom for ufologists bonkers ideas is a bad idea too.

>This is why I feel slightly uncomfortable with your idea of  
>placing so much importance on physicists and engineers and the  
>like. Do we really need their approbation? Their co-operation,  
>yes, but their control, no. A symposium of "experts" is fatally  
>flawed. There are no experts, only opinions and vested  
>interests.

All highly debatable and I want my breakfast.

>What about the percipients, the experiencers (as the Americans  
>like to call them)? Do they not have a hugely significant role  
>to play?

Yes, but not when they talk rubbish and we are so lulled by the glamour of the 'other' that we fall prey to that most hideous of ufological nonsense 'witness led investigation'. If people are claiming something, for it to be acceptable it must be proven to the satisfaction of the majority. Being part of a small, belief led clique (which ufology is) and as such having delusions of superiority (which many ufologists do, in lieu of having status is the 'real' world) means nothing. It's tempting suggest that without active ufology the experiences of the witnesses would be described very differently indeed.

>Without them it would be like studying zoology without any  
>animals, botany without any plants, physics without any  
>energy.

But we don't interview the bloody plants do we? You seem to be advocating a type of 'shamanistic' interpretation of witness

experience. That's fine but it doesn't mean doodly squat in the day to day world and from that point of view 'new age' thinking is never very far away. And that is a very bad thing indeed!

>I am put in mind of some of the greatest thinkers in history -  
>Socrates, Copernicus, Galileo, Willhelm Reich (even), who were  
>persecuted

Being persecuted didn't stop their ideas coming to fruition though, did it (well, perhaps with the exception of Reich's whose stuff sneaked out). Ufologists of the more bonkers persuasion \*have not ever proved one single thing\*, therefore I think it's safe to say they never will (oooo contentious).

>What has been happening recently in British ufology resonates  
>uneasily with the antics of the early Catholic Church -  
>silencing and extirpation of all unacceptable belief systems,  
>the Gnostics, the Cathars, the Albigenses etc., and I'm not  
>alluding in particular to Max Burns, but to the whole ethos of  
>"control" and censoring material for the masses, or at least  
>denigrating "unscientific" theories.

Turn the telescope round Judith! All we are asking for is that anyone who presents ideas should be subject to that most basic of principles - having at least some evidence. Not too much to ask surely, and as the witch I was burning only last night said, 'If only I'd shown my working out better'.

>Do we have the right to mock and deride those who are inclined  
>to believe in non-human intelligences?

'Course we do! Why not? Again, read Abram to get another view of what a non-human intelligence means in relation to humans.

>The ETHers may well yet have the last laugh

I very much doubt it Judith - but neither of us can prove that. And it's well know that ETH's don't laugh anyway, they're too scared of the dark!

>Peter Brookesmith has made a plea for intellectual honesty, a  
>laudable appeal ( and I really mean that ), but I am also  
>making an equally heartfelt appeal for intellectual  
>generosity. Retain one's views and opinions, but respect those  
>of others. Wrong ideas will ultimately be exposed as such, in  
>the natural order of things. Life is more profitably spent in  
>enriching one's own life, than in destroying another's.

No problem with this - but when supposedly serious orgs such as BUFORA wish to promote the patently untrue, the liars and the deceivers - especially when they have been proved to be so we need afford them no respect whatsoever, and that goes for the organisation which seeks to promote them.

>In the word's of William James, "A great many people think  
>they are thinking when they are merely rearranging their  
>prejudices".

Ahh, William James - wasn't he a great advocate a of nitrous oxide, a wonderfully hallucinogenic gas which makes reality even more like silly putty?

New idea - BUFORA should be sponsored by a different drug advocate each year then at least you've got an excuse for promoting madness!

Happy Trails

Andy

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 06:27:36 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 07:41:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalseve.net](mailto:updates@globalseve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:57:02 +0100

>>From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 14:50:36 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>>To: [updates@globalseve.net](mailto:updates@globalseve.net)

>>>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>>>To: UFO Updates  
>>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome  
>>>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 16:45:43 +0100

>>>Thanks for all the messages that flooded in over the weekend. To  
>>>be honest I had not even noticed that UFO UpDates was on the cc  
>>>list of the original Robert Moore and I thought I was only  
>>>talking to a few UK UFOlogists. I was quite surprised to see my  
>>>'spooof' went global. But no matter, it was an interesting  
>>>exercise.

>>>Let me qualify 'spooof'. This was not really trickery. Rather it  
>>>was a deliberate exercise in taking an idea to its natural  
>>>extreme. Many people in the UK have been furious over the Max  
>>>Burns lecture saying BUFORA lost the plot by inviting him. There  
>>>were demands for mass walk outs over the issue.

>>Boy, did you put one over on us. Whew! We all thought you  
>>were serious. What a bunch of maroons we are!

>>However, I do understand how this can happen. On more than one  
>>occasion, I have attempted, thru hummers, uh, thru HUMOR, to  
>>yell at somebody or other for saying something which I  
>>originally thought was out of line while in reality, I was out  
>>of line all along.

>>Just one last question, and I do not expect you to answer it as  
>>I am without portfolio, have not published anything (on UFOs)  
>>and am not a recognized researcher... nor am I an unrecognized  
>>researcher. Having said all that, I expect nothing from anyone,  
>>except either a chuckle, or a chuckle and some personal  
>>recognition that the offende, not the offender (that'd be me)  
>>got the message. So my question is, based on your more recent  
>>admission that you were merely joshing, my question is, Dear Ms.  
>>Offende, what is the temperature of the sand?

>>Jim Gesundt & Jaime Mortellaro, UFO Research without portfolio  
>>but a lot of Moxie... we mix it with our Gripple and rhubarb  
>>>wine.

>Hi,

>Er never very hot in Britain, if thats what you meant. Our  
>summers and winters tend to blend into one season known  
>colloquially as 'by eck its nippy' (see 'Northern dialect phrase  
>book' by E By Gum for translation)

>I have been quite amazed as a newcomer to this net thing (only

>six or seven weeks of it - seems like forever, but no matter)  
>how what starts as a nice discussion degenerates rapidly into a  
>brawl. Why? Can't we argue facts and theories minus  
>personalities and accept other peoples views? I can.

>The asrgument about Budd Hopkins is nothing to do with him as a  
>man nor with his sincerity - both of which are above reproach as  
>far as I have seen. It has all to do with the position he adopts  
>on the evidence and, because he is so admired, the effect that  
>has generally on the UFO community. He is, absolutely, entitled  
>to hold his views and stand his corner defending them. But he  
>has to appreciate that what he says is regarded very seriously  
>by thousands of people simply because of who he is. For that  
>reason people who have influence must be willing to have their  
>views debated. But we must also do that in a civilised fashion,  
>accepting that they can be right and we can be wrong.

>The very same thing applies to Nick Pope - the MoD man in the  
>UK. I like him too, but because he is taken so seriously by so  
>many people he has to consider carefully what he does and says  
>because many will perceive that as an endorsement. As such I was  
>not happy with his decision to tell the story of the Florida  
>tollbooth abduction without giving his readers a proper insight  
>into the matter. But my being willing to answer questions on the  
>issue to the London Times earlier this year (after much soul  
>searching, three years of pleading with Nick to do it himself  
>and when they asked me - rather than me approach them) had  
>nothing to do with my wanting to get at Nick. Far from it. In  
>fact it was all about doing the right thing by UFOlogy. We all  
>have a right to do what we believe in, just as we all have a  
>right to dispute those who feel differently. But this has to be  
>done with compassion and moderation - not as cat calling and  
>personal abuse.

>Seems easy enough to me.

>My response, by the way, was less a joke than an attempt to push  
>an idea to a logical conclusion and see how people liked where  
>we then were. This is known to science as developing an  
>experimental model and its an acceptable way of trying things  
>out without actually blowing up the planet in the course of ones  
>mistakes.

>Best wishes,

>Jenny Randles

Dear and gentle.... ah, dear List Folk....

I've left the post intact because the response should be short.  
Now how was I to know, since your post did not carry a header  
with an "S" in it, that it was from Brobdignag? Say, where is  
Brobdignag anyway? Just east of Lilliput?

However, and having said that ... MY post was not headed with  
a large, upper cased "S" needer. But then, this type of humor is  
expected from us Colonials. As for Nick... I was under the  
impression he was Greek and made book.

Shorty Morty

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena

'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## 'The Roots Of Complacency'

From: Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <[ufomiami@bellsouth.net](mailto:ufomiami@bellsouth.net)>

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 17:14:47 -0700

Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:13:03 -0400

Subject: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

### Introduction

Toward the end of his life, Dr. J. Allen Hynek was a frequent visitor to my home, the last of such visits taking place from August 20 to August 31, 1985, when he finally left to have his first surgery on September 5, 1985. After that his health declined rapidly and unfortunately he died on April 27, 1986.

During his visits, Dr. Hynek did quite a bit of work using my computer which was quite similar to his own at home. At that time, his interest was centered on the Hudson Valley sightings

Time marched on, and after Dr. Hynek passed away, the work was completed by Bob Pratt and published in book form in 1987, under the title 'Night Siege'.

One day, revising my diskettes, I found a file labeled 'Imbrogno' which I did not recognize, When I opened it, it was a paper intended to be the Preface of the book, that undoubtedly by error Allen had saved on one of my diskettes (on August 30, 1985, just the day before he left my home). It is a remarkable piece, and once you read it it will be easy to understand why it was not used as initially intended. I think the time has come to release it through the internet so every one will see what Dr. Hynek's thoughts about these remarkable sightings really were. I strongly suggest that you compare 'The Roots Of Complacency' (as Hynek himself titled it) with the version that appeared in 'Night Siege'.

Dr. Willy Smith UNICAT PROJECT June 1999

-----

The Roots Of Complacency

by

Dr. J. Allen Hynek

Something truly astonishing happened.... Not far from New York City, along the Hudson Valley, as hundreds of astonished people looked up, many driving along the Taconic Parkway, they saw something no one had ever seen before.

Some called it a "Space-ship from outer space" (for want of anything better) but it was generally described by numbers of competent, professional persons as startlingly brilliant lights, in the form of a "V", or Boomerang, silent, slowly-moving, and very large close-by object. It has often popularly been called the "Westchester (County) Boomerang".

The world has never known about this, even though the event happened not once but several times, and over the course of several years. To all intents and purposes, this was a non-event. The media across the world has remained dumb. Local papers, radios and TV's, it is true, did momentarily carry spots along with the daily news, but there the news just vanished.

How is it possible that in the United States, where even trivial events are often flashed across the world, only one TV and radio

network carried an account of this utterly astounding event?  
Far, far lesser stories are spewen forth across the world!

Could it possibly be that the whole thing just never happened?  
No: many times there was good, but extremely local, media coverage; many hundreds have personally attested to us, and to many others, that the "Westchester Boomerang" was most undeniably, very truly real to them. Furthermore, many witnesses at a given time, were geographically separate, and unknown to each other. Cars along the Taconic Parkway, a well traveled highway, stopped, and passengers looked in amazement, many frightened and bewildered at the spectacle.

Police department "blotters" proved that many calls came to several local police stations, and we have tape recordings of a number of the police involved. The Boomerang was undeniably real; it was not a chimera!

Yes, something truly and astonishing transpired, but was no one "minding the store", was everyone asleep at the switch? What about law enforcement agencies (whose duty is certainly to alert and assist when something amazing is afoot; what about civilian and military personnel?

When hundreds of largely professional, affluent people, in suburban areas, are astonished, awestruck, and many frightened by what they could only regard as a very bizarre event, would this not at least warrant and bring forth some comment from the nation's media? And what about law officers, government officials and... what of the FAA which supposedly monitors the airwaves over which the "Boomerang" repeatedly flew, and thus constituted a serious hazards, especially over the Taconic Parkway.

And what of scientists, to whom these events should have been of breathtaking scientific concern? But nothing...except, oh yes, a writer so inept at his task that not once did he checked, even briefly, the voluminous tapes and other material amassed by the present authors: a remarkable example of investigative reporting.

His conclusion: the Boomerang was caused by nothing more than a flight of small planes flying in formation, a totally untenable conclusion in view of the facts.

How, it would appear that we really have TWO astounding stories, rather than just one... different but related... and equally incomprehensible: the story of the low-flying luminous Boomerang (in itself which could rank high in the annals of science fiction... if it were science fiction! ) and the second, a totally unaccountable dereliction of duty (and there seem to be no other word for it), a complete superb and indifference to accountability.

It was a malady which appeared to plunge all who encountered it, EXCEPT the witnesses, into a deadly stupor. Such a malady, or perhaps a virulent virus of apathy and indifference to duty, could immobilize cities and a whole country. Of course, we don't know what the Boomerang was really about for:

---the Police and other law enforcement officers were derelict and failed in their duty to assist the many who called for fear and danger, as well as in awe and wonder.

---the FAA utterly failed to be concerned for air safety, flight rules, navigation lights, when told that some utterly strange and possibly menacing object was cruising close over streets and house.

---the Military was derelict by not attending to public safety and matters of National Defense (the country could have been subtly invaded!)

---the Scientists failed to uphold their "Hippocratic" oath of science: they were derelict in following the quest in following an outstanding mystery.

---the media, well, where were they? Truly derelict always avid news hounds, rushing to their typewriters or microphones to rush the news to the world (good, bad and trivial), but where were they? Hardly any of the 50 States heard the Boomerang story.



Why? Utterly indifferent and apathetic? If so, why?

Of the two stories, that of the Boomerang is by far the more directly told. Bizarre and fantastic though it may be (and is) it merely need competent retelling. The facts are on record. From the hundreds of cassette tapes in the thousands of statements made by witnesses, the Boomerang is a matter of record. But the second story, well, that is another matter.

This story is not at all directly told. Here there are no cassette tapes, no clear cut descriptions, and no policeman, no scientist, no military man, no media person, no FAA has recorded why they were derelict. We can only infer, as one might infer from the pages of history. We can only deduce and play detective. And we must try, for this second story, more truly a puzzle, could be of utmost importance to finding out how we, as humans, act under stress, trauma. and fear..... for the Boomerang had all of these!

The puzzle has far more parts than the tale of the Boomerang.. It is, indeed, a part of a continuing story of mankind's pioneering search for adventure and meeting, but repeatedly dashed and frustrated by those who cannot look to the heights of the pioneer: by the "it will never fly" or "it can't be done" mentalities. These who always must say that "since it can't be done, there is no need to even thinking about it or even talking about it.

Therein lies the spawning ground of indifference, of apathy, and to dereliction of duty.

All those who didn't follow through on the Boomerang event were not willfully derelict: they were merely the thousands of "it will never fly" and "it can't be done" and so there is no need to think about it. The corollary is: "Since it can't be done, whatever said had been done, were simply deluded... they must have been mistaken, and so no need to look into it further". It is the failure to seek for the light of the tunnel because there could 't be a light.

Intellectual adventure is sterile when there is continual inability to seek answer to challenges, to seek ways out of the tunnel of indifference. In the story of the Boomerang, the FAA, the media, scientists, politicians, the military.... all may momentarily touch upon the mystery, but suddenly it appeared that apathy saps further energy to incentive, and in its stead is a great desire nothing... it becomes a hotbed of inertia... a great desire to do nothing, fobbing it all off in the guise of a handy solution, like "planes in formation".

It is not as from a seeming direct desire to be in duty, but it is more as though the call for duty has vanished, or as though some bad fairy had administered a sleeping potion, an apathy draught.

How else might one hold that otherwise responsible law enforcement, FAA, military, the media etc. would renege on their duties?

There is a more realistic answer than calling upon some bad fairy (though it would certainly fit the facts) and that is that it all lies in our human (mental) nature. A psychologist would express it more professionally, but it simply amounts to the fact that the human mind has definite limits for acceptance and accountability. In the history of science this syndrome has been seen many times and in many ages. For instance, how often has it occurred that totally revolutionary ideas, so novel at first as to be utterly neglected or discarded... a form of apathy and total indifference.

As a homely analogy, one might say that such a totally novel idea "overheats the mental human circuits" and the fuse blows (or the circuit-breaker cuts out) as a protective device for the mind. The time is not yet right for the age and the new idea might just as well not been there in the first place. Mankind was not yet able to handle it.

Thus when mankind is presented with a totally bizarre, shocking, traumatic event (the Boomerang?) a mental circuit cuts out. Instead of a challenge for action, there is a dead battery.

This is, of course, well known in individual cases of amnesia in, for example, "shell shock": could it be that a collective amnesia or apathy can come into play? If so, might it be possible that collectively people can react traumatically, as to the Westchester Boomerang, to a collective amnesia, whether they are policemen, media people, the FAA etc.?

Whatever be the case, the effect is real. Many instances in history.... and the Boomerang is its most recent and spectacular example... when the breaking point of the collective mind occurs, it must openly disregard patent evidence of the senses: it can no longer encompass them within their normal borders.

The Holocaust perpetrated by Hitler in WW II is another sample: people simply refused to accept, and were indifferent to the evidence, because their minds couldn't bring themselves to accept that such a Holocaust could possibly be, despite ample evidence. It was also a "mental circuit breaker" a general apathy and a will to indifference.

The Boomerang and the Holocaust are but striking samples of what happens when the collective mind willfully disregards evidence when "it can't take it". The entire modern UFO syndrome is another: here we have utterly ample evidence of the global nature of the UFO phenomenon. Thousands of instances and over many countries the evidence for the UFO phenomenon is clear, but those in position of policy and authority (FAA, educators, scientists etc) are deaf or purposely obtuse. Apathy goes hand in hand with the ability to accept even the most inane answers, anything whatever, just to stave off the necessity to think.

So we cannot at the moment expect to do little about the wealth of material collected on the Westchester Boomerang (or for the much more abundant wealth of UFO material). The circuits are closed; apathy holds sway. But history has shown that in time the information and questions dam breaks, sometimes cataclysmically, and later, why, low and behold, the pundits by a complete irrational turn of fact, will say, "oh, we knew this all the time!".

Editor's note:

As detailed in 'Night Siege', the first incident was reported on December 31, 1982, and the sightings continued until the date of publication of the book, with a concentration of incidents during the summer of 1984.

Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo

Miami UFO Reporter

For more on Dr. Hynek visit:

<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Corridor/1341/index.html>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Filer's Files #24 --1999

From: George A. Filer <[Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 07:19:01 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:05:59 -0400  
Subject: Filer's Files #24 --1999

Filer's Files #24 --1999, MUFON Skywatch Investigations  
George A. Filer, Mutual UFO Network Eastern Director,  
June 18, 1999, [Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com) (609) 654-0020

Wilbert Smith, Senior radio engineer, Department of Transport,  
Director of Project Magnet for the Canadian government after  
visiting key US officials stated:

"The matter is the most highly classified subject in the  
United States Government, rating higher even than the H-bomb.  
Flying saucers exist. Their modus operandi is unknown but a  
concentrated effort is being made by a small group headed by  
Doctor Vannevar Bush. The entire matter is considered by the  
United States authorities to be of tremendous significance."  
(Top Secret memorandum on "Geo Magnetism" November 21, 1950:)

### NEW JERSEY

WANAQUE -- Tim Beckley writes about last weeks Jim Cleary  
interview with a Wanaque investigator. There are a few things  
wrong with this report. I was involved in the initial  
investigations and wrote the story up for Fate magazine. There  
were strange things flying around Wanaque that I do not believe  
were (Earth) fault lights, because these cannot shoot into and  
out of a reservoir. However, a craft did not go into the water  
for a week and stay there. Augie Roberts, somewhat of a famous  
Ufologist and early UFO witness himself saw and photographed a  
light over the water. He said it looked like it had submerged,  
but there was ice all over the reservoir and I think this was in  
February. Supposedly it shot down a beam of light onto the ice  
and cut a hole into it first. Some people were even going  
around with pictures showing the craft, but the much reproduced  
photos were really taken in Pennsylvania sometime before. They  
are a series of four or five photos showing a beam of light  
coming out of the bottom of the craft. Also the Governor never  
visited the site. The Mayor made some comment at a town council  
meeting and some thought the Air Force had shown up and  
threatened witnesses. But it was actually a NICAP member who  
wanted the case kept under his belt so he got credit for the  
investigation and word got out that he was an MIB or government  
agent. As usual things got out of hand and certain rumors  
persist to this day. As in the case of Roswell and other UFO  
incidents you have a legitimate case and what is added on later  
acts like a smoke screen to make the story sound ridiculous.  
There was at least one police officer with multiple sightings  
and there was talk that a car had disappeared. This is totally  
without proof. If you drive down the road around the reservoir  
you will disappear because it just keeps on going toward I think  
High Bridge; where Howard Menger was having some of his  
experiences. Thanks to Tim Beckley Mr. UFO. [MRUFO@webtv.net](mailto:MRUFO@webtv.net).

### INDIANA

GARY -- Eric Carman writes: "I would like to share with you an  
incident that I have only told my wife and brother about." On a  
relatively clear day last June, (I am not sure of the exact  
date) I was sitting in my living room at approximately 10:30 AM  
waiting for my daughter's school bus. I was seated next to my  
large picture window when, something caught my eye to the right.

At first glance, I saw what I perceived to be children's balloons floating away in the wind. When I took a second look, I was struck by something odd. There are 4-6 power lines located in front of the house and these balloons were slowly traveling in a trajectory directly parallel with the power lines. This peaked my interest enough to go outside and look. I noticed three gray, slightly metallic, slightly oval spheres slowly rotating or "rolling" over one another as they traveled horizontally. Then a low level fourth sphere came and joined the original three. They continued their horizontal path for a few more seconds in relation to the power lines, sped up tremendously and vanished. I was able to snap a photo, but I took it as the four UFOs joined and it doesn't show much. I do not know what they were but I know I will never forget them." Thanks to Eric Carman, CARQUEZ@aol.com.

## MINNESOTA -

TWO HARBORS -- Just north of Duluth on Lake Superior's southern end is a National Park called Split Rock Light House. It used to be a working lighthouse but is not any more. I was hiking with my daughter on June 4, 1999, along the shore. We stopped to see a VERY bright object hovering above the lake about three miles out from shore. There were no other objects in the sky nor any shipping to speak of in the area. It was about 1,000 feet above the water. We were unable to tell the size of the object since it was so bright and we just watched it hover there for about 30 minutes. After that it went straight up! I did not have my camera with me -- something I regret for more reasons than this. There were several other witnesses at the lighthouse. There was no aircraft traffic in the area according to the Duluth International Airport radar. Thanks to Dave Briscoe, Minnesota State Director Skywatch International.

## TEXAS

KARNES CITY -- Your Filer's Files 99-22, regarding Michael Harvey's sighting of a UFO while working the night shift for Conoco Oil Company at an open pit uranium mine. Graduate Geologist John Thompson and field investigator writes: "Did that hit a nerve." I worked much of South Texas in a geochemical survey for uranium. I have stood in many of those open-pits. Virtually, everything Harvey wrote rings true. He even had the designation for Caterpillar 657B earth movers correct. I cannot confirm the UFO sighting, but there were many strange things going on in those days including UFO reports. I had a rancher tell me once that two of his cows changed colors while drinking water on his ranch, not far from a Karnes City mine. Harvey's story holds up remarkably well for at least what he claims to be doing when seeing his UFO. Harvey stated, "The light was so bright that it hurt my eyes. The object was round and the bright light was coming from the center of the bottom of the UFO. Around the perimeter of the craft were hundreds of penlight size light beams that alternated in all colors of the spectrum. Now, I know they were laser beams. Two days after the UFO incident, the tap rock was removed to expose the uranium ore. We were astounded to find that the uranium ore was now a chalky white substance that had NO radioactivity at all! There was a 250 foot diameter circle of this chalky material in the center of the pit. Outside of the circle, the uranium ore was still as potent as before the incident. Core samples do not lie. This chalky material was uranium before this incident. Many a night I have thought about what happened and wondered why the UFO needed the uranium?" John Thompson comments, "I suspect that the open pit mine of his has long been covered over. Only the most sensitive instrument--far more expensive than a Geiger Counter--could perhaps, sense the truth of his claim about the uranium ore losing its potency where the UFO hovered. The circular area around the chalky material was still "potent" uranium ore. In any advent all the ore would be mined now. If somehow the UFO changed the material, it would have been noted somewhere by a geologist or mining engineer with Conoco. This case may be able to provide hard evidence of a UFO visitation and it would be worth following up and getting a signed MUFON form." Thanks to John Thompson MUFON GA State Section Director.

## OKLAHOMA

MINCO - S. Ritter writes, "I have two new UFO reports for you. On June 3, 1999, my husband and I had gone on a road trip and we saw two UFO's. At first they were headed south and then

the second stopped and started going north. They were the size of BB's (an eighth of an inch) held out at arm's length. We pulled over at the First American Bank in Minco, got out of the car and watched them for at least five minutes. We watched them until they disappeared. The second UFO sighting occurred the same night at 10:20 PM, as I continued to watch the sky. I noticed that there was a cluster of stars in a small half-circle formation. As I was closely watching, from out of nowhere an object shot out of the center of this cluster of stars. It accelerated at a very high speed heading east and then disappeared. It was also the size of a BB held out at arm's length. This was by far not a shooting star or a falling star. Thanks to. S. Ritter at Bbbritter in Yukon, OK.

## MONTANA

FLORENCE - On June 15, 1999, at 10:30 PM a gold light was observed shooting across sky similar to shooting star. The gold light then flashed bright blue/green and disintegrated or disappeared. It was observed by two people. Thanks to Skywatch International Inc.

## BRAZIL

Thiago Ticchetti reports that the NOTÍCIAS POPULARES Newspaper claims that a Flying Saucer appeared over ten Latin American countries during Monday afternoon and dawn on Tuesday, June 12 and 13, 1999. A spaceship the size of a football field may have landed in Goias, Brazil. There are several reports, all very similar, from residents of Chapadão do Sul, in Mato Grosso and Chapadão do Céu, Goiás. The phenomenon would have been seen in Bolivia, Colômbia, Argentina, Costa Rica, Panamá, México, Peru and Venezuela. The main report came from Francisco Fetter who was at work and around 6:00 PM. He looked to the sky and saw a strange thing. The thing looked a pot cover. The size was about a football field, had lights and became red before disappearing. He saw the UFO for three minutes and called another office 80 kilometers away. When Mozar Menezes got the call, he said, He was could see the object. "It was a spectacular light, wonderful," said Francisco. Housewife Ema Helena Schilick and her children, said that they also saw a strange object in the sky. Eunice Claudia and Ernane Emerson were at the bus stop when the UFO appeared. They said that it was a round object, enormous, and moving very slow. Four tourists at the Parque Nacional das Emas tell the same story. "This thing is a burning hot story," said the Revista UFO editor, A.J. Gevaerd. "We've received dozens of from all over Latin America." Gevaerd is going to Chapadão do Sul to investigate -- "I am going to interview some witnesses, because usually when these sightings happen there are also abduction cases." There are also rumors that fighters were launched from Anápolis Air Force Base, in Goiás, to chase the UFO. Thanks to Thiago Ticchetti, [thiagolt@opengate.com.br](mailto:thiagolt@opengate.com.br), (DEPTE - EBE-ET / Brasilia-Brasil)

## GIGANTIC UNITED KINGDOM CROP CIRCLE PICTOGRAM

EAST FIELD -- Stuart Dike and Andreas Müller 'and the International Crop Circle Archive' report a huge crop circle has been found near Alton Barnes, Wiltshire on the June 12, 1999. The first formation closer to the hill is a staggering 700 feet in length, with a mixture of different styles from season's past. It is basically a combination of the very first pictograms from the early nineties with different components from the designs that stirred the world, back in those heady days. The formation is close to Knapp Hill, and has amazing amount of different sections, including the famous Boxes, which were seen on the very early formations, plus Key designs, and an unusual Celtic Cross design placed in the central section of the overall pattern. Images and a video shot by Peter Sorensen copyright 1999, can be observed at the web site:

<http://www.cropcircleconnector.com/1999/Eastfield/Eastfield99a.html>

Editor's Note: The sheer size of the pictograms provides convincing evidence they were not made by human endeavors. Seven hundred feet of intricate pictograms should prove once and for all the reality of the phenomenon based on their complexity, huge size and a possible message. It would require dozens if not hundreds to hoax a site this large and complex. The logical

conclusion is that this pictogram crop circle was made by an unknown intelligence.

#### AUSTRALIA

GRAFTON - The Keith Basterfield Network and Skywatch report a total of six orange UFO's slowly flew over the Eastern Coast heading northeast on Friday, June 11, 1999. The first UFO was seen at 6:50 PM, a second at 9:45 PM, following the same flight path. At 10:10 PM, another object approached from the southwest also heading northeast. An amazing sight occurred at 10:25 PM as one by one, three orange UFO's emerged from behind a tree line. They slowly flew on the same flight path as the others. The two leading objects were one slightly behind the other at the same altitude. The third was trailing 300 meters behind, and about the same altitude of the first two. Its altitude is estimated at around 1,500 feet. When the group was to the north of my position, the center object appeared to almost stop. The leading object continued to move on alone, blinked a few times then went out. The trailing object then caught up and overtook the stationary center UFO. After it had passed, both UFOs began slowly blinking on-and-off in perfect unison. They then faded out together. While video taping the 10:10 PM sighting, a 'meteor' without a tail streaked through the field of view. I am not sure what it was, but it was very fast. A total of 23 minutes of video was taken of these sightings. Supposedly, there was a news report of UFO activity on Prime TV. Thanks to Barry Taylor [stingray@nor.com.au](mailto:stingray@nor.com.au)

<http://www.nor.com.au/users/stingray>

ESPERANCE, WEST AUSTRALIA -- Diane Harrison Australian Skywatch Director reports that on June 9, 1999, Peter witnessed tons of white filamentous threads falling from the sky over a 90 kilometer area. Paddocks, hedges, trees were covered with the stuff and it hung off power lines in great shrouds with lengths up to thirty feet long. Apparently the sky was thick with it up to a thousand feet or more. The threads fell for five hours from 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM. All the paddocks in the area had a 'sheen' caused by layers of the stuff. Peter picked up some of the 'hair' to try to get it analyzed. A Cessna aircraft was flying at 200 feet through the falling threads. Three contrails were stationary much higher. Channel 9 reported the 'Angel Hair' was used in Yugoslavia to put out electrical power generators. We all know that was an unrelated carbon based substance! Thanks to Australian UFO Research Network

#### RPIT ROSWELL REVISITATION REPORT #1

The primary purpose of this RPIT Report is to present the findings of RPIT (Roswell Photo Interpretation Team) photo analysts after five-months of intensive study of the Roswell "flying saucer" photos taken in the office of General Ramey on July 8, 1947, and then to invite the assistance of Ufologists who are willing to seriously address this question: "What can all this evidence really mean toward resolving the half century old Riddle of Roswell?" Even though the RPIT group at this juncture is only presenting this evidence and offering no final conclusions, it would appear that this may be the most convincing close-up visual evidence of arrival of an ET spacecraft on earth.

BACKGROUND: In May of 1998 Major George Filer, USAF-Ret., an official in the MUFON organization and publisher of "Filer's Files," contacted a fellow military retiree, Colonel James Bond Johnson, USA-Ret., to voice a special concern. Filer had been phone visiting with the widow of Lt. Gen. Roger Ramey, USAF-Ret., and she had expressed concerns over what she described as unfair treatment of her late husband in connection with his part in the Roswell Event of 1947. At issue is whether the general committed fraud upon the American people by announcing during a special live radio broadcast that the object first identified officially by the then Army Air Forces as a "captured flying saucer" was in fact "only a weather balloon and weather device." A few writers had even accused the general of "switching" the actual debris with fake junk prior to allowing a member of the press to examine and photograph the purported wreckage. Johnson, who on the afternoon of July 8, 1947, had taken a series of photos of General Ramey and two other officers in the general's 8th Air Force HQ offices in Fort Worth, Texas, for his newspaper, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, offered to

revisit the matter. Johnson only recently had obtained an enlargement of a photo of one of the officers, Major Jesse Marcel, intelligence officer of the 509th Bombardment Group, stationed at Roswell, NM. Major Marcel had headed a recovery team of the "flying saucer" wreckage from a ranch near Roswell and had been ordered to courier the debris to General Ramey's office for examination. Marcel had just arrived in Fort Worth by B-29 bomber and was photographed as the debris was being unpacked from meat wrapper paper packages in Ramey's office.

The general was away from his office but expected to return shortly. Two unopened packages of debris lying in clear view, Marcel's soiled flight uniform, scruffy field boots and his tie and uniform cap tossed across a nearby radiator on a blazing summer day in Texas point to a "fast breaking" and unresolved situation. Reporter-photographer Johnson had arrived unexpectedly to provide the sole photo coverage of what has proved to be the "Story of the Century!" Johnson first assisted with the debris unpacking and then "posed" Marcel with what later was described by the major as some of the "less impressive pieces" of the wreckage. When General Ramey returned to his office Johnson photographed him alone examining the pieces of wreckage and then he was joined in other shots by Colonel Thomas J. Dubose, Ramey's chief of staff. Of special interest, the general in each of the four pictures taken of him by Johnson is holding a letter-size paper. In the first two pictures the general has the message folded but in the last two shots it is unfolded and in a position to be read. It has been speculated that Ramey was handed an urgent message as he entered his office and that if he first had read the message he never would have permitted the photos to be made. In support of this theory, shortly after Johnson departed the Ramey office, the general ordered his weather officer to report to his office and to identify the debris as a "weather balloon and radar device." Then, the general personally went to a Fort Worth radio station that same night to make his dramatic announcement that "shot down" the earlier official AAF "flying saucer" "capture" story. And the Roswell debris NEVER has been seen since by any member of the media during the next 51 years! The five month study by RPIT has been done in a completely "Sunshine" climate with frequent updates being made to the UFO community and research results being posted independently on their web pages by each RPIT analyst. All of these RPIT member web sites are linked to the link page of James Bond Johnson. None of the RPIT analysts have sought any financial profit from their findings and also they have borne their own expenses to date in advancing this project.

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIONS TAKEN: After the call from Filer, Johnson first examined the Marcel photo he had obtained from the University of Texas at Arlington Library, depository of four of the original Ramey office photo negatives. He noticed what seemed to be never before noticed anomalous objects and symbols in the debris. He then contacted two members of the MUFON Orange County to show them his findings and then placed on the Internet an invitation for others to assist in "revisiting" the Ramey office photos. Selected as charter members of RPIT (Roswell Photo Interpretation Team) were three volunteers from the United States and two from the UK. The Team has since been augmented by other volunteers from Australia to the former USSR. The only things the Team shares in common is an interest in trying to solve the Riddle of Roswell; they all possess a computer and the required software for photo analysis. The team members at the beginning of the project were mostly skeptics regarding any ET connection to the Roswell Event. RPIT members independently obtained enlargements of the Ramey office photos directly from UTA and began their investigations under coordination by Ronald Regher, Los Angeles area aerospace satellite engineer and MUFON Orange County associate director. Initial Team findings concluded that none of the several Air Force explanations as to the details of the Roswell Event could have been accurate. The Air Force had claimed recently that the Roswell "UFO" was "likely" an experimental Mogul balloon train. RPIT has determined that: I. There was NO Mogul launch that reasonably could have produced the kinds of debris seen in the Ramey office photos. II. The Ramey office photos contain NONE of the items that would have been found in the wreckage of a Mogul balloon train: sheets of plain aluminum foil with balsa wood stick frames and all held together by several hundred feet of string; this all was then lifted by inflated helium filled neoprene balloons. Neither the instructions in English included

with each Mogul balloon train nor any other English writings -- or any other known language writings -- are to be found in the Ramey office photos. III. The RPIT initial discoveries also included: •(A) foil like material that is covered by organized symbols or glyphs such as would be utilized in "writings." The symbols are described as similar to ancient Egyptian glyphs but have not yet been deciphered. Some symbols are found repetitively in various parts of the photos, which would virtually eliminate the "chance" factor; •(B) beams which have very prominent organized symbols or glyphs embossed in bas relief along several beams in the wreckage; •(C) The beams appear to be hollow and fabricated from some type of possibly ceramic material -- but NOT balsa wood as used in a Mogul train! -- which has been formed and drilled in several places; and, •(D) Numerous other anomalous objects that would NOT be found in a Mogul train or any other weather balloon or Rawin device. Please forward suggestions to: Ronald Regehr, Coordinator, Marilyn Ruben, Analyst MJ [Ruben@aol.com](mailto:Ruben@aol.com), Neil Morris, [Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk), Ben Field, [Ben@abcfield.force9.co.uk](mailto:Ben@abcfield.force9.co.uk). Thanks to James Bond Johnson, RPIT's Project Director [JBONJO@aol.com](mailto:JBONJO@aol.com)

CONFERENCE: July 2-4, 30th Annual MUFON 1999 International UFO Symposium at Hyatt Regency Crystal City Hotel in Arlington Virginia. E-mail [mufonhq@aol.com](mailto:mufonhq@aol.com)

#### TAPE OF EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE UFO ENCOUNTER

Lunar Astronaut Dr. Edgar Mitchell was at Edwards the night the UFO chase occurred. The 6th person to walk on the moon said, "The night it happened I investigated it myself and this was a real event." Sam Sherman's audio documentary tape called THE EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE ENCOUNTER on the night of October 7, 1965, uses the actual voice recordings provided by the Air Force. During this event 12 high tech luminous UFOs invade secure air space and came down low over the runways at Edwards AFB. Tower operator Sgt. Chuck Sorrels spotted them and notified the Air Defense Command. Sgt. Sorrels is heard on the original tapes and in a new segment where he verifies the event as it is heard on the archival recordings. The UFOs are described and a decision is made to launch F-106 fighter interceptors. You are there in an important part of UFO history. Hear it for yourself, its the best UFO tape ever made and its record of a real event. The cost of the tape is \$14.95 each plus \$2.00 for shipping -- total \$16.95 -- you can send either a personal check or money order to: Independent International Films, Box 565, Dept. GF, Old Bridge, New Jersey 08857.

MUFON JOURNAL For more detailed investigative reports subscribe by writing to 103 Oldtowne Road, Sequin, TX 78155-4099 or E-mail [Mufon@aol.com](mailto:Mufon@aol.com). Filer's Files Copyright 1998 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post items from the Files on their Websites provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue that the item appeared. Send your letters to me at [Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com). If you wish to keep your name confidential please so state.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Cashman & IUR

From: Bill Weber <[koran@cchat.com](mailto:koran@cchat.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 10:02:05 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:11:11 -0400  
Subject: Cashman & IUR

Hi, all,

I just received the new edition of IUR and for the life of me can't understand why I hadn't subscribed earlier. For those desiring the best attempt at a scholarly publication (and one done without a leading University research budget) IUR fits the bill. This is legitimate, ground-breaking, first-class stuff.

Anyone who publicly laments the lack of thoughtful, credible UFO research isn't reading IUR. (It was certainly well worth my 25 bucks.)

And while I'm raving about the publication, I'd also like to rave about Mark Cashman.

Over, around and through the hysterics, name calling and character assassination by those claiming to be devoted to UFO research, Cashman has been quietly, and sometimes not so quietly, churning out the best stuff on the planet.

His recent, "Behavioral classification system for UFO occupants" is a thoughtful and sincere effort that lays some important groundwork for further study. I congratulate Mark Cashman and those involved in the publication of IUR.

Sincerely,

Bill Weber

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?

From: Nick Balaskas <[nikolaos@YorkU.CA](mailto:nikolaos@YorkU.CA)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 11:06:45 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:16:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?

Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 02:35:47  
To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
Subject: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?

>Hi All,

>Does anyone have any more information on the following sighting?

<snip>

Hi Roy,

Below is a reproduction of an article I clipped and saved from a November 27, 1989 Canadian newspaper (The Ottawa Citizen?). This article includes the name of one of the Hungarian meteorologists which should make it easier to get more information.

Papa is located between Vienna and Budapest, south of Gyor and north of Lake Balaton (a popular place for vacationing Hungarians which I visited in the early in 1980s while working overseas as an astronomy/meteorology observer/technician).

Nick Balaskas

-----

Hungarians track orange UFOs

BUDAPEST (Reuter) - Only weeks after reports of little green spacemen in Hungary, Meteorologists said they have sighted four large, bright-orange unidentified flying objects.

Meteorologist Gyula Bazso said Sunday the objects were spherical and 50 to 100 metres wide. He said one flew at a speed of 4,200 kilometres and hour.

Speaking from a meteorological station in Papa, western Hungary, Barso said he and colleagues elsewhere in Hungary spotted strange lights close to the Great Bear constellation late Friday night.

Bazso said he contacted the local military airbase which sent up an experienced pilot who located four objects at an altitude of 6,400 metres. All the UFOs, which he said were bright-orange, disappeared suddenly.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

Re: 24 November 1989, Papa, Hungary?

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell

From: Bob Young <[YoungBob2@aol.com](mailto:YoungBob2@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:48:42 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:18:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell

>From: Tom Carey <[TCarey1947@aol.com](mailto:TCarey1947@aol.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 10:33:16 EDT  
>Fwd Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 15:50:24 -0400  
>Subject: Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell

<snip>

>As matters now stand regarding 'The Glenn Dennis Story', based  
>upon the investigations of many people over many years, his  
>story must be rejected on the basis of a known lie [i.e., he  
>knowingly supplied investigators with a false name for "the  
>nurse"].

I've always wondered about that. Did Naomi Selff really mean  
Name, Myself, or perhaps No Name, Myself?

Hmm.

Clear skies,

Bob Young

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 14:47:43 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:36:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:35:26 -0400  
>Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:32:49 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:52:03 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Try whipping your cowling tool out of your pocket (while in  
>>flight) and making two comparisons with two distant objects in  
>>two different directions while manually rolling down your left  
>>window and turning your "trimmed" plane south, and then tell me  
>>if you can do all the above in a 1947 airplane within two  
>>minutes' time or less. I don't think so.

>There are a number of unwarranted assumptions in this.

>1) That the cowling tool was difficult to access. But it is not  
>a pipe wrench. It is more a thing the size of a pen and was  
>probably carried in his shirt pocket. Thus it is easy to access  
>within a fraction of a second. The comparison, likewise, would  
>probably take under two seconds between the objects and the DC4.  
>Try it at home.

Well, we're a long way from Mogul parchment parachutes.

I just want to add one further point to Mark's excellent reply. Arnold reported the DC4 was visible to his north, enroute to Seattle. He spotted it at the beginning of his sighting while he was looking around for aircraft in his vicinity that might explain the flashes of light.

Arnold was headed east at the time. The unknown objects were easterly or northeasterly. So Arnold would have seen the DC4 to his left out the pilot's side window and the unknowns either through his side window or left windshield.

Therefore, Arnold obviously would have made any size comparison with his cowling tool BEFORE he turned right and headed south. Once he began his turn he would lose sight of the DC4 to his left. After his turn, it would be in back of him.

From other parts of Arnold's report, it seems he observed these objects for a good minute or more before turning. It certainly was not a case where Arnold was trying to do everything at once while turning the plane.

Furthermore, since the DC4 and objects were initially both leftish of Arnold, it wouldn't take much shifting of the tool and Arnold's head to sight one and then the other to make a comparison. It could have been done relatively quickly. How accurately is another matter.

Such points would be blatantly obvious if the skeptics here would learn how to read and apply a little simple logic. What I see instead is a lot of intellectual sloth, stupidity, and

dishonesty, and/or typical kneejerk naysaying just for the hell of it.

More skeptical hay could be gathered by \_intelligently\_ questioning the accuracy of Arnold's size comparison or his estimate of DC4 distance. I can see Arnold conceivably being off by a factor of 2 to 1 one way or the other in estimating relative angular size. It would have been a difficult detection task. Arnold would have been close to the limits of visual acuity and would have had to deal with other factors like engine vibration and rapid object motion. So it was a rough comparison, sort of like holding out a finger at arms length to try to gauge the angular size of something in the distance. That at least allows you to bracket the size with reasonable estimates of possible error.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

From: **Greg Sandow** <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 15:22:35 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:45:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 21:16:10 PDT>

>Listfolk:

>Recently we have read charges on this list that Budd Hopkins  
>hypnotizes children while pursuing research into UFO-abduction  
>reports. I have had deep doubts about this very serious  
>allegation, which runs contrary to everything I know and have  
>observed about Budd's ethics, judgment, and sensitivity to  
>others.

>As some of you are aware, Budd does not have e-mail. I have,  
>however, just heard from my friend David M. Jacobs, who does.  
>Even more astonished than I to read these fantastic claims, he  
>phoned Budd to ask about them. Jacobs informs me -- not  
>surprisingly, to those of us who know Budd -- that Hopkins has  
>\_never\_ conducted hypnosis with children. Nor, for that matter,  
>has Jacobs.

>In other words, we've been at the receiving end of the Big Lie.  
>Those who have passed it on, innocently if recklessly, owe Budd  
>Hopkins an apology. Those who knew or suspected it was a lie but  
>circulated it anyway are beyond redemption. The former are  
>urged, in the name of common decency, to apologize publicly.  
>This list would be a good place to do it.

>Jerry Clark

Thank you for this, Jerry. I was going to post much the same  
thing, though not with the strength you brought to the matter.

Of course people who disagree with Budd's conclusions are free to  
criticize his work. So are people who agree with him.

But much of what has been posted here is simply irresponsible --  
as irresponsible, in fact, as Budd himself has been alleged to  
be. Apart from this nonsense about Budd hypnotizing children, I  
have yet to see a critique of Budd's use of hypnosis that (1)  
mentions Budd's reasons for believing some of the information he  
gets is accurate, along with techniques he uses to verify its  
accuracy, and (2) takes into account the full discussion among  
psychologists about hypnosis, nicely summarized in Stewart  
Appelle's paper on the abduction evidence, in the 1996 issue of  
JUFOS. (I quoted a large chunk of it here once; surely it's in  
the UpDates archives.)

I've stayed out of the discussion up to now, due to other  
commitments, but I had to add my voice to Jerry's.

Greg Sandow

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## NASA Demonstrates A More Open Forum

From: **Mitch Battros** <[earthcncg@earthlink.net](mailto:earthcncg@earthlink.net)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 08:33:15 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:52:22 -0400  
Subject: NASA Demonstrates A More Open Forum

NASA Demonstrates A More Open Forum...06/18/99  
by Mitch Battros (ECTV)

I am very pleased with what appears to be NASA's willingness to discuss more openly with myself and others, real life issues that affect us all. This is truly the better way. It is much more effective to allow an open forum where NASA can layout there assessments as well as those in the paranormal who make predictions. I believe this will help minimize the sometimes outlandish predictions made on the internet. At the same time, this forum lets NASA put on the record for all of us to see, what their data shows. When this is done, the track record will speak for itself.

A perfect example of the this new forum is "Comet Lee". Scientists with the "Millennium Group" are worried that Comet Lee at the very least, may cause solar explosions (CMEs) in our solar system, earthquakes, and hurricane - like weather on Earth. At the worst, well, Shoemaker- Levy's comet fragments crashing into Jupiter could be a pictorial warning for Earth if Comet Lee is captured in Earth-moon orbit.

Charles S. Morris, JPL Astronomer, wrote to me after I had posted my article on this matter. He has outlined his assessment as follows.

\* Comet Lee's orbit is not erratic. It is well-known. The comet will not hit the Earth or come any place close to it. The closest it will come to the Earth is about 77 million miles (the Sun is 93 million miles from Earth) at the end of September 1999. An orbital diagram is posted below...see for yourself.

\* Comet Lee (or any comet) will not cause coronal mass ejections. And Comet Lee's orbit is not affected by them.

\* The comet is not expected to become bright. It is not abnormally bright nor is it brightening at an unusual rate. In fact, it is not expected to become a naked-eye object. It is currently near its peak brightness.

Now this is the type of discovery protocol that has been missing. On NASA's part, they had become untrusting in the eyes of the public. They had also been to dismissive of those in the esoteric sciences, which led to even more suspicion of NASA being untruthful. On the other hand, those in the esoteric sciences had let too many of their colleagues get away with ridiculous predictions and frivolous analysis, perhaps leaving NASA to shake it's head with bewilderment.

Mr. Charles Morris of JPL and Mr. Craig DeForest of SOHO, I thank you for coming forward and responding to my articles in the way you have. I am hopeful we can continue this new way of correspondence. I believe it will be when both sides put forth their data in a respectable manner, that the truth will unfold.

As an old professor of mine once told me. "It is all in the track record".

Mitch Battros  
Producer - Earth Changes TV  
<http://www.earthchangesTV.com>

NASA Discloses Space Station Botch...06/18/99

CAPE CANAVERAL, Fla. (AP) - Flight controllers botched an attempt to move the new international space station out of the way of a speeding piece of space junk, but the rocket debris ended up passing at a safe distance. The incident was disclosed by NASA Thursday. NASA said the sequence of computer commands sent up by flight controllers to fire the station's engines failed because of human error. Initially, the U.S. military organization that tracks objects in space predicted the rocket chunk would pass within two-thirds of a mile of the space station Sunday. It ended up coming no closer than four miles. If the rocket debris had collided with the space station, it could have destroyed the empty outpost, which has been in orbit for seven months.

Yes NASA, we all just human when you get down to it. Now I want to know how you will handle asteroids and meteor showers?  
Just asking :-}

Best Wishes, MB

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 20:56:31 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:55:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 21:16:10 PDT

>Listfolk:

>Recently we have read charges on this list that Budd Hopkins  
>hypnotizes children while pursuing research into UFO-abduction  
>reports. I have had deep doubts about this very serious  
>allegation, which runs contrary to everything I know and have  
>observed about Budd's ethics, judgment, and sensitivity to  
>others.

>As some of you are aware, Budd does not have e-mail. I have,  
>however, just heard from my friend David M. Jacobs, who does.  
>Even more astonished than I to read these fantastic claims, he  
>phoned Budd to ask about them. Jacobs informs me -- not  
>surprisingly, to those of us who know Budd -- that Hopkins has  
>\_never\_ conducted hypnosis with children. Nor, for that matter,  
>has Jacobs.

>In other words, we've been at the receiving end of the Big Lie.  
>Those who have passed it on, innocently if recklessly, owe Budd  
>Hopkins an apology. Those who knew or suspected it was a lie but  
>circulated it anyway are beyond redemption. The former are  
>urged, in the name of common decency, to apologize publicly.  
>This list would be a good place to do it.

>Jerry Clark

Hi,

I don't know where the Budd does hypnosis on children story began. But like Peter Brookesmith I was at the 1993 Sheffield where Budd lectured and I got the same impression he says that he did from Budd's presentation there. Indeed, I was actually interviewed about this very point by a BBC radio programme that was at the conference and interviewed many of the speakers and audience. They clearly picked up on the same misunderstanding so it must have been widespread.

I recall at MIT how Budd was showing the way he worked with children - using identikit pictures of clowns, aliens, etc mixed together. So I knew he worked with young children. Perhaps the misunderstanding came from that given that he uses hypnosis as part of his normal methodology. But it was also certainly stimulated on whatever he said in his Sheffield lecture. Perhaps the organisers (some are on this list) have a transcript of the talk and we can figure out why this impression was given.

In any case, as I have said repeatedly, I have no personal doubts at all about Budd's sincerity and compassion for his witnesses. I have seen it at work and utterly respect him for it. My concerns are over hypnosis, regardless of the age of the witness. But I unreservedly apologise to Budd as suggested since I was certainly one of those under the impression Budd did use regression with children and I am delighted to know this is not the case.

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 21:27:31 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:05:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 19:58:05 PDT

>>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:37:44 +0100

>Jenny,

>>But there is a broader issue - if hypnosis has a long term  
>>detrimental effect on ufology. I am absolutely certain the  
>>latter is the case. Why? Not some arbitrary guesstimate thats  
>>for sure. I base my conclusion on three things.

>>3: Because I have personally been regressed on several  
>>occasions and therefore seen it unfold first hand. I know how  
>>tempting it is to see images and presume their reality status.  
>>My UFO encounter consisted of 50% stuff I could check and 50%  
>>stuff I never could. The stuff I could check was as much fantasy  
>>as actual memory. I wrongky reported basic facts in the order of  
>>the day of the week, etc. With such a track record it would  
>>obviously be foolish to base opinions on ufology on the  
>>uncheckable data that emerges via hypnosis because this test  
>>proves to me that a good portion of it is certain to be fantasy  
>>and possibly all of it is.

>Isn't yours what might be called, uh, anecdotal testimony? And  
>didn't your experience confirm pretty much what you thought  
>anyway? I don't say this disrespectfully -- as you know, I have  
>immense respect for you -- but I'm simply pointing out that the  
>argument you make here is effectively meaningless.

>>I know the counter argument. Ufologists do not rely on hypnosis  
>>testimony as the judge of truth. If a case matches another case  
>>then this proves hypnosis has contributed to the quest for  
>>knowledge. Sadly not.

>I think you've overstated the argument, no doubt for rhetorical  
>effect. I would urge you to read, or reread, Eddie Bullard's  
>important paper on the apparent irrelevance of hypnosis to the  
>content of abduction narratives. I don't know anybody we'd  
>respect who'd be so incautious as to say this "\_proves\_ hypnosis  
>has contributed to the quest for knowledge," but it does suggest  
>that things are not simple and that the usual anti-hypnosis  
>arguments are not entirely compelling and appear (so far anyway)  
>empirically undemonstrated. Which is not to say, of course, that  
>hypnosis should be used carelessly or thoughtlessly. We all  
>prefer cases without it. It doesn't follow -- as the Hill case  
>tells us -- that cases with it are ipso facto without merit.

>>But, back to hypnosis. The problems with it clearly tell you  
>>that hypnosis is not the way to access this fundamental reality  
>>- just to read peoples dreams and fantasies. These may well be  
>>based on a fundamental reality

>Statements like these betray an unhelpful bias. I know at least

>three abductees on this list -- eminently sane, thoughtful,  
>anything but crazy or suggestable -- who, I am sure, would  
>resent your suggestion that their experiences are mere "dreams  
>and fantasies." (How can they be, by the way, "dreams and  
>fantasies" and yet "a fundamental reality?") I think it would  
>behoove us, when we discuss matters about which much remains  
>unclear, to use neutral words like "narratives" to characterize  
>abduction accounts, unless we have clear and specific reason to  
>identify them as "dreams and fantasies" (or, for that matter,  
>interactions with aliens).

>>As you know we had a proper debate in UK Ufology - such as has  
>>never occurred in the US -

>You're wrong. The use of hypnosis in UFO investigations has been  
>a subject of considerable debate here for many years, and it has  
>produced a considerable paper trail. It seems to me what you're  
>saying is that unless such a debate leads to a conclusion you  
>agree with, it hasn't happened. In fact, at least from our  
>perspective, the data bearing on the answer are sufficiently  
>ambiguous to persuade many of us that the discussion should  
>continue before possibly premature conclusions are reached. We  
>may be right or wrong to feel that way, but ours is a perfectly  
>respectable position. A sweeping statement such as the one you  
>make here is not only false but unfair.

>

>>I only wish that more if you understood why we chose this  
>>option. Because Dennis is absolutely right. The day when a  
>>genuine researcher gets into serious legal difficulties as a  
>>result of hypnotic regression is a racing certainty. It may not  
>>be Budd. It could be anyone. But it will happen and, I'm afraid,  
>>UFOlogy will be rightly hauled over the coals by the media for  
>>allowing it to get that far.

>And ufology hasn't been hauled over the coals repeatedly  
>already? It's naive to think that if ufologists behave  
>perfectly, journalists (not to mention scientists) will  
>automatically treat them with respect. Fifty years of history  
>tells us that ufologists of all stripes, good, bad, and  
>indifferent, get ridiculed pretty much indiscriminately. There  
>are all kinds of good reasons for ufologists to conduct  
>themselves with sanity and discipline. The expectation that  
>when we do, the press and scientists will pat us on our  
>collective head is not one of them.

>Jerry Clark

Hi,

Thanks for all this. Firstly, let me clarify a few things. I do  
not for one moment suggest that the abductees on this list have  
been experiencing only dreams and fantasies. I know it is more  
than that.

What I did say, or at least did mean, was that hypnosis opens up  
ther mind to dreams and fantasies and these have provably  
intruded into the context of several abductions I have  
witnessed. In the end the bits that were real and the bits that  
were dreams were all mixed together and virtually inseparable. I  
dnt see how that helps an already confusing issue like  
abductions.

I have read Eddie Bullard on the lack of major differences  
between hypnosis-induced and non-induced testimony. Indeed it was  
part of my point. Because of that fact hypnotic regression is  
not actually necessary. If something adds confusion and is not  
necessary to our work and at least according to some doctors is  
potentially hazardous then that all adds up to me to pretty good  
reasons to oppose it.

Jerry, I think you do my an injustice to suppose that I am not  
perceiving a debate on hyonotic regression because the US did  
not produce the same outcome. I am perfectly happy to live with  
different points of view. But I have not seen an open debate and  
vote takem amongst the UFO investigation team of, say, MUFON. If  
I've missed it, fair enough. But I dont recall discussion in  
MUFON Journal or IUN on such a vote. Thats the difference in the  
UK - the investigation team (not me) called for the debate and  
voted (about 95% in favour as I recall) and have renewed that  
decision recently long after I quit as head of the investigation  
team. So it is a widespread feeling here.

Actually I am not opposed to hypnosis under properly controlled conditions and with full witness approval. By control the code of practice here absolutely demands a medically qualified person doing the job - and I am not sure that always applies in the US. But I have, for instance, sat in on some of the sessions that Peter Hough and Dr Moyshe Kalman did for their recent book on abductions. Peter and I have also done regression work (again with Dr Kalman) regressing NDE witnesses in a non UFO study. So I am not a killjoy.

You are probably right about the bias of the work in which I was regressed. But the UFO test was just one of a series (others involved regression to a past life, experiments on this with other witnesses that I then investigated to check accuracy of hard facts that were checkable). The evidence of ufologist Mike Wootten who did a similar test via a different psychologist is closely akin to mine and Mike is married to one of the UK's best alien contact witnesses so I doubt he was predisposed against.

I am absolutely in agreement that this is a complex issue and has no simple answers. Quick replies on the net often create the impression that we see things simplistically and I don't. Read my book 'Star Children' if anyone out there doubts that I am fully aware that something mighty odd is going on and that alien contact is probably a part of it. I am not concerned about hypnosis as a defence mechanism to rid the world of aliens. I know it wouldn't.

It is good that we are seriously debating this. It is equally good that different approaches occur in different UFO communities. Provided, of course, that we learn from the experience of one another. And, yes, Jerry I do appreciate that cuts both ways. This is why the ban on hypnosis was not open ended and I insisted on a five yearl review. It is not inconceivable hypnosis will be bawk on the agenda here one day.

As for Ufology being hauled over the coals, my point is not general criticism or ill-informed bad mouthing or failure to see the real evidence. Hypnosis is different. It potentially can have long term detrimental effects on a person and I know at least one UK witness who came to BUFORA, requested hypnosis, was turned down because of the ban and went elsewhere to have hypnosis that left him very distressed and uncertain as to whether he had brainwashed.

In another case a witness asked for hypnosis, was again turned down and came back a year later saying 'thank you' for not regressing me as events since have revealed the medical cause of my experiences and i would not have found them if I had worked with ufologists to seek an abduction memory.

More anecdotes, yes I know. But they are enough to make me worry. For I can see the day when some person, perhaps without any reasonable justification, will blame later trauma on the regression and abduction recall brought to the surface which they now feel to be untrue. As such they might convince people they have a case against the UFO community. Hypothetical - yes, it is. But improbable? I really dont think it is. ufology needs to think ahead to what will happen when that day comes.

To me it comes down to one thing - what is the best thing to do for a witness. Is it helping them to 'remember' the alien trauma? Even some who honestly want that now may change their mind afterwards. And can we really say that we act for the witnesses as much as we act for our own selfish desires to find out the truth - something hypnosis seems to make it so much easier to do?

The UK Code of Practice makes it illegal for us to put our interests ahead of what we honestly consider the interests of the witness. This is always a personal choice but it is a choice that needs to be made and not merely accepted as the way we do things.

Best wishes,

Jenny

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Stan Friedman <[fsphys@brunnet.net](mailto:fsphys@brunnet.net)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 18:10:02 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:13:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 21:22:28 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>>From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
>>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 19:02:23 -0400  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

<snip>

>>I've only met and spoken to Mr Hopkins once.

>>I have my problems with some of his work, but I think it is best  
>>to frame such objections dispassionately and with careful  
>>attention to what is attainable in this field.

>Too often we resort to name calling and ignore dispassionate  
>discourse.

>>I am currently at work on a critique of the problems I see in  
>>abduction research, and I will do my best to address those  
>>problems without reference to personalities. That's how science  
>>should be done.

>I have just had my critique of the abduction research published  
>by TOR (St. Martins), written with Russ Estes and Bill Cone.

>KRandle, Ph.D.\*

>Yes, I have now received my degree in psychology.

<snip>

Sincere congratulations to Kevin..

A difficult and significant achievement while writing and  
researching.

Any place to buy an autographed copy of the book?

Stan Friedman

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Blather: On The Ghost Bus

From: **Daev Walsh - Blather** <[daev@blather.net](mailto:daev@blather.net)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 18:36:07 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:20:07 -0400  
Subject: Blather: On The Ghost Bus

---

B L A T H E R

p a r a n o r m a l   p r o v o c a t e u r i s m

By Dave (daev) Walsh [daev@blather.net](mailto:daev@blather.net)  
Web: <http://www.blather.net>

---

June 18th 01999, Dublin, Ireland   Vol 3. No. 2

---

Lily O'Briens is a manufacturer of premium handmade chocolates located in the heart of County Kildare in the Emerald Green Island of Ireland. Surf along to their website and feast your eyes - and order via our secure server!

<http://www.lilyobriens.ie/>

---

Contents This Issue:

On the Ghost Bus: Blather takes a Bus to Hell

Owlman Plea: Jon Downes seeks a philanthropist

Bleedin' Errata!: Careless, us?

Magonia: Latest new from the Magonia website

Octocon X: The Tenth National Irish Science Fiction Convention,  
featuring Blather's daev.

---

ON THE GHOST BUS

At 19:30 hours on the 25th of May, this Blatherskite ended a headlong bicycle sprint across Dublin's humid inner city, arriving at O'Connell St. with barely enough time to leap aboard the Dublin Ghost Bus and wave his credentials, before the spectral vehicle lurched away into the evening.

Operated by Dublin Bus, the city's public transport company, the double-decker Ghost Bus cuts a curious jib as it trundles about the backstreets in its livery of blues, purples and black, with darkened or curtained windows.

Inside the bus, the driver and assistant are dressed in normal Dublin Bus uniforms, but the decor is dark and decorated with prints of the Irish Hell-Fire Club and Bram Stoker. Upstairs - where the punters sit - is adorned with red velvet curtains and paintwork that seems to unconsciously suggest that 'Molly' - as the bus is known - is more flesh and blood than we would expect.

As we edge slowly through the evening traffic towards the River Liffey, we are joined by James, our guide for the evening, dressed in an immaculate high-collared white shirt, cravat and waistcoat. James introduces the rest of the crew: the driver, 'Francis "Blood-on-the-tyres" Schumacher', 'Blind Igor, the Phibsboro Psychopath', and of course, Molly herself.

As we cross O'Connell Bridge, we pull back the curtains - it seems far too bright and sunny to be on a ghost tour - to learn about the strange apparition that appeared by a floating restaurant - the MV Aran, which used to be moored by the Customs House back in the 1980s.

[Live view of O'Connell Bridge:  
<http://www.ireland.com/dublin/liveview/index.htm>]

[See also:  
<http://www.archeire.com/archdublin/bridges/oconnell.html>]

As we wheel up D'Olier St., passed the offices of the Irish Times, James reels off a list of famous writers who had studied in the approaching Trinity College - including, of course, Bram Stoker, author 'Dracula'. We learn of the year of Stoker's birth - 1847, or 'Black 47' - the worst year of the Irish Famine, his sickly childhood and Ballybock Cemetery, his habitual play place.

[Trinity College Dublin:  
<http://www.archeire.com/archdublin/trinity/trinmain.htm>]

By now we're were on Nassau St. and turning up Kildare St., having patrolled a good half of Trinity's perimeter, and stopping off at the College of Physicians. Here we glimpse the beginning of a major topic of tonight's proceedings: Body Snatching. It was at this College that a Dr. Samuel Clossey operated his school of anatomy, apparently between 1786 and 1803. A 'tall, mean, overbearing' individual, he seems to have eschewed the frivolities of religion and emotion, to (paradoxically) revel in the delights of shocking his students - slicing up bodies to show that we are little more than meat. Clossey himself met a rather unsavoury end, thanks to his miserliness and bloodthirstiness. We won't give away the story here...

[Oddly, my copy of Dr. John Fleetwood's 'The Irish Body Snatchers

(1988) makes no mention of Dr. Clossey...]

Up Kildare St. a little further, and we pass by Leinster House - where the Dáil (Irish Parliament) can be found, and the National Museum. On the other side of the street from these public buildings is a row of fairly ordinary looking Georgian houses - one of which was the residence of Bram Stoker. Next we pass the Shelbourne Hotel, where, in 1910, in room 256, 'psychic' Sybil Leek allegedly contacted the ghost of one 'Mary Masters' in August 1965. Mary claimed to have popped her cogs in 1791 due to cholera. Apparently Leek's mother's maiden name was also Masters, and a row of Georgian houses was demolished to build the hotel, back in 1824.

Hans Holzer, in his book 'The Lively Ghosts of Ireland' mentions this case - Sybil Leek was a friend of his. We're sure James said the room was 256, however Holzer says 526, and well, as he was 'there' at the time, it's hard to argue with that.

[Leinster House:  
<http://www.archeire.com/archdublin/18thc/leinster.htm>]

[Shelbourne Hotel:  
<http://www.shelbourne.ie/>]

Then it's down Merrion Row, swinging a right onto Ely Place, where many of Dublin's rich lived - Oliver St. John Gogarty, Bram Stoker's brother Thornley, George Moore and John 'Black Jack' Fitzgibbon, the Earl of Clare (1746-1802), who lived in No. 6. He is infamously reported to have hung 13 people in one day (for the sheer hell of it), stating that he would make the Irish as 'tame as castrated cats'. Oddly, he himself was castrated in later years during an altercation in a Turkish brothel. He survived this setback, and died, much later on. Apparently multitudes of commoners carrying sacks joined his funeral cortege - curious, for such an unpopular man. At his

graveside the contents of the sacks were thrown onto his coffin - dozens of dead cats, in varying stages of decay.

The bus turns back onto Stephen's Green, heading up the Monk's walk, while James starts ramming a hatpin through a doll wearing a letter 'F', while Francis, the driver, starts screaming below. The 'passengers' are also given a go - some are more 'passionate' about stabbing than others, it seems. This leads into stories of how a Blacksmith's 1798 curse lead to the death of the 7ft (2.13m) tall Lieutenant Hempenstall, a.k.a. 'The Walking Gallows', who could hang a man with his silk cravat. According to Peter Somerville-Large's 'Irish Eccentrics', some wit dedicated two lines of verse to the Lieutenant's demise:

'Here lies the bones of Hempenstall,  
Judge, jury, gallows, rope and all.'

Before we know it, we're out of the bus and creeping down Long Lane, with James in his overcoat and trilby, carrying a bag of tools and swinging an umbrella. Into St. Kevin's Park with us, formerly St. Kevin's 'Cemetery'... where members of the Thomas Moore family, the poet, are buried. To the rather startled bemusement of some of our number, our guide demonstrates - using tools and gestures - the practice of body-snatching - whether it was of full bodies for sale to the medical community or merely the removal of teeth and hair from the corpses of cholera victims. We were shown how the corpse would be impaled under the chin and pulled from the grave, and a box of human teeth was passed around, to the consternation of several people...

St. Kevin's seems alive with stories - George 'Crazy Crow' Hendrick, an 18th century day-time 'porter of musical instruments' and night-time 'sack-em-up', practiced his snatching skills at St. Kevin's, some of which allegedly led to the entrapment of some of his colleagues in a mausoleum. Dr. Fleetwood book 'The Irish Body Snatchers', however, tells us that Hendrick only became a musical instrument porter in 1832, when the passing of the Anatomy Act killed the body snatching business.

The ivy-laded church ruins, in the centre of the park, apparently house the ghost of Bishop Dermot O'Hurley, executed in Penal Times. High season for bishopric apparitions is said to be 'late July'. Arthur Wellesley, better know as the Duke of Wellington, was baptised

in the tiny church.

We pile back onto the bus, and head over to St. Patrick's Cathedral, while James manages to horrify some passengers with readings from Jonathan Swift's (author of 'Gulliver's Travels', and Dean of St. Patrick's in the 18th century) infamous political satire 'A Modest Proposal - For Preventing The Children of Poor People in Ireland From Being Aburden to Their Parents or Country, and For Making Them Beneficial to The Public'. Swift himself is buried beneath the floor of the medieval building, and although our guide doesn't mention it, the Dean is said to appear in various locations around Ireland to this day...

[A Modest Proposal  
<http://art-bin.com/art/omodest.html>]

We hook into New St., where we notice that the adjacent school was established in 1432. So far, the stories have seemed well researched, and acknowledgement has been made of those which are more apocryphal. However, the most dubious tale yet is of an almost premature burial 'inside' St. Patrick's featuring a lady who apparently suffered a cataleptic fit.

She was revived when one of the funeral attendants attempted to divest her of her wedding ring - and her finger with it. She is said to have run home from the church, wondering what she was doing there, bleeding from her wound, and subsequently lived for 32 years. Unfortunately, this seems to be one of those archetypal tales which insists on showing up again and again. The first time this writer heard of it was about 15 years ago in Wexford, this time it referred to the apparent demise of the matriarch of a local estate, and her resurrection at the hands

of a terrified grave robber.

[St. Patrick's:  
<http://www.archeire.com/archdublin/17thc/stpats.htm>]

Next to St. Patrick's is Marshe's Library, assembled by Bishop Narcissus Marshe in the 17th century. The tour doesn't enter here, but if we may digress, this place is always worth a visit, as they have regular topical exhibitions of selected works - a couple of years ago they had a showing of publications relating to 'mythical' animals - but when these books were published, such creatures were thought to be real. They also have a first edition of 'Gulliver's Travels'...

The Bishop's ghost is said to haunt the library, eternally searching for the note left for him, hidden inside a book by his niece, who he had reared from childhood. She eloped with a seaman, and left Marshe heartbroken...

[Marshes's Library:  
<http://www.archeire.com/archdublin/18thc/marsh.htm>]

The bus heads up Patrick's St., under the arch at Christchurch cathedral, and pulling in at the top of Winetavern St. to hear tales of 'Hell', the jungle of sin which stretched along the side of the hill from Christchurch to St. Audeons. Apparently there exists an 18th century newspaper notice, advertising:

'To Rent: Rooms in Hell. Lawyers Preferred'.

[Christchurch Cathedral:  
<http://www.archeire.com/archdublin/17thc/christch.htm>]

On the southern end of Hell, over on Fishamble St., a new pub called 'Darky Kelly's' can be seen. Kelly was an 18th century 'madame' who kept a house known as 'The Maiden Tower' in the building in which the pub now resides. It was said to be 'notably labyrinthine' by officers of the law who once raided the place, probably because they spent so much time there before leaving...

Darky Kelly was executed, for the alleged murder of her child, the body of whom was never actually produced. Her prosecutor? One Simon Luttrell, Sheriff of Dublin, alleged Hell-Fire Club member, and reportedly the father of the child...

We roll downhill, and around the corner onto Cooke St. On our right is the rear of 'Adam and Eve's' church, which faces onto Merchant's Quay. In Penal times, when Catholic mass was outlawed, there used to be a tavern on the site called... 'Adam and Eve's'. This pub had a small church hidden inside it, where illicit worship was carried out - think of it as alcohol prohibition in reverse. Consider it... people going out under the auspices of drinking, but instead 'really' going to

mass. For Joyce fans, 'Adam and Eve's' is mentioned on the first page of 'Finnegans Wake', albeit the other way around.

'riverrun, past Eve and Adam's, from swerve of shore to bend of bay, brings us by a commodius vicus of recirculation back to Howth Castle and Environs.'

The bus stops off again by the north-facing gate of the city walls, dating back to 1240AD. James unlocks the gate, and we crowd in, and up the 'Forty Steps'. Here we hear tales of nuns making reports to the Gardai in 1955, following their encounters with leper ghosts, and mysterious green ladies, thought to be Darky Kelly bringing her unwanted offspring to St. Audeon's church. Fine frightening environs for dusktime tales...

[St. Audeon's:  
<http://www.archeire.com/archdublin/17thc/staudeon.htm>]

[City Walls:  
<http://www.archeire.com/archdublin/17thc/citywall.htm>]

The remainder of the tour brings us around Smithfield, on the north side of the Liffey, where we hear tales of 'Billy the Bowl' - the legless murderer of Stoneybatter, 'Prince Hackball'

(Patrick Corrigan), the infamous pickpocket, and the mysterious 'Scaldbrother', mentioned in a previous Blather issue. Some tales of Irish wakes (i.e. funerary traditions), and we amble back to O'Connell St., where Molly prepares to collect another horde of unwitting victims.

Highly recommended, for tourists and residents alike...

Scaldbrother:

<http://www.blather.net/archives2/issue2no24.html>

Departs from:

Dublin Bus

59 Upper O'Connell St.

Dublin 1

+353 1 8734222

<http://www.dublinbus.ie/>

The Dublin Ghost Bus Tour site:

<http://www.dublinbus.ie/html/travinfo/tours/ghost.html>

Price: £12.00

Duration: 2 1/4 Hours

Departure Time:

Tuesday-Friday: 7:30pm

Saturday: 7:30pm and 9:30pm

Sunday: 7:30pm

No Monday Tour

At the moment, the Ghost Bus seems to be operating between March and late Autumn. It may a good idea to phone Dublin Bus to confirm that the tour is actually on.

Dave (daev) Walsh

June 18th 01999

This issue is archived at

<http://www.blather.net/archives3/issue3no2.html>

---

OWLMAN PLEA! - From our man in Exeter, Mr. Jonathan Downes.

"Three years ago I published a book called 'The Owlman and Others' which told the story of how my ex-wife and I travelled across the semi-mythical land of Cornwall in search of high adventure, free drinks, and the legendary 'Owlman of Mawnan' - a grotesque feathered bird-man which haunts the area immediately surrounding Mawnan Old Church in southern Cornwall. Last year, noted fortean Film Director Ben Cusden and I started work on a feature film loosely based around the book. Very loosely.

Setting my fevered imagination to work I wrote a screenplay which owes more to cult American 'trash' director John Waters than anything else. The results of our labours can be found at

<http://www.fortunecity.com/roswell/arecibo/236/>

Now - here's the complicated bit. We only made sixteen minutes of it because we ran out of money. The reaction we have had from press and punters is stunning. Everyone loves it (even though it is completely ridiculous. We need about ten thousand quid to finish it, and anyone investing in it could be reasonably assured of a decent return on their investment as well as being part of the most influential piece of fortean bollocks to have been made for video ever!

Any fortean philanthropists out there?"

- Jon Downes, Centre for Fortean Zoology

<http://www.eclipse.co.uk/cfz/su2223@eclipse.co.uk>

---

BLEEDIN ERRATA!

In a classic show of carelessness, in the issue 'Hell-Fire Francis' we accidentally referred to the late Anton Szandor LaVey as 'Anton Salvador LaVey'. Appropriate punishment has been delivered. Thanks to Marcello Truzzi and Peter Lakbar for catching that one...

---

<http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk/newmag.htm>

What's new at Magonia

06/06/99

Visions of Bowmen and Angels

The strange case of Arthur Machen and the Angels of Mons. By Kevin McClure

Magonia Monthly Supplement #15

ETH - questions that need answering; Satanic update; Allagash under fire

---

Octocon X

The Tenth National Irish Science Fiction Convention

Guest of Honour:

Robert Rankin

Bestselling author of

The Brentford Trilogy and Apocalypse

Other Guests Include:

Eugene Byrne, Storm Constantine,

Maggie Furey, Robert Holdstock,

Graham Joyce, Tom Mathews, Ian McDonald,

Kim Newman, Geoff Ryman, Michael Scott,

Brian Stableford, Dave (Daev) Walsh and

James White

9-10 October 1999

Royal Marine Hotel

Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin, Ireland

<http://www.iol.ie/~jshields/octocon/>

---

|d|i|s|i|n|f|o|r|m|a|t|i|o|n|  
the subculture search engine

<http://www.disinfo.com/>

Everything You Know is Wrong!

---

SPONSORSHIP:

While Blather will always remain free to the subscriber, we're always willing to talk to interested parties with regard to sponsorship.

Contact: [daev@blather.net](mailto:daev@blather.net)

---

For the Blather archives, please go to:

<http://www.blather.net/archives/index.html>

---

SUBSCRIBING TO BLATHER

Send an email to:

<[list@blather.net](mailto:list@blather.net)>

with the word

subscribe

in the body of the message. An automatic acknowledgement



should be returned to you by e-mail within a few minutes.

UNSUBSCRIBING

Send an email to  
<[list@blather.net](mailto:list@blather.net)>  
with the word  
unsubscribe  
in the body of the message.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpDatesList.Com](http://UFOUpDatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## UFO Over Pakistan

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 00:22:42  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:23:16 -0400  
Subject: UFO Over Pakistan

It is widely believed among ufologists that UFOs seek out theatres of war, cf. the "foo-fighters" during WWII and the numerous sightings during the Korean War. The sightings below might be another example.

Forwarded from the newsgroup "uk.rec.ufo".

Stig

\*\*\*

From: Ralph J. P. Blaney" <[aerblney@reading.ac.uk](mailto:aerblney@reading.ac.uk)>  
Newsgroups: uk.rec.ufo  
Subject: UFO over Pakistan  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 20:37:48 +0100  
Organization: University of Reading

A fast-moving glowing spherical object was seen in various parts of Pakistan one night last week. There was concern that it could have been a missile from India. However, it was travelling too fast. The incident was reported in a Pakistani Urdu language newspaper.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

From: **Thiago Ticchetti** <[thiagolt@opengate.com.br](mailto:thiagolt@opengate.com.br)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 20:14:06 -0300  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:26:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 21:16:10 PDT

>Listfolk:

>Recently we have read charges on this list that Budd Hopkins  
>hypnotizes children while pursuing research into UFO-abduction  
>reports. I have had deep doubts about this very serious  
>allegation, which runs contrary to everything I know and have  
>observed about Budd's ethics, judgment, and sensitivity to  
>others.

>As some of you are aware, Budd does not have e-mail. I have,  
>however, just heard from my friend David M. Jacobs, who does.  
>Even more astonished than I to read these fantastic claims, he  
>phoned Budd to ask about them. Jacobs informs me -- not  
>surprisingly, to those of us who know Budd -- that Hopkins has  
>never\_ conducted hypnosis with children. Nor, for that matter,  
>has Jacobs.

>In other words, we've been at the receiving end of the Big Lie.  
>Those who have passed it on, innocently if recklessly, owe Budd  
>Hopkins an apology. Those who knew or suspected it was a lie but  
>circulated it anyway are beyond redemption. The former are  
>urged, in the name of common decency, to apologize publicly.  
>This list would be a good place to do it.

Dears friends of the list and Jerry Clark,

I don't know who can say such a lie.

We know Budd Hopkins and I met him here in Brazil in 1997,  
during the World Ufology Forum. I spoke with him and to me he  
appeared very, very serious and worker.

This big lie just show us how some people are jealous.

I can guarantee to you, Hopkins is a very good person and do a  
excellent job.

Thanks.

THIAGO LUIZ TICCHETTI  
Diretor Do Departamento de Publicação e Tradução Especializadas ( DEPTE -  
EBE-ET / Brasilia-Brasil)  
Director of the Publication Department and Specialized Translation  
ICQ - 35119615  
\*\*\*\*\* SE VOCÊ NÃO É POLÍCIA NÃO USE ARMAS \*\*\*\*\*

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Gigantic 'Heart' formation on Mars

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 01:26:23  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:28:41 -0400  
Subject: Gigantic 'Heart' formation on Mars

Source: Discovery News Brief, June 18, 1999,

<http://www.discovery.com/news/briefs/brief5.html?ct=376acff3>

Go to the site to see NASA's photo!

Stig

\*\*\*

>From Mars, With Love

\*\*

The Mars Global Surveyor has received a love letter from the Red Planet, as new images reveal a gigantic "Heart" formation stretched across the Martian surface.

New images released Thursday by NASA show a distinctly heart-shaped pit on the Martian surface. The "Heart" on Mars is the latest addition to a growing list of fanciful features spotted on the Red Planet's surface.

The most famous of all, of course, is the "Face" on Mars, a rock formation resembling a human face that was first photographed by the Viking spacecraft in the 1970s. The picture spawned ongoing speculation that extraterrestrials built the Face.

More recently, cameras from the Global Surveyor also revealed a "Happy Face" on Mars, a 134-mile-wide crater bearing a striking resemblance to the well-known happy face icon. This jolly formation was discovered during the first day of the Global Surveyor's mapping mission in March.

The Martian valentine was formed when a straight-walled trough, called a graben in geological terms, collapsed, according to a NASA press release.

Graben form along fault lines as bedrock terrain expands, says NASA. The features typically form as tectonic forces move the ground apart, or when the ground is uplifted by molten rock from deep within the planet shooting up toward the Martian surface, NASA says.

At its widest, the Martian "Heart" stretches about 1.4 miles across. Ground controllers trained the Global Surveyor's camera on the formation to examine the relationship between a lava flow and the graben and pits that cut across the flow, disrupting its path.

The graben, pit, and lava flow are located on the east flank of the Alba Patera volcano in northern Tharsis, a volcanic region of Mars, NASA says.

By Discovery News Brief

Related Stories:

\*Mission to Mars '99

\*The Face on Mars

\*Search Our Space Files

Picture: NASA

Copyright © 1999 Discovery Communications Inc.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: **Dennis Stacy** <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 18:20:33 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:30:31 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 22:22:35 -0400

<snip>

>Yes, Budd sent his samples of alleged alien writing to Stewart  
>Appelle, the editor of the Journal of UFO Studies (which, for  
>those on this list who might not know, is the only peer-reviewed  
>scientific journal in the UFO field).

>Budd sent them nearly two years ago. JUFOS, however, is in  
>serious financial trouble, and hasn't published an issue since  
>1996. Stewart had said he'd assemble a team to study the  
>material, but I don't know if he ever did. If he didn't, I'd  
>assume it was because JUFOS didn't seem likely to publish any  
>time soon.

Greg,

I'm confused. I could have sworn that you had posted to this  
thread words to the effect that you were having a hard time  
getting Budd to turn his many alien script samples over to  
anyone for analysis. Now you're saying it was done two years  
ago?

Just asking for clarification.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: **Dennis Stacy** <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 18:42:42 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:32:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 19:58:05 PDT

<snip>

>Statements like these betray an unhelpful bias. I know at least  
>three abductees on this list -- eminently sane, thoughtful,  
>anything but crazy or suggestible -- who, I am sure, would  
>resent your suggestion that their experiences are mere "dreams  
>and fantasies." (How can they be, by the way, "dreams and  
>fantasies" and yet "a fundamental reality?") I think it would  
>behoove us, when we discuss matters about which much remains  
>unclear, to use neutral words like "narratives" to characterize  
>abduction accounts, unless we have clear and specific reason to  
>identify them as "dreams and fantasies" (or, for that matter,  
>interactions with aliens).

Jerry,

I'm all with you on this one! Narrative as a descriptor sounds  
good to me.

Now can we count on Budd, Dave and John Mack to sign on to same?

Damn, there I go again, never content to leave well enough alone.

BTW, the word you want is suggestible.

Dennis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 21:15:00 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:35:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 19:58:05 PDT  
>Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:48:32 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:37:44 +0100

Previously Jenny had offered:

>>Dennis is absolutely right. The day when a  
>>genuine researcher gets into serious legal difficulties as a  
>>result of hypnotic regression is a racing certainty. It may not  
>>be Budd. It could be anyone. But it will happen and, I'm afraid,  
>>UFOlogy will be rightly hauled over the coals by the media for  
>>allowing it to get that far.

Hello all,

I've been tied up in a massive documentary film project for the last several months and haven't been able to participate in the list. However, Jenny's statement above reminds me of my first commercial film project when I was about 24 or so. I used a piece of copyrighted music without permission (naughty me) and after handing the film over to a distributor began to feel pangs of guilt. I asked a friend of mine (who was a lawyer) if I might really get sued by the music's producers.

His response? "One can only hope so," he said. "For, surely, it would be an indication of great profits for your little film. You would have made enough money for them to actually feel cheated!"

Likewise, we can only hope that Jenny's concerns about impending lawsuits against ufologists are well founded. Why? Because, for damages to be proven, the "memories" dredged up by the use of hypnosis would have to be accepted (at some point) as fact; not only by the "victim" but by the courts as well.

Despite the aftermath, it will be a welcome day when society and the courts declare any UFO experience as "real". Though I personally don't believe hypnosis is worth beans as an investigative tool, I wouldn't want to prevent Mr. Hopkins or anyone else from carrying on with their efforts. Sometimes the ends do justify the means...

Take care all,

Roger Evans

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 23:08:54 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:38:45 -0400  
Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:35:26 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>Date: Sat, 12 Jun 1999 22:52:03 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Voyager Newsletter, Mogul Parchment Parachutes

>>Try whipping your cowling tool out of your pocket (while in  
>>flight) and making two comparisons with two distant objects in  
>>two different directions while manually rolling down your left  
>>window and turning your "trimmed" plane south, and then tell me  
>>if you can do all the above in a 1947 airplane within two  
>>minutes' time or less. I don't think so.

>The key to doing a good sighting analysis is, first, to expose  
>any assumptions one is making, and to validate them against  
>reality. There is no point in attempting any analysis until that  
>step is complete. In the above, the assumptions were:>

>a) Flying an airplane is like driving a car. Turning is hard,  
>requires lots of concentration, and use of hands.

>b) Arnold had to roll down the window to open it.>>

>c) The cowling tool is large, clumsy and inaccessible.>

>>are difficult and time consuming.

>None of these seem justified in the light of the evidence.

Another tacit (unstated) assumption): that Arnold had to compress  
all these activities into a short time like a few seconds.  
Actually, he could have taken 10 seconds or more with the  
cowling tool, . turned the plane (30 seconds) and slide back the  
window (a few seconds) all within the 102 seconds of time as the  
objects went from Rainier to Adams. No big sweat!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <[ufoman@ican.net](mailto:ufoman@ican.net)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 00:55:51 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 09:59:06 -0400  
Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

>From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 00:52:12 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>>Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
>>Fwd Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 00:23:10 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Kenneth Arnold Sighting

<snip>

Sorry for butting in, but...

It seems to me that the only people re-hashing classic UFO cases are those who are absolutely skeptical about UFOs, have never seen one (or more) or who just don't want to accept that earth is being visited by (several) alien cultures from elsewhere.

To me, this re-hashing of classic cases (whether it's Kenneth Arnold, Lonnie Zamorra, or the Paul Trent photo case) seems pointless.

One day, we will all be straightened out, and I, for one, hope to be vindicated for the 14 separate sightings I have had.

The time is long overdue for earthlings to know the truth about flying saucers, UFOs, whatever you want to call them.

Cordially,

Michel M. Deschamps  
MUFON Provincial Section Director  
for Sudbury, Ontario, Canada &  
UFO Researcher/Historian

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

From: **Jean-Luc Rivera** <[JLRIV1@aol.com](mailto:JLRIV1@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 05:30:23 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 10:03:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 21:16:10 PDT

>Listfolk:

<snip>

>As some of you are aware, Budd does not have e-mail. I have,  
>however, just heard from my friend David M. Jacobs, who does.  
>Even more astonished than I to read these fantastic claims, he  
>phoned Budd to ask about them. Jacobs informs me -- not  
>surprisingly, to those of us who know Budd -- that Hopkins has  
>\_never\_ conducted hypnosis with children. Nor, for that matter,  
>has Jacobs.

Having been privileged to know Budd Hopkins for more than twenty years now, I can confirm what Jerry just wrote: Budd has never hypnotized children and has always refused to do so. All of Budd's research associates can certify it.

The 'confusion' (let us be nice) might have arisen from the fact that Budd has conducted some investigations in cases involving children, sometimes even toddlers, by interviewing the children, always at the request of and in the presence of the parents, and showing them a deck of images of different characters including a 'standard' grey to see who they identify as their 'visitors'.

These interviews never included hypnosis: anybody who knows even slightly Budd knows that he cares too much about people to do that.

>In other words, we've been at the receiving end of the Big Lie.  
>Those who have passed it on, innocently if recklessly, owe Budd  
>Hopkins an apology. Those who knew or suspected it was a lie but  
>circulated it anyway are beyond redemption. The former are  
>urged, in the name of common decency, to apologize publicly.  
>This list would be a good place to do it.

I agree heartily with Jerry.

Jean-Luc Rivera

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Cashman & IUR

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 06:24:21 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 10:10:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Cashman & IUR

>From: Bill Weber <[koran@cchat.com](mailto:koran@cchat.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Cashman & IUR  
>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 10:02:05 -0400

>I just received the new edition of IUR and for the life of me  
>can't understand why I hadn't subscribed earlier. For those  
>desiring the best attempt at a scholarly publication (and one  
>done without a leading University research budget) IUR fits the  
>bill. This is legitimate, ground-breaking, first-class stuff.

>Anyone who publicly laments the lack of thoughtful, credible UFO  
>research isn't reading IUR. (It was certainly well worth my 25  
>bucks.)

>And while I'm raving about the publication, I'd also like to  
>rave about Mark Cashman.

>Over, around and through the hysterics, name calling and  
>character assassination by those claiming to be devoted to UFO  
>research, Cashman has been quietly, and sometimes not so  
>quietly, churning out the best stuff on the planet.

>His recent, "Behavioral classification system for UFO occupants"  
>is a thoughtful and sincere effort that lays some important  
>groundwork for further study. I congratulate Mark Cashman and  
>those involved in the publication of IUR.

Dear Bill:

I certainly agree.

Of the recent issues, I liked the Winter (lost in the mail but  
got here anyhow) issue the best.

IUR belongs in the stacks of every major library, right next to  
the skeptical reviews and speculative (fringe?) sciences.

If you are lucky enough to have a serious "old-timer" or two for  
a friend, you might look through his copies from years back.

I did, and I was impressed.

- Larry Hatch

PS: As for things lost in the mail, I have a true personal  
story. [whether you want it or not. (burp)]

On vacation in Europe once, I was writing some postcards from a  
pub in a small town in Britain. I asked directions to the  
nearest mailbox.

I was told it was right in front of the such-and-such shop near  
the corner of This and That street.

Not knowing any of the above, I asked what color the mailbox  
was.

All UK mailboxes are the same color(s), just as in the USA, but nobody could remember which colors!

The common mailbox was such a familiar sight to them, that they had no conscious recall of the actual colors! A "discussion" ensued, with various pub-factions insisting on blue, red, dark green... and various combinations of same.

I finally found out myself when somebody simply led me to the box!

To save my life, I cannot remember what goddam color it was myself now!

The point of all this is that one has to watch which receptacle one puts ones mail into.

I once dropped a letter into a crack in the wall in Mexico that looked completely unpromising.

"Are you sure that's a legitimate 'Buzon del Correo?" I asked.

"Si! Si!" they all said

That letter got delivered properly regardless. - LH

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## British Columbia UFO Radio Show

From: **UFO\*BC** <[david\\_pengilly@dccnet.com](mailto:david_pengilly@dccnet.com)>  
Date: 19 Jun 1999 07:06:56 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 10:29:16 -0400  
Subject: British Columbia UFO Radio Show

One of the Directors of UFO\*BC, Gavin McLeod, will be on CKNW tonight. The show is called: "Rich Elwood, The Weekend Thing". It runs from 7:00 PM until 10:00 PM. It is broadcast throughout BC, on CKNW (AM 980) and its affiliates.

The local number is (604) 280-9898  
The toll-free number is 1-877-399-9898

Please phone the station if you have any questions for Gavin regarding UFO\*BC, UFO cases in BC, or just UFOs or paranormal in general. This is your chance to report your own unusual sighting!

Not counting any phone calls, Gavin is prepared to talk about some of UFO\*BC's best cases, such as:

Strange Lights Reported Over White Rock  
The Kimberley Diamond  
Crop Formation at Vanderhoof  
Bigfoot Tales from Kittimat Village  
Cadboroaurus Surfaces Off British Columbia  
The Prince George Photographs

Please call! If we get a good response, we will be sure to get on again!

\*\*\*\*\*

If you do not want to receive these updates, please reply with your e-mail address and I will gladly remove your name from the list. Thank you.

Dave Pengilly  
[dave@ufobc.org](mailto:dave@ufobc.org)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 10:35:32 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 10:41:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

>From: Stan Friedman <[fsphys@brunnet.net](mailto:fsphys@brunnet.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto" <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 18:10:02 -0300

>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 21:22:28 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>>Subject: Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman  
>>>From: Mark Cashman <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 19:02:23 -0400  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

<snip>

>>>I've only met and spoken to Mr Hopkins once.

>>>I have my problems with some of his work, but I think it is best  
>>>to frame such objections dispassionately and with careful  
>>>attention to what is attainable in this field.

>>Too often we resort to name calling and ignore dispassionate  
>>discourse.

>>>I am currently at work on a critique of the problems I see in  
>>>abduction research, and I will do my best to address those  
>>>problems without reference to personalities. That's how science  
>>>should be done.

>>I have just had my critique of the abduction research published  
>>by TOR (St. Martins), written with Russ Estes and Bill Cone.

>>KRandle, Ph.D.\*

>>Yes, I have now received my degree in psychology.

<snip>

>Sincere congratulations to Kevin..

>A difficult and significant achievement while writing and  
>researching.

Thank you, Stan. I appreciate your kind words. The biggest  
challenge was the statistical analysis of the raw data  
concerning the research for my dissertation.

>Any place to buy an autographed copy of the book?

Of course. I have a stack of them signed by Russ Estes and me.  
Addresses can be accessed through my website at:

[www.randlereport.com](http://www.randlereport.com)

You can also send \$25.95 plus \$5.00 for  
shipping and handling (which means the envelope and postage) to

Re: Jerry Black's Open Letter to Friedman

PO Box 264, Marion, IA 52302.

And thanks, Stan, for the opportunity to plug the book 'The Abduction Enigma'. It is now available in bookstores, as well as on-line services such as Amazon.

KRandle, Ph.D.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

## A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena 'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

### Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell

From: [KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:10:14 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 12:28:40 -0400  
Subject: Re: New Evidence Disproves Glenn Dennis' Roswell

List, All -

I'm not sure what induced Kal Korff to announce that the Glenn Dennis story was not accurate so long after most of us have decided that it was. I was, however, more surprised by the support of Dennis with the "so he lied" defense. We all agree that he lied about his nurse. What more do we need to know about him?

It would seem to me that once we have caught a witness in a lie, then we must re-evaluate all the testimony that comes from that witness. In this case it goes beyond just lying about one small and insignificant aspect of his tale, but the lies are essential to his entire story. Without the lies, Dennis would not be on the stage, and that might suggest something to us.

Certainly, we have been confronted by lies by UFO witnesses in the past. Some of those lies are harmless and meaningless. Others address the central issues. Dennis, for example, said that he had been a mortician in Roswell. In 1947 that wasn't exactly true. He was, in fact, only an embalmer. Is this... embellishment... sufficient for us to reject his story? No. In fact, it is clear that he was a mortician during his career, so the exaggeration in 1947 was, and is, of little importance.

We have been confronted by many people in the UFO field who have exaggerated their employment. Some have lied about their jobs, others have denied they held the jobs they held. Sometimes these lies can be understood in the context of the situation but even then, we begin to look at the tellers of those lies a little differently, especially when the lie is of no consequence. Why lie about something like that?

Others have lied about their educational background. Here Jesse Marcel, Sr. comes to mind. We have a discrepancy between the record and what Marcel said. Of course, if Marcel was still alive, we might be able to resolve this dilemma, but, in today's world we can't. We know that many military men have taken classes at various universities for their military occupations. Many of those classes were taught by the professors, but attendance at those courses are not listed by the universities.

There are also extension courses taught at military bases by the universities. I have, as yet, been unable to locate any records, with one minor exception, to suggest that this is the case with Jesse Marcel. Such classes are given for college credit. In my own case, when I entered the University of Iowa, I received a number of credits for university courses that I took in the Army. This might explain the discrepancy between what Marcel said and what we can find.

Of course, the real point is that Marcel was, in 1947, exactly who he said he was. He was the intelligence officer at Roswell and the story he told was corroborated by various records, newspapers, and other officers. The problem with his educational background is, at this point, a minor problem that is, essentially, irrelevant.

But, when we move into the realm of Glenn Dennis, we find, not a

single embellishment or exaggeration, but a complex web of lies that go directly to the core of his claims. He told us of a nurse who had told him what she had witnessed on the base - a partial, or preliminary, autopsy. She described the alien creatures to him, begging him not to reveal what she had said. He had been "sworn to secrecy."

Dennis, however, hesitated only briefly when asked the name. He told all of us that it was Naomi Self, or a variation of that name. Searches through all sorts of documented sources, military files, unit histories, school records, birth records and the like, failed to produce results. When Dennis was confronted with the results, he said that he had never given anyone the real name. It meant, according to Dennis, he had lied about a central feature of his tale.

Before more commentary, there is a personal note. A number of years ago, I was searching for Robert Slusher. I had spoken to a number of men named Robert Slusher who had been in the Army Air Forces in the mid-1940s. They were not the correct man.

This becomes important because, at that time, I was talking to Dennis. He asked me why, after he had violated the confidence, after he had provided me (and many others) with the name of his nurse, we had failed to find her. He was, well, not exactly irate, but certainly disappointed in our failure to find the nurse. I explained the situation to him, meaning that there were many people with the same name. Plug John Smith into a CD-ROM telephone 'book' and look at the number of hits.

The point is, Dennis, was pushing the name of the nurse. He was insistent that he had provided the correct name. When we went to him and said that his nurse didn't exist, he changed his tune. He hadn't given the right name.

The question is, why not just refuse to name her? Why invent a name for us to chase? Why reinforce that name by insisting he had provided the right name? Then, when confronted by the negative results, change the tale and retreat to the point where he refuses to name her now? Why not follow that path originally?

The answers to these questions lead to a single conclusion. There was no nurse. If there was no nurse, then the vast majority of his tale has no support and collapses. If there was no nurse, then that segment was a lie, so why should we accept any other aspect of his story?

The problem for us, as researchers, is that when we find a major problem with a tale told by a witness, we begin to rationalize it. We try to think of reasons to reject the importance of the lie so that we can continue to believe the tale.

It is the same for the researchers. When we learn that an important researcher has lied about his background, his employment, his education, he has, to my mind, destroyed his credibility. Yet, here, in the UFO field, we say, "So he lied? Everyone does it."

Well, not really. It's a simple excuse so that we can continue to believe in the man's work, or the witness' story. So, when I learned that Glenn Dennis lied about his nurse, when there was no independent corroboration for the tale he told, when there is evidence that Dennis was less than candid with other aspects of his story, then I have to reject it. The problem isn't that he lied about the nurse, but that he lied to us at all. He should have no credibility and we shouldn't dismiss the problems just by saying, "Well, he lied." We are obligated to publish that information as well. I did that in 'The Randle Report' that came out in June 1997.

So, sorry, but I reject the Glenn Dennis tale now because he lied, the nurse he described does not exist, and all attempts to rehabilitate this testimony demonstrates what is wrong with our research techniques.

Krandle, Ph.D.  
<http://www.randlereport.com>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:19:21 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 12:32:34 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 21:15:00 +0000  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 19:58:05 PDT  
>>Fwd Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 12:48:32 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:37:44 +0100

>Previously Jenny had offered:

>>>Dennis is absolutely right. The day when a  
>>>genuine researcher gets into serious legal difficulties as a  
>>>result of hypnotic regression is a racing certainty. It may not  
>>>be Budd. It could be anyone. But it will happen and, I'm afraid,  
>>>UFOlogy will be rightly hauled over the coals by the media for  
>>>allowing it to get that far.

>Hello all,

<snip>

>Likewise, we can only hope that Jenny's concerns about impending  
>lawsuits against ufologists are well founded. Why? Because, for  
>damages to be proven, the "memories" dredged up by the use of  
>hypnosis would have to be accepted (at some point) as fact; not  
>only by the "victim" but by the courts as well.

Not quite true. Richard Boylan has already been taken to court because of his "abduction research." He lost his license to practice in California because of it. It proved nothing about the reality of UFOs or abductions, but did demonstrate, at least some of the problems with hypnotic regression and researcher bias.

I haven't even mentioned all those who believe in Satanic Ritual Abuse, who told horrifying tales both with and without hypnosis, and who in turn sued the doctors for malpractice. I believe that it was just announced that one "victim" won \$2 million in a lawsuit in Illinois with more to follow.

KRandle, Ph.D.  
<http://www.randlereport.com>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 08:20:47 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 12:37:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 21:27:31 +0100

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 19:58:05 PDT

>>>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 11:37:44 +0100

>>Jenny,

>>>But there is a broader issue - if hypnosis has a long term  
>>>detrimental effect on ufology. I am absolutely certain the  
>>>latter is the case.

<snip>

>>>3: Because I have personally been regressed on several  
>>>occasions and therefore seen it unfold first hand. I know how  
>>>tempting it is to see images and presume their reality status.

<snip>

>>Isn't yours what might be called, uh, anecdotal testimony? And  
>>didn't your experience confirm pretty much what you thought  
>>anyway?

<snip>

>>>I know the counter argument. Ufologists do not rely on hypnosis  
>>>testimony as the judge of truth. If a case matches another case  
>>>then this proves hypnosis has contributed to the quest for  
>>>knowkedge. Sadly not.

<snip>

>>.. Which is not to say, of course, that  
>>hypnosis should be used carelessly or thoughtlessly. We all  
>>prefer cases without it. It doesn't follow -- as the Hill case  
>>tells us -- that cases with it are ipso facto without merit.

<snip>

>>>These may well be based on a fundamental reality

<snip>

Dear Jenny, Jerry and all.

I'm glad to hear that Budd doesn't torment little muchkins with  
hypnosis, whether they deserve it or not.

I just flashed on a non-invasive way to check for alien

intervention in the lives of children.

Simply let them draw pictures, without any adult pressure.

Not having had any children myself, here is my expert plan:

1) Do not order or encourage children to draw pictures. Instead, show a good example by making little sketches of people places and things, as if this were an ordinary activity.

2) Leave paper, pencils, crayons etc. in convenient and familiar friendly places, but not where the dog can chew them up.

3) Establish strict rules about artwork on the walls, drapery or other hard to clean surfaces.

4) Copy any interesting sketches, but put the originals right back where they were found! Avoid any sign of confiscation or invasion of privacy at all costs.

5) Be patient.

6) Be patient again.

7) If that doesn't work, you grab the little munchkins and say: "Hey look! I'm paying for this whole show!"

"Do you know what Catholic School is costing me? "

"Drop that goddam Adam and Eve crap and come up with a picture of the squid that ate Chicago, or I'll cut off your Whitley Strieber book allowance!!"

- - - -

I am sure that this approach will produce results, when suitably modified as to the particular details of the family at hand.

- - - -

Perhaps others can suggest an even less invasive method.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Gigantic 'Heart' formation on Mars

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:52:32 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 12:41:58 -0400  
Subject: Re: Gigantic 'Heart' formation on Mars

>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 01:26:23  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>Subject: Gigantic 'Heart' formation on Mars

>Source: Discovery News Brief, June 18, 1999,

><http://www.discovery.com/news/briefs/brief5.html?ct=376acff3>

>Go to the site to see NASA's photo!

>Stig

>\*\*\*

>>From Mars, With Love

><snip>

>Picture: NASA

>Copyright © 1999 Discovery Communications Inc.

"Mmmmmmmppppfhgh!"

Dear List folk and other folks....

The above is a direct quote from Gesundt on Stig's article, after going to the site to see the "heart shaped" formation on the face of Mars.

He later told me that he forced himself, by holding his hands firmly on his mouth, he was not going to comment on this latest Mars formation.

He lied.

Dr. Morty

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 17:31:00 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 13:25:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 21:15:00 +0000  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>Hello all,

>I've been tied up in a massive documentary film project for the  
>last several months and haven't been able to participate in the  
>list. However, Jenny's statement above reminds me of my first  
>commercial film project when I was about 24 or so. I used a  
>piece of copyrighted music without permission (naughty me) and  
>after handing the film over to a distributor began to feel pangs  
>of guilt. I asked a friend of mine (who was a lawyer) if I might  
>really get sued by the music's producers.

>His response? "One can only hope so," he said. "For, surely, it  
>would be an indication of great profits for your little film.  
>You would have made enough money for them to actually feel  
>cheated!"

>Likewise, we can only hope that Jenny's concerns about impending  
>lawsuits against ufologists are well founded. Why? Because, for  
>damages to be proven, the "memories" dredged up by the use of  
>hypnosis would have to be accepted (at some point) as fact; not  
>only by the "victim" but by the courts as well.

>Despite the aftermath, it will be a welcome day when society and  
>the courts declare any UFO experience as "real". Though I  
>personally don't believe hypnosis is worth beans as an  
>investigative tool, I wouldn't want to prevent Mr. Hopkins or  
>anyone else from carrying on with their efforts. Sometimes the  
>ends do justify the means...

Hi,

Unfortunately, as some of us know, a lawsuit does not have to be valid, justified or taken to court to be damaging. Vindictive suits are becoming common in a litigious society. The prospect of some person sensing an opportunity is there (if not to get money via an out of court settlement then to do so via a tabloid who will see this as a good story even if its legal, moral and factual merits are zilch).

Would that such a case could serve to benefit ufology. Sadly it would not. I am not for one moment suggesting such a case would be justified or successful, but I am afraid it could happen regardless.

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 19](#)

## J. Allen Hynek Quote

From: **Francisco Lopez** <[d005734c@dc.seflin.org](mailto:d005734c@dc.seflin.org)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 10:30:15 -0400 (EDT)  
Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 13:51:15 -0400  
Subject: J. Allen Hynek Quote

From: Michael Estes <[mestes@methow.com](mailto:mestes@methow.com)>  
Via: "'[ufolist@egroups.com](mailto:ufolist@egroups.com)'" <[ufolist@egroups.com](mailto:ufolist@egroups.com)>

The following is quoted by J. ALLEN HYNEK in the Foreword to  
'Challenge To Science - UFO Enigma' by Jacques Vallee, 1966:

### FOREWORD

WHAT is the responsibility of the scientist confronted with observations that seem not only a challenge but sometimes also an affront to science? How does one discharge this responsibility? The UFO phenomena presents us with such a problem. To most scientists who have no acquaintance with the subject, save that gained from scanning the popular press, it is an "untouchable" area. Flying saucers indeed!-the product of immature, imaginative, and even unbalanced minds, the playground of the pseudo-scientist and the quasi-mystic, the haven of the crackpot.

Is this really so? Obviously, if one is to apply the scientific principles we all staunchly defend, one must take the time to look into the subject carefully-to look and to consider. But time is precisely what today's scientists-in some respects the world's busiest people -do not have! Who can take the time to wade through the seeming morass of stories, fanciful tales, chimera, and balderdash when SO many pressing things demand the scientist's immediate attention?

As an astronomer, I probably would never have approached the subject had I not been officially asked to do so. Over the past eighteen years I have acted as a scientific consultant to the U.S. Air Force on the sub-ject of unidentified flying objects-UFO's. As a conse-quence of my work on the voluminous air force files and, to a greater extent, of personal investigation of many puzzling cases and interviews with witnesses of good repute, I have long been aware that the subject of UFO's could not be dismissed as mere nonsense. Nonsense is present, to be sure, and misidentification of otherwise familiar objects that many sincere people report as UFO's. But is there not a "signal" in the "noise," a needle in the haystack? Is it not precisely our role to try to isolate the valid from the nonsensical? By carefully working through tons of pitchblende, Madame Curie isolated a tiny amount of radium-but the significance of that minute quantity was world--shaking.

It is my conclusion (speaking now personally and not in an official capacity) after many years of working through "tons" of reports, that there is a signal, that there is "radium" in the "pitchblende," waiting to be extracted. The authors of this book have come to the same conclusion, by a somewhat different path. Whether the scientifically valid in the entire UFO phenomenon proves to be a physical signal or a psychological one -or even a heretofore unknown phenomenon-it is in every respect a challenge to science.

Perhaps I should have spoken earlier; eighteen years is a long time. But it takes more evidence to get an idea accepted in a revolutionary field, be it biological evolu-tion, relativity, or quantum mechanics, than it does to advance simply another step in an accepted scientific domain. Furthermore, astronomers are

among the most conservative of scientists. Perhaps this is because their time scale is so great that they naturally bide their time in proposing or accepting revolutionary ideas, particularly if such ideas are subject to sensational treatment in the press and in the minds of the people.

Nonetheless, I have of late been rebuked, in my correspondence with people whose integrity I respect, with the charge that I failed to call the importance of the air force data on UFO's to the attention of my peers. If any defense is needed, in view of the controversial and explosive nature of the subject, it is that I did indeed on many occasions call guarded attention to the steadily growing mass of reports made by intelligent people from many countries. As early as 1952, before the Optical Society of America, I pointed out the significant nature of some types of UFO reports (article published in the Journal of the Optical Society of America, April, 1953). Over and above that, there remains the fact that for years I have personally devoted a portion of my time to this subject, an action that would be unthinkable had I not felt it was worthy of examination. I have long been aware that the UFO phenomenon is a global one and that it has captured the attention of many rational people. Numerous scientists have privately told me of their interest and their willingness to look further into the problem.

Also, as a scientific consultant to the U.S. Air Force, I carry a unique responsibility: any statement I make on the importance of the UFO phenomenon, unless backed by overwhelming evidence, carries the danger of "mobilizing the credulity of the world," as a university colleague of mine so aptly put it. I recognize that responsibility in accepting the invitation of the authors to write the Foreword to this book. It was only my respect for the authors as serious investigators and the continued and growing mass of unexplained UFO reports that prompted me to accept. I have over the years acquired something of a reputation as a "debunker" of UFO reports. If this arose from my honest desire to find a rational natural explanation for the stimuli that give rise to the reports, a procedure very frequently crowned with success, then I must bear with that reputation. If it stems, however, from a belief that I deliberately adopted a Procrustean approach, cutting down or stretching out evidence to make a forced fit, deliberately to "explain away" UFO reports at all cost, then it is a most unwarranted charge.

In my nearly two score years' association with the investigation of the reports, I have yet to write a book on the subject, primarily because there is no physical evidence in support of the phenomenon. Were I to write such a book today, however, I probably would take much the same approach followed by the present authors. The Vallees present a formidable amount of evidence for the global nature of the UFO phenomenon, but despite this they come to no firm conclusion. As they state: "We must realize that the observations we have reviewed . . . have no value in themselves. They are important and deserve study, only because each one is an illustration of a phenomenon that has manifested itself since May, 1946, in every country in the world." Besides the fact that the reports bear striking similarities to each other they continue to be made by people of good repute, which makes it imperative that a scientific investigation be undertaken. Because of the global nature of the total phenomenon, this investigation might well be carried out under the auspices of the United Nations. The psychological implications of the UFO phenomenon on world affairs certainly make it worthy of study. It makes no difference, in this respect, what the physical truth of the matter is; it is the impact it has on the minds of people in many nations that makes it potentially important in the psychosociological balance of the world.

My own interest, as an astronomer, in the total phenomenon is, of course, purely scientific. Some readers may well wonder whether this seemingly flamboyant subject is amenable to scientific inquiry. What constitutes scientific evidence in this field? The authors present a convincing argument that the UFO phenomenon can be studied with the advanced methods of inquiry of the physical scientist and of the sociologist and psychologist. In all of these methods the electronic computer figures prominently.

Scientific inquiry becomes possible when the phenomenon under study exhibits patterns and regularities, when it is subject to

classification Lee authors have shown that a classification system (the start of many branches of science) of UFO phenomena is possible and, indeed, that each type they have identified shows a different diurnal frequency pattern. In particular, their catalogue of five hundred cases should be of interest to scientists. I cannot help drawing a parallel with the first catalogues of celestial radio sources: the great majority- of the entries were unidentified optically; only more ad-vanced methods of analysis and observation revealed that some of these were distant radio galaxies and that some were the striking new puzzle, quasi-stellar sources. The present catalogue of UFO cases consists, with very few exceptions, of unidentified items; one wonders whether the parallel with the catalogue of radio sources continues.

Certainly no progress can be made without scientific study. Unfortunately, as the authors point out, scientists, "draped with dignity," have often refused to study the reports. The fact of the matter is that many of my colleagues who have undraped their dignity long enough to take a hard look at the reports have joined the grow-ing ranks of the puzzled scientists: they privately indi-cate serious interest in the phenomenon but publicly they choose, like the subject itself, to remain unidenti-fied; they are unwilling to expose themselves to the raillery and banter that go with it. It is to them in par-ticular, and to all who foster the true Galilean spirit, that this book will be of greatest value. They grope and seek, examining even those ideas that seem fanciful and strange, for they know how strange and fanciful the term "nuclear energy" would have been to a physicist one hundred years ago. They are ready to accept a new challenge to science.

J. Allen Hynek  
Chairman, Department of Astronomy, and Director,  
Dearborn Observatory, Northwestern University

-----

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [ufolist](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Confusion

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 20:27:38 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 07:52:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Confusion

>From: Jean-Luc Rivera <[JLRIV1@aol.com](mailto:JLRIV1@aol.com)>  
>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 05:30:23 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 21:16:10 PDT

>>Listfolk:

><snip>

>>As some of you are aware, Budd does not have e-mail. I have,  
>>however, just heard from my friend David M. Jacobs, who does.  
>>Even more astonished than I to read these fantastic claims, he  
>>phoned Budd to ask about them. Jacobs informs me -- not  
>>surprisingly, to those of us who know Budd -- that Hopkins has  
>>never conducted hypnosis with children. Nor, for that matter,  
>>has Jacobs.

>Having been privileged to know Budd Hopkins for more than twenty  
>years now, I can confirm what Jerry just wrote: Budd has never  
>hypnotized children and has always refused to do so. All of  
>Budd's research associates can certify it.

<snip>

Hi,

I want to respond to the way this 'debate' has degenerated into  
this story of a 'big lie'. Frankly, I am horrified.

To summarise, so far as I know I have NEVER (yes, I know that is  
rude and shouting on the net) argued that Budd Hopkins is not a  
decent, honest, compassionate man who cares deeply about the  
people he works with. I have met Budd several times over the  
years, always been impressed by him and have repeatedly  
expressed my positive views on him in print. Read any of my  
books concerning abductions and that will be obvious. We  
disagree on the interpretation of CE 4s and on the use of  
hypnosis but that is not important to me as I disagree with many  
UFOlogists on many things and I have never had anything but  
respect and admiration for his work or for himself as a person.  
So I hope that is completely clear.

Consequently at no point have I ever even contemplated  
attacking, name calling, rebuking or whatever a man whom I  
admire. This whole issue is about hypnosis - something Budd  
supports and I don't. He might be right and I might be wrong.  
Everyone else is entitled to their opinion on the matter. But  
surely we can debate this as a question of issues without  
turning it into a needless fight about personalities.

The whole thing stems from two things which need to be clarified  
and re-emphasised in case anyone has not followed the full  
debate. Firstly, a reply that I sent to a UK posting circulated

between ex BUFORA members criticising a lecturer who gave a presentation that they did not support. I thought I was responding just to those UK people. Unknown to me the message was forwarded to this list as part of the cc list of one of those in BUFORA.

In my reply I deliberately set up the UK critics by taking their argument through irony to an extreme - suggesting that we should all ban various people from future lectures because we don't like what they were doing. Budd came up in the course of that as an example UK researchers would comprehend (he is one of the few well known American researchers to regularly lecture in the UK). This piece was a set up, designed to show what taking this censorship to an extreme would achieve. People were lured into the idea of creating a declaration banning UFOlogists before realising its implications.

Immediately the reactions set in I posted an explanation. This showed the folly of the argument - how, for instance, many of those calling for a ban had themselves invited Budd to the UK, how I was lecturing with Budd (by no means for the first time) shortly so should ban myself, how it was just absurd to reach the point where arbitrary censorship by people who set themselves up to do this dictated ufology.

From this innocent premise (which made the point in the UK and ended the debate on the disputed lecture) the thing took off into a tangent about why I had suggested (and completely none seriously as you can see) that Budd would be censored from UK lectures . This was his alleged work with children and his use of hypnosis (banned in the UK by BUFORA, but by no means by all groups). The row took off (now despite me ). It became seen as an attack on Budd.

Jerry Clark then asked Budd if he did regress children, he categorically stated he had never done so and would not do so. Jerry termed the claim that he had ever done so as being reckless and irresponsible. Further words followed from other postings suggesting jealousy was a factor and seemed to be implying that the attack on Budd had been deliberate rather than an accidental misunderstanding.

I cannot speak for anybody else who has offered comments on this list - only myself. I have explained above how this even got to be debated at all - never with the slightest intention to slur Budd that's for sure. I have also explained in another posting why I was under the impression Budd did work with children. It was as a consequence of a lecture he gave in 1993 in Sheffield. I understood then that (obviously in fact I evidently misunderstood then that) from his paper. Peter Brookesmith on this list (who raised this lecture first) confirmed he got that impression too. In Fortean Times Issue 72 reporting on the conference (with photos of Budd, etc) there is a detailed report on his lecture which notes this comment. And at the conference a BBC reporter was wandering around recording views from people present and was asking them what they thought of this new development - therefore presumably getting the same misunderstanding as we did.

I have absolutely no qualms whatsoever about accepting Budd at his word. I know he is as honest as the day is long and his statement is good enough for me. But somewhere, out there in the videos and transcripts of that 1993 Sheffield conference the reason for this widespread confusion must exist. But it was clearly an innocent and completely honest mistake made by quite a few people who were at that conference who were simply reporting what they took to be a new twist in the subject to be taken on board. That's all.

I wont be seeking this proof, since as far as I am concerned Budd's word is all I need and that's the end of the matter for me. I have apologised to him for the misunderstanding. But if any of you harbour any doubts that there was something more to this such as jealousy or an outrageous attack on Budd then I assure you otherwise .

Incidentally, although this list has reacted as if the suggestion that children are regressed is a criminal act and tantamount to someone attempting character assassination, I never saw it that way. I knew that regressing children has been considered in both the US and the UK and almost certainly has

happened somewhere. Teenagers certainly have been regressed. I am genuinely delighted that both Budd and David Jacobs would not ever contemplate this. It certainly matches my feelings about them and increases my existing positive impression of their work. But even had they done so, I would not have considered them criminals merely unwise in doing something I personally disagree with but expect other folk do not.

In fact, if you think about it, the abreaction I think this mistaken impression about regression work provoked rather illustrates my point. It was widely perceived as a horrible comment to make and something that would be seen as terrible to do. Rather more horrific than I ever perceived it myself, in fact. But if so, then why? Merely because children should not be regressed? If so, at what age do we regress them? 12? 15? 18? Is it okay to regress a person who might suffer from epilepsy (the reason why the UK ban was introduced when such a session went wrong)? Or people who are in any way beset with some kind of psychological stress? Or is it okay to work with children by whatever method to try to dredge out memories of some terrible hidden trauma (hidden one assumes for good reason by their conscious mind)?

None of this is a simple issue, but it is an emotive one. I am totally happy to live with Budd doing things his way and take on board his findings and integrate them with mine and those of others who use different methods again. It would be a poor world if we all had to do things the same way and could not tolerate any different approach. Indeed we grow from diversity of method. I just have my views on hypnosis and I am prepared to stand up for them. I am glad others of different mindsets are willing to do the same.

Remember also that I do not ignore abduction data (including Budd's) and take it pretty seriously - at least to the point of discussing it alongside non abduction data in my books. So I am neither advocating a witch hunt against Budd or against Hypnosis itself. I repeat that my postings were expressing my reasons for not trusting hypnosis and I will freely debate counter arguments which I realise does exist and has merit. Who knows you may even change my mind - as I have changed it once myself. Between 1978 and 1988 when the ban was introduced I took part in at least 20 hypnosis experiments and regarded it as the best way to go. Evidence and experience persuaded me otherwise. So who knows about tomorrow?

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 16:21:34 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 07:58:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 17:14:47 -0700  
>From: Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <[ufomiami@bellsouth.net](mailto:ufomiami@bellsouth.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

>Introduction

>Toward the end of his life, Dr. J. Allen Hynek was a frequent  
>visitor to my home, the last of such visits taking place from  
>August 20 to August 31, 1985, when he finally left to have his  
>first surgery on September 5, 1985. After that his health  
>declined rapidly and unfortunately he died on April 27, 1986.

>Snipped most respectfully

Thank you so much for this Virgilio. You have no idea how happy  
and gratefull I am to have read this particular post....

>The Roots Of Complacency  
>by  
>Dr. J. Allen Hynek

>Something truly astonishing happened.... Not far from New York  
>City, along the Hudson Valley, as hundreds of astonished people  
>looked up, many driving along the Taconic Parkway, they saw  
>something no one had ever seen before.

>Some called it a "Space-ship from outer space" (for want of  
>anything better) but it was generally described by numbers of  
>competent, professional persons as startlingly brilliant lights,  
>in the form of a "V", or Boomerang, silent, slowly-moving, and  
>very large close-by object. It has often popularly been called  
>the "Westchester (County) Boomerang".

The Westchester County Boomerang had been seen on multiple  
occasions since Dr. Hynek wrote those words. I saw it in Sept.  
of 1998, and again on several occasions, in Westchester and  
elsewhere. However since some of these "other" occasions were  
not multiply witnessed events (at least, to my knowledge, not  
reported to authorities) and in the other, I am not about to  
disclose, for many reasons, not the least of which is, you  
wouldn't believe it.

>The world has never known about this, even though the event  
>happened not once but several times, and over the course of  
>several years. To all intents and purposes, this was a  
>non-event. The media across the world has remained dumb. Local  
>papers, radios and TV's, it is true, did momentarily carry spots  
>along with the daily news, but there the news just vanished.

>How is it possible that in the United States, where even trivial  
>events are often flashed across the world, only one TV and radio  
>network carried an account of this utterly astounding event?  
>Far, far lesser stories are spewen forth across the world!

>Could it possibly be that the whole thing just never happened?  
>No: many times there was good, but extremely local, media  
>coverage; many hundreds have personally attesteds to us, and to  
>many others, that the "Westchester Boomerang" was most

>undeniably, very truly real to them. Furthermore, many  
>witnesses at a given time, were geographically separate, and  
>unknown to each other. Cars along the Taconic Parkway, a well  
>traveled highway, stopped, and passengers looked in amazement,  
>many frightened and bewildered at the spectacle.

>Police department "blotters" proved that many calls came to  
>several local police stations, and we have tape recordings of a  
>number of the police involved. The Boomerang was undeniably  
>real; it was not a chimera!

>Yes, something truly and astonishing transpired, but was no one  
>"minding the store", was everyone asleep at the switch? What  
>about law enforcement agencies (whose duty is certainly to alert  
>and assist when something amazing is afoot; what about civilian  
>and military personnel?

>When hundreds of largely professional, affluent people, in  
>suburban areas, are astonished, awestruck, and many frightened  
>by what they could only regard as a very bizarre event, would  
>this not at least warrant and bring forth some comment from the  
>nation's media? And what about law officers, government  
>officials and... what of the FAA which supposedly monitors the  
>airwaves over which the "Boomerang" repeatedly flew, and thus  
>constituted a serious hazards, especially over the Taconic  
>Parkway.

<snip>

>The puzzle has far more parts than the tale of the Boomerang..  
>It is, indeed, a part of a continuing story of mankind's  
>pioneering search for adventure and meeting, but repeatedly  
>dashed and frustrated by those who cannot look to the heights of  
>the pioneer: by the "it will never fly" or "it can't be done"  
>mentalities. These who always must say that "since it can't be  
>done, there is no need to even thinking about it or even talking  
>about it.

>Therein lies the spawning ground of indifference, of apathy, and  
>to dereliction of duty.

>All those who didn't follow through on the Boomerang event were  
>not willfully derelict: they were merely the thousands of "it  
>will never fly" and "it can't be done" and so there is no need  
>to think about it. The corollary is: "Since it can't be done,  
>whatever said had been done, were simply deluded... they must  
>have been mistaken, and so no need to look into it further". It  
>is the failure to seek for the light of the tunnel because there  
>could 't be a light.  
> Snip

Dr. Hynek went on to talk about a complacency born of the wrong  
mind set. I agree. I am an engineer as well as having a Ph.D.  
in other disciplines. I worked in aerospace military for many  
years and still occasionally see duty as a consultant, in spite  
of being semiretired.

I've seen wonders since I graduated with an engineering degree  
from Manhattan College in 1966. Some of these caused goose  
bumps when I witnessed them for the pride in scientific and  
engineering feats accomplished, as with the Lunar Landings, the  
Grand Tour (as it was originally called) which was the Voyager  
Series of flights. I was there when the engineers and  
mathematicians were doing their cypherin' much by hand for  
Pete's sake.... computers were in their infancy in 1966, in  
terms of not being on every engineer's desktop.

Point is, I am not easily impressed any more.

But when I looked up over my home in Hartsdale, NY, located in  
central Westchester County, about three miles as the crow flies  
from the Hudson River, and saw that huge triangle traveling at  
less than 50 mph, at an altitude of less than 3500 feet, and not  
making a sound, I was so awe struck I cannot describe the event  
without making those goose bumps reappear on my body.

I know what I saw. And I know what I did not see ... wasn't  
swamp gas, a flight of Foo birds, neither was it a flight of  
ultra lights, Virginia Slims or anything else known in my  
physics repertoire. Nothing I learned about in school, at work  
or after much more than 30 years in this business of High

Technology can support what that thingy was

So what? That was a question. So I called the local airport, which in my case was White Plains (Westchester County) airport. I got an amused response to a simple question, "Has anything anomalous been reported in the skies over Westchester tonight?" Simple question. I didn't say I saw a frying putty tat, a saucer, a disk, swamp gas or even a triangle nearly hovering at 3500 with the ceiling at 5,000 feet and not making a sound while YOUR airport traffic was approaching under this thing by a thousand to fifteen hundred feet. I mean for cripe's sake the damned thing was better than a thousand feet ACROSS and strobing so bright they could see it on the moon!

And the same reaction when this person in the tower referred me to the FAA, whom I called on Long Island. Only this time there was a long pause before they made fun of me. Right! Uh huh.

Then I called people I do know and know me ... the cops! Hey, Gesundt gets around! Seriously, I've been donating my time to law enforcement for twenty-five years. I do the Simulated Emergency Test every year here in the county and handle ALL the disaster communications from law enforcement to Red Cross to Ham and even CB radios. Been doin it since 1970.

After all the fun was done, I found out that there were about 30 reports, with one claiming a landing (or hovering) of a triangular object at one of the reservoirs in the northern part of the county. I guess they put that loon in with John Ford.

I agree with Dr. Hynek.

Complacency.

But I would add one additional word ... culpability.

Some of you like to solve the UFO conundrum with swamp gas of your own. Save it. You are fooling no one but the biggest fools alive. Yourselves. We, that is to say I and many more like me, can see through your truth. Because it doesn't conform to ours? No. Because many of you are blinded your own light.

Some people cannot, unfortunately for them, see the light surrounding them. Some others, cannot see anything else, once they've discovered the light surrounding themselves. Funny isn't it?

Not.

Jim Mortellaro

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

From: Peter Brookesmith - Mendoza <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 21:39:15 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 10:03:27 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

With the compliments of the Duke of Mendoza:

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 21:16:10 PDT

Recently we have read charges on this list that Budd Hopkins hypnotizes children while pursuing research into UFO-abduction reports. I have had deep doubts about this very serious allegation, which runs contrary to everything I know and have observed about Budd's ethics, judgment, and sensitivity to others.

<snip>

>Even more astonished than I to read these fantastic claims, he >phoned Budd to ask about them.

The tone of outrage and righteous indignation that this and related posts have displayed strikes me as a trifle belated, apart from being bloated. I particularly wonder why it took Jerome, a devoted and assiduous reader of "Fortean Times", six years to crank his glands into an uproar of "astonishment" or (alternatively) to notice that his morality meter had long since bent its needle.

>Jacobs informs me -- not >surprisingly, to those of us who know Budd -- that Hopkins has >\_never\_ conducted hypnosis with children. Nor, for that matter, >has Jacobs.

I am pleased to hear it. Given the passage of time since this--

"...Hopkins [did not] make any attempt to address the radical criticisms and doubts about his technique and competence that others have made concerning this case and others he has pursued (for a brief review, see FT 67, page 53). And when one learns, out of his own mouth, that he is - without qualification or training - hypnotically regressing children 'down to the age of two and a half' to ask them about their 'alien abduction' experiences, some instinct screams in protest at his arrogance. Doesn't it ever occur to Hopkins that he could be wrong in his conviction, and that he may be implanting nightmares in these children's heads?"

--was printed in FT 72, and the silence thereon until now, I am not about to ruffle myself unduly to check whether I (or Jenny Randles, or those sitting next to me in the body of the hall) have misinterpreted what Hopkins said. However, my memory is that his words were, approximately, "\_We\_ have testimony from hypnotizing children as young as two and a half now." If that is essentially correct, it's not difficult to see how it created the impression that the "we" included Hopkins and described his practice. But I now suspect that "we" means "abductologists", and that Hopkins meant something like "The evidence from hypnosis includes some from subjects as young as two and half". Consider this:

"In the more than two and a half years since I have been working with abductees I have seen more than a hundred individuals referred for evaluation of abductions or other "anomalous" experiences. Of these, seventy-six (ranging in age from two to fifty-seven; forty-seven females and twenty-nine males, including three boys eight and under) fulfill my quite strict criteria for an abduction case: conscious recall or recall with the help of hypnosis, of being taken by alien beings into a strange craft, reported with emotion appropriate to the experience being described and no apparent mental condition that could account for the story. I have done between one and eight several-hour modified hypnosis sessions with forty-nine of these individuals, and have evolved a therapeutic approach I will describe shortly."

That is on pp2-3 of John Mack, "Abduction", Simon & Schuster 1994. It is of course entirely possible that Mack didn't hypnotise any of the very young children he mentions, but that Hopkins thought Mack had when he spoke at Sheffield in 1993.

>In other words, we've been at the receiving end of the Big Lie.  
>Those who have passed it on, innocently if recklessly, owe Budd Hopkins an apology. Those who knew or suspected it was a lie but >circulated it anyway are beyond redemption. The former are >urged, in the name of common decency, to apologize publicly.  
>This list would be a good place to do it.

O, la! - what unctuous hyperbole. Some people really do need to get a sense of proportion. At worst this is not a lie, let alone The Big Lie, but a misunderstanding, and one generated by Hopkins's ambiguity. I \*hope\* Jerome is not here implying that I am a liar. Recklessness hardly enters into it.

Neither common decency nor the facts call for a public anything unless you're addicted to something akin to the traditions of the Christian flagellants or Maoist self-criticism. In many respects the Clarkian style of ufological correctness - to whose props we may now add sackcloth and ashes for the plebs, and a book, a bell and a candle for theologian Clark - resembles these, but that doesn't mean their (or his) less couth proclivities should be encouraged among hoi polloi. If a blunder has been made - which has yet to be established - a clarifying note to Budd Hopkins is in order. Whether an apology is required depends on the nature of the mistake, if any, and that too has yet to be determined. Let me here echo Jenny's appeal for hard evidence if it can be made available quickly.

Watching Jerome in one of his officious lathers usually leaves me suspended uneasily between sensations of queasiness and profound mirth; more than usually in this instance. This is the man who described my objections to the supremely tasteless speculations about John Napolitano's paternity in which Hopkins indulged in "Witnessed" (see Chapter 25, and have your sick bag ready as you read) as "moral grandstanding". Perhaps I am singularly blessed: not only with beautiful green eyes ("rather wasted on a man I always think" - Lady Caroline Moore, 1999) but with a talent for misunderstanding - sincerely, of course - the import of what people say. But this struck me as (a) an implicit defense of Hopkins's grotesque and potentially damaging musings and (b) taking one thing with another, an indication of a tendency to moral confusion on the part of the Boy Bishop of Canby, if not actual evidence of it.

With or without hypnosis, it seems to me that in his dealings with children Hopkins is running a severe risk of "implanting nightmares in... children's heads", and in "Witnessed" he gives us an illuminating and depressing blow-by-blow account of how he plays with this fire in his dealings with Johnny (aged nine when interviewed). Adults can believe what they want about what's happened to them, being theoretically mature, and there's no question but that some actually feel better about themselves and their lives through believing they've been abducted. That's fine by me. But children intrinsically lack an adult's experiential defensive armory against suggestion and insinuation: those who nurture the terrors in children by encouraging or accepting at face value their tales of abduction are, in my grandstanding morality, child abusers. I would guess that if any group of people associated with abductions is going to sue a "researcher", it will be those who are children now, so I hope abductologists in general have hefty pension funds, an excellent investment



Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

portfolio and paid-up personal accident insurance.

The older I get the better I understand the rage of Robert Todd.

best wishes  
Postman D. Messenger  
Not Shot Yet

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Night Sky Mystery - Is It A Bird, Is It A Plane..?

From: Diane Harrison <[tkbnetw@fan.net.au](mailto:tkbnetw@fan.net.au)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 12:51:53 +1000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 10:10:49 -0400  
Subject: Night Sky Mystery - Is It A Bird, Is It A Plane..?

The Keith Basterfield Network Australasia  
E-Mail [tkbnetw@fan.net.au](mailto:tkbnetw@fan.net.au)  
<http://www.fan.net.au/~tkbnetw>

\*\*\*\*\*  
UFO Australian Research Network Hot Line Number  
1800 77 22 88 Free Call  
\*\*\*\*\*

From Diane in Warwick  
Rported By UFOR Queensland

NIGHT SKY MYSTERY IS IT A BIRD, IS IT A PLANE..?

19th June 1999

By Scott Murdoch Warwick Daily News

We know what it isn't but not what is it is.

That's the official word from Toowoomba UFO expert after reports do bright orange lights flashing across the Warwick sky Thursday night.

The lights captured the attention of a number of residents, promoting dozens of phone calls to the Daily News yesterday. The lights were seen about 9.30pm and in the direction which ranged from the Warwick Hospital to above Akooroomak.

UFO Research Queensland Toowoomba rep Karim Hashim-Jones could not explain the unknown lights. "I've come up with what it isn't but not what it is" he said, "It could be extra-terrestrial life or top top secret aircraft - we just don't know. Mr Hashim-Jones said there had been "hundreds" of reports of light above Toowoomba's sky in the last few weeks, but he had not heard of anything in Warwick.

"I know it's not space junk or a station or an aircraft - because the description doesn't fit." Warwick resident's Mandy Ralph saw three bright objects, and she now believes there is "something out there."

"The lights were going straight but they then went anti-clockwise and drifted and then all of a sudden they went." Ms Ralph was relieved when told of other reports. "Good, I'm glad someone else saw them and I'm not going crazy," she said. "It was a bit scary actually not knowing what it was." Ms Ralph said she believed Thursday night's sighting could, in fact have been a UFO. Channel 10 forecaster Ray Wilkie advised people to look into the sky Thursday night at what was believed to be a space Station.

Oakey Aviation centre airfield operations manager Dick Blunt said Helicopters had been flying in the Warwick region but not Thursday night.

Regards Diane Harrison  
Your roving UFO Investigator from Warwick

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: **Greg Sandow** <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 22:32:32 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 10:29:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 18:20:33 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 22:22:35 -0400

>Greg,

>I'm confused. I could have sworn that you had posted to this  
>thread words to the effect that you were having a hard time  
>getting Budd to turn his many alien script samples over to  
>anyone for analysis. Now you're saying it was done two years  
>ago?

>Just asking for clarification.

Dennis,

Budd readily agreed to give his alien writing samples to Stewart Appelle (for analysis in JUFOS), when I suggested he do it. It took him a while to get them sent, but he did do it. I've posted about this here several times. I don't know why you don't remember.

Greg Sandow

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 00:23:44 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 10:46:21 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 17:14:47 -0700  
>From: Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <[ufomiami@bellsouth.net](mailto:ufomiami@bellsouth.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

### >Introduction

>Toward the end of his life, Dr. J. Allen Hynek was a frequent  
>visitor to my home, the last of such visits taking place from  
>August 20 to August 31, 1985, when he finally left to have his  
>first surgery on September 5, 1985. After that his health  
>declined rapidly and unfortunately he died on April 27, 1986.>>

>During his visits, Dr. Hynek did quite a bit of work using my  
>computer which was quite similar to his own at home. At that  
>time, his interest was centered on the Hudson Valley sightings>

>Time marched on, and after Dr. Hynek passed away, the work was  
>completed by Bob Pratt and published in book form in 1987, under  
>the title 'Night Siege'.>

>One day, revising my diskettes, I found a file labeled  
>'Imbrogno' which I did not recognize, When I opened it, it was a  
>paper intended to be the Preface of the book, that undoubtedly  
>by error Allen had saved on one of my diskettes (on August 30,  
>1985, just the day before he left my home). It is a remarkable  
>piece, and once you read it it will be easy to understand why it  
>was not used as initially intended. I think the time has come  
>to release it through the internet so every one will see what Dr.  
>Hynek's thoughts about these remarkable sightings really were.  
>I strongly suggest that you compare 'The Roots Of Complacency'  
>'Night Siege'.>

>.Dr. Willy Smith UNICAT PROJECT June 1999

-----  
>The Roots Of Complacency  
>by  
>Dr. J. Allen Hynek

I thank Dr. Smith for publishing this very interesting preface  
(unpublished)...possibly the last thing Hynek wrote. And, of  
course, it portrays the situation even today....

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Cashman & IUR

From: **Tim D. Brigham** <[TBrigham@ksinc.net](mailto:TBrigham@ksinc.net)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 01:16:14 -0500  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 14:01:35 -0400  
Subject: Re: Cashman & IUR

>From: Bill Weber <[koran@cchat.com](mailto:koran@cchat.com)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Cashman & IUR  
>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 10:02:05 -0400

>Hi, all,

>I just received the new edition of IUR and for the life of me  
>can't understand why I hadn't subscribed earlier. For those  
>desiring the best attempt at a scholarly publication (and one  
>done without a leading University research budget) IUR fits the  
>bill. This is legitimate, ground-breaking, first-class stuff.

<snip>

Hello all,

Although I try to avoid posting "right on" messages to the list (do they annoy the hell out of everyone else as they do me? eh, maybe its just the fact that I'm jaded as hell. Thank G-d for the ignore list option in MS mail.), I thought it was important enough to agree that the current IUR really is an excellent read from cover to cover, and everyone should take a look.

>And while I'm raving about the publication, I'd also like to  
>rave about Mark Cashman.

>Over, around and through the hysterics, name calling and  
>character assassination by those claiming to be devoted to UFO  
>research, Cashman has been quietly, and sometimes not so  
>quietly, churning out the best stuff on the planet.

.... or for the readers digest version - as CG Jung said "real work is completed in silence and strikes a chord in only the minds of a very few."

Mark Cashman's piece is a great read, and from what I have seen of his work, he is an example of how we should all try to examine this stuff empirically and objectively. I may not always agree with his conclusions, but to me, the fact that I can still appreciate the work that he does and NOT agree with him, proves that he is really doing things as they should be done and deserves not just 'right on' rants, but genuine respect. Nice work, Mark.

Tim

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Satanic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]

From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 02:50:59 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 14:52:43 -0400  
Subject: Satanic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.co](mailto:KRandle993@aol.co)>  
>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:19:21 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

<snip>

>Not quite true. Richard Boylan has already been taken to court  
>because of his "abduction research." He lost his license to  
>practice in California because of it. It proved nothing about  
>the reality of UFOs or abductions, but did demonstrate, at least  
>some of the problems with hypnotic regression and researcher  
>bias.

>I haven't even mentioned all those who believe in Satanic Ritual  
>Abuse, who told horrifying tales both with and without hypnosis,  
>and who in turn sued the doctors for malpractice. I believe that  
>it was just announced that one "victim" won \$2 million in a  
>lawsuit in Illinois with more to follow.

>KRandle, Ph.D.  
><http://www.randlereport.com>

Kevin,

Congratulations on your Ph.D. I look forward to reading your new book. I have followed the abduction enigma for many years but I remain in the "questioning center" about it.

Your post makes me wonder what parallels there may be between people reporting Alien Abduction and Satanic Ritual Abuse. I haven't heard much about Satanic abuse in recent years and I have been under the assumption that most cases proved groundless and may have been the products of fundamental fears and overactive imaginations. I have not been interested enough in the subject to research it. My guess may be far from the truth. I am trying to understand your above statement.

Have people told horrifying satanic ritual events without hypnosis that have been proven factually true? What was the nature of the plaintiff's charges in the lawsuit where one "victim" won \$2M in Illinois? Was that for the doctors leading into a hypnotic fantasy? What parallels do you see between the origin and etiology of the alien abduction enigma and cases of Satanic abuse? Are any mentioned in the book?

I certainly don't condone lying but Glen Dennis sure did a lousy job of it. He couldn't keep his lies straight. He violated the first "principle" of a con artist.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## BWW Media Alert 19990620

From: [BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com)  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 09:17:20 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 14:53:37 -0400  
Subject: BWW Media Alert 19990620

Bufo Calvin  
P O Box 5231, Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Internet: [BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com)  
Website: <A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>"><http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>  
</A>  
<A HREF="<http://www.onelist.com/subscribe/bwnl>">Bufo's WEIRD NEWS LINKS</A>  
<A  
HREF="<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/redirect-home/bufosweirdworld>">Link  
to Amazon.com  
</A>

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED (permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this edition of Bufo's WEIRD WORLD provided that attribution is made to <http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>. It is good etiquette to check with strangers before you e-mail them something. If you forward this, please make sure it is clear that you are forwarding it).

June 20, 1999

This one is in rougher form and may be a bit shorter, due to it being Father's Day. A correspondent (if you'd like credit, please let me know) gave some of the UK ones...didn't get a chance to verify them all.

As usual, let me know what you think at <A HREF="mailto:[bufocalvin@aol.com](mailto:bufocalvin@aol.com)">BufoCalvin@aol.com  
</A>.

On to the listings: Times are generally Pacific.

LIVE EVENTS (Lectures, conferences, etc.)

WHAT: 20th anniversary ROCKY MOUNTAIN UFO CONFERENCE (one of the major annual conferences). Speakers include: Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle; Marilyn J. Sprinkle; John Carpenter, UFO Abductions at Home and Abroad; Cristianne Quiros, Alien-Human hybrids on Earth; Jack "Kewaunee" Lapsertitis, the BIGFOOT/ET/UFO Connection; Ann Druffel, How to Defend Yourself Against Alien Abduction; Lyssa Royal, Lloyd Pye, Our Alien Ancestors; Richard Haines, CE-5: Close Encounters of the Fifth Kind  
WHEN: June 16 through June 20  
WHERE: UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING  
HOW MUCH: \$85, plus workshop fees  
CONTACT: 1-800-448-7801 ext. 2

WHAT: Lecture by Dr. Steven Greer of CSETI on ET Contact  
WHEN: Thursday, June 24, 7:30 PM  
WHERE: Berkeley Fellowship of Unitarian Universalists. 1924 Cedar St. (@ Bonita). Berkeley. California  
HOW MUCH: \$10  
CONTACT: Global View Communications, 510-540-6143

RADIO

Eddie Middleton's very popular show in the South, Nightsearch, has a website at  
<A HREF="<http://listen.to/nightsearch>"><http://listen.to/nightsearch></A>.  
Starting soon, the new website at  
<A HREF="<http://www.nightsearch.net/>"><http://www.nightsearch.net/></A>.  
Unfortunately, no streaming audio. Sundays from 2:00 to 4:00 PM (Pacific).  
The call-in line is 901-365-1430.

Don Ecker, of UFO MAGAZINE, hosts STRANGE DAZE on the Liberty Works. It can be heard on streaming Real Audio at

<A HREF="<http://www.broadcast.com/radio/talk/lwrn>"><http://www.broadcast.com/radio/talk/lwrn></A>.

Mike Jarmus, REALITY AND BEYOND, 7:00 PM Sundays,  
<A HREF="<http://spectrum.orn.com/omega.ram>"><http://spectrum.orn.com/omega.ram></A>. Streaming audio available

Sunday, June 20, 7:00 PM, DR. COLM a. KELLEHER, National Institute for Discovery Science

#### ART BELL - DREAMLAND

Currently, the most popular talk show on this area.

<A HREF="<http://www.artbell.com/>"><http://www.artbell.com/></A>. Live streaming audio (and video) available.

#### JEFF RENSE - SIGHTINGS

Jeff is well-versed on the topics, but likes to let the guests speak, resulting in one of the best radio shows on these topics. You can hear Real Audio of the show, and there are archives as well. Go to

<A HREF="<http://www.sightings.com/>"><http://www.sightings.com/></A> for more information. The show is on at 7:00 PM Pacific Monday through Friday, and 8:00 PM Pacific on Sunday. You can hear it anywhere through your computer. Please note that Jeff also often covers topics which I do not consider relevant to this list. To subscribe to the Jeff Rense Weekly E-news (which includes articles and a complete guest listing), e-mail (subject: Subscribe) <A HREF="mailto:[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)">mailto:[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)</A>.

Tuesday, June 22, 7:00 PM, UFO\*BC Monthly UFO/paranormal in Canada report

Wednesday, June 23, 7:00 PM, Michael Lindemann, Weekly UFO/World report;

Donna Seebo, intuitive guidance

Thursday, June 24, 7:00 PM, Dr. Bruce Goldberg (perhaps best known for doing hypnotic progressions into future lives) on astral voyages

#### PAUL WILLIAMS & SCOTT CARR: UFO DESK

This New York show has been around for years, but is now available on streaming audio. The website is

<A HREF="<http://www.escape.com/~paulw/ufodesk.html>"><http://www.escape.com/~paulw/ufodesk.html></A>. It runs at 8:00 PM (Pacific) on Sundays.

#### JEFF MISHLOVE AND THE VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY

Webcast every weekday at 8:00 PM for two hours, with a repeat at 10:00 PM.

Webcast at

<A HREF="<http://www.wisdomradio.com/>"><http://www.wisdomradio.com/></A>.

#### ERSKINE OVERNIGHT

Webcast 9:00 PM to Midnight with an immediate repeat at Talkamerica.com

Monday: Richard Webster on Spirit Guides & Angel Guardians

Tuesday: Dr. Michael Newton life between lives

Wednesday: David John Oates--Reverse Speech

Thursday: Norio Hayakawa ---Secrets of Area 51

Friday: Felicia Adler---Master Dating

#### TELEVISION

##### A&E (USA)

##### BBC 1 (UK)

Sunday, June 20, 10:35 PM (GMT), EVERYMAN (faith healers, including Jack Temple, Stephen Turoff, and Geoff Boltwood)

##### CBS

Friday, June 26, 9:00 PM, UNSOLVED MYSTERIES (includes Bigfoot and a psychic healer)

##### CHANNEL 4 (UK)

Sunday, June 20, 8:00 PM (GMT), SECRETS OF THE STONES (Stonehenge)

##### THE HISTORY CHANNEL (USA)

Tuesday, June 22, 5:00 PM, ANCIENT ALIENS (ancient astronaut evidence)

Tuesday, June 22, 9:00 PM, ANCIENT ALIENS (ancient astronaut evidence)

Wednesday, June 23, 1:00 AM, ANCIENT ALIENS (ancient astronaut evidence)

##### THE LEARNING CHANNEL (USA)

Thursday, June 24, 6:00 PM, BIGFOOT (John Waters)  
Thursday, June 24, 9:00 PM, BIGFOOT (John Waters)  
Next Sunday, June 27, 8:00 PM, UFOS: FIFTY YEARS OF DENIALS  
Next Sunday, June 27, 9:00 PM, UFOS: UNCOVERED: ARE ALIENS HERE?  
Next Sunday, June 27, 10:00 PM, UFOS UNCOVERED: DARK SECRETS (includes pilot UFO sightings and Area 51)  
Next Sunday, June 27, 11:00 PM, UFOS: FIFTY YEARS OF DENIALS  
Next Monday, June 28, 12:00 AM, UFOS: UNCOVERED: ARE ALIENS HERE?  
Next Monday, June 28, 1:00 AM, UFOS UNCOVERED: DARK SECRETS (includes pilot UFO sightings and Area 51)  
Next Wednesday, June 30, 7:00 PM, STRANGE SCIENCE: UNUSUAL PEOPLE (includes spontaneous human combustion and psychic artists)  
Next Thursday, July 1, 1:00 AM, STRANGE SCIENCE: UNUSUAL PEOPLE (includes spontaneous human combustion and psychic artists)  
Next Thursday, July 1, 10:00 PM, STRANGE SCIENCE: MYSTERIOUS SKIES (includes UFOs)  
Next Friday, July 2, 1:00 AM, STRANGE SCIENCE: MYSTERIOUS SKIES (includes UFOs)

LOCAL CABLE (USA)

BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED (I'm short on time this week, so I'm going to list it the way it was sent to me...trimmed down for dates only):  
SUNDAY CH 56 1:30 AM MANHATTAN NEIGHBORHOOD NETWORK NY  
JUNE 20,1999 BETTY,BOB,BECKY ANDREASSON LUCA A four part series on how there family survived multiple abduction experiences. They are the family that many books have been written on there experience such as The Andreasson Legacy, also The Andreasson Affair. 'AWESOME SHOWS' DON'T MISS"  
JUNE 27.1999 \*PART 2 OF THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY

SUNDAY CH35/80/96 930PM CABLEVISION OF WOODBURY NY  
JUNE 27.1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PART 3 ABDUCTIONS

MONDAY CH27 10AM CABLEVISION OF RIVERHEAD NY  
JUNE 28.1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PART 4 ABDUCTIONS

MONDAY CH 59/37 11PM CABLEVISION OF YONKERS NY  
JUNE 28,1999ABDUCTIONS PART 4

TUESDAY CH 34 830PM CABLEVISION OF YORKTOWN HEIGHTS NY  
JUNE 29, 1999 ABDUCTIONS PART 4

TUESDAY CH 6 830 PM COMMUNITY TV OF SANTE FE, NEW MEXICO  
JUNE 29.1999 JACKIE KANTOR SPIRITUALIST

TUESDAY,  
JUNE QUEENS QPTV CH 56 10PM

WEDNESDAY CH 12 830PM GATEWAY ACCESS 12 SPRING CREEK NY  
JUNE 30, 1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PART 1 ABDUCTIONS

WEDNESDAY PAC 8 OF LOS ALAMOS NEW MEXICO CH 8 4PM  
Various paranormal topics

WEDNESDAY CH12 MINNESOTA CABLE ACCESS TRAC 12 4PM&1130PM  
JUNE 30.1999 TONY "THE BARD" IZZO "POET" SINGER" COMPOSER

THURSDAY CH 25 5PM CABLEVISION OF HAUPPAGUE NY

THURSDAY CH 27 10 AM LTV OF EASTHAMPTON NY  
JUNE 24, 1999 ABDUCTIONS PT 4

FRIDAYS CH 8 9PM PAC 8 TV OF LOS ALAMOS NEW MEXICO  
JUNE 25, 1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PT 3 ABDUCTIONS

FRIDAYS CH 99 930PM CABLEVISION OF BROOKHAVEN NY  
JUNE 25, 1999 ERICH VON DANIKEN "AUTHOR" CHARIOT OF THE GODS"

TO CONTACT JANET OR TO BE A GUEST ON HER TV SHOW  
WRITE TO: BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED  
JANET RUSSELL  
POB 311  
MEDFORD NY 11763  
EMAIL: [Rosebuds6@aol.com](mailto:Rosebuds6@aol.com)  
Website: <http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
Beyond The Unexplained with Janet Russell

MTV (USA)

THE SCIENCE CHANNEL

New schedule again, since March 29.  
Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 9:00 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE (don't know which one)  
Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 9:30 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE  
Weekdays, 10:00 AM, STRANGE BUT TRUE?  
Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 5:00 PM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE  
Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 5:30 PM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE  
Weekdays, 6:00 PM, STRANGE BUT TRUE?  
Every day but Monday and Sunday, 1:00 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE  
Every day but Monday and Sunday, 1:30 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE  
Tuesdays through Saturdays, 2:00 AM, STRANGE BUT TRUE?  
Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, 9:00 AM and 9:30 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE'S MYSTERIOUS UNIVERSE  
Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, 5:00 PM and 5:30 PM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE'S MYSTERIOUS UNIVERSE  
Saturdays, OUT OF THIS WORLD all day long

THE SCI-FI CHANNEL (US Feed)

Tuesday, June 22, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4033  
Wednesday, June 23, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4034  
Thursday, June 24, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4035  
Friday, June 25, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS, EPISODE #4036

SPACE (Canada)

-----  
This is Bufo saying, "If =everything= seemed normal, that =would= be weird!"  
-----

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [bufocalvin](#) | [jocelyn](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Time Travel

From: **Jenny Randles** <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:23:38 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 14:58:16 -0400  
Subject: Time Travel

Hi,

A note for UK members mostly. Channel 4 TV screen the one hour programme about Time Travel at 2 am (Sunday Night/Monday AM 20/21 June). It was made and first aired last year but if you missed it first time round and are an insomniac do watch. Otherwise get the VCR out. Its a debate style featuring half a dozen assorted 'TT nuts' - eg Miles Johnston and myself along with one of the witnesses who claimed she spent a night in a French hotel 80 years in the past (see my book 'Time Travel or my article in Fate 'Night in a phantom hotel'). Theres also a guy who has built a time machine in a garage under a railway bridge and brought it into the studio for a trial run.

It clashes with the Indians and the Mariners live on Channel 5 - which I wont miss. I'll use the time machne and tune in last week instead. But if you missed this last year and can get Channel 4 it is quite a laugh at times and conspiracy riddled at others.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Bluehare Dark Peak <[bluehare24@hotmail.com](mailto:bluehare24@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 17:29:45 GMT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:06:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

[Non-Subscriber? Post and 'as is' --ebk]

ATTENTION UFOLOGISTS  
A MESSAGE FROM GENIUS LOKI FOLLOWS

We are a group of people, active in UFO hoaxing since the mid 80s, and going under the collective name of Genius Loki. Some reading this document may think hoaxing is unacceptable a waste of time which could be put to better use investigating "UFOs." Show us a UFO and we will happily investigate it!

We believe that if ufologists are unable to determine that a case is hoaxed or not then they should stick to watching sci-fi.. Stupidity within the subject of UFOlogy has reached new peaks of intensity during the last two years. The latest example is how the so-called Sheffield Incident/Howden Moors UFO Crash has been promoted by certain individuals.

This is not the place to go into the specifics of the case. Many will be familiar with it already and it has been widely featured on UFO Updates and UFO Magazine. Several websites have also featured the case in depth. From our point of view it had been satisfactorily solved.

But there are those who will not see reason and instead see saucers and conspiracy everywhere. A ufologist, Max Burns, had become unhealthily obsessed with the Sheffield Incident. He theorised that a UFO had been present that night and was responsible for shooting down a Tornado jet, flown by an Italian NATO crew from RAF Coningsby. Despite having no evidence for these allegations Burns further theorised that the crash had been covered up by the Government who had also initiated a "dirty tricks campaign" against Burns and others. To add idiocy to stupidity Burns also alleged that some British UFOlogists were undercover secret agents, acting as part of the cover-up.

As time went on it became clear that Burns was prepared to manipulate facts to promote his fanciful version of the Sheffield Incident. Evidence of this is abundant and can be found most recently on UFOUpdates where Dr Clark analysed Burns' recent BUFORA lecture.

According to Dr David Clark's investigation of the Howden Moors/Sheffield Incident there was no evidence to indicate either a Tornado had crashed or that a UFO had been involved. Nor did Dr Clark find evidence of a cover-up. As far as we could see, Clark's investigation was comprehensive and exhaustive. The case was closed - but NOT apparently for Max Burns.

Since the case became public in 1997 we have been watching developments with interest and disbelief. As part of our hoaxing experiments we decided to see just how good a researcher Burns and his supporters were



and devised a scenario which would test their investigative powers. It will be necessary to use Burns' emails more or less in full to demonstrate the depths of his credulity. Emails sent by Genius Loki personnel, besides the initial lure, have been paraphrased for brevity.

Initially we made ourselves thoroughly aware of the case by studying material originated by Burns and Clark and their supporters, and by observing email debate on a number of Internet sites. Burns was emailed from an anonymous source on 20 March 1999. The source claimed to be a member of a crack military/SAS team involved in part of the Howden Moors event. The email sent to Burns read:

"Dear Max Burns

My daughter, who has a keen interest in the matter of UFOs, has recently shown me several articles from UFO Magazine relating to the "Sheffield Incident."

As a result of reading the varying accounts of what happened I have tracked you down via the Internet and the material you have published there. Max, I must congratulate you on the thorough research you have done. But I think I may be able to add to it.

In March 1997 I was a member of, for want of a better phrase, a "special forces" unit. This unit was a regional based squad with close links to all the emergency services. At 2200 hours GMT we were called to a shout on the moors to the west of Sheffield. Our briefing, given en route in the chopper, was to secure and guard a crash site until a larger unit arrived from Hereford. My six man team landed at a location on a remote part of the moors where we were met by a senior police officer and a mountain rescue official. What had taken place was obvious - a military jet had crashed. There were pieces scattered around and a large piece of fuselage was lying part submerged in the peat bog. Several armed policemen were guarding the area and others were bringing in pieces of the plane from the surrounding moorland.

The pilot was still strapped into the cockpit but was clearly dead. Of the co-pilot there was no sign; presumably he had ejected. The police were picked up by a force chopper shortly after we arrived but the mountain rescue guy stayed with us. We secured the site and waited. It was clear something unusual had taken place that night because the moors to the E, SE and S of us were criss-crossed by people and vehicles until well past 0300 hours.

You must understand that at that time we had no idea of the cause of this event. We were just there to do a job of work and we idly speculated about the stupidity of RAF pilots. At approx. 0330 hours two Chinook helicopters arrived from the Southwest, and several special forces troops disembarked, together with a drop of a small bulldozer. We exchanged information - i.e. that no one had been to the site to the site since we arrived, and we were taken out shortly afterwards. Our unit went to the Gulf area until July '97 and I heard no more about the matter. Indeed, I wouldn't have given this incident a second thought had it not been for my daughter's magazines. We were routinely sent out at all hours of the day and the night to perform the oddest tasks so this one was certainly not out of the ordinary. But my interest was stimulated and I began to realise that this was no ordinary plane crash. So I made inquiries with some of my contacts still in the service (I left in mid'97 following an 'accident' on the live ranges at Otterburn) and it seems that you are on the right lines.

What I have gleaned may only be a rumour but I was told that a Tornado did crash on the moors west of Sheffield but that its crash had an unusual cause. Several Tornados had been scrambled that same night to intercept two "unknowns". One was followed out over the North Sea before giving its pursuers the slip. The second was chased over the Peak District. Orders were apparently given to open fire on the craft as it hovered but before the Tornados could engage a blue beam shot from the object (said to be "a small, black

diamond-shaped unknown") and one of the planes just exploded in the sky and broke apart. The other was vectored to a safe distance but when it returned the "unknown" had gone.

As a result of this information I decided to satisfy my curiosity and took a trip out to the Peak District moors to see what remained. I reasoned that if it had been an "ordinary" crash there should still be evidence left around, just as there are with the many other aircraft wrecks in that area. The site is far more remote than I had thought and it took quite a while to reach it on foot. When I got there I was surprised to find there was no immediately visible trace of the crash, but after scouting around the outlying area I found several marks where parts of the aircraft had impacted and more significantly several split and scorched gritstone boulders. Although I could find not one piece of aircraft I suspect a few hours with a metal detector would come up with the goods. How much of this will be of use to you I don't know Max, you seem to be making a pretty good stab of getting to the truth of the matter, despite the actions of various undercover operatives who are in the pay of the Intelligence Services. If there is any way I can be of assistance please let me know but remember that I am still bound by the Official Secrets Act and cannot divulge anything which could reveal my true identity to you. There is an incredible amount of secrecy surrounding this incident and you should be very, very careful with your inquiries. If you are interested enough I would be pleased to meet you somewhere and take you up to the crash site (on certain conditions), but I have to be very careful."

This email took approximately fifteen minutes to create, with little or no forethought. The intention was to set the scene, cast the ground bait and see what happened. Within two days Burns replied:

"This email comes to you via my ghost email address, and if we are to have any more communication regarding this matter it would be best if you used this address for security reasons.

I thank you for coming forward with some of the finer details regarding the night of the 24th March 1997, As you are aware as I am, that there is an apparent extreme amount of secrecy involved in protecting the true facts about what had occurred between the time frame of 21.45 & 22.06 that night. It is obvious from your style of writing that you are from a military background.

As am I with members of my family serving in the Air Force and Army through three generations.

I have come under attack as you are more than likely aware from under cover operatives regarding this case, and they have become quite hostile in there attempts to discredit my self. (Standard intelligence move) also my research into the incident with dirty tricks campaigns and muck raking all standard stuff.

Obviously I wish to visit ground zero as soon as possible in the hope of obtaining

1.Wreckage for metallurgic testing to confirm that the wreckage if any recovered is of the same type of materials, as used in the Tornado F3 interceptor. Preferably with some paint on fragments to confirm paint colour and type as used in the above.

2.Scorched stones for a carbon date testing to confirm the approx. date of the scorching.

3.Soil samples for obvious reasons, as well as photographic evidence of the scene.

You have not given me any reason to doubt your sincerity in this matter, in-deed the detail's you supplied to myself in the initial correspondence. What I personally consider from a very meticulous man and a keen observer with an eye to details.

Call it caution, call it paranoia as a possible scenario, as I do not know you. This could be a ploy by intelligence to take me out to an old, World War two crash site.

So that I may be discredited further down the line. However I usually go on my gut instincts I would be

lying to you if I said that I did not have some reservations about your reasons and motivation for the offer of help in this matter. I do feel that you are on the level. I hope you are not offended, but I feel that you would more than likely have been offended if I had not asked you this question.

Why are you helping me?

I do know that the co-pilot was recovered, by the police just after 23.00 on or around the viaduct at Ladybower reservoir. So I presume that the walk to ground zero is within a seventy five minutes walk from the viaduct's at Ladybower reservoir. Depending on the direction of flight of the tornado and how many seconds before the explosion which I presume is the first alleged by the authority's sonic boom at 21.52, as I have not been able at present to obtain the seismograph from that time frame.

Obviously because the readings on that particular seismograph would show a pattern that is not a compression wave caused by a true sonic boom.

I also know that the co-pilot only just escaped with his life due to the fact that he was soaking and stinking of aviation fuel, as reported by a member of the air force who works on jet engines.

Who was flagged down by the co-pilot while he was travelling back from walking in the Welsh hills While travelling in a mini towards Sheffield that night.

Some other questions that I would be interested in obtaining answers to are

- 1.The name of the senior police officer?
- 2.The name of the mountain rescue attendee? (probably Ted Burton)

- 3.Which unit of the armed police response team were present and where they are based?

- 4.The name of the deceased Pilot?

- 5.The name of the co-pilot?

I believe I am correct in my assertion that this was a N.A.T.O tornado jet?

Which was launched from RAF Conningsby. (Italian air crew)?

7. The registration number of the Tornado?

- 8.To what location the wreckage was transported for the obvious thorough post crash examination?

9. Was any part of the top soil removed or replaced?

I presume that as the Chinooks came from Hereford that they were loaded with S.A.S.

I know that you more than likely do not have all the answers that I require, but at least I have apprised you Of where I am coming from regarding this matter.

I can only assure you of my agreement to meet certain conditions regarding the protection of your true identity.As is the case of the radar operator from Linton on Ouse who tracked the unknown outside the city of Sheffield between the time frame of 21.55 to 22.05 the second sonic event occurred at 22.06 I presume that this was the unknown leaving the area. Due to the fact that the radar track of the object was lost at 22.05.

At the risk of being discredited by the supposed ufologists who are masquerading as researchers. The agenda of the above mentioned people to spread dis-information to confuse the issue, and to keep other Researcher's at each other's throats. (The usual tactics deployed) I even know who some of these people are as it has become apparent what there agenda is and why due to the way that they have had to behave.

In there joint efforts to discredit myself, almost exposing themselves. Due to the fact that I am so close on this. It does amuse myself that it must have been discussed at some level regarding my claims and allegations regarding this matter and they must be scratching heads as to how I managed to piece it all together?

Part of it was the way it all turned nasty when I started to claim that a tornado jet had crashed culminating in the death of a pilot during the interception of an unknown. I mulled it over and decided that this was basically correct especially after the behaviour of so called sceptics. When I made these claims. I have refused to supply the name of the radar operator at risk of being accused of being a liar etc. etc. etc..

I am available next weekend or at any date which is suitable to yourself please advise of what you need me to comply with I do have a secure line and can supply this number if you wish it?  
What ever, your decision I thank you for contacting me I know the great personal risk you are taking. My word is my bond, confidentiality assured.  
Respectfully, Max Burns."

Readers should observe that Burns clearly believes that the letter was sent by a military man -  
'It is obvious from your style of writing that you are from a military background' -  
purely on the strength of a few oblique Andy McNab-style cliches, conjured up whilst the email was being put together.  
Although he has vague doubts as to the veracity of the author he makes no real attempt to ask meaningful questions which may have revealed or even hinted at a hoax. Many of the questions Burns was asking were ones to which he had already claimed to have answers to! We chose not to reply immediately, giving Burns time to do any checking of the story. His next post was somewhat surprising:

"Hi,  
I wondered if you still wish to proceed as discussed in you previous post? Or perhaps you could supply me with the grid references and I could make my own way up there?  
Or I could meet you in the LadyBower Inn on the Snake Pass at a time and date suitable to your self....? Please advice....if you do not wish to have any more correspondence? I will understand if that is the case...Max hanging on a string..."

Hanging on a string.....! We could virtually smell his eagerness. There was no more doubt, Burns was clearly hooked. We sent Burns another email message on 27 April 1999:

"Dear Max Burns,  
"Contact as promised. I will have some available time shortly and I am prepared to take you to the Tornado crash site. I will meet you on 16 May 1999. I will be out camping in the area for a few days preceding our meeting, to check things out.  
I will meet you at the Kings Tree car park (GR167939). I will be there at exactly 13.00 hours, whatever the weather. I will need to identify you. I suggest that you carry a copy of that days London Times newspaper. For certainty of identification you should stand facing the reservoir, reading the paper. I will approach you and make first contact with the phrase "Lovely day for a hike, isnt it?" If I am not there at 13.00hrs this will indicate that my security has been compromised in some way or that I am in some other way uncertain about that site as a meeting point. Wait until 13.15hrs to be sure. If I have not arrived by that time I will meet you at: GR133969. This location is within two miles of the Tornado crash site. If this becomes necessary I will be there until 16.15hrs. Again for identification I suggest that when you arrive at the rocks you sit and look back down the valley, reading the London Times. I will then make contact as before. Once I have met you I will take you to the Tornado crash site. It may be useful for you to bring the following items:  
Spade/s/Metal detector/Geiger counter/Camera/s/Video recorder/s/Voice recorder/s  
and anything else you may need./I can show you the site and traces of impact known to me. These areas are remote and dangerous. Even at this time of year. I suggest you dress accordingly, bring waterproofs, plenty food and liquids etc.  
If you wish you may bring one or two other people with you to validate your meeting and possibly to help in locating the crash site at other times. This will be my only contact.  
Bluehare."

Max replied with a simple: "Thanks, I will be there."

Note again that there was no challenge, no attempt to verify, just a simple acceptance. In the weeks between this message and 16 May, Burns began to tell other ufologists he had new information which he would reveal soon. Clearly he was jumping the gun. Matthew Williams, admitted crop circle hoaxter, joined forces with Burns and began defending his position, also claiming new information about the case. None was forthcoming.

May 16th dawned bright and clear. A car containing Burns and two other 'truthseekers' sped towards the meeting place. They were ten minutes late in arriving at the Kings Tree car park (having failed to even do enough research even to realise it is closed to cars in the summer months, but eventually driving there anyway!). In true James Bond fashion Max stood overlooking the dam, reading a copy of that days London Times. Just picture it! Their car was plastered with alien and UFO stickers - hardly the best way for anyone to about meeting someone who could help them crack the greatest secret in the universe! Needless to say their contact failed to turn up at the resevoir. Burns and co. had clearly expected him though as they had not come prepared for a lengthy trek out to the moors in search of him at the default meeting location. We decided to give Burns and co. another try.

Another email was sent to Burns within hours of his return from the Peak District on the night of May 16. The email queried what had happened to him, pointing out he had been under constant observation and chiding him for arriving in a car decked out with UFO stickers. Burns replied:

"We were late arriving at the Kings Tree because the police landrover stopped us and held us there for nearly 15 minutes while the woman cop decided if she was going to let us past. Yes, I did not even consider the stickers on my friends car, sorry.....due to an ankle injury incurred by one of my group, who was not dressed correctly we had to abort and help him back to the vehicle. much to my disappointment. I do appreciate the risks you are taking, and urge you to consider another meet even if I have to come alone...or meet you somewhere else. Please reconsider, I can come alone, you are right the stickers on the car was careless considering what happened. I am committed to this investigation and the truth of the matter, I have put twenty seven months into this, at great expense to my reputation.  
Max Burns."

The words 'amateur' and 'rank' spring to mind here.

Burns - obviously keen to curry favour- replied again on 20 May.

"Dear BH..  
I have some suggestions which I would like to make, may I make them in a future post shortly? And If you wish I can show you some of the progress that I have made with regard to the situation.. e.g., flaws in the cover story that can be proved.  
Please advice  
MB.."

We had now learned that Burns was due to speak at a British UFO Research Association (BUFORA) meeting shortly and decided to see what happened following that. He was sent a short message telling him we would be pleased to meet him again on the moors. We also upped the stakes a little by suggesting that we had now retrieved several pieces of metal from the alleged crash and would still be pleased to take him to the site. He was told he would be contacted again on June 19th with directions for a June 20th meet.

Burn's BUFORA lecture came and went. Apparently feeling was so strong within BUFORA about Burns that

several key members had resigned when he was given a platform to speak. This did not deter the die-hard extraterrestrial believers who run BUFORA. We sat through his lecture but no new information was brought forward. Burns did mention at the end of his lecture that he had some new material which he hoped he could verify soon, and it was clear it was his military contact he was referring to. Not once did he hint that he was suspicious about the source of this information, or suggest that he suspected a hoax. The BUFORA lecture was poorly attended and the audience gave him a hard time, unable to accept his unsubstantiated claims.

Subsequently, Burns was emailed and told we would contact him again on June 19. The final phase of the hoax had been initiated. Burns had bit. And on 19th June he was sent these instructions:

"Max Burns

Contact as promised. We can finish this tomorrow. After the problems last time we must get it right. This is what will happen if you wish to proceed.

Sunday June 20th

11.am Be at the public telephone box in the layby beside the Ladybower reservoir (before the viaduct) grid ref 196864.

The 'phone will ring. Answer it. Do not speak other than to acknowledge your presence or to answer any questions I ask. Have a pen and paper to write down instructions.

If, for some reason, the 'phone box is not working, someone is using it or I am unable to call at that time:

11.30am Be at the public telephone box on Ashopton Road, Bamford (opposite the signpost marked 'Bamford Moor') grid ref 202849.

Follow instructions as for above.

Act on instructions given and we should have met by mid-afternoon. Bring all you need. As I said before I do not mind one other person being with you. But please be careful with the car - it gives you away and with any luck you will be travelling back with some interesting materials. Please confirm receipt of, and intention to act on, this message, immediately.

Bluehare."

A return receipt arrived on the evening of June 19 via Derby UFOlogist Omar Fowler, who clearly shares Max's strange belief system, and wanted to be in on the action.

On June 20th (curiously near the summer solstice, which requires a sacrificial victim!) Burns was telephoned at the default phone box. He answered and wrote down instructions based on the following script read to him by an actor:

"Is that Max Burns?

Ok, hi, nice to speak to you at last.

Right, listen very carefully, I want to be on the phone as briefly as possible, for obvious reasons.

The sack is buried. But not in the ground. It's in a stream. I don't want to be at the location when you pull it out, for obvious reasons. You must pull the sack out of the water and raise it above your head. I'll have you under observation from the Grinah Stones.

As soon as I see you've got the sack ok I will come down to meet you, then take you back up to the site and we can discuss all this and what to do about it in detail. I have some ideas.

It's in a stream at the head of the Derwent Valley.

Listen carefully and follow these instructions. Are you ready?

Go to the Kings Tree car park where you were before and follow the path up the valley bottom for about three and a half miles.

When you get to a point below the Shepherd's Meeting Stones and the Grinah Stones, the path becomes indistinct. Make sure you are following the stream at this point. On the left bank there is a clear and obvious land slip where the rocks and earth are exposed. This is approximately Grid Ref:143976.

The sack is in the stream at this point. It's a blue, plastic, farmer's sack - pretty obvious when you are in the right place.

Do you understand?

Ok. I'll see you later."

Two hours later Burns appeared in the Upper Derwent Valley, wearing a luminous yellow top, and accompanied by an unknown man. Burns had taken the message seriously and come fully equipped with -

unbelievably - a metal detector! Burns studied the landscape carefully, checking for the correct location. The sack - there was a sack - was bright, almost luminous blue was in about two feet of water and contained 20 kilos of scrap metal. Despite frequent recourse to his notes and maps Burns and his friend failed to locate the sack which could have contained the Ultimate Secret. During his search Burns failed to make even rudimentary attempts to check if if he was being watched. After a while the sight of two sad believers floundering in rain and mud grew boring and so we withdrew.

The hoax was complete.

Please remember this hoax was not perpetrated by the 'Intelligence Services', it was not perpetrated by the Freemasons, or indeed any of the other bogeymen which Burns and his ilk believe are involved in misleading British ufologists. It was done by ufologists, for ufologists to demonstrate the ease with which it can be done. At no time did Burns or any of his friends make any concerted attempt to check out this improbable story. What this hoax has demonstrated is the embarrassing ineptitude of UFO believers and in particular the credulity of some extremists who are driven purely by the will to believe - no matter how ludicrous the subject matter or scenario they fed.

Caveat Lector!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## RIPT & MJ-12

From: **Asgeir W. Skavhaug** <[asge-s@online.no](mailto:asge-s@online.no)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 19:51:41 +0200  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:10:09 -0400  
Subject: RIPT & MJ-12

>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>Date: Wed, 18 Nov 1998 22:22:44 -0500  
>Fwd Date: Thu, 19 Nov 1998 10:37:37 -0500  
>Subject: Re: RPIT Roswell Revisitation: The Next Step?

>Regarding...

>>From: James Bond Johnson <[JBONJO@aol.com](mailto:JBONJO@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Mon, 16 Nov 1998 17:03:46 EST  
>>Subject: RPIT Roswell Revisitation: The Next Step?

>James wrote:

>>Further, RPIT has been able to read in part the official message held  
>>in the hand of General Ramey in the four shots taken of him which  
>>make reference to "victims of the crashed DISK being transported to  
>>Fort Worth" from "Site Two" near Magdalena, N. Mexico, and further  
>>appears to suggest or order the general to issue an announcement as  
>>to a "weather balloon" cover-up.

>James,

>The 'Ramey telegram' may be indecipherable, however, as the  
>printing consists of fixed spacing, this offers important clues  
>to the probabilities.

<snip>

or,

>From: James Bond Johnson <[JBONJO@aol.com](mailto:JBONJO@aol.com)>  
>Date: Sun, 1 Nov 1998 19:56:51 EST  
>Fwd Date: Tue, 03 Nov 1998 08:54:47 -0500  
>Subject: RPIT Roswell Revisitation Report No. 1

>RPIT Roswell Revisitation Report No. 1

>PRIMARY PURPOSE: The primary purpose of this RPIT Report No. 1  
>is to present the findings of RPIT (Roswell Photo Interpretation  
>Team) photo analysts after five-months of intensive study of the  
>Roswell "flying saucer" photos

<snip>

James & James & List,

Regarding the interpretation of the Ramey message, and for  
instance the letterhead/seal interpretations, I thought I would  
refer to the report to Congressman Steve Schiff having to do  
with the Roswell incident ("GAO report", from United States  
General Accounting Office), ' issued in 1995, and which I  
happend to come across on the Web:

<http://www.abcfield.force9.co.uk/maj12b.htm>

and specifically referring to to Appendix 2:

<http://www.abcfield.force9.co.uk/maj12b.htm#app2>



Note that the word "flying disc" (disc with a "c") is being used here. And, maybe Mr. R. Davis from NSA could help in providing some info. on letterheads, etc.?

This report is probably known to many of the members of the List already, but for new members the report could have some interest.

According to the Web site, a copy of the report may be obtained by calling (202) 512-6000 and referencing Document number GAO/NSIAD-95-187.

Further, some months ago I watched a TV program on the Discovery channel, showing the interpretation work on the Dead Sea Scrolls. They were using a certain computer program to enhance the letters' readability on the scanned book pages, or the photos of these. That is, they were using a CAD program to enlarge the letters, and then fill in the letters and their fuzzy outlines with black. I don't know whether the RPIT members have been using this method in their work, but in any case, the results obtained from using this method will also depend on the use of subjective judgements in some way or other.

Regards,  
Asgeir

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 20](#)

## 'Strange Days...Indeed' - Tonight: Stanton T.

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:48:48 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:48:48 -0400  
Subject: 'Strange Days...Indeed' - Tonight: Stanton T.

From: UFO UpDates - Toronto

On 'Strange Days... Indeed' tonight, Stanton T. Friedman, author, researcher and sifter of things ufological.

Join co-host Jonn Kares and I on 'Strange Days...Indeed' as we discuss with Stan the recent conferences in Istanbul, San Marino the current state of ufology and any other aspect of the phenomena to which Stan's amazingly agile mind-mouth combination cares to take us...

The program starts at 11:00pm EST on  
1010 CFRB AM - 50,000 watts 'Clear-Channel'

6070khz Shortwave

and you can listen via Media Player at:

[www.cfrb.com/](http://www.cfrb.com/)

You'll need to access the site using Internet Explorer since Media Player seems to choke using any version of Netscape - thanks Mr. Bill!

To call the program 'live', dial:

On-Air 416-872-1010  
1-800-561-CFRB [all over North America]  
\*TALK [local mobiles]

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

From: **Brian Cuthbertson** <[brianc@freeside.fc.net](mailto:brianc@freeside.fc.net)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:07:06 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 09:09:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 17:14:47 -0700  
>From: Dr. Virgilio Sanchez-Ocejo <[ufomiami@bellsouth.net](mailto:ufomiami@bellsouth.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: 'The Roots Of Complacency'

Quoting from Dr Hynek ...

>It was a malady which appeared to plunge all who encountered it,  
>EXCEPT the witnesses, into a deadly stupor. Such a malady, or  
>perhaps a virulent virus of apathy and indifference to duty,  
>could immobilize cities and a whole country. Of course, we  
>don't know what the Boomerang was really about for:

>---the Police and other law enforcement officers were derelict  
>and failed in their duty to assist the many who called for fear  
>and danger, as well as in awe and wonder.

>---the FAA utterly failed to be concerned for air safety, flight  
>rules, navigation lights, when told that some utterly strange  
>and possibly menacing object was cruising close over streets and  
>house.

>---the Military was derelict by not attending to public safety  
>and matters of National Defense (the country could have been  
>subtly invaded!)

>---the Scientists failed to uphold their "Hippocratic" oath of  
>science: they were derelict in following the quest in following  
>an outstanding mystery.

>---the media, well, where were they? Truly derelict always avid  
>news hounds, rushing to their typewriters or microphones to rush  
>the news to the world (good, bad and trivial), but where were  
>they? Hardly any of the 50 States heard the Boomerang story.

>Why? Utterly indifferent and apathetic? If so, why?

Hmmm. Looking at a much narrower example of similar behavior,  
quoting from the following UFO\*BC incident written up in full  
at:

<http://www.ufobc.org/landing.htm>

>Unable to drive up to the craft they returned to the parking  
>lot entrance. Leaving the engine running, each of them picked  
>up a piece of wood from the ground and then set off up the bank  
>towards the UFO Neither of them felt afraid, only curious. As  
>they got closer they could see that the vehicle was about 15  
>feet across and eight feet high to the top of the illuminated  
>dome. Which K. S. said was similar in appearance to a BB pellet.  
>What was more unusual was a black oval shaped "ball" that was  
>bouncing around wildly within the translucent dome. It was from  
>here that the light was emerging.

>About five yards from the craft a thought suddenly popped into  
>each man's head, "leave it alone". With that, a loud klaxon like  
>noise was emitted from the craft, about every four seconds.  
>Without a word each man dropped his club, turned around and  
>>walked back to the truck.

How many times have I read about UFO incident reports, like the above, in which otherwise curious witnesses are suddenly and inexplicably rendered disinterested, such that they cease any further investigation? The above is the only case I happen to have bookmarked.

It makes one wonder, at odd hours of the nite, just how voluntary is this "utterly indifferent and apathetic" attitude of the authorities, this "deadly stupor" railed against by Hynek.

Surely external control, even if possible in localized cases, could never be applied to groups at large? No, why attribute to external causes what is so easily explained by basic human nature? Most folks spend their lives in a disinterested stupor, after all.

Surely those magnificent men in their flying triangle machines don't have that much control. Surely we understand them well enough to be confident of that.

Nah ... utterly unfounded speculation.  
I guess I read too much science fiction.  
Sorry I brought it up.

-Brian C.

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: **Dennis Stacy** <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:18:46 -0500  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 09:21:52 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 22:32:32 -0400

>>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 18:20:33 -0500  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 22:22:35 -0400

>>Greg,

>>I'm confused. I could have sworn that you had posted to this  
>>thread words to the effect that you were having a hard time  
>>getting Budd to turn his many alien script samples over to  
>>anyone for analysis. Now you're saying it was done two years  
>>ago?

>>Just asking for clarification.

>Dennis,

>Budd readily agreed to give his alien writing samples to Stewart  
>Appelle (for analysis in JUFOS), when I suggested he do it. It  
>took him a while to get them sent, but he did do it. I've posted  
>about this here several times. I don't know why you don't  
>remember.

>Greg Sandow

Greg,

Because I'm not always in Optimal Mental Acuity Mode, or OMAM,  
as Dave Rudiak would have told you if only you'd asked!

Has it really been two years since we discussed this? My God,  
how time flies! My apologies to you, Budd, and everyone else.  
Really! (And I did say I was confused, didn't I?)

A personal e-mail precedes this; you'll note from its context  
that I mistook the e-mail I was replying to as one that had been  
posted to this thread. Now see, via OMAM, that it was privately  
posted. OMAM good!

Tell ya'll what I'm gonna do. I'm off to the Rockies next week,  
where I'm gonna climb a mountain (or at least a high foothill),  
contemplate while listening to a little Van Morrison in the  
headphones (Astral Weeks, Moondance & Avalon Sunset), and chill  
out on anything but Coors. When I come down from the mount (or  
hill, as the case may be), everything's gonna be copacetic and  
supercalifragilisticexpialidocious (hyphenate that one, Errol!),  
unless I spelled the latter wrong. Ufology will be a bona fide  
respected science and all ufologists therein right on spot.

Arnold will have seen what he saw. Money will be readily available for any research project under the sun, I'll be a better person, and we'll all live happily (together) ever after.

Well, the picture won't be quite that rosy, of course, but there are behind the scenes indications that some things (if not all) are getting rosier. Some money is seeping in, some good projects have already been funded, and a few more are looming on the horizon. Can't comment on specifics at this point, but some promising projects are definitely afoot.

This is not meant as a cynical tease on my part. The above promising projects are in various stages of progression and completion. Some extend over a period of years. Science is slow by nature.

Not necessarily as slow as my memory, but slow nonetheless.

A happy and fruitful summer to everyone.

SA Sasquatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: **Brian Cuthbertson** <[brianc@freeside.fc.net](mailto:brianc@freeside.fc.net)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:18:04 -0500 (CDT)  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 09:25:19 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

Re the following post ...

>From: Bluehare Dark Peak <[bluehare24@hotmail.com](mailto:bluehare24@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 17:29:45 GMT  
>:  
>:

>[Non-Subscriber? Post and 'as is' --ebk]

>ATTENTION UFOLOGISTS  
>A MESSAGE FROM GENIUS LOKI FOLLOWS

>We are a group of people, active in UFO hoaxing since  
>the mid 80s, and going under the collective name of Genius Loki.

<rest snipped>

Not that I support Max Burns (frankly I haven't followed that case), but why should we believe the above post any more than the purported hoaxed email they claim they sent to Burns? They admit they're into hoaxing, after all.

Any post by a group with such a self-congratulatory name is immediately suspect anyway, at least to this Texan.

My 2 cents,

-Brian C.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]

From: **Tim Matthews** <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 22:26:28 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 09:30:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]

>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 02:50:59 -0700  
>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.co](mailto:KRandle993@aol.co)>  
>>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:19:21 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

><snip>

>>Not quite true. Richard Boylan has already been taken to court  
>>because of his "abduction research." He lost his license to  
>>practice in California because of it. It proved nothing about  
>>the reality of UFOs or abductions, but did demonstrate, at least  
>>some of the problems with hypnotic regression and researcher  
>>bias.

>>I haven't even mentioned all those who believe in Satanic Ritual  
>>Abuse, who told horrifying tales both with and without hypnosis,  
>>and who in turn sued the doctors for malpractice. I believe that  
>>it was just announced that one "victim" won \$2 million in a  
>>lawsuit in Illinois with more to follow.

>>KRandle, Ph.D.  
>><http://www.randlereport.com>

>Kevin,

>Congratulations on your Ph.D. I look forward to reading your new  
>book. I have followed the abduction enigma for many years but I  
>remain in the "questioning center" about it.

>Your post makes me wonder what parallels there may be between  
>people reporting Alien Abduction and Satanic Ritual Abuse.

<snip>

I suspect that there are many parallels and I still wonder why  
US researchers are so enamoured by these very questionable  
hypnotic techniques. Although therapy/visiting the shrink is  
rather more popular in the US, in the very imperfect UK 95% of  
us are against the use of hypnosis in terms of close encounters  
experiences (and more besides!!).

No group in Northern England sanctions is as far as I can tell  
and this has been in force for many years - which is perhaps  
why we don't have as many 'alien abductions' over here...?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)



## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]

From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 22:36:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 09:33:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]

>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 02:50:59 -0700  
>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>Have people told horrifying satanic ritual events without  
>hypnosis that have been proven factually true?

<snip>

>What parallels do you see between the  
>origin and etiology of the alien abduction enigma and cases of  
>Satanic abuse?

Sorry I can't go into more detail at the moment as I'm going to be off line for the next couple of days, but check out a few Magonia articles on Satanic Ritual Abuse and their relationship to UFO abductions:

[www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/90/sra.html](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/90/sra.html)

[www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/90/satanupdate.html](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk/arc/90/satanupdate.html)

[www.magonia.demon.co.uk./90/folklore.html](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk./90/folklore.html)

and remember that these sorts of claims (Satanic and abduction) can wreck people's lives.

--  
John Rimmer  
[www.magonia.demon.co.uk](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk)  
Official Sponsors of the 1999 Solar Eclipse

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 02:53:23 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 09:38:56 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Bluehare Dark Peak <[bluehare24@hotmail.com](mailto:bluehare24@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 17:29:45 GMT  
>:  
>:

>[Non-Subscriber? Post and 'as is' --ebk]

>ATTENTION UFOLOGISTS  
>A MESSAGE FROM GENIUS LOKI FOLLOWS

>We are a group of people, active in UFO hoaxing since  
>the mid 80s, and going under the collective name of Genius Loki.  
>Some reading this document may think hoaxing is unacceptable  
>a waste of time which could be put to better use  
>investigating "UFOs." Show us a UFO and we will happily  
>investigate it!

>We believe that if ufologists are unable to  
>determine that a case is hoaxed or not then they should stick  
>to watching sci-fi.. Stupidity within the subject of UFOlogy  
>has reached new peaks of intensity during the last two years.  
>The latest example is how the so-called Sheffield Incident/Howden  
>Moors UFO Crash has been promoted by certain  
>individuals.

>This is not the place to go into the specifics of the case.  
>Many will be familiar with it already and it has  
>been widely featured on UFO Updates and UFO  
>Magazine. Several websites have also featured the case  
>in depth. From our point of view it had been  
>satisfactorily solved.

>But there are those who will not see reason  
>and instead see saucers and conspiracy everywhere. A  
>ufologist, Max Burns, had become  
>unhealthily obsessed with the Sheffield Incident. He  
>theorised that a UFO had been present that night and was  
>responsible for shooting down a Tornado jet, flown by  
>an Italian NATO crew from RAF Coningsby. Despite  
>having no evidence for these allegations Burns further  
>theorised that the crash had been covered up by the  
>Government who had also initiated a "dirty tricks  
>campaign" against Burns and others. To add idiocy to  
>stupidity Burns also alleged that some British UFOlogists  
>were undercover secret agents, acting as part of the cover-up.

>As time went on it became clear that Burns was prepared to  
>manipulate facts to promote his fanciful version of  
>the Sheffield Incident. Evidence of this is  
>abundant and can be found most recently on UFOUpdates  
>where Dr Clark analysed Burns' recent BUFORA lecture.

Dear Friends,

I have read the above with interest and found it to be the most bizarre set-up I have read in ages, but I knew this was on the cards. These people who were at the BUFORA lecture looked pretty innocent to me' they were probably revelling in their own self delight on their purposeful entrapment of Max. (Thank god I took pictures at the lecture)

When Max first received this e-mail he did infact circulate this to all on his mailing list and looked for reaction. I told him it stank and was maybe a set-up by those who wish to try and publicly humiliate him. (Boy was I right)

Call this research do you? I think this is now the lowest form of ufology we can get. We are now scraping the barrel and how sad I am when writing this.

How long must this BS carry on? You talk of Max and him hoaxing this whole incident, I think you have to read your own e-mail, wasn't it yourselves who made contact with Max regarding a crash site? Wasn't it yourselves who told Max that you were part of a military team who had knowledge of this incident? Wasn't it yourselves who led Max to believe the BS you were writing?

I think that you instigated the whole BS for some weird reason and for who's benefit? You say for the betterment of UK Ufology? BS that is a total cop-out and you know it, what makes my stomach churn about people like yourselves is the fact, that this just isn't about the Sheffield Incident, but your petty hang up of those who have a believe in the ETH.

Who appointed you the self guardians of ufology? Who gave you this high & mighty platform? Who the hell are you to judge all UK ufologists who happen to believe in the ETH as mad hat believers and crackpots? When will the likes of yourselves climb down from this high horse you have been sat on for some time!

Do you have day time jobs? Who funds this crap?

Does anyone blame Max for answering your poxy e-mails? If you had spent 27 months on a case and then you received such info, would you ignore it? Oh what a sad day this is' this really is the death of uk ufology as we know it, I can understand why people are leaving the field of research with BS like this being churned out.

The jam: Going underground:

Roy..

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Time Travel [Caution: 'umour]

From: **From: Jim Mortellaro** <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 22:33:39 EDT  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 10:03:01 -0400  
Subject: Re: Time Travel [Caution: 'umour]

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Time Travel  
>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:23:38 +0100

>Hi,

>A note for UK members mostly. Channel 4 TV screen the one hour  
>programme about Time Travel at 2 am (Sunday Night/Monday AM  
>20/21 June). It was made and first aired last year but if you  
>missed it first time round and are an insomniac do watch.  
>Otherwise get the VCR out. Its a debate style featuring half a  
>dozen assorted 'TT nuts' - eg Miles Johnston and myself along  
>with one of the witnesses who claimed she spent a night in a  
>French hotel 80 years in the past (see my book 'Time Travel or  
>my article in Fate 'Night in a phantom hotel'). Theres also a  
>guy who has built a time machine in a garage under a railway  
>bridge and brought it into the studio for a trial run.

>It clashes with the Indians and the Mariners live on Channel 5 -  
>which I wont miss. I'll use the time machne and tune in last  
>week instead. But if you missed this last year and can get  
>Channel 4 it is quite a laugh at times and conspiracy riddled at  
>others.

>Best wishes,

>Jenny Randles

Dear and Gentle List Members est Al,

Especially you, Al.

First, it is common knowledge that British TV is run by the  
Government. And in Britain, the Government consists of people in  
wigs. They must all be on chemo or something. Either that or  
most British goobers have naked pates (accent grave, or is it  
agar, agoo, ague)... whatever.

So Ms. Randles, this means that your TV program (which is  
spelled incorrectly by the by... it is spelled PROGRAM not  
PROGRAMME). Cheeses lady, we can dress yous up but we can't take  
yous anywhere!

Anyway, people in wigs usually lie like rugs so they can't be  
trusted even when they are walked all over. And besides,  
British goobers are royal goobers. And everyone knows these  
people are inbred. Which is why most alien abductees are not  
British. The aliens need fresh meat and you people are not  
acceptable. Stale. Too stale. A little stiff, too. You people  
should try a little Gripple... or maybe even a lot of Gripple.

Where was I? Oh, yah, uh I was about to talk about time travel,  
or "TT" as you refer to it. Please read MY book, "Tea, Square &  
Proud" and go to page 598, where you will see proven beyond a  
shadow of a doubt, that TT is impossible. This is because of  
the "Enigma Conundrum" which states that no one may go forward  
without going backward first and versa vice. It's the law. So  
therefore, TT is an oxymoron. Like "regressive hypnosis."

Dr. Jaime Gesundt,  
Authority on time, travel and fresh wines - we will sell no wine,  
until it's ready.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 00:10:47 +0000  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 10:07:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:19:21 EDT  
>Fwd Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 12:32:34 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

Previously, I had offered:

>>Likewise, we can only hope that Jenny's concerns about impending  
>>lawsuits against ufologists are well founded. Why? Because, for  
>>damages to be proven, the "memories" dredged up by the use of  
>>hypnosis would have to be accepted (at some point) as fact; not  
>>only by the "victim" but by the courts as well.

Kevin's reply:

>Not quite true. Richard Boylan has already been taken to court  
>because of his "abduction research." He lost his license to  
>practice in California because of it. It proved nothing about  
>the reality of UFOs or abductions, but did demonstrate, at least  
>some of the problems with hypnotic regression and researcher  
>bias.

>I haven't even mentioned all those who believe in Satanic Ritual  
>Abuse, who told horrifying tales both with and without hypnosis,  
>and who in turn sued the doctors for malpractice. I believe that  
>it was just announced that one "victim" won \$2 million in a  
>lawsuit in Illinois with more to follow.

Hi, Kevin (or should I say "Dr. Randle"?),

Congrats on your recent academic achievement!

The point I was trying to make is that the courts are very rarely about justice or the truth; but rather, about what is considered "possible". For instance, if a plaintiff claimed that they were damaged because they believed a toy gun once pointed at them was real, a jury might buy into that argument. Why? Because common knowledge is that real guns do exist; the confusion would be understandable. If someone claimed that they were made to believe they had been abused as a child, they could prevail in court since society now acknowledges that child abuse does exist. If someone claimed they had been led to believe they were the one time participants of satanic rituals, they could prevail because people now know that satanic rituals do exist.

On the other hand, it would take a damn good lawyer to convince a jury that someone was damaged because they actually thought they had been abducted by aliens from outer space. Why? Because society hasn't really bought into the idea that life "out there" exists. If common knowledge dictates otherwise, then why should the plaintiff be believed? (Granted, because the courts are not always about justice it is also possible to win a case that has no merit.)

But it should be remembered that simply filing a lawsuit does not guarantee it will be tried; and this is the real issue, I think. If a prelim-hearing judge thinks the lawsuit to be frivolous; out it goes. Therefore, for a court to take something

like "alien abductions" seriously enough to give it a place on an already overcrowded docket indicates a gentle (but important) shift in the public/legal acceptance regarding the possibility of ET's. To put things in perspective, imagine someone in 1949 trying to get a "false memory alien abduction" lawsuit into court, much less the belief and support of a jury!

I say bring on the lawsuits! Bring on the media! Let's have testimony about ET's on legal record for a change.

Take care,

Roger Evans

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 10:24:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 13:09:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 02:50:59 -0700  
>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.co](mailto:KRandle993@aol.co)>  
>>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:19:21 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

><snip>

>>Not quite true. Richard Boylan has already been taken to court  
>>because of his "abduction research." He lost his license to  
>>practice in California because of it. It proved nothing about  
>>the reality of UFOs or abductions, but did demonstrate, at least  
>>some of the problems with hypnotic regression and researcher  
>>bias.

>>I haven't even mentioned all those who believe in Satanic Ritual  
>>Abuse, who told horrifying tales both with and without hypnosis,  
>>and who in turn sued the doctors for malpractice. I believe that  
>>it was just announced that one "victim" won \$2 million in a  
>>lawsuit in Illinois with more to follow.

>>KRandle, Ph.D.  
>><http://www.randlereport.com>

>Kevin,

>Congratulations on your Ph.D. I look forward to reading your new  
>book. I have followed the abduction enigma for many years but I  
>remain in the "questioning center" about it.

>Your post makes me wonder what parallels there may be between  
>people reporting Alien Abduction and Satanic Ritual Abuse. I  
>haven't heard much about Satanic abuse in recent years and I  
>have been under the assumption that most cases proved groundless  
>and may have been the products of fundamental fears and  
>overactive imaginations. I have not been interested enough in  
>the subject to research it. My guess may be far from the truth.  
>I am trying to understand your above statement.

>Have people told horrifying satanic ritual events without  
>hypnosis that have been proven factually true? What was the  
>nature of the plaintiff's charges in the lawsuit where one  
>"victim" won \$2M in Illinois? Was that for the doctors leading  
>into a hypnotic fantasy? What parallels do you see between the  
>origin and etiology of the alien abduction enigma and cases of  
>Satanic abuse? Are any mentioned in the book?

>I certainly don't condone lying but Glen Dennis sure did  
>a lousy job of it. He couldn't keep his lies straight. He  
>violated the first "principle" of a con artist.

Hi,

My congratulations also to Kevin. The Randle/s are coming.  
Beware.

As to Satanic Ritual Abuse - my friend and frequent co-author has plenty of experience, not as a satanist I had better add knowing how these things get out of hand on the net (!), but as a researcher into withcraft. He has written an excellent book on this topic. As a UK abduction researcher too (who uses hypnosis by the way as hes never been a BUFORA member but fulfills my moral rule by only doing so through and under constant supervision of a clinical psychologist) he's been seeking the parallels with SRA and with bogus social worker cases which he also considers relevant. There is some material on this in his book (pompously titled - not by him I should add) - 'The truth about alien abductions' (Cassell, UK - I believe distributed in the US by Sterling). Also theres a chapter in our joint book - 'The Encyclopedia Of The Unexplained' (Michael O'Mara).

We are currently working on another book together (our 11th if I counted right) which is called 'Supernatural Causes?' and investigates deaths and injuries attributed to the supernatural. Peter is planning something in there on the patterns with such cases, I believe, although its early days in the project to be sure what will get into the final cut.

Peter is not yet on the net (I've tried to persuade him) but anyone keen to pursue this research could write or call/fax to:

6 Silsden Avenue  
Lowton  
Warrington  
WA3 1EN UK

Tel/Fax: ++(44) (0) 1942 604 265

Best Wishes,

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Phillip S. Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 07:51:45 -0700  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 14:16:03 -0400  
Subject: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

Phillip S. Duke Ph.D. Experimental Pathology announces availability of his new Book titled 'The AIDS-ET Connection'. Evidence is presented from Biomedicine and Ufology that HIVs and their pandemics are of purposeful ET origin.

The AIDS-ET Connection is a new unifying hypothesis which logically, simply and neatly explains all cattle mutilation and human abduction phenomena. A brief Letter titled "Is there an AIDS-ET connection" was published in the Oct. MUFON UFO J. Forum following which the author's work has been black listed by MUFON.

Described in the Book is a case where a male abductee with implant tested HIV Positive until his implant was surgically removed, after which he tested and remains HIV Negative. Verified in writing by Dr. Roger K. Leir.

Did you know that all cattle mutilation body sites correspond with possible HIV transmission sites in humans? That cattle are relatively similar to humans genetically?

That mutilated cattle blood might be a medium for HIV replication?

Did you know that the physical exam human abductees receive very much emphasizes possible locations of HIV transmission? That the human body materials sampled including blood are all logical choices to test for possible presence of HIV?

Do you know how many people walking around have HIV? You don't? Well, no one does, as there is no central reporting agency. All test results are confidential.

Dr. Mirko D. Grmek M.D. Ph.D. highly respected author of 'The History Of AIDS', Princeton U. Press, stated "The epidemic's spread is exponential justifying cataclysmic predictions." That was in 1990. Do you think the situation has improved since then?

My recent book 'The AIDS-ET Connection' goes into all these issues and more. It is presently available for \$19.95 total cost from me at 2503 S. 47th Street Omaha NE 68106 USA. Also from Amazon.com under Medicine/Disease/AIDS/HIV.

The Book is sold with a lifetime money back guarantee. Return for full refund anytime.

If you cannot afford to purchase this book please write stating why and the reason for your interest in the subject. A copy may be sent you.

If you desire medical assistance consult a physician without delay. Good Luck!

Sincerely,

Phil Duke Ph.D.  
[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)  
Phone: 1-402-553-8525 - Listed.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 99 09:02:35 PDT  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 20:27:21 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 20:04:55 -0500  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Dennis Stacy <[dstacy@texas.net](mailto:dstacy@texas.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>Date: Wed, 16 Jun 99 20:17:40 PDT

>>I think I've committed what some consider the ultimate heresy:  
>>speaking well of Budd Hopkins. Sorry, Dennis. You know my views  
>>on the Roper poll.

Dennis,

>But we do know who's responsible for promoting the Roper poll's  
>so-called scientific stature, don't we? Even in the face of such  
>friendly criticism as yours.

Budd Hopkins is as entitled to his views as you are to yours and I am to mine. I'm sure that just as no doubt he's wrong about some things, so are you and I.

>But I forget: Budd is above criticism. And to criticize would  
>represent something resembling heresy, wouldn't it?

Oh, for crissake. C'mon, Dennis. The reality is that to many who knock him, often for bad or even invented reasons, Budd is beyond praise.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

From: Jerome Clark" <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 99 09:20:40 PDT  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 20:32:27 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 21:39:15 -0400  
>From: Peter Brookesmith - Mendoza <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>With the compliments of the Duke of Mendoza:

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>>Date: Thu, 17 Jun 99 21:16:10 PDT

Patient and gentle listfolk:

>Recently we have read charges on this list that Budd Hopkins  
>hypnotizes children while pursuing research into UFO-abduction  
>reports. I have had deep doubts about this very serious  
>allegation, which runs contrary to everything I know and have  
>observed about Budd's ethics, judgment, and sensitivity to  
>others.

>>Even more astonished than I to read these fantastic claims, he  
>>phoned Budd to ask about them.

>The tone of outrage and righteous indignation that this and  
>related posts have displayed strikes me as a trifle belated,  
>apart from being bloated. I particularly wonder why it took  
>Jerome, a devoted and assiduous reader of "Fortean Times", six  
>years to crank his glands into an uproar of "astonishment" or  
>(alternatively) to notice that his morality meter had long since  
>bent its needle.

I guess you'd have to be a Peter Brookesmith to know the  
derivation of cranking glands into an uproar, or even to conceive  
that somebody, such as the undersigned, would have chosen  
not to read something PB wrote. Simple fact of the matter: I  
didn't read his FT article. Now that the falsehood it circulated  
has had years of undeserved life, I wish I'd read it and sought  
verification at the time. I confess, however, that -- with the  
occasional exception (a splendid piece on Dark Side ufology in  
one of his books) -- I find Peter's work at best of modest interest,  
his often smirky, immensely self-pleased prose generally  
unreadable.

>>In other words, we've been at the receiving end of the Big Lie.  
>>Those who have passed it on, innocently if recklessly, owe Budd  
>>Hopkins an apology. Those who knew or suspected it was a lie but  
>>circulated it anyway are beyond redemption. The former are  
>>urged, in the name of common decency, to apologize publicly.  
>>This list would be a good place to do it.

>O, la! - what unctuous hyperbole. Some people really do need to  
>get a sense of proportion. At worst this is not a lie, let alone  
>The Big Lie, but a misunderstanding, and one generated by  
>Hopkins's ambiguity. I \*hope\* Jerome is not here implying that I  
>am a liar. Recklessness hardly enters into it.

>Neither common decency nor the facts call for a public anything  
>unless you're addicted to something akin to the traditions of the  
>Christian flagellants or Maoist self-criticism. In many respects  
>the Clarkian style of ufological correctness - to whose props we  
>may now add sackcloth and ashes for the plebs, and a book, a bell  
>and a candle for theologian Clark - resembles these, but that  
>doesn't mean their (or his) less couth proclivities should be  
>encouraged among hoi polloi. If a blunder has been made - which  
>has yet to be established - a clarifying note to Budd Hopkins is  
>in order. Whether an apology is required depends on the nature of  
>the mistake, if any, and that too has yet to be determined. Let  
>me here echo Jenny's appeal for hard evidence if it can be made  
>available quickly.

As usual, beneath Brookesmith's bloated and self-congratulatory prose, there is little of substance. He falsely charged that Budd Hopkins was hypnotizing small children. I am willing to accept his explanation that he did so out of honest misunderstanding. I am not willing to accept his tedious, self-serving rationale -- laced, typically, with ad-hominem remarks -- for not withdrawing and apologizing for his role in circulating a bogus allegation. Contrast his response with the profoundly decent one of Jenny Randles.

We may be sure, sadly, that said bogus allegation now has a life of its own and will be recycled endlessly by Hopkins's ill-wishers throughout the world.

The older I get, the smaller, it seems, Peter Brookesmith becomes.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: RIPT & MJ-12

From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 11:11:14 EDT  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 20:35:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12

>From: Asgeir W. Skavhaug <[asge-s@online.no](mailto:asge-s@online.no)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: RIPT & MJ-12  
>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 19:51:41 +0200

>>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>>Date: Wed, 18 Nov 1998 22:22:44 -0500  
>>Fwd Date: Thu, 19 Nov 1998 10:37:37 -0500  
>>Subject: Re: RPIT Roswell Revisitation: The Next Step?

>>Regarding...

>>>From: James Bond Johnson <[JBONJO@aol.com](mailto:JBONJO@aol.com)>  
>>>Date: Mon, 16 Nov 1998 17:03:46 EST  
>>>Subject: RPIT Roswell Revisitation: The Next Step?

>>James wrote:

>>>Further, RPIT has been able to read in part the official message held  
>>>in the hand of General Ramey in the four shots taken of him which  
>>>make reference to "victims of the crashed DISK being transported to  
>>>Fort Worth" from "Site Two" near Magdalena, N. Mexico, and further  
>>>appears to suggest or order the general to issue an announcement as  
>>>to a "weather balloon" cover-up.

I might caution that there is no consensus as to what the ones  
on that first line really are. The word victims has been  
interpreted in various ways including a number who have  
suggested the word is actually "remains. There is nothing close  
to approaching consensus to suggest that there is anything about  
"Site Two" near "Magdalena, N. Mexico." Others have suggested  
the city name is Roswell rather than Magdalena.

>>James,

>>The 'Ramey telegram' may be indecipherable, however, as the  
>>printing consists of fixed spacing, this offers important  
clues >>to the probabilities.

<snip>

>or,

>>From: James Bond Johnson <[JBONJO@aol.com](mailto:JBONJO@aol.com)> >>Date: Sun, 1 Nov  
1998 19:56:51 EST >>Fwd Date: Tue, 03 Nov 1998 08:54:47 -0500  
>>Subject: RPIT Roswell Revisitation Report No. 1

>>RPIT Roswell Revisitation Report No. 1

>>PRIMARY PURPOSE: The primary purpose of this RPIT Report No. 1  
>>is to present the findings of RPIT (Roswell Photo  
Interpretation >>Team) photo analysts after five-months of  
intensive study of the >>Roswell "flying saucer" photos

<snip>

>James & James & List,



>Regarding the interpretation of the Ramey message, and for  
>instance the letterhead/seal interpretations, I thought I would  
>refer to the report to Congressman Steve Schiff having to do  
>with the Roswell incident ("GAO report", from United States  
>General Accounting Office), ' issued in 1995, and which I  
>happend to come across on the Web:

><http://www.abcfield.force9.co.uk/maj12b.htm>

>and specifically referring to to Appendix 2:

><http://www.abcfield.force9.co.uk/maj12b.htm#app2>

If this is a teletype document, then there would be no letterhead on it. Teletype paper came in long rolls. I have seen the seal interpreted as an old style telephone or the liberty bell or just a smudge.

>Note that the word "flying disc" (disc with a "c") is being  
>used here. And, maybe Mr. R. Davis from NSA could help in  
>providing some info. on letterheads, etc.?

>This report is probably known to many of the members of the  
>List already, but for new members the report could have some  
>interest.

>According to the Web site, a copy of the report may be obtained  
>by calling (202) 512-6000 and referencing Document number  
>GAO/NSIAD-95-187.

>Further, some months ago I watched a TV program on the  
>Discovery channel, showing the interpretation work on the Dead  
>Sea Scrolls. They were using a certain computer program to  
>enhance the letters' readability on the scanned book pages, or  
>the photos of these. That is, they were using a CAD program to  
>enlarge the letters, and then fill in the letters and their  
>fuzzy outlines with black. I don't know whether the RPIT  
>members have been using this method in their work, but in any  
>case, the results obtained from using this method will also  
>depend on the use of subjective judgements in some way or  
>other.

Here is the real important part of this posting. There are subjective judgments being made. We are interpreting what we see with a best guess regardless of the sophistication of the equipment. We are interpreting the message in the context of the assumption that it relates to the Roswell case. We have no evidence that this is the case. All we KNOW is that Ramey, on July 8, was holding this document in his hand.

KRandle, Ph.D.  
[www.randlereport.com](http://www.randlereport.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 21](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse

From: Steven Kaeser <[steve@konsulting.com](mailto:steve@konsulting.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 12:03:10 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 20:39:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 02:50:59 -0700  
>>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.co](mailto:KRandle993@aol.co)>  
>>>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:19:21 EDT  
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>><snip>

>>>Not quite true. Richard Boylan has already been taken to court  
>>>because of his "abduction research." He lost his license to  
>>>practice in California because of it. It proved nothing about  
>>>the reality of UFOs or abductions, but did demonstrate, at least  
>>>some of the problems with hypnotic regression and researcher  
>>>bias.

>>>I haven't even mentioned all those who believe in Satanic Ritual  
>>>Abuse, who told horrifying tales both with and without hypnosis,  
>>>and who in turn sued the doctors for malpractice. I believe that  
>>>it was just announced that one "victim" won \$2 million in a  
>>>lawsuit in Illinois with more to follow.

>>>KRandle, Ph.D.  
>>><http://www.randlereport.com>

>>Kevin,

>>Congratulations on your Ph.D. I look forward to reading your new  
>>book. I have followed the abduction enigma for many years but I  
>>remain in the "questioning center" about it.

>>Your post makes me wonder what parallels there may be between  
>>people reporting Alien Abduction and Satanic Ritual Abuse.

>><snip>

>I suspect that there are many parallels and I still wonder why  
>US researchers are so enamoured by these very questionable  
>hypnotic techniques. Although therapy/visiting the shrink is  
>rather more popular in the US, in the very imperfect UK 95% of  
>us are against the use of hypnosis in terms of close encounters  
>experiences (and more besides!!).

>No group in Northern England sanctions is as far as I can tell  
>and this has been in force for many years - which is perhaps  
>why we don't have as many 'alien abductions' over here...?

Indeed, I was not aware that Kevin had recently earned his  
Ph.D., and congratulations are in order.

That being said, I think that too much generalization is  
occurring here. The decision to withdraw Boylan's license was not  
based specifically on his performing "abduction research".  
While I can't find a good reference to provide specifics, which  
were posted to the "net" years ago, I believe it was related to  
his therapudic techniques and were not directly related to

hypnotic regression or abduction research. It would a serious error to imply that those who practice "abduction research" in California will have their licenses revoked, or that those who use "hypnotic regression" may face a similar fate.

Kevin's statement is accurate, but could be taken to mean much more than I hope he had intended. I would add that not all abduction researchers are "enamoured" by hypnotic regression, and Kevin raises a good point when he mentions that there are numerous legal challenges involving "satanic ritual abuse", as well as "sexual abuse".

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 13:54:48 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 00:25:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 22:36:54 +0100  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]

>and remember that these sorts of claims (Satanic and abduction)  
>can wreck people's lives.

Documentation, please, on how abduction claims have wrecked  
lives.

Anecdotes not welcome, since they can easily be countered with  
situations I've personally observed, in which people pulled  
themselves together by coming to terms with their reported  
abduction experiences.

Let's have some statistical data. What proportion of abductees  
have wrecked their lives by thinking they've been abducted?

Greg Sandow

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: **Andy Roberts** <[Brigantia@compuserve.com](mailto:Brigantia@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 16:09:38 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 09:48:39 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

Y'all,

Well, you've got to laugh and admire at the gall of whoever was behind this hoax (which takes several readings before the full ramifications sink in). No doubt there will now be a flurry of 'outraged' decent ufologists who are appalled at such a hoax being perpetrated on the 'UFO community'.

They will be wrong.

There is a long tradition of hoaxing within ufology and associated subjects, and careful hoax experiments can only be helpful. For example The Warminster hoax, MJ-12, the various crop circle hoaxes etc have all been tremendously useful in showing us just how witnesses experience, how investigators go about their business, how the media (both general and ufological) report a case and how the rumour mill spreads and mutates.

This is very useful stuff to know indeed because when done under controlled conditions, where all the information is known and carefully documented, these hoaxes tell us a lot about as-yet 'unidentified' cases.

However unpalatable this may seem it is true. The Burns hoax is just one in a long line of instructive exercises which we ignore at our peril.

Ey ooop, they've started already:

Roy Hale misperceived:

>These people who were at the BUFORA lecture looked pretty  
>innocent to me' they were probably revelling in their own self  
>delight on their purposeful entrapment of Max. (Thank god I took  
>pictures at the lecture)

Will Roy now practise psycometry over his photos of the BUFORA (Sponsors of Max Burns) lecture to determine who the hoaxers were? As far as I can see Max acted on the messages entirely of his own free will. Again and again, making no attempt to verify any part of what he was being told.

>How long must this BS carry on? You talk of Max and him hoaxing  
>this whole incident, I think you have to read your own e-mail,  
>wasn't it yourselves who made contact with Max regarding a crash  
>site? Wasn't it yourselves who told Max that you were part of a  
>military team who had knowledge of this incident? Wasn't it  
>yourselves who led Max to believe the BS you were writing?

Forgive me if I'm wrong Roy, but it wouldn't have been a hoax if the above wasn't true. What's your point exactly? Surely Max acted on his own free will in this matter, could have chosen not to have replied time and time again to the hoaxes, could have seen through the obvious James Bond-isms in the text, and so on. But he chose to let his beliefs lead him by the nose. If Burns, or indeed any other investigator, is lacking in the nous to spot and obvious hoax, (and I'm sure we're all saying to ourselves 'huh, \*we\* wouldn't have fallen for that'), then what does it

say about the level of investigative abilities?

>Who appointed you the self guardians of ufolgy? Who gave you  
>this high & mighty platform? Who the hell are you to judge all  
>UK ufologists who happen to believe in the ETH as mad hat  
>believers and crackpots? When will the likes of yourselves climb  
>down from this high horse you have been sat on for some time!

Roy goes into rant mode and reads from the initiation document to his UFO club! Righteous indignation won't solve cases Roy, nor will it affect the reality or not of the ETH.

>Do you have day time jobs? Who funds this crap?

Would it matter if the perpetrators were unemployed or brain surgeons? I don't see the relevance. Presumably the people behind the Piltdown Man hoax were all educated, employed people. Your point is?

>Does anyone blame Max for answering your poxy e-mails? If you  
>had spent 27 months on a case and then you received such info,  
>would you ignore it?

Good point Roy - no I might not ignore it but I'd sure as hell take precautions to check things out. C'mon Roy, if someone told you you could make contact with a military source by standing reading The Times at the side of a resevoir wouldn't you just have a teensy-weensy bit of doubt?

> Oh what a sad day this is' this really is  
>the death of uk ufology as we know it

Someone ought to trademark the expression 'death of UK Ufology' as it is used so much by different people!

>I can understand why  
>people are leaving the field of research with BS like this being  
>churned out.

In my experience people tend to leave ufology when they don't find in it what they believed was there. Hence why there is such a huge turnover (certainly in the UK) of good researchers.

>The jam: Going underground:

I'll see your crap Paul Weller quote and raise you a Robert Hunter:

'Sometimes you get shown the light in the strangest of places if you look at it right'.

As the hoaxer/s say: 'caveat lector' (surely related to Hannibal Lector judging by the way Burns was chewed up and spat out!)

Happy Solstice Trails

Andy

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Big Grey Man of Ben McDhui

From: Allen Loper <[cheepnis@mindspring.com](mailto:cheepnis@mindspring.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 17:00:06 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 09:57:56 -0400  
Subject: Big Grey Man of Ben McDhui

>Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 04:46:12 -0400  
>From: Andy Roberts <[Brigantia@compuserve.com](mailto:Brigantia@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome - The truth is out!  
>To: UFO UpDates <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)> ,

>>From: Judith Jaafar <[judithjaafar@compuserve.com](mailto:judithjaafar@compuserve.com)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Mad Max: Beyond the Blunderdome - The truth is out!  
>>Date: 18 June 1999 00:35

>the moment in lieu of evidence to the contrary. The world and  
>what exists in it and within the human mind is a far more  
>interesting and exciting subject than any warped sci fi invented  
>by ufologists. Read my demolition of the Big Grey Man of Ben  
>McDhui in the latest Fortean Studies or Strange Daze - shows how  
>the natural can become the supernatural but yet still 'sexy'.

Hi all,

I would very much like to read this and would appreciate any help in finding a www reference.

TIA  
k

"Life is pleasant. Death is peaceful. It's the transition that's troublesome."

--Isaac Asimov

<http://www.mindspring.com/~cheepnis>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: "Matthew Williams" <[truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net](mailto:truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 20:31:25 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 09:51:29 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

This from Max Burns related via phone at 18:30 21.6.99

In light of the protagonists coming forward to lead Max up a garden path... The whole basis for the attached text was to try to get Max to release this falsehood at the recent BUFORA lecture. Unfortunately for the "hoaxers" we were quite aware that this was possibly a hoax, but when investigating incidents your not allowed luxury of seeing into the future and can only investigate cases and folow leads up with sincerity.

Although I have been aware of the falsehood since the 20th March, after taking council from people in Ufology that I trust, the opinion was that you still have to follow leads.

The fact that I have not released any of the information that they have supplied in their story/emails, either in my research or my lecture, as far as I am concerned speaks volumes for my diligence to verify any potential facts. It is quite sad that some people will go to these lengths in an attempt to entice someone to discredit their research fr their own personal gain.

Unfortuantely also for the purputators of this hoax, as I have chosen not to go public with this information they were at a loss, as the fruits of their deception had borne no results. So they have now released this statement to score some points from their deceptive work.

On a positive note: A good day was had out out on the moors by all involved. Well aware that this could be a hoax the whole day was planned more in line with a day out on the moors rather than meeting the witness.

To note: Dr David Clarke recently discredited his own research, the fact of the matter is that Dr Clark maintains that the cause of the whole nights events was due to a covert low flying excercise which involved six tornados launched from RAF Marham that evening. This excercise culminated in a couple of pilots accidentally breaching the sound barrier whilst performing mid air turns, which gave light to a number of misidentifications of said aircraft culminating in a number of UFO reports as well as a light aircraft etc etc et al.

The problem is that the (Sheffield) seismic events occured at 21.52 at 22.06 however from Dr Clarks own research PRO (Public Relations Officer) Ed Bullpit that all six aircraft were safely on the ground by 21.35 therefore how could the covert low flying excercise possibly be the cause for events which happened 17 minutes and 31 minutes after the air group had landed respectively. The covert low flying excercise could not possibly be the explaintaion for the nights events. Unless Dr Clark can explain how landed aircraft can be the cause of such events, if that is your case Dr Clark, then you do not have a case. Please explain how this discrepancy could occur.

Max Burns

----



Now a note from Matthew Williams.

I think that the act of hoaxing for negative reasons is a bad one. The reasons put forward by the "hoaxers" show their motives are less than honorable. Indeed they feel the need to use anonymous email addresses to hide behind because if their identities were known they would be universally shunned by the UFO community for their activities. However in my experience this type of behaviour is typical of what I am terming "northern ufology". This is not to damn all Northern Ufologists of who there are many, but to highlight an ALARMING trend in certain circles for this type of hoaxing and time wasting. Most of this behaviour seems to be taking place "up north", and involves a very well known band of not so merry people. Many readers out there are probably aware of who these people are and their motives and may have seen some of their other "hoax" works in the past.

The point is that these so called Ufologists are let down by the fact that Max chose to keep details of the Moors trip secret until verifiable details had been gathered. It is obvious that the hoaxers wanted to show that Max is someone who is easily led by any piece of information and this is not the case! Given the fact that the person who originally sent Max the emails told Max to meet him on the moors under specific conditions, and that Max is heavily involved in research on the Sheffield case, he could hardly ignore the request to meet this person. As a warning (which Max was well aware of) myself and other researchers pointed out that this could well be a set up to waste Max's time and money. Many of us have been "hoaxed" like this in the past, so this is nothing new. Max discussed the possibility of the new witness being a hoax with 10 or so people before attending the moors.

However Max chose to take a chance on the person attending and brought with him equipment to detect metal, radiation and record events. This is the actions of a serious researcher, but the "hoaxers" choose to make fun of this. This shows how shallow they are.

I believe that this is a last ditch attempt by some to discredit Max because after presenting an excellent lecture at BUFORA which was both balanced and well illustrated, some people are worried that Max may gain more favour.

Why is it that some people would then choose to attach a researcher by all dirty methods possible. What is it that we are not supposed to learn about the Sheffield case... what is it that they would rather us not hear. These dirty tricks only draw more light onto the case, and now Max is getting even more publicity because of these peoples actions - so the hoaxers have lost again!

I would like to draw peoples attentions to those who have openly attacked Max in the most underhand of ways recently and make a supposition that these are probably the same people who perpetrated this hoax. These same people left a number of clues behind to their identity in this "hoax" statement which leads straight to their door considering my private emails to them direct - which were not copied to anyone else... very sloppy... but I won't name names. I will leave it up to them to admit to their childish acts. These same people probably also make hoax calls to the police and fire service when their egos are feeling a little low. Now you understand the mentality of the so called "ufologists" we are dealing with here.

Well done children, time to grow up, thats all I can say.

Matthew Williams Truthseekers International.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Kind Words

From: **Kevin Randle** <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 18:13:20 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:01:37 -0400  
Subject: Kind Words

List, All -

A number of you have sent congratulations on my completion of one part of my continuing education. Let me thank all of you for your kind words. I'm glad to have that, and the dissertation, behind me.

KRandle, Ph.D.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Peter Brookesmith Mendoza <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 19:44:36 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:07:15 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

With the compliments of the Duke of Mendoza:

>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:18:04 -0500 (CDT)  
>From: Brian Cuthbertson <[brianc@freeseide.fc.net](mailto:brianc@freeseide.fc.net)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>Any post by a group with such a self-congratulatory name is  
>immediately suspect anyway, at least to this Texan.

The name is a neat pun, one immediately apparent to those with a classical education and a background in literary criticism, typical of British wit, and no Texans - who could teach the British polity many useful things, given the opportunity, and ears that would hear - should feel demeaned if it passed over their heads.

Genius loci: Latin for 'the spirit of the place'.

Loki: one of several variant spellings for the horrid creature who, in Scandinavian mythology, gnaws away destructively at the roots of Yggdrasil, the tree of life. This figure appears in Wagner's Ring cycle and in more modern reincarnations in DH Lawrence's "Women in Love" and (I think...) in Tolkien's "Lord of the Rings".

Mmm. I guess you could say that wit of this kind is a little self-consciously clever, and so by extension self-congratulatory.

Bloody hilarious post, though, whoever's hoaxing whom. O my sides, as someone said.

best wishes  
Punctatum D. Misereri  
Whatever That Means

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Kathleen Andersen <[KAnder6444@aol.com](mailto:KAnder6444@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 19:27:18 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:05:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Bluehare Dark Peak <[bluehare24@hotmail.com](mailto:bluehare24@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 17:29:45 GMT

>ATTENTION UFOLOGISTS  
>A MESSAGE FROM GENIUS LOKI FOLLOWS

>We are a group of people, active in UFO hoaxing since  
>the mid 80s, and going under the collective name of Genius Loki.  
>Some reading this document may think hoaxing is unacceptable  
>a waste of time which could be put to better use  
>investigating "UFOs." Show us a UFO and we will happily  
>investigate it!

>We believe that if ufologists are unable to  
>determine that a case is hoaxed or not then they should stick  
>to watching sci-fi.. Stupidity within the subject of UFOlogy  
>has reached new peaks of intensity during the last two years.>>

Can someone pass a message to this group and ask if they can  
next hoax God. For after all, I've never seen him/her/it. Some  
people spend their lives in search of God, many make a living  
talking about God, more than 90% of the planet worships a God  
but then that is all based on theory and not concrete evidence.

Why must some of us have such closed minds to the existence of  
things unless we can touch it, see it, hear it or smell it. If  
someone did not venture out and build a telescope we would never  
learn that there are real things beyond what our eyes can focus  
on. If someone didn't have the foresight to build a microscope  
we would never learn of a miniature world that lives on us and in  
us.

I am currently working on an interview with Michio Kaku author  
of Hyperspace, Visions and Beyond Einstein. Yes even a scientist  
can keep an open mind. I like what he has to say:

"99.9% of UFO sightings might be wrong, but it only takes one  
sighting to change the foundations of all our scientific  
knowledge"

Kathleen Andersen  
MUFON State Section Director  
Seattle

Yes even a skeptic once in a while!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: **Thiago Ticchetti** <[thiagolt@opengate.com.br](mailto:thiagolt@opengate.com.br)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 22:33:04 -0300  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:14:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 07:51:45 -0700  
>Subject: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>From: Phillip S. Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>

>Phillip S. Duke Ph.D. Experimental Pathology announces  
>availability of his new Book titled 'The AIDS-ET Connection'.  
>Evidence is presented from Biomedicine and Ufology that HIVs and  
>their pandemics are of purposeful ET origin.

>The AIDS-ET Connection is a new unifying hypothesis which  
>logically, simply and neatly explains all cattle mutilation and  
>human abduction phenomena. A brief Letter titled "Is there an  
>AIDS-ET connection" was published in the Oct. MUFON UFO J. Forum  
>following which the author's work has been black listed by  
>MUFON.

>Described in the Book is a case where a male abductee with  
>implant tested HIV Positive until his implant was surgically  
>removed, after which he tested and remains HIV Negative.  
>Verified in writing by Dr. Roger K. Leir.

No, I don't think so. It is easier to believe that the USA government  
created the HIV virus.

THIAGO LUIZ TICCHETTI  
Diretor Do Departamento de Publicação e Tradução Especializadas ( DEPTe -  
EBE-ET / Brasilia-Brasil)  
Director of the Publication Department and Specialized Translation  
ICQ - 35119615  
\*\*\*\*\* SE VOCÊ NÃO É POLÍCIA NÃO USE ARMAS \*\*\*\*\*

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## GOES and METEOSAT pictures of UFOS?

From: Luis Eduardo Pacheco <[ufozone@bigfoot.com](mailto:ufozone@bigfoot.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 23:18:12 -0400 (EDT)  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:31:15 -0400  
Subject: GOES and METEOSAT pictures of UFOS?

I'm writing an article for my electronic magazine (in Spanish) about the subject, so I'm searching the pictures in question.

After a not too sucesfully web search in the NOAA site (GOES Home Page) and other sites on the Net I'm wondering if anybody on the list can send me more information, specially the images wich was asociated at the NORAD alert in 1997?

The issue was un-earthed, again, by the press a month ago in my country, triggering my decision to write about that thing.

Thank you and excuse my Tarzan-like English.

Un abrazo!

```
*****
* Luis Eduardo Pacheco * Caseros * Buenos Aires * Argentina *
*****
* INFORME ALFA: Una vision de la Ovnilogia y las Paraciencias *
* desde la logica, el sentido comun y la mente abierta *
*
* YA ESTA DISPONIBLE EL NUMERO 1 *
* ===== *
*
* http://visitweb.com/ALFA * Email: informe\_alfa@bigfoot.com *
*****
```

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: GT McCoy <[gtmccoy@harborside.com](mailto:gtmccoy@harborside.com)>  
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 21:50:30 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:40:49 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 07:51:45 -0700  
>Subject: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>From: Phillip S. Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>

Hello list

>Phillip S. Duke Ph.D. Experimental Pathology announces  
>availability of his new Book titled 'The AIDS-ET Connection'.  
>Evidence is presented from Biomedicine and Ufology that HIVs and  
>their pandemics are of purposeful ET origin.

Sorry, sir I don't buy your malicious crap.

>The AIDS-ET Connection is a new unifying hypothesis which  
>logically, simply and neatly explains all cattle mutilation and  
>human abduction phenomena. A brief Letter titled "Is there an  
>AIDS-ET connection" was published in the Oct. MUFON UFO J. Forum  
>following which the author's work has been black listed by  
>MUFON.

I wonder why.

>Described in the Book is a case where a male abductee with  
>implant tested HIV Positive until his implant was surgically  
>removed, after which he tested and remains HIV Negative.  
>Verified in writing by Dr. Roger K. Leir.

>Did you know that all cattle mutilation body sites correspond  
>with possible HIV transmission sites in humans? That cattle are  
>relatively similar to humans genetically?

Yep, a recent human cloning technique used cow eggs and human  
sperm/yolk (maybe there is something to the Minotaur  
fable?)

\_However\_. AIDS has been duly documented its transmission also  
duly documented. Monkey bites, eating rare Monkey meat is how  
AIDS got into the human population. Not O'l Bossie. Pigs are  
closer to us, genetically - they're not ungluates for one. Two,  
Pigs have a a very similar overall genetic makeup, they suffer  
from simular diseases. Cows do not - I vote for the Oinkers  
being the medium of choice.

>That mutilated cattle blood might be a medium for HIV  
>replication?

>Did you know that the physical exam human abductees receive very  
>much emphasizes possible locations of HIV transmission? That the  
>human body materials sampled including blood are all logical  
>choices to test for possible presence of HIV?

Having to place myself in defense of the Aliens what unearthly  
good (or bad) would the transmission of a hard to get disease to  
the Human Population unless they were, ah, Purtian Aliens that  
wanted to control human immorality (I don't think so, we are  
capable of monumental immorality they'd have to do a zapping of  
the whole planet a la "Marvin the Martian" of Warner Bros. fame.)

>Do you know how many people walking around have HIV? You don't?  
>Well, no one does, as there is no central reporting agency. All  
>test results are confidential.

Yes, but keeping ones "pants zipped and yer wick dry" does  
wonders for the transmission of AIDS.

>Dr. Mirko D. Grmek M.D. Ph.D. highly respected author of 'The  
>History Of AIDS', Princeton U. Press, stated "The epidemic's  
>spread is exponential justifying cataclysmic predictions." That  
>was in 1990. Do you think the situation has improved since then?

>My recent book 'The AIDS-ET Connection' goes into all these  
>issues and more. It is presently available for \$19.95 total cost  
>from me at 2503 S. 47th Street Omaha NE 68106 USA. Also from  
>Amazon.com under Medicine/Disease/AIDS/HIV.

>The Book is sold with a lifetime money back guarantee. Return  
>for full refund anytime.

>If you cannot afford to purchase this book please write stating  
>why and the reason for your interest in the subject. A copy may  
>be sent you.

>If you desire medical assistance consult a physician without delay.  
>Good Luck!

Solid advice, even if I do says meself!

You know list folk, this is the kind of crap that make Ufology a  
laughingstock! AIDS is a great tragedy it is not to be made  
light of and I don't want to do that, but absurdity must be met  
with absurdity. Who do you think you are to attribute Aliens or  
God to what is a Disease that is clearly human.

-GT McCoy

"Cats look down on us, Dogs look up to us, Pigs treat us as  
Equals." -W.S. Churchill

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse

From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:23:17 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:51:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>From: Tim Matthews <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]  
>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 22:26:28 +0100

>No group in Northern England sanctions is as far as I can tell  
>and this has been in force for many years - which is perhaps  
>why we don't have as many 'alien abductions' over here...?

Hi All,

Regarding the above I wonder if this is the case for most  
Southern UFO Research groups? be interesting to find out.

So here is the question: If you are a member of a Southern UFO  
Research team do you use the methods of hypnotic regression when  
dealing with alleged Alien abductees?

Roy..

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: RIPT & MJ-12

From: Neil Morris <[Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 15:37:14 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 11:11:14 EDT  
>Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>From: Asgeir W. Skavhaug <[asge-s@online.no](mailto:asge-s@online.no)>  
>>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: RIPT & MJ-12  
>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 19:51:41 +0200

>>>From: James Easton <[pulsar@compuserve.com](mailto:pulsar@compuserve.com)>  
>>>Date: Wed, 18 Nov 1998 22:22:44 -0500  
>>>Fwd Date: Thu, 19 Nov 1998 10:37:37 -0500  
>>>Subject: Re: RPIT Roswell Revisitation: The Next Step?

>>>Regarding...

>>>>From: James Bond Johnson <[JBONJO@aol.com](mailto:JBONJO@aol.com)>  
>>>>Date: Mon, 16 Nov 1998 17:03:46 EST  
>>>>Subject: RPIT Roswell Revisitation: The Next Step?

>>>>James wrote:

>>>>Further, RPIT has been able to read in part the official message held  
>>>>in the hand of General Ramey in the four shots taken of him which  
>>>>make reference to "victims of the crashed DISK being transported to  
>>>>Fort Worth" from "Site Two" near Magdalena, N. Mexico, and further  
>>>>appears to suggest or order the general to issue an announcement as  
>>>>to a "weather balloon" cover-up.

>I might caution that there is no consensus as to what the ones  
>on that first line really are. The word victims has been  
>interpreted in various ways including a number who have  
>suggested the word is actually "remains. There is nothing close  
>to approaching consensus to suggest that there is anything about  
>"Site Two" near "Magdalena, N. Mexico." Others have suggested  
>the city name is Roswell rather than Magdalena.

Hi All,

As a member of RPIT I suppose I'd better pass comment...

Firstly regarding the "take's" of the wording of the message, many of the "versions" of the wording floating about on the Internet seem to be from very early "looks", done in many cases with "glass and eye" on the 16x20 prints, I think it became apparant this method could only go so far and produced at times wide variations in interpretation. I would suggest these "takes" were early impressions rather than results cast in stone. Not having access to the 16x20 prints I have concentrated more on using scanned sections of my 11x14 prints, the images of the message on my website are samples of some of the images I have used.

>>>The 'Ramey telegram' may be indecipherable, however, as the  
>>>printing consists of fixed spacing, this offers important  
>clues >>to the probabilities.

<snip>

>If this is a teletype document, then there would be no  
>letterhead on it. Teletype paper came in long rolls. I have seen  
>the seal interpreted as an old style telephone or the liberty  
>bell or just a smudge.

Two important points here both indicating the message was  
"typed" on sheet stationery. Yes most of the text is laid out in  
a fixed grid fashion, so much so that in the latest image I have  
placed on my Ramey Signal section of my website, once I had  
found a correct font point size I was able to type complete  
lines of text on top of the message image and keep in sync with  
the underlying image text.

The fact that the text is in a fixed grid also precludes using  
some of the interpretations of the words because in many cases  
they just don't fit the allowed number of letter spaces  
available, a case in point... Magdalena is 9 letters, the space  
allowed at the point in the message only has space for 8. Using  
a simple piece of squared paper to act as the grid and laying  
out the message many of these problems become clear.

The paper is also clearly not a teletype message, as Kevin  
points out teletype machines used (and still do) continuous roll  
paper which is just torn away as the message is complete, this  
makes a large "letter heading" on the paper impossible if it  
were teletype output. Also if you check the message itself, on  
line 2 after the (my take) word CONVAY (yes I know, bad  
spelling) there are variations in the line levels of the  
following words. As the word CONVAY looks distinctly like it has  
been corrected I suggest that as this correction was made the  
sheet was wound up out of the typewriter, the correction made  
and the paper then wound back, after the next word was typed the  
clerk noticed the line level error and made a correction in  
level and possible a further correction after the next word too.  
This line feed action would be impossible to carry out on a  
teletype machine but a common occurrence in a typewriter.

I do disagree with the "old style phone" in the top left corner.  
I think I have demonstrated on my website that there is a good  
case for this item being a circular official seal monogram of  
some type similar to many DOD/Military type in use at the time,  
this one using as part of the seal wording "COMBAT" together  
with a distinctive "arrowhead" device.

<snip>

>>Further, some months ago I watched a TV program on the  
>>Discovery channel, showing the interpretation work on the Dead  
>>Sea Scrolls. They were using a certain computer program to  
>>enhance the letters' readability on the scanned book pages, or  
>>the photos of these. That is, they were using a CAD program to  
>>enlarge the letters, and then fill in the letters and their  
>>fuzzy outlines with black. I don't know whether the RPIT  
>>members have been using this method in their work, but in any  
>>case, the results obtained from using this method will also  
>>depend on the use of subjective judgements in some way or  
>>other.

>Here is the real important part of this posting. There are  
>subjective judgments being made. We are interpreting what we see  
>with a best guess regardless of the sophistication of the  
>equipment. We are interpreting the message in the context of the  
>assumption that it relates to the Roswell case. We have no  
>evidence that this is the case. All we KNOW is that Ramey, on  
>July 8, was holding this document in his hand.

And the document seems to mention:

"4" "VICTIMS" "WRECK" "CONVAY" "CRASHES" "MIDDAY" "STORY ADV"  
and might I also offer "EVEN PUT THEORY WEATATN BALLOONS"

On the afternoon of July 8th 1947 at 8th Air Force Headquarters,  
and responsible for the command of RAAF, what might this be  
referring to?.

As for MJ-12... it's not clear just what the figure "4" in close  
association with the word "VICTIMS" on line 2 of the message  
refers to, time? or quantity-number?.

But I find it coincidental that in the MJ-12 IP Unit Summary, Intelligence Assessment document, paragraph 9 refers to 4 technicians, 3 dead, 1 status unknown, allegedly caused by some form of contamination at one of the recovery sites.

? 4 victims of contamination? An interesting coincidence.

>KRandle, Ph.D.  
>[www.randlereport.com](http://www.randlereport.com)  
>

Well done on the Ph D.

Best Regards  
Neil.

New image and updated "take" is at :  
<http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/ftw-pics/new-1/rmysign1.htm>

```

--
*           *           *           *           *           *           *
Neil Morris.      /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\
Dept of Physics.  1
Univ of Manchester 0
Schuster Labs.   1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St.    0
Manchester.       1
UK.               \0101010110010110110010110101101011011110101011010/
G8KOQ

```

E-mail: [neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)

Roswell and Alien Autopsy Archive-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/>  
Dave Willetts Home Page-> [http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/dave\\_willetts/](http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/dave_willetts/)  
Mike Sterling Home Page-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/mike-s/>  
Tim Morgan Home Page -> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/tim-m/>

\* \* \* \* \*

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse

From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:40:57 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:58:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 12:03:10 -0400  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Steven Kaeser <[steve@konsulting.com](mailto:steve@konsulting.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 02:50:59 -0700  
>>>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>>>>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:19:21 EDT  
>>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>>><snip>

>>>>>Not quite true. Richard Boylan has already been taken to court  
>>>>>because of his "abduction research." He lost his license to  
>>>>>practice in California because of it. It proved nothing about  
>>>>>the reality of UFOs or abductions, but did demonstrate, at least  
>>>>>some of the problems with hypnotic regression and researcher  
>>>>>bias.

>>>>>I haven't even mentioned all those who believe in Satanic Ritual  
>>>>>Abuse, who told horrifying tales both with and without hypnosis,  
>>>>>and who in turn sued the doctors for malpractice. I believe that  
>>>>>it was just announced that one "victim" won \$2 million in a  
>>>>>lawsuit in Illinois with more to follow.

>>>>>KRandle, Ph.D.  
>>>>><http://www.randlereport.com>

>>>>Kevin,

>>>>>Congratulations on your Ph.D. I look forward to reading your new  
>>>>>book. I have followed the abduction enigma for many years but I  
>>>>>remain in the "questioning center" about it.

>>>>>Your post makes me wonder what parallels there may be between  
>>>>>people reporting Alien Abduction and Satanic Ritual Abuse.

>>>><snip>

>>>>>I suspect that there are many parallels and I still wonder why  
>>>>>US researchers are so enamoured by these very questionable  
>>>>>hypnotic techniques. Although therapy/visiting the shrink is  
>>>>>rather more popular in the US, in the very imperfect UK 95% of  
>>>>>us are against the use of hypnosis in terms of close encounters  
>>>>>experiences (and more besides!!).

>>>>>No group in Northern England sanctions is as far as I can tell  
>>>>>and this has been in force for many years - which is perhaps  
>>>>>why we don't have as many 'alien abductions' over here...?

>>>>>Indeed, I was not aware that Kevin had recently earned his  
>>>>>Ph.D., and congratulations are in order.

Thank you very much.

>That being said, I think that too much generalization is  
>occurring here. The decision to withdraw Boylan's license was not  
>based specifically on his performing "abduction research".  
>While I can't find a good refernce to provide specifics, which  
>were posted to the "net" years ago, I believe it was related to  
>his therapudic techniques and were not directly related to  
>hypnotic regression or abduction research. It would a serious  
>error to imply that those who practice "abduction research" in  
>California will have their licenses revoked, or that those who  
>use "hypnotic regression" may face a similar fate.

>Kevin's statement is accurate, but could be taken to mean much  
>more than I hope he had intended. I would add that not all  
>abuduction researchers are "enamoured" by hypnotic regression,  
>and Kevin raises a good point when he mentions that there are  
>numerous legal challenges involving "satanic ritual abuse", as  
>well as "sexual abuse".

In 'The Abduction Enigma' we give the specifics of the troubles that the "unnamed one" had in connection to his "research." He had his license revoked for implanting "abduction" memories in, at least, two of his clients. Both women believed they had been victims of Satanic Ritual Abuse, or childhood sexual abuse. He told them that they were actually victims of abduction and used hypnotic regression to reinforce those views. The trouble was not that "the unnamed one" had conducted abduction research but that he implanted his own belief structure on his clients.

He is not alone in this. Edith Fiore also lost her license in the state of California. While using past life regression to treat a client, and using hypnotic regression to access the past life was told by the client there was nothing there. Fiore's comment was "Make it up." She also convinced a woman that she had been abducted by alien creatures.

These are the two major examples of "researchers" implanting their belief structures on their clients. Both had advanced degrees and had been in practice for years. The point is, they came to believe in alien abduction and then began to convince their clients they too were victims of alien abduction.

It also demonstrates a real problem with abduction research. It shows some of the problems with hypnotic regression. These are not the only examples of researchers implanting their belief structures on those they interview.

KRandle, Ph.D.  
[www.randlereport.com](http://www.randlereport.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:56 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 11:00:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 13:54:48 -0400

>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 22:36:54 +0100  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]

>>and remember that these sorts of claims (Satanic and abduction)  
>>can wreck people's lives.

>Documentation, please, on how abduction claims have wrecked  
>lives.

>Anecdotes not welcome, since they can easily be countered with  
>situations I've personally observed, in which people pulled  
>themselves together by coming to terms with their reported  
>abduction experiences.

Hi Greg, All -

Couldn't we turn this around and say, "Documentation please" on  
alien abduction? Couldn't we say "Anecdotes not welcome..."  
Aren't we working here with little in the way of documentation  
of alien abduction?

I can supply some good documentation on Satanic Ritual Abuse  
ruining lives. Paul Ingram is in jail because of his daughters'  
claims of ritualistic abuse, his wife divorced him, and he, of  
course, lost his job and house.

On the other hand, we can point to some abductees who've seen  
their lives radically altered by tales of alien abduction. So  
what if there are a few, some, many who have deal with alien  
abduction easily or well. There are those who have not... but,  
these would be some of the dreaded anecdotes.

KRandle, Ph.D.  
[www.randlereport.com](http://www.randlereport.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: David Clarke <[crazydiamonds@compuserve.com](mailto:crazydiamonds@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:05:41 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 20:25:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: "Matthew Williams" <[truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net](mailto:truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 20:31:25 +0100  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>To note: Dr David Clarke recently discredited his own research,  
>the fact of the matter is that Dr Clark maintains that the cause  
>of the whole nights events was due to a covert low flying  
>exercise which involved six tornados launched from RAF Marham  
>that evening. This exercise culminated in a couple of pilots  
>accidentally breaching the sound barrier whilst performing mid  
>air turns, which gave light to a number of misidentifications of  
>said aircraft culminating in a number of UFO reports as well as  
>a light aircraft etc etc et al.

>The problem is that the (Sheffield) seismic events occurred at  
>21.52 at 22.06 however from Dr Clark's own research PRO (Public  
>Relations Officer) Ed Bullpit that all six aircraft were safely  
>on the ground by 21.35 therefore how could the covert low flying  
>exercise possibly be the cause for events which happened 17  
>minutes and 31 minutes after the air group had landed  
>respectively. The covert low flying exercise could not possibly  
>be the explanation for the nights events. Unless Dr Clark can  
>explain how landed aircraft can be the cause of such events, if  
>that is your case Dr Clark, then you do not have a case. Please  
>explain how this discrepancy could occur.

Max never fails to amaze and entertain. No one has to lead him  
up the garden path, as he is quite capable of doing that  
entirely by himself. His ability to misinterpret, distort and  
misrepresent facts really does deserve some kind of special award;  
as I've said before he is simply incapable of interpreting any  
kind of evidence correctly. Nowhere have I ever claimed that six  
specific aircraft from any specific airbase were the cause of  
the sonic booms recorded near Sheffield on March 24, 1997.

That is a simple fact, something neither Max nor his  
"Truthseeker" friends could bring themselves to accept.

For the benefit of the hard of hearing, I reproduce the relevant  
section from the conclusions to my Howden Moor report which  
demonstrates once again how Max is incapable of telling the  
truth:

>There clearly was a military exercise taking place centred upon  
>the Peak District that night, one phase of which (now officially  
>admitted) is timed from 7.30-9.30pm, when the RAF claim all  
>their aircraft were safely grounded and accounted for. However,  
>the evidence from both witnesses in Derbyshire and South  
>Yorkshire and the sonic booms recorded by the BGS suggest a  
>covert part of this operation continued after the booked  
>operation had been officially completed. Many more aircraft were  
>involved in this exercise than has been officially admitted as  
>is clear from the 13 low-flying complaints lodged with the RAF  
>on March 24 from widely separated areas of the British  
>coastline.

>It is clear that a formation of Tornado aircraft travelled  
>across the Peak District on a southeast to northwest flightpath

>between 9.45 and 10pm, coinciding with the first of two sonic  
>booms recorded 12 minutes apart from the Sheffield area.

Discredited my own research?

I think not!

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Truth In Numbers

From: **Bob Kathman** <[BKathman@microprose.com](mailto:BKathman@microprose.com)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 11:15:47 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 20:17:14 -0400  
Subject: Truth In Numbers

>From: Kathleen Andersen <[KAnder6444@aol.com](mailto:KAnder6444@aol.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 19:27:18 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>I am currently working on an interview with Michio Kaku author  
>of Hyperspace, Visions and Beyond Einstein. Yes even a scientist  
>can keep an open mind. I like what he has to say:

>"99.9% of UFO sightings might be wrong, but it only takes one  
>sighting to change the foundations of all our scientific  
>knowledge"

This is interesting...I was just thinking about this the other day but in relation to abductions. Some abductees have commonality with others in their experiences, which seems to add credence to their claims and yet, if there were not a single correlation, that fact would still not be proof against their reports. And, if there were only one, true abductee in the world, their story would still be worth telling.

Curiously, UFO, crop circle, abduction and cattle mutilation cases tend to come in multiples, as they are still with us over time.

Bob

(New to the list and peeking out from lurkdom)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## S4 Database - New Address

From: Olav Phillips <[ophilips@imsn.net](mailto:ophilips@imsn.net)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 09:52:55 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 20:24:32 -0400  
Subject: S4 Database - New Address

Hi everyone,

I just wanted to let everyone know the S4 Database has a new URL  
<http://www.anomalies.net/>

Unfortunatley our old address @icom.net is no longer operational.

Please drop by and visit! We have updated and expanded our file archive to over 70,000 UFO/Paranormal files and images AND with the new server we are activley working to expand the UFO community into Cyberspace by donating free webspace to UFO Researchers and groups. So if you need webspace and your a UFO researcher or research group please email me about free (no strings) webspace. Its our way of giving back to the community and trying to help out! No ads no charges just free space..in the near future we'll be able to provide DNS service also!

Hey thanx for your time,

Olav  
System Administrator  
The S4 Database  
<http://www.anomalies.net>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Royce J. Myers III <[evidence@hotmail.com](mailto:evidence@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 11:38:13 PDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 21:29:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>To: "02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers";  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:40:49 -0400

>Hello list

>>Phillip S. Duke Ph.D. Experimental Pathology announces  
>>availability of his new Book titled 'The AIDS-ET Connection'.  
>>Evidence is presented from Biomedicine and Ufology that HIVs and  
>>their pandemics are of purposeful ET origin.

>Sorry, sir I don't buy your malicious crap.

And there seems to be quite a bit of it floating around in  
ufology as of late. Good old Kinkos, anyone can publish a book  
now.

<snip>

>>Described in the Book is a case where a male abductee with  
>>implant tested HIV Positive until his implant was surgically  
>>removed, after which he tested and remains HIV Negative.  
>>Verified in writing by Dr. Roger K. Leir.

>>Dr. Mirko D. Grmek M.D. Ph.D. highly respected author of 'The  
>>History Of AIDS', Princeton U. Press, stated "The epidemic's  
>>spread is exponential justifying cataclysmic predictions." That  
>>was in 1990. Do you think the situation has improved since then?

Let's do a little name dropping. Nothing like referencing people  
with Ph.Ds. Please....

<snip>

>>My recent book 'The AIDS-ET Connection' goes into all these  
>>issues and more. It is presently available for \$19.95 total cost  
>>from me at 2503 S. 47th Street Omaha NE 68106 USA. Also from  
>>Amazon.com under Medicine/Disease/AIDS/HIV.

Amazon.com: "We'll sell anything with a profit margin." Let me  
guess, the next book will connect E.Ts with the breaking up of  
the phone company, the Monica Lewinsky incident, and the last  
episode of Seinfeld.

>You know list folk, this is the kind of crap that make Ufology a  
>laughingstock! AIDS is a great tragedy it is not to be made  
>light of and I don't want to do that, but absurdity must be met  
>with absurdity. Who do you think you are to attribute Aliens or  
>God to what is a Disease that is clearly human.

>-GT McCoy

It is sad to see that someone would try to sell you a book based  
on a very sad and tragic disease.

Regards,

Royce J. Myers III

\*\*\*\*\*DON'T TRIP ON YOUR OPEN MIND\*\*\*\*\*

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Judith Dale <[judithdale@earthlink.net](mailto:judithdale@earthlink.net)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 11:39:46 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 21:26:48 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>From: GT McCoy <[gtmccoy@harborside.com](mailto:gtmccoy@harborside.com)>  
>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 21:50:30 -0700

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 07:51:45 -0700  
>>Subject: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>>From: Phillip S. Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>

Greetings to All,

>>Hello list

>>Phillip S. Duke Ph.D. Experimental Pathology announces  
>>availability of his new Book titled 'The AIDS-ET Connection'.  
>>Evidence is presented from Biomedicine and Ufology that HIVs and  
>>their pandemics are of purposeful ET origin.

>Sorry, sir I don't buy your malicious crap.

Can't say that I find this nonsense to be "malicious", but it certainly is crap, IMHO.

>>The AIDS-ET Connection is a new unifying hypothesis which  
>>logically, simply and neatly explains all cattle mutilation and  
>>human abduction phenomena. A brief Letter titled "Is there an  
>>AIDS-ET connection" was published in the Oct. MUFON UFO J. Forum  
>>following which the author's work has been black listed by  
>>MUFON.

>I wonder why.

Well, at least someone had some sense.

>>Described in the Book is a case where a male abductee with  
>>implant tested HIV Positive until his implant was surgically  
>>removed, after which he tested and remains HIV Negative.  
>>Verified in writing by Dr. Roger K. Leir.

>>Did you know that all cattle mutilation body sites correspond  
>>with possible HIV transmission sites in humans? That cattle are  
>>relatively similar to humans genetically?

>Yep, a recent human cloning technique used cow eggs and human  
>sperm/yolk (maybe there is something to the Minotaur  
>fable?)

>\_However\_. AIDS has been duly documented its transmission also  
>duly documented. Monkey bites, eating rare Monkey meat is how  
>AIDS got into the human population. Not O'l Bossie. Pigs are  
>closer to us, genetically - they're not ungluates for one. Two,  
>Pigs have a a very simular overall genetic makeup, they suffer  
>from simular diseases. Cows do not - I vote for the Oinkers  
>being the medium of choice.

Yes, well, the CDC and WHO would like us to believe that the origin of HIV lies in the Green Monkey. However, there is also the theory that HIV was grown in the biological warfare labs,



which interestingly are often in the same companies that produce vaccines. Actually, the very same labs that produced the first Hepatitis B vaccines. Further, the epidemiological path of HIV seems to follow the groups initially targeted for the first Hepatitis B vaccine trials. The question, then, that arises, is were those first Hepatitis vaccines contaminated with HIV? There seems to be evidence indicating that they were. So, was it an intentional contamination, or accidental? Given that the first targeted groups to receive the vaccine were IV drug users and homosexual men in L.A., New York City, and San Francisco, and certain portions of the population in Africa, certainly there is room for suspicion regarding intention.

I suppose if one is sufficiently paranoid, a case could be made for ET involvement in the process. Perhaps, this is the case for Dr. Duke.

>>Did you know that the physical exam human abductees receive very >>much emphasizes possible locations of HIV transmission? That the >>human body materials sampled including blood are all logical >>choices to test for possible presence of HIV?

If in fact, some of us are being studied, biologically, by ETs, I don't doubt that they would be interested in any illness such as HIV infection. And, HIV, certainly is present in many cells of an infected person. So what?

>Having to place myself in defense of the Aliens what unearthly >good (or bad) would the transmission of a hard to get disease to >the Human Population unless they were, ah, Puritian Aliens that >wanted to control human immorality (I don't think so, we are >capable of monumental immorality they'd have to do a zapping of >the whole planet a la "Marvin the Martian" of Warner Bros. fame.)

Truly, there are many other, more effective, means to bring about the demise of the Human Race.

>>Do you know how many people walking around have HIV? You don't? >>Well, no one does, as there is no central reporting agency. All >>test results are confidential.

>Yes, but keeping ones "pants zipped and yer wick dry" does >wonders for the transmission of AIDS.

Indeed, HIV is not easy to contract. Infact, it is less infectious than Hepatitis B, which is a much more hardy virus, and present in vast quantities in the bodily fluids of those who are infected. Much more so than HIV. Given the psychosocial stigma associated with HIV, it probably is a good thing that infection results are kept confidential.

>>Dr. Mirko D. Grmek M.D. Ph.D. highly respected author of 'The >>History Of AIDS', Princeton U. Press, stated "The epidemic's >>spread is exponential justifying cataclysmic predictions." That >>was in 1990. Do you think the situation has improved since then?

No, but, if one avoids very specific unsafe behaviors, one will not get infected.

>>My recent book 'The AIDS-ET Connection' goes into all these >>issues and more. It is presently available for \$19.95 total cost >>from me at 2503 S. 47th Street Omaha NE 68106 USA. Also from >>Amazon.com under Medicine/Disease/AIDS/HIV.

Well, this sounds like one more attempt to up the ante for panic, hysteria, and paranoid delusions. To my way of thinking, this piece of work has no place in the field of serious UFO/ET investigation, or theories.

>You know list folk, this is the kind of crap that make Ufology a >laughingstock! AIDS is a great tragedy it is not to be made >light of and I don't want to do that, but absurdity must be met >with abusurdity. Who do you think you are to attribute Aliens or >God to what is a Disease that is clearly human.

GT, I am in complete agreement with you.

Blessings to all,

Judith

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 22](#)

## Aurora 1897 - Again

From: **Richard D. Nolane** <[raynaud@total.net](mailto:raynaud@total.net)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 15:02:52 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 21:33:09 -0400  
Subject: Aurora 1897 - Again

Dear Jerome Clarke, Kevin Randle and List,

Thanks for your messages about the infamous Aurora Crash story.

As I wrote, I know rather well the "ancient UFO history" subject - I have published a book about it in France.

What I wanted to know is what you think of the account of Charlie C. Stephens interviewed by Jim Marrs in "Alien Agenda", of the own account of Marrs saying that he had seen what he was told to be the grave of the "alien pilot", of the picture of this headstone and of the picture and story of the analysis by Dr Tom Gray (University of North Texas).

All of them are in the Marrs's book. And remember that Jim Marrs writes he continues to be undecided about the case.

Yes, the Aurora case seems to be one of the many hoaxes among the interesting reports of the 1897 Airships wave. But, as any good researcher might do, I don't like to see parts of a story left without explanations.

Thanks in advance, and congratulations, Mr Randle.

RDN

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: New Images Placed On RPIT Site - "The Bird"

From: **Asgeir W. Skavhaug** <[asge-s@online.no](mailto:asge-s@online.no)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 21:15:10 +0200  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 07:29:40 -0400  
Subject: Re: New Images Placed On RPIT Site - "The Bird"

>From: Neil Morris <[neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
>Date: Fri, 01 Jan 1999 12:11:03 -0800  
>Fwd Date: Sat, 02 Jan 1999 10:58:22 -0500  
>Subject: New Images Placed On RPIT Site

>All on UpDates,

>I've today place 2 new images on my web site that address more  
>of the features in the "weather balloon" debris photographed on  
>July 8th 1947 in Gen Ramey's office at Fort Worth Tx.

<snip>

>The 2 images can be accessed by following the links marked  
>"updated 1st Jan 1999" from the webpage:

> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/ftw-pics/new-1/index.htm>

>The new images are at the bottom of the 2 updated pages.  
>Best Regards and a Happy New Year,

>Neil.

Or,

>From: Bob Shell <[bob@bobshell.com](mailto:bob@bobshell.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 09 Apr 1999 08:24:47 +0100  
>Fwd Date: Fri, 09 Apr 1999 23:31:32 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Update from RPIT

>>Date: Thu, 08 Apr 1999 07:32:01 -0700  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Neil Morris <[neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
>>Subject: Update from RPIT

>>Dear All,

>>I'd like to share with you some new and interesting finds from  
>>our continuing review of the Fort Worth Photographs.  
>>The attached image is a composite of sections taken from the  
>>RamyAlone and the RameyDubose images, each shows some of the  
>>smaller beam/foil debris.

>Neil,

>Much as I respect your intentions, I must say that I think you  
>are seriously off-base on this part of your study. I see nothing  
>in these photos but balloon and radar target debris, and I think  
>it is really stretching things to try and make it anything else.  
>I'm with you on the telegram, but not on this.

>Bob

Or,

>From: YourName - Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>Date: Fri, 09 Apr 1999 03:52:48 -0700Fwd  
>Date: Sat, 10 Apr 1999 00:51:18 -0400

>Subject: Re: Update from RPIT

<snip>

>Neil and team,

>After following this trail from the beginning I sure don't see  
>much. I don't want to sound too snippy but cheesus, I've been  
>looking at your images and if you can't get any better resoution  
>or focus, I don't see anything more than indistinctirregularities.  
>You read symbols out of blobs.

<snip>

>Josh

Neil, Bob, Josh, RPIT members & List,

I went back to some of the old mails and URLs dealing with the  
Ramey photos, and I was trying to find the same as RPIT had  
found.

Referring to the following URL:

<http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/ftw-pics/new-1/rmyemlx.gif>

I can easily pick out the "2" like symbol, and I can see it is  
\_not\_ a random mark\_, but, the other observations I can hardly  
figure out at all.

Instead, I can see some darker outlines of some kind of  
"decorations" \_close\_ to the "2" symbol, and painted on the  
material. They are located \_between\_ the two white circles A and  
D, and the "2" symbol -- with the raised, "3-D" edges -- even  
seems to form a part of these decorations.

Further, \_my interpretation\_ is that I seem to see outlines of  
\_a bird's head\_, with the "beak" almost touching the "D", and I  
see the bird's black eye (just follow the black line to the  
left), and the outlines of the rest of the head as well. Above  
the head (at the lower part within the "A circle") I can see  
some decorations resembling "a bunch of flowers" ("tulips", or  
even "slim" mushrooms?), or this might even be the tail feathers  
of the bird, with the bird's head bent 90 degrees (relative to  
the "feathers"). (The rest of "the bird's" body is disappeared  
in white.....)

The more I concentrate on this, the more it looks like a bird!

(Many birds! In fact, I can see birds everywhere - especially  
when I concentrate on the dark spots as eyes!)

Best regards,

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 20:20:55 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 12:33:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 16:09:38 -0400  
>From: Andy Roberts <[Brigantia@compuserve.com](mailto:Brigantia@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>Y'all,

>Well, you've got to laugh and admire at the gall of whoever was  
>behind this hoax (which takes several readings before the full  
>ramifications sink in). No doubt there will now be a flurry of  
>'outraged' decent ufologists who are appalled at such a hoax  
>being perpetrated on the 'UFO community'.

>They will be wrong.

>There is a long tradition of hoaxing within ufology and  
>associated subjects, and careful hoax experiments can only be  
>helpful. For example The Warminster hoax, MJ-12, the various  
>crop circle hoaxes etc have all been tremendously useful in  
>showing us just how witnesses experience, how investigators go  
>about their business, how the media (both general and  
>ufological) report a case and how the rumour mill spreads and  
>mutates.

>This is very useful stuff to know indeed because when done under  
>controlled conditions, where all the information is known and  
>carefully documented, these hoaxes tell us a lot about as-yet  
>'unidentified' cases.

Hi,

Just as an illustration on this sort of thing - in late 1986 I was contacted by a man claiming to be from the military and to have reams of covert documents of what (in retrospect) were the then unknown MJ 12 fiasco. What did I do? Ignore the request we meet? Course not. But I did several things. I made sure (with some effort) I did nothing alone and always had a back up witness checking me through. When we met the shady witness in a pub we used a ploy decided between us up front to get his car licence plate, used contacts to trace him and did a lot of background checking into his story after the meeting and prior to the next scheduled meet - including tracing his place of work and speaking to his colleagues.

This apparently scared our contact off and he never showed up as arranged with the docs - although he did write with a fun letter as to how he was arrested and had the papers confiscated. So we lost out on getting the MJ 12 papers although we had a great story (which is told in detail in 'From out of the Blue' for those interested). Six months later Tim Good revealed MJ 12 to the world and the rest is history, mystery and a dollop of tripe.

Am I mad I missed out on a fortune and a best selling book?

Nope. Checking out this story from day one was the only sensible thing to do. It ran the risk of putting off anyone who was looking for a patsy who would believe anything without question.

But thats UFology for you.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Teri Edgar <[uzrgrrl@mindspring.com](mailto:uzrgrrl@mindspring.com)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:53:12 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 12:33:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Kathleen Andersen <[KAnder6444@aol.com](mailto:KAnder6444@aol.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 19:27:18 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>From: Bluehare Dark Peak <[bluehare24@hotmail.com](mailto:bluehare24@hotmail.com)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 17:29:45 GMT

>>ATTENTION UFOLOGISTS  
>>A MESSAGE FROM GENIUS LOKI FOLLOWS

>>We are a group of people, active in UFO hoaxing since  
>>the mid 80s, and going under the collective name of Genius Loki.  
>>Some reading this document may think hoaxing is unacceptable  
>>a waste of time which could be put to better use  
>>investigating 'UFOs'. Show us a UFO and we will happily  
>>investigate it!

>>We believe that if ufologists are unable to  
>>determine that a case is hoaxed or not then they should stick  
>>to watching sci-fi.. Stupidity within the subject of UFOlogy  
>>has reached new peaks of intensity during the last two years.>>

>Can someone pass a message to this group and ask if they can  
>next hoax God. For after all, I've never seen him/her/it. Some  
>people spend their lives in search of God, many make a living  
>talking about God, more than 90% of the planet worships a God  
>but then that is all based on theory and not concrete evidence.

>Why must some of us have such closed minds to the existence of  
>things unless we can touch it, see it, hear it or smell it. If  
>someone did not venture out and build a telescope we would never  
>learn that there are real things beyond what our eyes can focus  
>on. If someone didn't have the foresight to build a microscope  
>we would never learn of a minature world that lives on us and in  
>us.

>I am currently working on an interview with Michio Kaku author  
>of Hyperspace, Visions and Beyond Einstein. Yes even a scientist  
>can keep an open mind. I like what he has to say:

>"99.9% of UFO sightings might be wrong, but it only takes one  
>sighting to change the foundations of all our scientific  
>knowledge"

>Kathleen Andersen  
>MUFON State Section Director  
>Seattle

>Yes even a skeptic once in a while!

Hi Kathleen,

I'm beginning to doubt that those with "closed minds" will ever  
have a sighting, even if a 'FO lands in their driveway. Reality  
is based on our perceptions and if we cannot stretch our minds



to accept anything beyond what society has told us it's alright to believe in, how will we ever perceive a UFO?

Your point about God is a good one. How can we accept the reality of God, who only a few biblical characters claimed to have seen (and described as a UFO encounter) and, yet, not believe in UFOs who so many around the globe have seen?

In fact, I rather believe that unless we do stretch our minds a great deal, we will never find "proof" of UFOs. Perhaps it's time the human race started to grow up and evolve past the five senses and take notice of the evidence for other realities.

Your pal,

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 13:39:22 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 12:33:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>From: Thiago Ticchetti <[thiagolt@opengate.com.br](mailto:thiagolt@opengate.com.br)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 22:33:04 -0300

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 07:51:45 -0700  
>>Subject: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>>From: Phillip S. Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>

>>Phillip S. Duke Ph.D. Experimental Pathology announces  
>>availability of his new Book titled 'The AIDS-ET Connection'.  
>>Evidence is presented from Biomedicine and Ufology that HIVs and  
>>their pandemics are of purposeful ET origin.

>>The AIDS-ET Connection is a new unifying hypothesis which  
>>logically, simply and neatly explains all cattle mutilation and  
>>human abduction phenomena. A brief Letter titled "Is there an  
>>AIDS-ET connection" was published in the Oct. MUFON UFO J. Forum  
>>following which the author's work has been black listed by  
>>MUFON.

>>Described in the Book is a case where a male abductee with  
>>implant tested HIV Positive until his implant was surgically  
>>removed, after which he tested and remains HIV Negative.  
>>Verified in writing by Dr. Roger K. Leir.

>No, I don't think so. It is easier to believe that the USA government  
>created the HIV virus.

>THIAGO LUIZ TICCHETTI  
>Diretor Do Departamento de Publicação e Tradução Especializadas ( DEPTE -  
>EBE-ET / Brasilia-Brasil)  
>Director of the Publication Department and Specialized Translation  
>ICQ - 35119615  
>\*\*\*\*\* SE VOCÊ NÃO É POLÍCIA NÃO USE ARMAS \*\*\*\*\*

I think it is still easier to believe that the disease arose  
naturally, like other diseases. One horrible new disease  
popped up and apparently died out in San Francisco recently.

A fast flesh eating microbe had contaminated some heroin that  
drug users were injecting. Suddenly, the cases stopped as the  
contaminated batch was used up I suppose.

Hardly a government plot IMHO.

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

From: Peter Brookesmith Mendoza <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 21:04:13 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 12:33:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

With the compliments of the Duke of Mendoza:

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark" <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 99 09:20:40 PDT

>I find Peter's work at best of modest interest,  
>his often smirky, immensely self-pleased prose generally  
>unreadable.

It's good to know that Jerome can change his mind, after years of maintaining how - though he might disagree with whatever I had to say - he always found it interesting. This shows he is open minded and tolerant and a very good egg.

But not terribly up to date. For years it has been an open secret that I do not sleep on a bed but on a carefully squared-up 10ft x 6ft x 7ft pile of unsold (frankly, my dear, unsaleable) manuscripts of my lurid scribblings, and that the majority of my income is in fact derived from selling implausible-looking but highly effective items of S&M equipment to fellow members of a number of gentlemen's clubs in St James's. You bet I know a gland in an uproar when I see one.

But what, exactly, do Jerome's generously provided and variously repeated literary opinions have to do with anything I said last time around? Could it be that he does not want to gaze upon his own peccadilloes, to which I so unkindly drew attention? It is certainly true that he has been rather quiet about a major drift of what I wrote, which (lest we forget) concerned his ethical and moral self-contradictions.

>I am not willing to accept his tedious,  
>self-serving rationale -- laced, typically, with ad-hominem  
>remarks -- for not withdrawing and apologizing for his role in  
>circulating a bogus allegation.

I am perfectly happy, if the facts so suggest, to apologize to Budd Hopkins. I see no reason to apologize to Jerome or anyone else who has no locus standi in the business.

I really do not care what Jerome is willing to accept or not from me, or from anyone else. I do care a little more that he misrepresents me quite so transparently. Those who represent themselves as historians should be less economical with the truth. Turning the telescope the right way round will also show me in my true proportions.

best wishes  
Pastime D. Monopoly  
International Banker

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 99 20:01:10 PDT  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 12:33:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:40:57 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 12:03:10 -0400  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Steven Kaeser <[steve@konsulting.com](mailto:steve@konsulting.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>>>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 02:50:59 -0700  
>>>>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>>>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>>>>>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:19:21 EDT  
>>>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

Kevin,

>He is not alone in this. Edith Fiore also lost her license in  
>the state of California. While using past life regression to  
>treat a client, and using hypnotic regression to access the past  
>life was told by the client there was nothing there. Fiore's  
>comment was "Make it up." She also convinced a woman that she  
>had been abducted by alien creatures.

>These are the two major examples of "researchers" implanting  
>their belief structures on their clients. Both had advanced  
>degrees and had been in practice for years. The point is, they  
>came to believe in alien abduction and then began to convince  
>their clients they too were victims of alien abduction.

I don't find these to be particularly compelling examples. Did  
you ever meet the late Edith Fiore? She was a serious nut case  
and in no sense a ufologist (not, of course, that -- God help us  
-- one can't be a nut case and a ufologist). She had  
wide-ranging New Age views and a long history as a mystical  
seeker, including involvement with a sex-and-saucer cult run by  
the notorious contactee/charlatan Dick Miller. Her book on  
abductions was laughable, as were her books on satanic  
possession and reincarnation. I once heard her relate -- with a  
straight face -- that in a previous life one of her patients had  
been an alien who died at Roswell.

To me, Fiore tells us little if anything about ufology or  
abduction research, but she does tell us that -- advanced  
degrees notwithstanding -- someone can be certified as a  
psychologist or a psychiatrist and yet be at the least  
temperamentally unqualified, at the worst dangerous to her  
clients.

Charges that people's lives have been ruined by mental-health  
professionals have been leveled against some of the leading  
lights, including Freud and Jung. (A small library of books

exists on the harm these two alone allegedly did, and a larger library documents abuse by less prominent psychological professionals.) Within the context of abduction experience, one would have no trouble collecting horror stories, I'm sure, by abductees whose testimony was treated as self-evident proof of mental disorder by psychotherapists -- thus adding false anxieties and charges to the stress the abductees were already undergoing.

>It also demonstrates a real problem with abduction research. It >shows some of the problems with hypnotic regression. These are >not the only examples of researchers implanting their belief >structures on those they interview.

It also demonstrates a real problem with psychology and psychiatry, where one can find many examples of mental-health professionals implanting their belief structures on those they interview. Complacent belief in the superiority of psychotherapists over sensitive, experienced abduction researchers is unwarranted. At the very least the question is still very much an open one.

Congratulations on the Ph.D., by the way. Use it well.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: James Easton <[voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 03:48:55 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 12:33:07 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

Regarding:

>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 15:06:50 -0400  
>From: Bluehare Dark Peak <[bluehare24@hotmail.com](mailto:bluehare24@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

Whilst appreciating the 'funny side' of this, there's another side which ain't remotely amusing.

We are all prey for malicious 'sincerity' and no matter how credible it may seem, it's, regrettably, always sensible to have reservations about any witness testimony.

Trusteth no-one...

I don't know Max Burns at all. I do know that I empathise with the situation he faced and appreciate the dilemma in determining what is a reliable witness account. Especially when the witness is so 'sincere'. Or should that be deceitful.

Today Max Burns, maybe your turn tomorrow.

Publishing Max's private e-mail transcends distasteful to become reprehensible and there's no entitlement to any kudos in that respect.

Incidentally, I note that Max did express his reservations about the information given.

The danger is encouraging such amateur 'hoaxers' and giving the impression that elementary deception supports their condescending self acclimation.

Anyone can be dishonest. Maybe it just takes a bit more courage to say 'I'm a liar and this is my name'.

As Tim Matthews said re another UK 'hoax':

<http://www.ufomind.com/ufo/updates/1999/mar/m11-016.shtml>

'What has the world come to when people are prepared to go to such extraordinary lengths to try and mislead researchers?'

James.  
E-mail: [voyager@ukonline.co.uk](mailto:voyager@ukonline.co.uk)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |



[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Phillip S Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 18:37:25 -0700  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 22:27:20 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>From: GT McCoy <[gtmccoy@harborside.com](mailto:gtmccoy@harborside.com)>  
>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 21:50:30 -0700

Dear Mr. McCoy,

I respond to your post in which you publicly characterize my recent book 'The AIDS-ET Connection' as "malicious crap" and "the kind of crap that makes ufology a laughingstock" along with several other derogatory statements.

Scientifically speaking, the issue of how HIVs originated is quite unsettled. I refer you to "Inventing The AIDS Virus" by respected molecular biologist Dr. Peter Duesberg with Foreword by Nobel Prize winner Dr. Kary Mullis. The book's thesis is that HIV has nothing to do with AIDS. What is your position on this important question? What evidence do YOU base it on?

In my correspondence the existence of the black list has not been denied. Its purpose is to suppress knowledge of my work. That is "why?"

It appears your understanding of human science cloning procedures is imperfect. So far only the gray aliens have produced alien/human hybrids. I refer you to Dr. David M. Jacobs' 1998 book The Threat. It is all on this important subject.

The "monkey bite" idea is politically correct just like the "Roswell balloons" etc. If you buy one you buy both as they are brought you as part of the same politically correct package. There is no good evidence for the monkey bite idea despite the government's trying hard. SimianIV (which does not make the monkeys sick) is very very different from HIV-1. SimianIV is never found in humans. \_Never\_.

Yes, pigs and people may seem to resemble each other at times, but genetic analysis by Dr. Womack at the U. of Texas and others shows there is more genetic homology between humans and cattle. Also, cattle are easier to come by in secret and have more blood. And they are cleaner. All good reasons to use them not pigs.

You characterize HIV as a "hard to get" disease. According to AmFAR by 2000 AD 110 million people will have HIV of which 10 million are children. According to Dr. Grmek M.D. Ph.D. the spread is "exponential" with "cataclysmic" expectations. As you say, all that's necessary to control transmission is to control people's sexual activities. Is that easy? Likely? You know the answer.

Sexual transmission along with a 10 year asymptomatic infectious period assures maximizing HIV spread along with AIDS in the 25-44 age range. How else can you assure that people in the prime of life will sicken and die? Only by sexual transmission.

When enough people are sick, dying and dead, which will be sooner than you think (if you ever think) human civilization

will collapse. Eliminating organized human opposition to The Day.

The whole planet is being "zapped" as you put it. You just don't know it.

You never commented on my factual statements concerning cattle mutilation sites and human abduction examination sites corresponding with HIV body transmission sites. Nor on the abductee whose HIV test changed with his implant removal. How do you explain these facts? FACTS. Not funny (to you) criticisms without basis. But facts.

And in closing, I appreciate your statement "solid advice" but in fact I only put this in for legal protection. Medical assistance may well prolong life. Whether or not this is a blessing I leave to your judgment. Visit your local pediatric AIDS ward and find out. Yes, if the Mother has HIV, probably the infant will too...

Finally, regarding your angry statements "Who do you think you are..." I reply thusly:

I am a graduate of the UCLA College of Letters and Sciences with the B.S. in Chemistry. I am a graduate of the USC School of Medicine Department of Pathology with the Ph.D. in Experimental Pathology.

Tell me, what scientific degrees do YOU have? My graduate training was paid for by NIH. They knew I was worth it. What were YOU worth to them?

I did a year's Postdoctoral training working with Dr. Denham Harman, originator of the Free Radical Theory of Aging. I numbered two Nobel Prize winners among my teachers.

How many Nobel Prize winners did you train with?

I published my research work in prestigious journals such as Molecular Pathology, J. Natl. Cancer Inst., etc. How about YOU?

I was formerly owner and Director of Duke Laboratories in Illinois. We were licensed by the CDC, FDA, etc. I held all the licenses personally. How about YOU?

I could go on further but you should get it by now. If not just forget it.

Mr. McCoy, you are correct when you say that AIDS is a "Disease that is clearly human." Monkeys and other animals do not get it. Only humans do.

Why is that?

Just why are the gray aliens here?

There is only one form of cosmic wealth and that is real estate. You are losing yours along with a lot of other people. They are stealing your birthright as a human being and you don't know it.

The evidence that HIV/AIDSs are purposeful ET alien creations is all laid out in my book. Get the book and read it and then if you want criticize. But please don't criticize what you don't know about and don't understand. Thank you.

I reply to your negative quotation regarding cats, dogs and pigs as follows, with one by a person whose teachings you are obviously not familiar with.

"Cast not your pearls before swine, lest they trample them underfoot and then turn and rend you." Jesus of Nazareth.

Phillip S. Duke Ph.D.  
[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: RIPT & MJ-12

From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 00:18:34 +0000  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12

Re: RIPT & MJ-12

>From: Neil Morris <[Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 15:37:14 +0100  
>Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:07 -0400  
>Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12

Previously, Neil had offered:

>The paper is also clearly not a teletype message, as Kevin  
>points out teletype machines used (and still do) continuous roll  
>paper which is just torn away as the message is complete, this  
>makes a large "letter heading" on the paper impossible if it  
>were teletype output.

<snip>

>And the document seems to mention:

>"4" "VICTIMS" "WRECK" "CONVAY" "CRASHES" "MIDDAY" "STORY ADV"  
>and might I also offer "EVEN PUT THEORY WEATATN BALLOONS"

Hi, Neil.

Some things I thought I'd throw into the mix.

First, when I was a kid, there was an old (or I suppose new, at that time) teletype machine at the TV station where my father worked. The type it put out was identical to that of an old Remington typewriter my parents still have. Therefore, I'm not sure that based on type, alone, could someone determine whether the memo in question originated from a teletype machine though some teletypes used upper case only.

Second, I remember the news guys bitching and moaning about how unreliable the teletype was. Things were always coming in spelled incorrectly due to machine error (as well as error on the part of the original "typist", I'm sure).

Third, the feed on the machine was not always on the mark, which resulted in uneven lines of type more often than not. As we've become used to laser printers and ink jet printers, it's good to remember that some of the old equipment wasn't always up to snuff, even when hitting on all cylinders! (hell, my ink jet printer still screws up from time to time)

And lastly, the news department had a habit of stamping the top of a teletype after it came in, for whatever reason. I'm not familiar with the habits of the military back in those days. Is it possible that they, too, stamped teletypes upon receipt? If so, it might explain the "header" at the top of the memo. Just a thought...

Take care.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 01:00:11 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:56 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>Documentation, please, on how abduction claims have wrecked  
>>lives.

>>Anecdotes not welcome, since they can easily be countered with  
>>situations I've personally observed, in which people pulled  
>>themselves together by coming to terms with their reported  
>>abduction experiences.

>Hi Greg, All -

>Couldn't we turn this around and say, "Documentation please" on  
>alien abduction? Couldn't we say "Anecdotes not welcome..."  
>Aren't we working here with little in the way of documentation  
>of alien abduction?

Perfectly reasonable. Though there's quite a large literature on abductions, where the anecdotal reasons for believing in them are set forth in great detail. There are also Eddie Bullard's studies, which put some scientific heft behind the proposition that something not readily explainable is going on (or at least not explainable by some of the familiar attempts at explanation). There's also Stuart Appelle's paper in JUFOS, which sets forth the difficulties in accepting the belief that abductions are real, but also sets forth the equal difficulties in believing -- at the present state of available evidence -- that they aren't.

Claims like John Rimmer's are, by contrast, made very casually, with, as far as I know, no supporting documentation, no deep argument, not even any mustering of data pro and con. That's why I asked for documentation -- not to be a brat, not to answer his snipe with one of my own, but in the hope that he'd provide some, so this wretched argument could be elevated to at least an elementary level of rational discourse.

Stewart's paper grows more relevant every day. I'm not saying he has the answers to all our questions -- but he's merciless in saying which theories have been advanced without much data to prove them.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)





# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 01:18:34 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:56 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>On the other hand, we can point to some abductees who've seen  
>their lives radically altered by tales of alien abduction. So  
>what if there are a few, some, many who have deal with alien  
>abduction easily or well. There are those who have not... but,  
>these would be some of the dreaded anecdotes.

That's why anecdotes are treacherous. I know or have heard of people whose lives have been hurt by heavy metal, on-line chat rooms, and rollerblading. Should I start crusading to prove those things are harmful? I know someone who ruined herself financially because she was obsessed with a world-famous opera diva, and followed the singer around the world, attending every performance she gave. Does this mean opera is a problem?

It's tempting to think we know something because we can tell stories that support our point of view. I can't tell you the number of interviews I gave, articles I wrote, radio shows I went on to participate in arguments about hiphop (or rap music, as some people might call it). Was it dangerous? Did it cause violence? Often the hosts of these radio shows would have an anecdote or two. Almost never did they have any real information about the subject; they had no idea, for instance, of how many people were taken off the street by hiphop, how many kids formed businesses, how many people left gang life forever.

The point of that story isn't to say that I was right, or that the radio hosts were right. The point is to say that we can't decide anything without real information. If you want to know whether hiphop is good or bad, first acquaint yourself with the entire field. Learn how it works, hear story after story, until you can decide which kind of story really dominates. Even better, get real, objective quantitative data.

It's the same with abductions. It's pointless to tell stories of people hurt by believing they'd been abducted, and equally pointless, from a scientific point of view, for me to say that people have been helped by coming to accept that belief. I only tell my stories to balance the other side, to say that the stories don't all go one way. What's missing on both sides is, again, quantitative data. How many people have been helped by accepting that they think they've been abducted, how many have been hurt?

Until we have solid information, we're stuck in a vacuum. And we'll all just repeat the stories that support our own point of view.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse

From: John Velez <[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 02:26:44 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:40:57 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 12:03:10 -0400  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Steven Kaeser <[steve@konsulting.com](mailto:steve@konsulting.com)>  
>>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 02:50:59 -0700  
>>>From: Josh Goldstein <[clearlt@pacbell.net](mailto:clearlt@pacbell.net)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins

>>>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.co](mailto:KRandle993@aol.co)>  
>>>>Date: Sat, 19 Jun 1999 11:19:21 EDT  
>>>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins  
>>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>>><snip>

>>>>>Not quite true. Richard Boylan has already been taken to court  
>>>>>because of his "abduction research." He lost his license to  
>>>>>practice in California because of it. It proved nothing about  
>>>>>the reality of UFOs or abductions, but did demonstrate, at least  
>>>>>some of the problems with hypnotic regression and researcher  
>>>>>bias.

Hi Kevin, hi All,

Kevin writes:

>These are the two major examples of "researchers" implanting  
>their belief structures on their clients. Both had advanced  
>degrees and had been in practice for years. The point is, they  
>came to believe in alien abduction and then began to convince  
>their clients they too were victims of alien abduction.

And we should bring back 'keelhauling' for anyone who engages in such practices. What I find disturbing is that the implication is that even trained/skilled professionals can't be trusted to do a competent (or honest) job when it comes to abduction. So where do we turn? Only to 'groups' of professionals who can then police themselves? Maybe only institutions can be trusted to do an honest and competent job. But then, there are no "groups of professionals" or "trusted institutions" doing the research, is there?

>It also demonstrates a real problem with abduction research. It  
>shows some of the problems with hypnotic regression.

The real "problem" Kevin, is that there are no\_responsible\_ mainstream professionals or institutions taking on the research! When you involve 'amateurs' in anything you're going to get a very mixed bag of individual competence and ethics. Thus far, just about all of the investigating and so called research has been carried out by amateurs (in some cases opportunists) who merely stepped into the vacuum left by professionals. (ie; scientists, health care pros, etc.)

Rather than stumping for the rooting out of incompetent amateurs, or abolishing the use of hypnosis, (whose validity as a therapeutic tool or means of memory retrieval is still very much an open question) the energy might be better spent convincing professionals that there is something worthy of investigating. Something worthy of their time and their resources.

Like it or not, believe it or not, many human lives worldwide are being affected by this phenomenon. How many people have to report before the institutions and professionals that we rely on for help and answers begin to get involved? I am astounded at the condescensions and complete apathy that that community (academic) has demonstrated so far. I mean for Christ's sake, where are all the psychiatrists/psychologists in all of this? Everybody is ready to point out what is wrong, but no one seems interested in getting it done right.

(If you're not a part of the solution, you're a part of the problem!)

I've been whistling this tune for six years. Many others for much longer. Maybe it will have to progress in the same way that AIDS awareness did. At first, the good ole 'Moral Majority' kind of ignored it because after all it was only affecting those ungodly, degenerate, homosexuals. That is, until people began to realize that those who were dying from AIDS were their own brothers, sisters, friends, and coworkers. It wasn't until the epidemic was brought home to their own doorsteps that the public began to -demand- research and action. I'm waiting to see how long it takes before the needs of so very many ordinary people who are reporting abduction finally gets the attention of/acknowledged by, the mainstream scientific community.

Most of us already know what's wrong Kevin. What I'd like to know is, when do we unite in an effort (begin expending energy) towards getting it done right, and by the right people?

As they used to say in my old 'hood', "So far, it's all just so much rap!"

Peace,

John Velez, UFO abduction \*victim

(\*Yes, -victim- I didn't ask for -any- of this!)

---

[jvif@spacelab.net](mailto:jvif@spacelab.net)  
ABDUCTION INFORMATION CENTER  
<http://www.if-aic.com/>

"Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind."

---

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 08:47:14  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952

Source: "alt.alien.research".

Stig

\*\*\*

From: [Koolhand@webtv.net](mailto:Koolhand@webtv.net) (Jim Ball)  
Newsgroups: alt.alien.research  
Subject: UFO Phenomena  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 00:12:08 -0400 (EDT)

--WebTV-Mail-125815488-91  
Content-Type: Text/Plain; Charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7Bit

I've been pondering this UFO business since personally observing the big flap around D. C. in the 50's while on duty at Bolling AFB.

There were hard radar targets - several - moving at fantastic speeds. We went out on the flightline after scrambling several fighters to intercept them to watch the show, and it was a spectacular one to see.

These lights accomplished some incredible maneuvers, impossible even with today's aircraft.

Nobody had a clue as to what we were witnessing, except that it was unearthly, or unexplainable, to say the least.

There was never an acceptable AF explanation to describe what we, and thousands of others, witnessed. I'm still stumped, but I now have a theory for all to comment on: perhaps these craft are beings from another dimension parallel to our earth, but in a different time-space continuum....they can enter our space when they wish, but we can't enter, or even see theirs, which is far advanced from ours.

What do you think....is this a possible credible thesis?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse

From: **Tim Matthews** <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 08:07:17 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>From: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>To: 02 - UFO UpDates Subscribers;  
>Subject: UFO UpDate: Re: Hypnotic Abuse  
>Date: 22 June 1999 15:51

>From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:23:17 +0100

>>From: Tim Matthews <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
>>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]  
>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 22:26:28 +0100

>>No group in Northern England sanctions is as far as I can tell  
>>and this has been in force for many years - which is perhaps  
>>why we don't have as many 'alien abductions' over here...?

>Regarding the above I wonder if this is the case for most  
>Southern UFO Research groups? be interesting to find out.

>So here is the question: If you are a member of a Southern UFO  
>Research team do you use the methods of hypnotic regression when  
>dealing with alleged Alien abductees?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 13:31:56 +0100  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Matthew Williams <[truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net](mailto:truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 20:31:25 +0100

>Now a note from Matthew Williams.

>I think that the act of hoaxing for negative reasons is a bad  
>one. The reasons put forward by the "hoaxers" show their motives  
>are less than honorable. Indeed they feel the need to use  
>anonymous email addresses to hide behind because if their  
>identities were known they would be universally shunned by the  
>UFO community for their activities.

>However in my experience this  
>type of behaviour is typical of what I am terming "northern  
>ufology". This is not to damn all Northern Ufologists of who  
>there are many, but to highlight an ALARMING trend in certain  
>circles for this type of hoaxing and time wasting. Most of this  
>behaviour seems to be taking place "up north", and involves a  
>very well known band of not so merry people. Many readers out  
>there are probably aware of who these people are and their  
>motives and may have seen some of their other "hoax" works in  
>the past.

I think what is on display regarding this whole minor ( I  
apologise for dented ego's regarding that remark) Northern UFO  
group of people is nothing more than an excellent piece of  
Networking, and for that they must be commended.

It's all about good lines of communication and well they seem to  
have mastered this.

Who out of this bunch is turning into a New Age Man?

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Peter Brookesmith Mendoza <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 09:05:14 -0400  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

With the compliments of the Duke of mendoza:

>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 11:39:46 -0700  
>From: Judith Dale <[judithdale@earthlink.net](mailto:judithdale@earthlink.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>Yes, well, the CDC and WHO would like us to believe that the  
>origin of HIV lies in the Green Monkey. However, there is also  
>the theory that HIV was grown in the biological warfare labs,  
>which interestingly are often in the same companies that  
>produce vaccines.

Here are the antidotes to this kind of factoid:

In the USA and Europe in the 1980s and '90s there were suspicions that HIV had reached the human population through vaccines, in particular a batch of live polio vaccine that was created using African green monkey cells. This was used in Zaire, Rwanda and Burundi between 1957 and 1960. An American scientific panel examined the evidence in 1992-3, and concluded the vaccines were free of HIV. A major problem with the 'contaminated vaccine' theory was that the HIV-1 and SIV viruses are genetically so far apart that it was virtually impossible for the SIV to have mutated into HIV-1 in such a short timespan. It was suggested too that viruses in smallpox vaccine grown on cow cells had reacted with bovine leukemia viruses to produce HIV, but this theory too collapsed when it was shown that the DNA of the two microorganisms were incapable of combining. Astronomers Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe declared their conviction that the AIDS virus came from outer space. The two British scientists have long maintained that many epidemic-inducing microbes arrive on meteorites, asteroids and minor comets entering the Earth's atmosphere. The distinguished astronomers have consistently ignored biologists' objections that the microbes would be wiped out by a combination of ultra-violet light in outer space and the heat generated when the space debris enters the atmosphere.

Then came the conspiracy theorists. One of the first was British doctor John Seale, who published an article in the Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine in 1985 that claimed the US Army had concocted HIV out of genetic material from viruses causing bovine leukemia, visna in sheep, lentiviruses from horses and goats, and human T-cell leukemia/lymphocyte virus. The recipe, Seale said, had been cooked up at Fort Detrick, Maryland, in 1977. Lying behind Seale's thesis were two articles that had appeared the same year in Literaturnaya Gazeta, the journal of the Soviet Writer's Union, and told much the same story. According to Professor S. Drozdov of the Research Institute of Poliomyelitis and Encephalitis in Moscow, the CIA had let the virus loose by testing it on federal prisoners in the USA and in the field in Africa.

None of these claims bore much relation to scientific or to historical facts. The earliest identified AIDS cases date back to 1959, when the concept of genetic coding was unknown. Reverse transcriptase was discovered in 1970, and retroviruses were discovered in people in 1978. But it was not until 1983 that the



technique of polymerase chain reaction, which revolutionized research into and manipulation of DNA, was invented. Essentially the cloning technology that the 'invention' of HIV requires did not exist in 1977. In 1986, the Soviets admitted they had their own cases of AIDS, and after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 the Soviet Academy of Sciences apologized for disseminating the notion that AIDS was an American invention, an idea that, it admitted, had been inspired by the KGB. The US State Department had already concluded as much, and believed the accusations were designed to discredit the USA in developing countries.

Facts have never stood in the way of a good conspiracy theory, however. In 1996 Dr Leonard G. Horowitz, a dental health expert and former faculty member of Tufts and Harvard Universities, published (at his own expense) a 592-page hardcover 'expose' - Emerging Viruses: AIDS & Ebola: Nature, Accident or Intentional? - of the links between AIDS, the National Institutes of Health, US biological warfare research establishments and an almost inevitable list of several favorite targets of conspiracy addicts, such as the Rockefeller family, the CIA, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and the Nixon administrations of 1968-74. According to Dr Horowitz's book, AIDS researcher Dr Robert Gallo did not discover HIV in 1984, but had already invented it by 1971. (One is amazed that Dr Gallo has refrained from legal action.) The virus was deployed in Africa as a means of population control, and the whole plot was originally put together by Dr Henry Kissinger as early as 1969.

Dr Horowitz also claims that 'the world's most feared and deadly viruses' - Marburg and Ebola - were likewise man-made, and 'share the dubious distinction of breaking out in or around areas of CIA/NATO operations' in Africa, and were put to good use in diplomatic blackmail. NATO does not operate in Africa. Circumstantial evidence and a powerful belief system can prove almost anything. Horowitz's 'critical examination' of 'the New York Times bestselling "nonfiction" book The Hot Zone by Richard Preston ... reveals Preston's book is undoubtedly counterintelligence propaganda seemingly intended to prepare the world for future epidemics and additional virus outbreaks.' (Horowitz says rather breathlessly that a 'a final serendipitous discovery identified ... Preston as the recipient of a \$20,000 literary grant from the Sloan Foundation', a fact that could be gleaned by looking at the first few pages of the book.)

But the point of conspiracy theories is less to satisfy logic than to articulate and dramatize emotions. In the case of AIDS, the blaming ritual that conspiracy theory requires has amalgamated moral disgust and social and racial stereotyping. The Reagan administration's unwillingness to commit funds to HIV and AIDS research stemmed from a disbelief that AIDS would ever affect heterosexuals, despite growing evidence to the contrary. The disease had already quarantined itself, in this view, and had conveniently done so among a group of people whose way of life was morally and physically repugnant to the decision makers. Behind them stood a phalanx of right-wing religious bigots only too ready to proclaim that gays had brought their plague upon themselves: 'AIDS is a judgement of God,' thundered the Rev. Billy Graham, and was echoed by television evangelist and Moral Majority leader Jerry Falwell: 'AIDS is God's punishment. The scripture is clear: We do reap it in our flesh when we violate the laws of God.' Alabama senator Jeremiah Denton was reported to have said unequivocally, 'Let the faggots die.'

By the late 1980s, the claim that AIDS was a product of biological warfare experiments in Africa had metamorphosed itself to haunt the imagination as home-grown folklore. On the political fringe, groups such as the United Front Against Racism and Capitalist Oppression could maintain that that AIDS was 'bio-warfare directed mainly against gays' by the CIA. But by this time the threat to heterosexuals was widely recognized, and so among many African Americans the legend grew - along with the disproportionate spread of AIDS in the black community - that the biological 'war' was a genocidal attack on them. This was not a belief limited to separatist groups or black nationalists, although it was certainly endorsed by them. Stephen Thomas and Sandra Quinn, from the University of Maryland, polled black Americans in seven states between 1988 and 1990 on attitudes to the disease. Nearly 40 per cent of the black college students surveyed in Washington, DC, agreed with the statement: 'I believe

there is some truth in reports that the AIDS virus was produced in a germ-warfare laboratory.' Still more disturbing was the finding that of 999 black churchgoers, one third agreed strongly with the statement: 'I believe AIDS is a form of genocide against the black race.'

Against this backcloth it becomes all the more urgent to promote some rational, fact-based approach to the causes of AIDS and emerging diseases.

Incidentally, it's also not true that the numbers of AIDS infections, nationally or globally, is not tracked. But national pride in some Third World countries and simple lack of medical infrastructure in others make the figures not entirely reliable.

-----

FURTHER READING

Berridge, Virginia: AIDS in the UK (Oxford University Press) 1996  
Conner, S. & Kingman, S: The Search for the Virus (Penguin) 1988  
Epstein, Steven: Impure Science (University of California Press) 1996  
Fisher-Hoch, S. & McCormick, J.B: The Virus Hunters (Bloomsbury) 1996  
Garrett, Laurie: The Coming Plague (Penguin) 1995  
Gould, Peter: The Slow Plague (Blackwell) 1993  
Karlen, Arno: Plague's Progress (Victor Gollancz) 1995  
Mack, Arien(ed): In Time of Plague (New York University Press) 1991  
McNeill, William H.: Plagues and Peoples (Basil Blackwell) 1977  
Porter, Roy: Disease, Medicine and Society in England, 1550-1860 (Cambridge University Press) 1995  
Preston, Richard: The Hot Zone (Random House) 1994  
Rosenberg, Charles: Explaining Epidemics (Cambridge University Press) 1992  
Wills, Christopher: Plagues (HarperCollins) 1996

-----

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 23](#)

## On Firmage's UFO Theories

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 06:57:16  
Fwd Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:01:26 -0400  
Subject: On Firmage's UFO Theories

Source: Red Herring,

<http://www.herring.com:80/insider/1999/0622/cip-firmage.html>

Stig

\*\*\*

Big Fish: is Joe Firmage an Internet genius?

By Paul Kapustka  
Redherring.com  
June 22, 1999

\*\*

In case you haven't noticed, Joe Firmage is in the news again. Written off for his outlandish views on UFOs (among other topics), Mr. Firmage last week resurrected his business persona by unveiling a "venture construction firm" called Intend Change, which he will lead as a founding partner.

So is Joe still a nut, or is he once again a business genius? Is he neither, or a little of both? Will his new company become a market success in the startup-development space, in the way that his last company, USWeb/CKS (Nasdaq: USWB), became a leader in the Web-design field? Will Joe flake out again as he advances his scientific theories and social agendas? For now, Mr. Firmage's reëmergence raises many questions -- which you might want answered before doing business with him.

With the launch of Intend Change, Mr. Firmage has reinvented himself as a venture catalyst, a self-proclaimed Internet expert whose new firm will turbocharge your nascent business plan, outfit you with a seasoned management team and some shiny venture dollars, and otherwise grease the skids for a successful IPO or big-buck acquisition. All that for a modest 10 percent stake in your company. Sound good? But wait, there's more.

CHECK THOSE BAGS

And it's stuff you may not want. Though he went through great pains to distance his scientific theories from Intend Change's business at last week's press event, Mr. Firmage firmly intends to imbue Intend Change with his personal zeal. That means both a commitment from Intend Change's founders to contribute half their equity to nonprofit, charitable activities and a no-excuses continuation by Mr. Firmage of his extracurricular extraterrestrial activities. Is the business opportunity worth the baggage? Those close to Mr. Firmage seem to think so.

The prevailing sentiment among Mr. Firmage's friends and coworkers is that he is something of a genius, who sees things in a way mere mortals cannot. Some people who know him well won't even discount Mr. Firmage's outlandish UFO theories, even in private conversation.

"If it were anyone else, I'd say they were crazy," says one business associate of Mr. Firmage's, when asked for an opinion on the UFO matters. "But I've learned not to question Joe, because more often than not, he is correct."

Without question, Mr. Firmage is in possession of a serious intellect. Those choosing to match wits with him would be well advised to do their homework, because (as shown by the depth of his writings and speeches) Mr. Firmage will most certainly have done his. Armed with an extensive vocabulary, technical smarts, and pure marketer's charm, Mr. Firmage has certainly convinced those close to him that he is no wacko.

(SOME) MEN ARE FROM MARS

Some of his closest compatriots, including his partner Toby Corey, seem to regard Mr. Firmage with a sort of reverence, an emotion they are not at all ashamed to show in public. Other business partners at least seem willing to overlook Mr. Firmage's shortcomings. Robert Shaw, the current CEO of USWeb/CKS, tried to convince us that he's "never had a client ask me" about Mr. Firmage's radical scientific views. Please. Where have the clients been for the past few months -- on Mars?

OK, that's a cheap shot. But genius is a big title, and one we're not sure Mr. Firmage lives up to yet. Certainly, his business track record is a successful one. First, he started up and sold a company (Serius, a software tools firm) to Novell (Nasdaq: NOVL) for \$24 million before he could legally rent a car; then, he and Mr. Corey (along with another ex-Novell executive, Sheldon Laube) launched USWeb in 1995, taking it to a public-market offering that made them millionaires. Not bad for someone who's still waiting to celebrate his 30th birthday.

But USWeb's success story is more one of elbow grease and good timing than of Internet genius. Certainly, the market has not given USWeb/CKS the valuation of a landscape-changing force like Amazon.com (Nasdaq: AMZN) or eBay (Nasdaq: EBAY). Perhaps Mr. Firmage has worthy connections and some good business lessons to teach. But in a market saturated with advice and investment dollars, are his smarts worth the baggage they come with? And are they worth 10 percent of your company?

It's a question for entrepreneurs to answer. Mr. Firmage, open for business again, awaits your call.

Related links:

- \*Intend Change's partners stand behind Mr. Firmage.
- \*The May 1999 Red Herring reviewed Mr. Firmage's tome, "The Truth."
- \*Mr. Firmage had a lot to say about our review.

- \*Intend Change
- \*USWeb/CKS

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 13:27:19 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 07:02:58 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:05:41 -0400  
>From: David Clarke <[crazydiamonds@compuserve.com](mailto:crazydiamonds@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>>From: Matthew Williams <[truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net](mailto:truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 20:31:25 +0100  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

<snip>

>For the benefit of the hard of hearing, I reproduce the relevant  
>section from the conclusions to my Howden Moor report which  
>demonstrates once again how Max is incapable of telling the  
>truth:

>>There clearly was a military exercise taking place centred upon  
>>the Peak District that night, one phase of which (now officially  
>>admitted) is timed from 7.30-9.30pm, when the RAF claim all  
>>their aircraft were safely grounded and accounted for. However,  
>>the evidence from both witnesses in Derbyshire and South  
>>Yorkshire and the sonic booms recorded by the BGS suggest a  
>>covert part of this operation continued after the booked  
>>operation had been officially completed. Many more aircraft were  
>>involved in this exercise than has been officially admitted as  
>>is clear from the 13 low-flying complaints lodged with the RAF  
>>on March 24 from widely separated areas of the British  
>>coastline.

>>It is clear that a formation of Tornado aircraft travelled  
>>across the Peak District on a southeast to northwest flightpath  
>>between 9.45 and 10pm, coinciding with the first of two sonic  
>>booms recorded 12 minutes apart from the Sheffield area.

Hi,

I can only add one bit to this. Its not something I have thought  
of retrospectively. I told David about it two years ago and  
wrote about it in my first summary of the case (Northern UFO  
News 176 - June 1997 issue)

I live in a village just north of Buxton in the Peak District.  
As the aircraft flies that is very close to the sighting  
location to my north east. That night both my mother and I were  
in the garden as I was showing her the then bright comet  
Hale-Bopp with my binoculars. We went back in around 7:30 to  
watch Coronation Street on TV (couldn't miss that could we?) But  
I popped out several times later to watch the comet until around  
10 pm (my last trip outside as it was getting chilly). We both  
noted and I certainly commented on this before David found out  
about the military exercise that there was an unusual amount of  
aerial activity in the skies during the period 7 - 10 pm.

We do get civil aircraft going into Manchester and low level  
flights of military jets (mostly in daylight) that nearly knock  
the chimney off our bungalow. But there was unquestionably an

excess amount of activity that night. There were slow moving lights, probably helicopters, and faster moving aircraft. All were to the north and east of me. In the two years since I have never seen anything akin to the level of activity that night.

Best wishes,

Jenny Randles

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse

From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 14:06:48 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 07:12:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>From: Roy Hale <[roy.hale@virgin.net](mailto:roy.hale@virgin.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:23:17 +0100

>>From: Tim Matthews <[matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk)>  
>>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]  
>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 22:26:28 +0100

>>No group in Northern England sanctions is as far as I can tell  
>>and this has been in force for many years - which is perhaps  
>>why we don't have as many 'alien abductions' over here...?

>Hi All,

>Regarding the above I wonder if this is the case for most  
>Southern UFO Research groups? be interesting to find out.

>So here is the question: If you are a member of a Southern UFO  
>Research team do you use the methods of hypnotic regression when  
>dealing with alleged Alien abductees?

>Roy..

Hi,

I should clarify the position regarding hypnosis in the UK. It was not uncommon between 1978 (first use) and 1988 and I was involved in around 20 cases first hand. The decision to issue a moratorium on its use followed restrictions that at first did not in any sense ban its use. These were introduced in our 1982 Code of Practice. The code was agreed between many UK groups (certainly a few from the south - eg SCUFORI in Swindon). This ensured that hypnosis could only be done by a medically qualified practitioner to protect the witness. There was already a trend of 'DIY' hypnosis by ufo investigators learnt by watching doctors and employed to save money. This offered no security to the witness, hence the code.

When we set up the code I tried to persuade as many groups as possible to adopt it. I published it in my book 'Science and the UFOs' in 1985 (ironically the one that triggered the Streiber abduction memory that has probably done more than any case to boost the use of regression - maybe someone was trying to tell me something with that one!) A large number of groups did adopt this code - not just BUFORA, but MUFORA (now NARO). SCUFORI, ASSAP, etc.

The code was useful but hypnosis continued. Then came the debacle with an epileptic witness in a none BUFORA case that did not follow the code. This, plus growing doubts over hypnosis as useful testimony, led to the voluntarily decision for a five year hiatus taken not by BUFORA council but autonomously by the team of investigators that I then supervised. We made the informed choice ourselves after a proper and frank debate. We agreed to abide by the majority vote (although I recall only one or two voted no). The moratorium was a unilateral BUFORA plan. So far

as I know even groups who supported the code did not adhere to the ban. NARO - for instance - still uses hypnosis through a fully qualified clinical psychologist (Dr Moyshe Kalman) and I have sat in on some of that work post the moratorium myself - as recently as 1996 in fact. But I have not personally initiated nor recommended to any witness that this process be adopted in their case. Indeed I always advise against.

The BUFORA moratorium was renewed as a permanent ban after I left as Director of Investigations. The belief in it has grown since 1988, not lessened, through awareness of false memory syndrome, fantasy prone personality research, SRA and the like. But I still think far less groups - even in the UK - have an outright ban like BUFORAs as opposed to a sensible restrictive and medically supervised approach.

Personally, I don't think hypnosis works, but I am not actually opposed to its use provided the witness goes into it fully informed and at their own conscious insistence (not through agreeing with the subconscious desire of a UFO investigator to try to come up with the next big case). Also provided the code is strictly adhered to and the regression is conducted by a medical doctor who monitors the percipient for blood pressure, etc, at all times. I think it is useful to have comparative data between hypno and non hypno cases.

However, I feel that Britain is really taking a stand against indiscriminate use of regression in some other parts of the world - where, to generalise, young people can without any breach of rules be regressed by non medically qualified people. That, in my view, is wholly inappropriate for this subject and if it needed BUFORA (as we did) to possibly over-react through an outright ban and send a message out. It was worth doing. I am merely sad, that in the usual muddle of BUFORA, nothing like enough was ever done to make the world aware of our moratorium or why we were taking these decisive steps. As a result it has been an empty gesture to some extent. But I am very glad we made it even so. Because we showed that what counts in a case is the welfare of the witness above all else. Too often ufologists selfishly judge the need for hypnosis on their desire to get a good story out - even if they don't realise they are doing this. Self regulation through a code of practice seems like a 'nanny state' thing as people have told me. But it is better than a free for all. It shows witnesses, science and the public that we are thinking about our responsibilities so I remain 100% committed to the code of practice and urge all those groups out there (probably 90% of UK groups and 99% of world groups) who have not signed up - or in many cases don't even know such a thing exists - to consider taking the plunge. At the moment BUFORA and a few others are a drop in the bucket. One day the bucket will fall apart.

The experience of a certain ufologist and his (sorry - I mean not his) abduction (sorry - I mean not an abduction) on a US road only emphasises the point. (I am being deliberately obscure here as names are unimportant and I've been asked not to repeat them). What matters is that this man's experience involved no UFO, no aliens, just a possible missing time and the hypnosis created a deeper memory (or in my view here most likely a fantasy). Even the witness (sorry - not the witness) now seems to feel the hypnosis did not uncover an abduction. He has the background and can judge this tough issue. Most people pressured (often subtly) into this process of revealing a hidden memory cannot and are left with a legacy of confusion. That's why those who have been through it like this (non witness) or myself (see my book Star Children) have an obligation to speak up for the good of others. But it's his choice and he has chosen no.

I have seen several cases where a non-existent time lapse was assumed, regression applied and a memory unravelled that cannot be real because there was never a time lapse to start with. There is the infamous UK case of a woman who video filmed a weather balloon. NARO investigated immediately as that woman called me within hours of her sighting via Jodrell Bank. Our case investigation was objective and I think showed very clearly what this woman saw that day. There was no hint of a time lapse. Later another ufologist and she retraced the case, decided there was now a time lapse and regressed her. Do we here see the start of an abduction memory emerging via a case which in my view cannot be an abduction since there was never a UFO present, just a balloon? It is a tricky matter but a far from unimportant one.



To be sure these issues are complex and hardly simple choices.  
But it is surely obvious that there are enough good reasons to  
be wary of the value of hypnosis if not enough to do what BUFORA  
has done and take a brave stand against it.

Best wishes,

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: [KAnder6444@aol.com](mailto:KAnder6444@aol.com)  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 11:08:35 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 07:16:15 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>>From: Bluehare Dark Peak <[bluehare24@hotmail.com](mailto:bluehare24@hotmail.com)>  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>Subject: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 17:29:45 GMT

>>We believe that if ufologists are unable to  
>>determine that a case is hoaxed or not then they should stick  
>>to watching sci-fi. Stupidity within the subject of UFOlogy  
>>has reached new peaks of intensity during the last two years.>>

>From: Kathleen Andersen <[KAnder6444@aol.com](mailto:KAnder6444@aol.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 19:27:18 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>Why must some of us have such closed minds to the existence of  
>things unless we can touch it, see it, hear it or smell it.

I'm answering myself here. I didn't want anyone to think I was standing up for the Max Burns case. Actually I was in England at the time the conversation was going on and didn't read email for almost two weeks. I was commenting on ufology in general and not that particular case which ended up in my "delete bin".

Yes, I get tired of "UFO report, UFO report, UFO report" here and there. I become alarmed we are a society of Chicken Littles. However there are a small few that defy explanation. For that reason alone I still opt to spend my personal time researching what its all about.

Kathleen Andersen  
Seattle

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 99 13:01:47 PDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 07:27:36 -0400  
Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie

>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 21:04:13 -0400  
>From: Peter Brookesmith Mendoza <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>With the compliments of the Duke of Mendoza:

>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: Jerome Clark" <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Budd Hopkins And The Big Lie  
>>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 99 09:20:40 PDT

Peter,

>>I find Peter's work at best of modest interest,  
>>his often smirky, immensely self-pleased prose generally  
>>unreadable.

>It's good to know that Jerome can change his mind, after years  
>of maintaining how - though he might disagree with whatever I  
>had to say - he always found it interesting. This shows he is  
>open minded and tolerant and a very good egg.

You're a fine writer, Peter, and at times an immensely  
self-pleased one who seems unable to imagine that the views of  
honest, decent, sane persons who don't happen to agree with you  
deserve anything but contempt and ridicule. As examples of the  
latter, I found your FT pieces on Hopkins and Jacobs frankly  
unreadable, which is why I missed your bogus charges about Budd  
the first time around.

Reading your stuff, I have the feeling that the two Brookesmiths  
are in conflict. The Brookesmith I praise and enjoy is the good  
writer who can be glimpsed struggling to emerge from behind what  
looks to this reader (and to others with whom I've discussed  
your work) like an outsized ego. There are worse social crimes  
than being egotistical or even egomaniacal, of course, but the  
King Sneer act does get a tad tiresome, in my judgment. But  
hey, do what you gotta do, dude.

>But what, exactly, do Jerome's generously provided and variously  
>repeated literary opinions have to do with anything I said last  
>time around? Could it be that he does not want to gaze upon his  
>own peccadilloes, to which I so unkindly drew attention? It is  
>certainly true that he has been rather quiet about a major drift  
>of what I wrote, which (lest we forget) concerned his ethical  
>and moral self-contradictions.

Huh? Whatever you say, guy. And now ...

... let's get back to what you're trying to avoid here: You  
accused Budd Hopkins, first, of dishonesty and, second, of  
hypnotizing children in search of abduction testimony. Both  
charges are false. When I pointed that out to you, you went  
into full ad-hominem rant. And of course you were wildly  
indignant when I suggested that an apology might be in order.  
(As I recall, Mao and Stalin suddenly entered the discussion.)

Jenny Randles, for example, did not consider the suggestion outrageous. It wasn't as if I were asking you, after all, to retract your basic beliefs re the abduction phenomenon which, right or wrong or both, you have every right to hold. I just thought, naively it appears, that you would have the ethical and moral conviction that when grave and potentially damaging accusations turn out to be unfounded, the accuser -- if he has spoken from honest mistake, as I assume you have -- ought to say he's sorry.

>>I am not willing to accept his tedious,  
>>self-serving rationale -- laced, typically, with ad-hominem  
>>remarks -- for not withdrawing and apologizing for his role in  
>>circulating a bogus allegation.

>I am perfectly happy, if the facts so suggest, to apologize to  
>Budd Hopkins. I see no reason to apologize to Jerome or anyone  
>else who has no locus standi in the business.

Uh, did I ask you to apologize to me? I don't think so. That herring was notably red, my friend. Since you have made the false charges in more than one public forum, a public retraction in at least one such forum would seem in order, don't you think?

>I really do not care what Jerome is willing to accept or not  
>from me, or from anyone else. I do care a little more that he  
>misrepresents me quite so transparently. Those who represent  
>themselves as historians should be less economical with the  
>truth. Turning the telescope the right way round will also show  
>me in my true proportions.

Uh ... yeah ... right ... sure. Now, back to the issue at hand: Are you prepared to admit that you were wrong to accuse Hopkins of (1) being dishonest (as opposed, say, to merely being wrong from your point of view) and (2) hypnotizing children? The world -- or at least the list -- awaits your answer. A simple yes or no will do.

Cheers,

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 13:46:04 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 07:23:50 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Jerome Clark <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 99 20:01:10 PDT

<snip>

>I don't find these to be particularly compelling examples. Did  
>you ever meet the late Edith Fiore? She was a serious nut case  
>and in no sense a ufologist (not, of course, that -- God help us  
>-- one can't be a nut case and a ufologist). She had  
>wide-ranging New Age views and a long history as a mystical  
>seeker, including involvement with a sex-and-saucer cult run by  
>the notorious contactee/charlatan Dick Miller. Her book on  
>abductions was laughable, as were her books on satanic  
>possession and reincarnation. I once heard her relate -- with a  
>straight face -- that in a previous life one of her patients had  
>been an alien who died at Roswell.

<snip>

>>Congratulations on the Ph.D., by the way. Use it well.

>Jerry Clark

Dear Jerry, I take serious exception to your statement above,  
which I repeat ...

" ... God help us -- one can't be a nut case and a ufologist ... "

I resent that remark, as I am a perfect example that one can  
be a perfect nut case and still be a UFOologist. We must  
be tolerant of each other, Jerry. Otherwise, people are going  
to talk about us.

Gesundt

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Paradigm Research Group Update - 6/22/99

From: **Stephen G. Bassett** <[ParadigmRG@aol.com](mailto:ParadigmRG@aol.com)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 18:42:03 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 07:55:21 -0400  
Subject: Paradigm Research Group Update - 6/22/99

P R G  
Paradigm Research Group

PRG UPDATE: June 22, 1999

### General Overview

The presidential impeachment process and accompanying scandal have exited stage right, and now the NATO action in Yugoslavia is exiting stage left. The President and presidency will enjoy a measure of revitalization. The Congress will soon fully focus on business as usual. Dozens of hours of monthly political media coverage will become available to other issues.

The sitting President has shown more publicly disclosed interest in the UFO issue than any other in this century. He has alluded to the subject in public discourse, permitted members of his advisory staff to be briefed, taken briefings himself, and directed an associate attorney general to make direct inquiries. His CIA director took a 3-hour briefing on the UFO issue and government cover-up.

It is ten months to the start of the 2000 presidential and congressional primaries. Introduction of the fundamental facts surrounding the extraterrestrial presence via congressional hearings can still take place in time to make them part of the debates selecting the first public officials to serve in the 21st century. This represents a window of opportunity for those elements within the government favoring basic formal disclosure.

These individuals are most certainly aware of the public and private statements by former government employees. They understand the damage being done to the public trust and the social contract as the withholding of this information continues while the unclosable breach in the cover-up grows.

But opposition within the government to formal disclosure exists as well. Without focused pressure from the public, this opportunity could pass unrequited.

### PRG's Immediate Agenda

The primary focus remains the initiation of potent investigative journalism targeting the ongoing leakage from the standing government cover-up and the efforts to obtain open Congressional hearings. Such reportage could come from any of a half dozen directions at this time.

Further, the return to relative normalcy within the nation's capitol reopens the door for direct engagement of House and Senate members. This will begin immediately after the 1999 MUFON International Symposium being held in Arlington, VA, just across the river from Washington, on July 2,3,4.

Note: the 1999 event will be an excellent conference and there is still time to make reservations. More information is at [<http://dc.jones.com/~lauraufo/symposium99.htm>] > <http://dc.jones.com/~lauraufo/symposium99.htm> ]. PRG is doing everything it can to assist Susan Swiatek of MUFON in making the 1999 Symposium as successful as possible. I intend to be at

the conference for the entire schedule. Anyone wanting to get together, please email [ParadigmRG@aol.com](mailto:ParadigmRG@aol.com)">ParadigmRG@aol.com.

Congressional members are naturally more attuned to respond to their constituents. Any assistance in arranging meetings with a member or appropriate aide is most helpful. A sample letter one might use to set up such a meeting is appended for your convenience. Please convey this wording to any one who might be in a position to approach their representatives in this context.

---

Dear Representative/Senator \_\_\_\_\_:

As a result of public statements by Col. Philip Corso, Apollo astronaut Dr. Edgar Mitchell, Mercury astronaut Gordon Cooper and others, I am greatly concerned that elements of some government agencies are not being properly forthright with the American people regarding the alleged presence of extraterrestrial life forms in our world, now.

I am also aware of a national effort to initiate open Congressional hearings to take testimony from many other government witnesses who have personal experience with events and evidence potentially confirming so called UFOs as space craft and the presence of non-human life forms. These efforts include a national petition and state ballot initiative targeting 16 state elections.

Stephen Bassett of the Paradigm Research Group is a consultant and lobbyist registered to represent a number of organizations regarding this issue as well as the issue itself. He is capable of speaking to the specifics regarding the points raised.

I strongly encourage you to set up a meeting between your office and Mr. Bassett so you may be properly informed as to the merits of holding such hearings. His contact information is as follows: Phone: 301-564-1820, Fax: 301-564-4066, Email: [ParadigmRG@aol.com](mailto:ParadigmRG@aol.com)">ParadigmRG@aol.com.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

---

The effort to directly approach legislative members is intended to tie in with...

#### The UFO State Ballot Initiative

Early in the year, Robert Bletchman, MUFON Director of Public Relations, considered the implications of using the power available in some states of legal referendums. Bob drafted a proposed "UFO Ballot Initiative," and contacted Larry Bryant, MUFON Director of Governmental Affairs, to assist him in convincing national MUFON to endorse the project.

There are 16 states that recognize the direct initiative process, whereby constitutional amendments or statutes proposed by the people are directly placed on the election ballot and then submitted to the people for their approval or rejection. (This is the Direct Initiative, where the state legislature has no role in the process. An additional seven states permit indirect initiatives in which the passed proposition is presented to the legislature for final vote.)

The following are direct initiative states: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. To place a Direct Initiative on the ballot requires a signed petition by the voters within the state. The number of signatures varies by state and is usually a small percentage of the previous voter turnout. Additional information can be obtained at [<http://www.ufocity.com>]"><http://www.ufocity.com>].

The proposed language of the "Ballot Initiative to End Official Secrecy on UFO Reality" is as follows:

---

We the voting citizens of the state of Arizona [and, eventually, of other similarly empowered states] do hereby direct this

state's governor to issue, forthwith in the customary manner, an OFFICIAL PROCLAMATION, the wording of which shall be:

"It is hereby proclaimed that the year 2000 be observed as the year of UFO awareness. Because of the federal government's failure to be officially forthcoming about Unidentified Flying Objects, the public remains ill informed and confused on a matter of potentially great consequence.

We therefore urge the U.S. Congress to expeditiously convene open, comprehensive hearings in which governmental personnel (military, civilian-contract, and agency employees -- active and retired) are permitted to present sworn testimony regarding their personal knowledge of any UFO-related evidence, to be given under immunity by waiver of any applicable security oath or agreement of nondisclosure. This proclamation acknowledges the following facts:

(1) The weight of the cumulative evidence -- e.g., eyewitness, electronic-detection, photographic, documentary - overwhelmingly supports the conclusion of a majority of Americans that some of the reported UFOs represent somebody else's spacecraft;

(2) The federal government's handling of the UFO issue has contributed to the public cynicism toward and general mistrust of government -- a development injurious to our republic;

(3) This initial year of the third millennium affords us a renewed opportunity to explore, assess, and convey every facet of UFO reality." \_\_\_\_\_

It should be noted that at the heart of the USBI is wording associated with the national 'Open Congressional Hearing for Modern UFO Evidence' petition. More information on this is located at: [  
<http://www.paradigmclock.com/therighttopetition.html#Petition>  
ion"><http://www.paradigmclock.com/therighttopetition.html#Petition> ]

The ballot initiative signature collection will require MUFON members within each state to coordinate the work necessary to obtain the signatures and deal with the governor's representatives. The drive would be publicized in the MUFON UFO Journal, with press releases prepared by Robert H. Bletchman for the states involved and additional support from MUFON headquarters.

There is the possibility the ballot initiative process has the power to transform MUFON into a powerful representative of the public's interest in the political/social implications of the UFO/ET/Government connection. It could add thousands of members and substantial resources should MUFON choose to use the initiative process as a tool for expansion. All of this will be a major topic of discussion at the 1999 MUFON National Symposium, and is one more reason to attend.

The UFO State Ballot Initiative (USBI) should attract media attention later this year, which could assist the legal work being conducted by...

CAUS (Citizens Against UFO Secrecy)

Peter Gersten, an attorney and co-founder of CAUS, is pursuing:

1) an FOIA lawsuit against the Department of Defense regarding information about the triangular shaped UFOs. The preliminary pretrial conference scheduled for June 14th was canceled by the Court. The US Attorneys Office is preparing a Motion for Summary Judgment (to dismiss) the lawsuit based upon the fact that the DoD conducted a "reasonable" search and did not find any information. CAUS will be filing a Motion for Limited Discovery, asking the Court to allow it to submit a list of 40 interrogatories (questions) to be submitted to the DoD.

2) an FOIA lawsuit against the FBI; CIA & Department of Defense regarding information about the 'alien abduction phenomenon.' The lawsuit planned for this summer, assuming the necessary affidavits have been received. All three agencies have reported a finding of "no records."

3) a non-FOIA lawsuit against the US Government and State of



Arizona which will be based upon the provision of Article IV; Sec IV of the US Constitution which states that the federal government shall (must) protect the states against invasion. CAUS will argue that the alien abduction phenomenon as well as certain aspects of the UFO phenomenon constitute an invasion under this provision. CAUS will be asking a federal judge to direct the federal government to protect the citizens of Arizona from this invasion...or at least conduct a hearing into its nature, origin and identity.

In support of this lawsuit, CAUS is seeking affidavits regarding black triangle sightings and the reported abduction phenomenon. Full information and the affidavit form and instructions are on the CAUS website:

<http://www.caus.org>

CAUS' need for affidavits will be helped along by the.....

#### World Wide Watch

The concept for the World Wide Watch was launched by Diana Botsford and the MSN UFO Community website and is scheduled for June 26th (Saturday), 1999. The start time is 8pm - YOUR local time and the Watch ends at 11pm, Hawaii, USA time or 4 am EST (Sunday)

This is a global sighting expedition in which organizations and individuals will join in searching the skies for unusual phenomena. The MSN UFO Community's chat room will be kept open for a 24-hour period so regional coordinators can receive sightings reports from any and all observers. This information will be made instantly available on a public database created solely for this event.

Organizations involved include: Skywatch International, MUFON, Citizens Against UFO Secrecy, the World Wide UFO Reporting Center, CSETI, The Australian UFO Research Network & Affiliates, and La Sociedad de Investigaciones Biofísicas.

Much more information can be seen at:

<http://communities.msn.com/ufo/www.asp>

Seeing a number of organizations working together prompts a commentary on.....

#### Financial Support

Don't wait for the largess of philanthropists. Interest level in UFO/ET phenomena is at an all time high and now extends into the tens of millions in the US alone. For about \$300 per year, less than a fitness club membership, it is possible to join, or contribute to at a commensurate level, the most prominent research/activist organizations in the field and subscribe to the primary publications. Interested citizens, rather than joining one group to feel "connected" to the issue, need to see their support of all primary organizations as their family investment in the single most important event/transition in human history. Such an opportunity will not come again and is possible solely by the chance timing of their birth. They must decide now whether they wish to play an active, tangible role in this extraordinary occurrence or simply be a spectator - treating this paradigm change as if it were just another television special for their entertainment.

If 10,000 citizens choose to "hit for the cycle" and cover the field, they would immediately pump \$3,000,000 into the science and politics of UFO/ET phenomena/disclosure - 100,000 put \$30,000,000 into the work. And no one has spent more than their annual cable TV bill.

The financial power to ensure full citizen participation in what heretofore has been dominated by military/intelligence components of the state has always been in our hands. All that is required is an act of will. A basket of organizations to join/support and recommend to your associates might include:

CAUS: Citizens Against UFO Secrecy [www.caus.org/support.htm](http://www.caus.org/support.htm)  
\$20 (contribution)

CNI News: [www.cninews.com/CNI\\_Subscribe.html](http://www.cninews.com/CNI_Subscribe.html)  
\$24 (subscription)

CSETI: Center for the Study of Extraterrestrial Intelligence  
\$40 (membership)  
[www.cseti.org/member/morder.htm](http://www.cseti.org/member/morder.htm)

CUFOS: Center for UFO Studies  
[www.cufos.org/assoc1.html](http://www.cufos.org/assoc1.html)">[www.cufos.org/assoc1.html](http://www.cufos.org/assoc1.html)  
\$25 (membership)

EM: Enterprise Mission  
[www.enterprisemission.com](http://www.enterprisemission.com)">[www.enterprisemission.com](http://www.enterprisemission.com)  
\$20 (contribution)

FUFOR: Fund for UFO Research [www.fufor.org](http://www.fufor.org)">[www.fufor.org](http://www.fufor.org)]  
\$20 (contribution)

MUFON: Mutual UFO Network  
[www.mufon.com/about/member.nclk](http://www.mufon.com/about/member.nclk)"  
\$30 (membership)

NUFORC: National UFO Reporting Center  
\$20 (purchase)

[www.nwlink.com/~ufocntr/Video.html](http://www.nwlink.com/~ufocntr/Video.html)

ORTK: Operation Right to Know [www.ortk.org/member.html](http://www.ortk.org/member.html)  
\$15 (membership)

PEER: Program for Extraordinary Experience Research  
\$30 (contribution)  
[www.peer-mack.org/orderform.html](http://www.peer-mack.org/orderform.html)

SI: Skywatch International  
\$25 (membership)  
[www.itlnet.net/web/skywatch/application.html](http://www.itlnet.net/web/skywatch/application.html)

UFO Magazine [www.ufocity.com/ufomag/subscribe.html](http://www.ufocity.com/ufomag/subscribe.html)  
\$30 (subscription)

\$299

It is not difficult to lose touch with what is at stake with the issues these organizations and people are attempting to resolve in the interest of the nation and its citizens. There have been reminders.....

#### Health and Morbidity Watch

The health and morbidity of researcher/activists continues to be monitored at the following page on the Paradigm Clock website [

[www.paradigmclock.com/In\\_Memoriam-Healthwatch.html](http://www.paradigmclock.com/In_Memoriam-Healthwatch.html)">[www.paradigmclock.com/In\\_Memoriam-Healthwatch.html](http://www.paradigmclock.com/In_Memoriam-Healthwatch.html) ].

During the past twelve months, five individuals who are prominent and involved on the cutting edge of either research, activism or public awareness on the UFO/ET issue have suffered heart conditions. Three are recovering from heart attacks - Richard Hoagland (age 54), Dr. Roger Leir (64) and Bud Hopkins (67); one died from a heart attack - Col. Philip Corso (83); and one is recovering from a bout of ventricular tachycardia - Keith Rowland (40+).

In the past three years five more individuals, who have or had also been on the cutting edge of research, activism or public awareness, were struck with cancer. Four died from these cancers - Kathy Keeton (58), Steven Schiff (51), Shari Adamiak (40+) and Karla Turner (60+); and one survived two bouts of malignant melanoma - Dr. Steven Greer (43).

There have been other deaths, including Betty Cash (69), but by far the most troubling for this author was that of the Congressman from New Mexico, the Honorable Steven Schiff. He was the first member of the House or Senate since 1968 to make the UFO/ET question a proper matter of legislative inquiry. He was not satisfied with the responses he received regarding Roswell related records and said so on television programs

numerous times. He was struck with an unusual and powerful squamous cancer of the ear, which resisted all treatment and went into his brain. It is quite unlikely that anyone receiving this update has ever known anyone who has died from such a cancer.

What must we learn from this growing health/morbidity list?

1. The individuals who have elected to address this subject are not exactly having their lives extended.
2. The work is enormously difficult and requires tremendous sacrifices.
3. The personal and financial stresses placed on researchers/activists is great enough without being enhanced by infighting, petty bickering, personal grudges, libel, slander, side taking, back stabbing, and purely self serving agendas.
4. Aside from any bait tossing government operatives and agent provocateurs, the honest people in the field have much more in common than not. Respect and understanding of other's contributions and theories coupled with tolerance and forgiveness of other's faults and mistakes will ultimately serve everyone's interests in the greatest measure.
5. These illnesses on first glance seem to challenge actuarial expectations. Until we know more, it is essential that all of us pay close attention to this matter and publicize the specifics when possible. In that regard please consider sending any new information regarding the health of individuals within the field to [ParadigmRG@aol.com](mailto:ParadigmRG@aol.com)">ParadigmRG@aol.com.

Whatever negatives one may perceive, there is much to admire in those who have taken on the responsibility their special knowledge has forced upon them. As it happens, there is one quality in particular possessed by those whom I admire most - fearlessness. I deal with politicians, staff and media who are afraid for their job, their income, their reputation, and their image. They're afraid of ridicule, their boss, their own government and their peers.

Sarah McClendon, Richard Hoagland, Larry Bryant, Peter Gersten, Steven Greer, Art Bell, Jim Marrs, Roger Leir, Derrel Sims, Robert Dean, Bud Hopkins, Steven Schiff, Edgar Mitchell and others are people I have found be afraid of no idea, no person and no government. They intend to pursue the truth as best they can, no matter what the cost. The message that is conveyed transcends being right on every aspect of every proposed theory or interpretation. That message is this: until the citizens of this country are in full partnership with their own government on matters of policy and understanding regarding the extraterrestrial presence - they will not back off - ever.

The concept of common interest brings to mind another point.....

The Power of an in situ Collective

Exceptional as the Internet is as a tool for empowering the individual, it has the drawback of creating a virtual collective of separated, and to some degree, isolated people. This citizen movement has largely been a home office, one-person-one-computer enterprise with little division of labor. Everyone works hard and everyone is overwhelmed. This state of affairs is, of course, mostly a matter of money.

There is a pressing need for greater coalitioning - for consolidation and sharing of resources. In this regard, benefactors can play a major role. A hundred proposals could be written tomorrow. I can only speak to my area of interest.

It would cost about \$125,000 a year to operate a formal, officed lobbying effort targeting the government on its handling of the UFO/ET phenomena issue. This would include a chief lobbyist, two paid staff, a few volunteers, modest rent and the appropriate computer and communications equipment - \$125,000. Such a modest sum to address the social/political implications (the science needs \$millions).

Perhaps someone of means, capable of understanding just what is at stake in all this, would consider an opportunity to

participate in the greatest event in human history and possibly  
save our constitutional republic in the bargain, one worth  
taking.

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [paradigmrg](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Firmage's ISSO Update

From: **Joe Firmage Automessenger** <>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 15:10:52 -0700 (PDT)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 07:54:56 -0400  
Subject: Firmage's ISSO Update

Hello,

I am sending you this update with four items of note:

First, there is an excellent source of information I would like to bring to your attention: The Journal of Scientific Exploration (JSE), published by the Society for Scientific Exploration (SSE). Neither JSE nor SSE are connected with ISSO, but I believe that this journal is such an excellent and unique source of research in frontier areas of science (including the UFO phenomenon) that I consider it important to spread the word about this publication.

The official description in the Allen Press Buyer's Guide to Scientific, Medical and Scholarly Journals states: JSE publishes refereed research articles aimed at scientific advance and the expansion of human knowledge in areas falling outside the established scientific disciplines. It provides an unbiased professional forum for discussion and debate of anomalous phenomena. Research articles are selected for publication on the basis of scholarship, as determined by peer review, and can be either supportive, critical or neutral.

To the best of my knowledge the journal is the only source of information, discussion and commentary on topics covering the entire spectrum of anomalous phenomena and exceptional human abilities in an unbiased and rational manner. The goal of JSE is neither to advocate the reality of anomalous phenomena, nor to debunk.

I urge you to visit their website at <http://www.jse.com> for further information and, if you wish, to subscribe to this Journal.

Second, posted to the following URL is a first cut at a "New Millennium Library" -- a subset of seminal resources I would strongly advise you to study, to educate yourself on subjects which an increasing number of leading futurists believe will drive humanity's future. If you have the courage to consider seriously the hypothesis that I and many other thinkers now take quite seriously, then carefully review each of the following references in sequence...

<http://www.TheWordIsTruth.org/know.htm>

You may see the 21st Century in a completely new perspective once through these books and sites. Check back at this link before the end of the year to see a more comprehensive list of recommendations.

Third, posted to the following URL you'll find a few remarks on a recent article reviewing my writings.

<http://www.TheWordIsTruth.org/redherring.htm>

Finally, due to the volume of incoming information and the pace of recent activities, I have shifted the launch of the International Space Sciences Organization to July, 1999. I'll send out a notice just before launch, to let you know the

details. Sorry for the delay. Bookmark ISSO's forthcoming website at [www.issso.org](http://www.issso.org).

Very best,

J O S E P H   F I R M A G E

---

Chairman, Int'l Space Sciences Organization

If you would prefer to be removed from this mailing list, follow the link below: <http://www.TheWordIsTruth.org/remove.cfm>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Cattle Mutilation in Chino Valley, Arizona

From: Desiree Holloway <[snake@mwaz.com](mailto:snake@mwaz.com)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 20:33:30 -0700  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 08:03:31 -0400  
Subject: Cattle Mutilation in Chino Valley, Arizona

I am writing in reference to a recently reported cattle mutilation which took place at the Deep Well Ranch in Chino Valley, Arizona between Thursday, June 3 and Saturday, June 5. The local newspaper stated, "they found the animal, which was nursing a calf this Spring, with its nose, the front half of its tongue and its bottom lip cleanly cut away. The person or persons committing the gruesome act also removed the reproductive organ and rectum from the animal's hind quarters."

There are no further details at this time, but perhaps it is worth investigating,. Also, there have been numerous flights of Apache helicopters over Chino Valley, especially after this reported episode. One particular flight was a group of approximately seven helicopters, flying at extremely low altitude, so low in fact that the rocks trembled on the ground and the pilots were clearly visible to the naked eye.

Any response to my letter would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,

Desiree Holloway  
P.O. Box 2062  
Chino Valley, AZ 86323  
[snake@mwaz.com](mailto:snake@mwaz.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Henny van der Pluijm <[hvdp@worldonline.nl](mailto:hvdp@worldonline.nl)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 05:42:02 +0200 (MET DST)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 08:09:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 18:37:25 -0700  
>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>From: Phillip S Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>

>The evidence that HIV/AIDSs are purposeful ET alien creations is  
>all laid out in my book. Get the book and read it and then if  
>you want criticize. But please don't criticize what you don't  
>know about and don't understand. Thank you.

Mr. Duke,

Please present some of this evidence to this list.

Thank you.

```
 /----- Met vriendelijke groet/Best wishes ----- \  
          Henny van der Pluijm  
          hvdp@worldonline.nl  
  
          Technology Pages  
          http://home.worldonline.nl/~hvdp  
 \-----/
```

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
          [This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Alien Life May Be Hard To Find

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 05:50:03  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 08:11:26 -0400  
Subject: Alien Life May Be Hard To Find

Source: New Scientist via EurekAlert!,

<http://www.eurekalert.org:80/releases/ns-its062399.html>

Stig

\*\*\*

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE: 23 JUNE 1999 AT 14:00:00 ET US

Contact: Claire Bowles  
[claire.bowles@rbi.co.uk](mailto:claire.bowles@rbi.co.uk)  
44-171-331-2751

US Contact: New Scientist Washington office  
[newscidc@idt.net](mailto:newscidc@idt.net)  
202-452-1178

\*New Scientist

If the Sun is exceptional, alien life may be hard to find

What a star!

\*\*

Don't believe everything you read in books—our Sun is no ordinary star. And its very uniqueness has implications for SETI, the search for extraterrestrial life, claims Guillermo Gonzalez of the University of Washington in Seattle: "Unless astronomers narrow down their search to stars as exceptional as the Sun, they are wasting much of their time."

The Sun is a single star whereas most stars are in multiple systems. But that apart, textbooks say the Sun is pretty average. However, after trawling through the data on the Sun, Gonzalez has found many idiosyncrasies. It is among the most massive 10 per cent of stars in its neighbourhood. It also has 50 per cent more heavy elements than other stars of its age and type, and about a third of the variation in brightness.

The most unusual aspects of the Sun concern its orbit around the centre of the Galaxy, says Gonzalez. Its orbit is significantly less elliptical than that of other stars of its age and type, and hardly inclined at all to the Galactic plane. What's more, the Sun is orbiting very close to the "corotation radius" for the Galaxy—the place at which the angular speed of the spiral pattern matches that of the stars.

Gonzalez argues that these exceptional characteristics made it possible for intelligent life to emerge on Earth. He points out that stable planetary orbits such as the Earth's are much more likely around single stars like the Sun. For a massive star with inhabitable planets that are relatively far away, stellar flare-ups would be little threat to the planets. Heavy elements are essential to make planets like Earth, and a star with a stable light output is essential for life.

As for the orbit of the Sun, its circularity prevents it plunging into the inner Galaxy where life-threatening supernovae are more common. And its small inclination to the Galactic plane prevents abrupt crossings of the plane that would stir up the Sun's Oort Cloud and bombard the Earth with comets. By being near the Galaxy's corotation radius, the Sun avoids

crossing the spiral arms too often, an event that would expose it to supernovae, which are more common there.

Because life-bearing stars have to be close to the corotation radius, that rules out more than 95 per cent of stars in the Galaxy in one fell swoop. "There are fewer stars suitable for intelligent life than people realise," says Gonzalez, who has submitted his findings to Astronomy & Geophysics. "I'm amazed at how little thought the SETI people put into selecting their stars."

Seth Shostak of the SETI Institute in Mountain View, California, disagrees. "Our targets are all very close to the Sun. They share our Galactic neighbourhood and motions. If the Sun is the most suitable type of star to be scrutinised, then we are, indeed, looking in all the best places."

"Most astronomers disagree with Gonzalez," adds SETI researcher Dan Werthimer of the University of California at Berkeley. "Our Sun is pretty average. In any case, you don't need a star exactly like our Sun for life."

###

PLEASE MENTION NEW SCIENTIST AS THE SOURCE OF THIS ITEM

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Henny van der Pluijm <[hvdp@worldonline.nl](mailto:hvdp@worldonline.nl)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 05:34:21 +0200 (MET DST)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 08:05:24 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 18:37:25 -0700  
>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>From: Phillip S Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>

<snipped a lot before and after this paragraph>

>You never commented on my factual statements concerning cattle  
>mutilation sites and human abduction examination sites  
>corresponding with HIV body transmission sites. Nor on the  
>abductee whose HIV test changed with his implant removal. How do  
>you explain these facts? FACTS. Not funny (to you) criticisms  
>without basis. But facts.

Mr. Duke,

Can you give additional information about this case in order  
for others to verify whether this has taken place?  
Thank you.

```
 /      Met vriendelijke groet/Best wishes      \  
      Henny van der Pluijm  
      hvdp@worldonline.nl  
  
      Technology Pages  
      http://home.worldonline.nl/~hvdp  
 \  
  /
```

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: judithdale <[judithdale@earthlink.net](mailto:judithdale@earthlink.net)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 21:46:54 -0700  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 08:59:12 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 09:05:14 -0400  
>From: Peter Brookesmith Mendoza <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>With the compliments of the Duke of mendoza:

Thanks, Peter, for your input and information. More of my thoughts below:

>>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 11:39:46 -0700  
>>From: Judith Dale <[judithdale@earthlink.net](mailto:judithdale@earthlink.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>>Yes, well, the CDC and WHO would like us to believe that the  
>>origin of HIV lies in the Green Monkey. However, there is also  
>>the theory that HIV was grown in the biological warfare labs,  
>>which interestingly are often in the same companies that  
>>produce vaccines.

>Here are the antidotes to this kind of factoid:

>In the USA and Europe in the 1980s and '90s there were  
>suspicions that HIV had reached the human population through  
>vaccines, in particular a batch of live polio vaccine that was  
>created using African green monkey cells. This was used in  
>Zaire, Rwanda and Burundi between 1957 and 1960. An American  
>scientific panel examined the evidence in 1992-3, and concluded  
>the vaccines were free of HIV. A major problem with the  
>'contaminated vaccine' theory was that the HIV-1 and SIV viruses  
>are genetically so far apart that it was virtually impossible  
>for the SIV to have mutated into HIV-1 in such a short timespan.  
>It was suggested too that viruses in smallpox vaccine grown on  
>cow cells had reacted with bovine leukemia viruses to produce  
>HIV, but this theory too collapsed when it was shown that the  
>DNA of the two microorganisms were incapable of combining.  
>Astronomers Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe declared  
>their conviction that the AIDS virus came from outer space. The  
>two British scientists have long maintained that many  
>epidemic-inducing microbes arrive on meteorites, asteroids and  
>minor comets entering the Earth's atmosphere. The distinguished  
>astronomers have consistently ignored biologists' objections  
>that the microbes would be wiped out by a combination of  
>ultra-violet light in outer space and the heat generated when  
>the space debris enters the atmosphere.

<snip>

Hadn't heard of the particular 'theories' you mention above, before. Curious, to say the least. I am aware of the other 'theories' you detailed. Given the horror of HIV infection's toll on the body's immune system, brain cells, etc., and the fact that the virus seems to every day reveal some new bizarre twist in it's ability to hide, linger, all the while reeking havoc, it is no wonder that a great mythology would spring up around it. Including that its origins were 'Alien' or off earth. Ofcourse, the bottom line remains how do we treat the infection and how do we not only increase and improve survival once a

person is infected, but can we eradicate it?

I first became aware of the HIV created in biowarfare labs theory in 1990, whilst working to establish an HIV/AIDS support system in the Black Hills of South Dakota. Shortly after attending an intensive training for medical people about HIV/AIDS, I had the opportunity to watch a video made by a physician in L.A. (his name is lost in my memory banks, now). This physician raised the question of the origin of the virus, and mentioned the possibility of contaminated Hepatitis B vaccines. Later I talked about this video with some of the other nurses I was working with. One of them told me that she had recently received a letter from the Navy, telling her that she may have been exposed to HIV via the Hepatitis B vaccine series she had received when she was in active duty. The letter went on to assure her that any negative health impact and care required as the result of HIV infection, would be paid for by the Navy. She did get tested and had a series of negative HIV antibody results.

That simple bit of evidence has left me wondering for years about the true origin of HIV. We may never know. However, in my professional work with those that are infected with HIV, and in my contact with close friends who were infected, I've come to see that the true origins of the virus, become rather irrelevant in the face of living with HIV.

In some ways, the mythology that has grown to surround HIV/AIDS, reminds me of the mythology that has grown around UFO's and ET's. It seems that as humans, when faced with something so hugely beyond our ability to easily understand and grasp, we struggle to make sense of what is going on. I find us to be very creative in the explanations we come up with. Sadly, some explanations are more far fetched than what it is they have been created to explain.

Blessings,

Judith

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: New Images Placed On RPIT Site - "The Bird"

From: Neil Morris <[Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 09:57:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 09:06:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: New Images Placed On RPIT Site - "The Bird"

>From: Asgeir W. Skavhaug <[asge-s@online.no](mailto:asge-s@online.no)>  
>To: <[updates@globalseve.net](mailto:updates@globalseve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: New Images Placed On RPIT Site - "The Bird"  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 21:15:10 +0200

>>From: Neil Morris <[neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
>>Date: Fri, 01 Jan 1999 12:11:03 -0800  
>>Fwd Date: Sat, 02 Jan 1999 10:58:22 -0500  
>>Subject: New Images Placed On RPIT Site

>>All on UpDates,

>>I've today place 2 new images on my web site that address more  
>>of the features in the "weather balloon" debris photographed on  
>>July 8th 1947 in Gen Ramey's office at Fort Worth Tx.

><snip>

>Neil, Bob, Josh, RPIT members & List,

>I went back to some of the old mails and URLs dealing with the  
>Ramey photos, and I was trying to find the same as RPIT had  
>found.

>Referring to the following URL:

><http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/ftw-pics/new-1/rmyemlx.gif>

>I can easily pick out the "2" like symbol, and I can see it is  
>\_not a random mark\_, but, the other observations I can hardly  
>figure out at all.

>Instead, I can see some darker outlines of some kind of  
>"decorations" \_close\_ to the "2" symbol, and painted on the  
>material. They are located \_between\_ the two white circles A and  
>D, and the "2" symbol -- with the raised, "3-D" edges -- even  
>seems to form a part of these decorations.

>Further, \_my interpretation\_ is that I seem to see outlines of  
>\_a bird's head\_, with the "beak" almost touching the "D", and I  
>see the bird's black eye (just follow the black line to the  
>left), and the outlines of the rest of the head as well. Above  
>the head (at the lower part within the "A circle") I can see  
>some decorations resembling "a bunch of flowers" ("tulips", or  
>even "slim" mushrooms?), or this might even be the tail feathers  
>of the bird, with the bird's head bent 90 degrees (relative to  
>the "feathers"). (The rest of "the bird's" body is disappeared  
>in white.....)

>The more I concentrate on this, the more it looks like a bird!

>(Many birds! In fact, I can see birds everywhere - especially  
>when I concentrate on the dark spots as eyes!)

Asgeir,

You make a very valid point here, if you look hard enough at

these pictures you can see "almost" anything in them!

But what I have tried to highlight and bring to attention on my website are the many "symbols" which seem to be found duplicated in a number of areas within the images, I think this reduces the "ink blot/butterfly" effect odds somewhat.

As I've said in the past though I do think some of this stuff is "decoration", here are a couple of examples:

<http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/ftw-pics/new-1/rppngano.gif>  
<http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/ftw-pics/new-1/rbnsym.gif>

Commentary on these images can be found in:

<http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/ftw-pics/new-1/fab-idx.htm>

Many thanks for your interest in the project I hope you continue to stick with us.

Neil.

```

--
*           *           *           *           *           *           *
Neil Morris.      /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\
Dept of Physics. 1
Univ of Manchester 0
Schuster Labs.   1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St.    0
Manchester.       1
UK.               \0101010110010110110010110101101011011110101011010/
G8KQO

```

E-mail: [neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)

Roswell and Alien Autopsy Archive-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/>  
Dave Willetts Home Page-> [http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/dave\\_willetts/](http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/dave_willetts/)  
Mike Sterling Home Page-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/mike-s/>  
Tim Morgan Home Page -> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/tim-m/>

\* \* \* \* \*

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: RIPT & MJ-12

From: Neil Morris <[Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 13:04:59 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 09:13:51 -0400  
Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12

>From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 00:18:34 +0000  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12

>Re: RIPT & MJ-12

Hi Rodger,  
Some excellent points to chew over here,

>>From: Neil Morris <[Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
>>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 15:37:14 +0100  
>>Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:07 -0400  
>>Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12

>Previously, Neil had offered:

>>The paper is also clearly not a teletype message, as Kevin  
>>points out teletype machines used (and still do) continuous roll  
>>paper which is just torn away as the message is complete, this  
>>makes a large "letter heading" on the paper impossible if it  
>>were teletype output.

> <snip>

>>And the document seems to mention:

>>"4" "VICTIMS" "WRECK" "CONVAY" "CRASHES" "MIDDAY" "STORY ADV"  
>>and might I also offer "EVEN PUT THEORY WEATATN BALLOONS"

>Hi, Neil.

>Some things I thought I'd throw into the mix.

>First, when I was a kid, there was an old (or I suppose new, at  
>that time) teletype machine at the TV station where my father  
>worked. The type it put out was identical to that of an old  
>Remington typerwriter my parents still have. Therefore, I'm not  
>sure that based on type, alone, could someone determine whether  
>the memo in question originated from a teletype machine though  
>some teletypes used upper case only.

The conclusion about the message not being teletype output  
wasn't arrived at by the "style" of format of the typeface etc  
but by the fact that on what can be "just" seen at the very top  
of the paper. Just visible is what appears to be the impression  
of a heading in larger print and possibly underlined, the last  
letter(s) possibly being a capitol "L". Unless this was a large  
"rubber stamped" impression we must assume it was preprinted on  
the sheet, there is also the Seal/Monogram just visible in the  
top left corner of the message sheet both these items taken  
together seem to point to the paper being printed stationery,  
and as teletype machines used continuous roll paper feed, sheet  
headings were impossible, and teletype machines had a fixed font  
size too.

>Second, I remember the news guys bitching and moaning about how



>unreliable the teletype was. Things were always coming in  
>spelled incorrectly due to machine error (as well as error on  
>the part of the original "typist", I'm sure).

Teletype machine in those days were pure mechine technology the only 2 electrical components were the drive motor and send/receive electromagnet keyer, wonderful pieces of noisy cogs and gears, I have a Creed 7b machine (1960's vintage) in the garage that I used to use receiving teletype off HF radio in the days before computers took over the job. The big problem with them was keeping the damb things in sync, most had a governed motor with some form of "stobe" markings so that using the local mains electric AC light 50hz (uk) 60hz (us) the machine could be speed regulated to a resonable accuracy, if you didn't do this on a regular basis and the machine drifted off speed, then you got into errors in a big way, but they could cope with low grade lines quite well.

>Third, the feed on the machine was not always on the mark, which  
>resulted in uneven lines of type more often than not. As we've  
>become used to laser printers and ink jet printers, it's good to  
>remember that some of the old equipment wasn't always up to  
>snuff, even when hitting on all cylinders! (hell, my ink jet  
>printer still screws up from time to time)

A lot depended of the type of print head used, in the case of my Creed it used a rotating drum print head and gave rock solid lines with very little verticle jitter, some used a "basket" as per a std typewriter these too would give a resonable line of print, later designs used a variation of the "golfball", now those did give very "variable" results if the timings were out on selector cams.

It must be remembered that the teletype (in those days) didn't use a full set of typewriter characters. The code used to transmit telex was limited to 5 data bits, a maximum of 32 codes, 5 of these were command codes to select two alternate banks of characters plus some of the codes were non printable command codes ie "Carr return" "Line feed". Upper and lower cases were not used, you either had a fixed upper case OR lower A-Z, all those I've seen used upper case, you also had the numbers 0-9 and a limited set of symbols and that was it!. It wasn't until the advent of the computer that extended telex codes or normal ASCII and higher speeds (above 110/300 baud) became the norm, but back in 1947 they would have been stuck with the few speeds used in the US 45.5, 54 , 60 baud and the old 5 bit code.

This was the std code used:

|        | w | r | e | b | cmds                                                    |
|--------|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Figs.  | 3 | - | 7 | ( | 5 9 . = , 8 ' u 8 4 ) \$ : 6 % ? l / 2 0 @ 1            |
| Lettr. | E | A | U | K | T O M V N I S D Z R L H C Y F B J X W P G Q             |
|        | 1 | x | x | x | x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x                         |
| B      | 2 | x | x | x | x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x                         |
| i spkt | o | o | o | o | o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o |
| t      | 3 | x | x |   | x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x                         |
| s      | 4 | x |   |   | x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x                         |
|        | 5 |   |   |   | x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x                         |

Notes... wru = who are you? get the auto id transmitter to send the id of the machine you'r connected to.

- f \$ = money symbol for locality.
- bel = Just ring my bell!.
- spc = Space character.
- rtn = Carriage return character.
- lf = Line feed character.
- ltr = Shift to using letter set of characters.
- fig = Shift to using figure set of characters.

If you were a real "guru" using the chart above you could learn to "read" the punched paper tape that was also used with the teletype machines, the chart "bits" refer directly to the punched holes in the tape the sprocket hole(spkt) is shown how it appeared in the tape.

As a point of interest, though the US military used all modes of communications, phone, teletype, radio, both phone and teletype were not classed as "secure". It wasn't until around 1955 that

the mechanical "crypto" units were thought secure enough to be fitted to the military teletype network and "secure" traffic could be sent in an automated fashion. Prior to this all "secure" traffic went via courier or encrypted radio telegraphy (morse key and handy dandy code book!). This is why I feel the "message" could be a "secure" signal, it could have been received as "secure R/T", jotted down in pencil in it's code groups and forwarded to the "crypto" unit where it would be decoded and typed up on sheet stationery by a unit clerk ready for presentation. But if the message is related to the events at Roswell would the enormity of the situation even allow this type of traffic to go via a manual "crypto unit" ?. What sort of security clearance did the people in those units have? as they would have to handle at some point the traffic in "clear" and, of course have to read and understand it to process it. So, could it be the other "secure" alternative, a "courier" delivered message typed on the senders "unit stationery". It is the most secure (least eyes) method, but it would also have the disadvantage of being the slowest too.

>And lastly, the news department had a habit of stamping the top >of a teletype after it came in, for whatever reason. I'm not >familiar with the habits of the military back in those days. Is >it possible that they, too, stamped teletypes upon receipt? If >so, it might explain the "header" at the top of the memo. Just a >thought...

This sort of ties in with your first point, both the "heading" and the "seal" could be "stamped", but their placement seems quite accurate and ordered, not the result of "stamping", I also feel the size of the "header" works against it being stamped. The "seal", what can be made out of it, also seems a lot more detailed than the samples of circular "stamped" seals I have seen on documents of this date, many were of just the std "received" or automated "received/date /time" type or simple dept/group identifiers and didn't include the amount of detail the "message" seal seems to have.

Neil.

```
--
*           *           *           *           *           *           *
Neil Morris. /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\ 1
Dept of Physics. 1
Univ of Manchester 0
Schuster Labs. 1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St. 0
Manchester. 1
UK. \0101010110010110110010110101101011011110101011010/ 1
G8KOQ
```

E-mail: [neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)

Roswell and Alien Autopsy Archive-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/>  
Dave Willetts Home Page-> [http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/dave\\_willetts/](http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/dave_willetts/)  
Mike Sterling Home Page-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/mike-s/>  
Tim Morgan Home Page -> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/tim-m/>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Hypnotic Abuse

From: **Tim D. Brigham** <[TBrigham@ksinc.net](mailto:TBrigham@ksinc.net)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 07:41:18 -0500  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 09:22:30 -0400  
Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse

>From: Jenny Randles <[nufon@currantbun.com](mailto:nufon@currantbun.com)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Hypnotic Abuse  
>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 14:06:48 +0100

<snips>

>Personally, I dont think hypnosis works, but I am not actually  
>opposed to its use provided the witness goes into it fully  
>informed and at their own conscious insistence (not through  
>agreeing with the subconscious desire of a UFO investigator to  
>try to come up with the next big case). Also provided the code  
>is strictly adhered to and the regression is conducted by a  
>medical doctor who monitors the percipient for blood pressure,  
>etc , at all times. I think it is useful to have comparative  
>data between hypno and non hypno cases.

>However, I feel that Britain is really taking a stand against  
>indiscriminate use of regression in some other parts of the  
>world - where, to generalise, young people can without any  
>breach of rules be regressed by non medically qualified people.  
>That, in my view, is wholly inappropriate for this subject and  
>if it needed BUFORA (as we did) to possibly over-react through  
>an outright ban and send a message out. It was worth doing. I am  
>merely sad, that in the usual muddle of BUFORA, nothing like  
>enough was ever done to make the world aware of our moritorium  
>or why we were taking these decisive steps. As a result it has  
>been an empty gesture to some extent. But I am very glad we made  
>it even so. Because we showed that what counts in a case is the  
>welfare of the witness above all else. Too often ufologists  
>selfishly judge the need for hypnosis on their desire to get a  
>good story out - even if they dont realise they are doing this.  
>Self regulation through a code of practice seems like a 'nanny  
>state' thing as people have told me. But it is better than a  
>free for all. It shows witnesses, science and the public that we  
>are thinking about our responsibilities so I remain 100%  
>committed to the code of practice and urge all those groups out  
>there (probably 90% of UK groups and 99% of world groups) who  
>have not signed up - or in many cases dont even know such a  
>thing exists - to consider taking the plunge. At the moment  
>BUFORA and a few others are a drop in the bucket. One day the  
>bucket will fall apart.

Jenny,

I haven't much jumped into the hypnosis debate, but your  
comments regarding responsible use of the technique in order to  
protect witnesses struck a chord. I have heard firsthand, at  
abduction conferences and the like, people meeting with friends  
and saying things such as "Hey I just completed my course in  
hypnosis! If you guys need anyone hypnotized, give me a call."  
I've also been informed (though not verified firsthand, because  
in many cases I understand it to be a tightly kept secret) that  
many local abduction 'support' type groups have other abductees  
who have had absolutely no training regressing other witnesses.  
Again, anecdotes, but I'm not making a scientific arument here,  
just hoping irreperable damage isn't being done. But if the  
damage is being done, I think Budd Hopkins is probably the least  
of our worries. The eager UFO buff who decides 'because Budd can

do it, I can do it, and I even had a 3 hour seminar!' may be causing the majority of the damage.

I will stay away from the entire debate regarding regressing children, as that really pushes me to the limit of losing it (I refer here not to Budd Hopkins, but in general), except to say I personally don't feel anyone should be regressing children, much less anyone who is not extremely qualified to do so. Allowing someone (especially someone unqualified) to do this to you is one thing, but allowing it to be done to your child.....

As others have suggested, I do not doubt that lawsuits on this matter will be brought forth in the future.

Tim

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## P-47: Astronaut Cooper and UFOs

From: Loy Pressley <[lkpres@KOYOTE.COM](mailto:lkpres@KOYOTE.COM)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 04:19:33 -0500  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 10:10:05 -0400  
Subject: P-47: Astronaut Cooper and UFOs

Good morning, All.

Not long ago I remember someone saying that Astronaut Gordon Cooper flatly denied ever having seen a UFO. Well, last night on The History Channel as part of their "In Search of History" series, they broadcast a segment entitled "Ancient Aliens". At the end of the show is a segment with Astronaut Cooper talking about his and his fellow aviators attempts to intercept UFOs while he was stationed in Germany. He says that the UFOs were high above any altitude that they could reach and that the UFOs were flying in the same types of formations that they used but were much faster and more maneuverable than their fighter aircraft. He said the UFOs were metallic looking and looked like the aircraft that he (Cooper) and his fellow pilots were flying except that they had no wings.

Although not mentioned by Cooper during the show, if I remember my sightings reports correctly, Cooper and his fellow aviators tried to intercept the UFOs many times over a period of many days. Although they could get to altitudes where they could see the UFOs, they could not get high enough to actually intercept them.

At the end of the segment, Cooper states plainly that he believes in UFOs and that he believes that we are being visited by an intelligent civilization from outside our solar system.

Loy

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952

From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 09:33:40 -0300  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 10:04:15 -0400  
Subject: Re: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952

>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 08:47:14  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>Subject: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952

>\*\*\*

>From: [Koolhand@webtv.net](mailto:Koolhand@webtv.net) (Jim Ball)  
>Newsgroups: alt.alien.research  
>Subject: UFO Phenomena  
>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 00:12:08 -0400 (EDT)

>I've been pondering this UFO business since personally observing  
>the big flap around D. C. in the 50's while on duty at Bolling  
>AFB.

>There were hard radar targets - several - moving at fantastic  
>speeds. We went out on the flightline after scrambling several  
>fighters to intercept them to watch the show, and it was a  
>spectacular one to see.

>These lights accomplished some incredible maneuvers, impossible  
>even with today's aircraft.

>Nobody had a clue as to what we were witnessing, except that it  
>was unearthly, or unexplainable, to say the least.

Hi Jim,

It is interesting to hear from an eye-witness to this event.  
More detail would be appreciated.

>There was never an acceptable AF explanation to describe what  
>we, and thousands of others, witnessed. I'm still stumped, but I  
>now have a theory for all to comment on: perhaps these craft are  
>beings from another dimension parallel to our earth, but in a  
>different time-space continuum....they can enter our space when  
>they wish, but we can't enter, or even see theirs, which is far  
>advanced from ours.

>What do you think....is this a possible credible thesis?

As for the theory you offer above, this wouldn't be the first  
time that I have seen or heard this put forward.

Some Ufologists and in particular science fiction have embraced  
it. It's not one that I find myself entertaining.

Best,

Don Ledger

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952

From: Jim Ball <[Koolhand@webtv.net](mailto:Koolhand@webtv.net)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 10:55:17 -0400 (EDT)  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 11:17:37 -0400  
Subject: Re: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952

>Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 09:33:40 -0300  
>From: Donald Ledger <[dledger@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:dledger@ns.sympatico.ca)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Re: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952

>>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 08:47:14  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>>Subject: Witness To Washington Flap July, 1952

>>From: [Koolhand@webtv.net](mailto:Koolhand@webtv.net) (Jim Ball)  
>>Newsgroups: alt.alien.research  
>>Subject: UFO Phenomena  
>>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 00:12:08 -0400 (EDT)

>>I've been pondering this UFO business since personally observing  
>>the big flap around D. C. in the 50's while on duty at Bolling  
>>AFB.

>>There were hard radar targets - several - moving at fantastic  
>>speeds. We went out on the flightline after scrambling several  
>>fighters to intercept them to watch the show, and it was a  
>>spectacular one to see.

>>These lights accomplished some incredible maneuvers, impossible  
>>even with today's aircraft.

>>Nobody had a clue as to what we were witnessing, except that it  
>>was unearthly, or unexplainable, to say the least.

>Hi Jim,

>It is interesting to hear from an eye-witness to this event.  
>More detail would be appreciated.

At that period in time we were all paranoid about the Soviet Union and their advanced weapon systems; we were at war in Korea with the Chinese and North Koreans. There was kind of a national hysteria present, including military personnel. So a cursory conclusion, encouraged by our superiors, was that we were seeing: Northern Lights, Venus, Mars, weather balloons, temperature inversion, stars, reflections of city lights (although there was no cloud cover that night) and a myriad of other earthly things, either singly or in combination, during the activity of that warm July evening.

These lights performed incredible maneuvers at impossible speeds - our fighters tried to give chase but could never close. There were always solid radar returns on pilot's radar, as well as the Bolling tower radar...so there were definitely things up there which registered solid radar returns. We watched the show, fascinated and amazed...what were these things? To this day I still don't know and our superiors ordered us not to discuss it further, so we didn't.... still, we all knew what we saw.

Jim Ball



[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: **Tim D. Brigham** <[TBrigham@ksinc.net](mailto:TBrigham@ksinc.net)>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:45:18 -0500  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 11:23:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 01:18:34 -0400

>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:56 EDT  
>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>On the other hand, we can point to some abductees who've seen  
>>their lives radically altered by tales of alien abduction. So  
>>what if there are a few, some, many who have deal with alien  
>>abduction easily or well. There are those who have not... but,  
>>these would be some of the dreaded anecdotes.

>That's why anecdotes are treacherous. I know or have heard of  
>people whose lives have been hurt by heavy metal, on-line chat  
>rooms, and rollerblading. Should I start crusading to prove  
>those things are harmful? I know someone who ruined herself  
>financially because she was obsessed with a world-famous opera  
>diva, and followed the singer around the world, attending every  
>performance she gave. Does this mean opera is a problem?

>It's tempting to think we know something because we can tell  
>stories that support our point of view.

<snips>

>It's the same with abductions. It's pointless to tell stories of  
>people hurt by believing they'd been abducted, and equally  
>pointless, from a scientific point of view, for me to say that  
>people have been helped by coming to accept that belief. I only  
>tell my stories to balance the other side, to say that the  
>stories don't all go one way. What's missing on both sides is,  
>again, quantitative data. How many people have been helped by  
>accepting that they think they've been abducted, how many have  
>been hurt?

>Until we have solid information, we're stuck in a vacuum. And  
>we'll all just repeat the stories that support our own point of  
>view.

Hi Greg, Kevin, etc.

First, congrats again to 'Doc Kev' on his acadmemic  
accomplishment. As an aside- kevin, may I ask what your  
dissertation was on? Just curious if you were at all able to  
bring in the UFO stuff into your work, even in an indirect  
manner.

With that said...

For some time, I have had an interest in talking to people who,  
at some point in the past, believed that they had been abducted  
by aliens, only to later change their mind and come to the  
conclusion that there was actually a different explanation for  
their experience(s).

I think this issue may bring up another problem with such anecdotes, besides the many probs Greg has pointed out so well.

Is it not a safe assumption that people who have been harmed by, or at the very least, changed, their beliefs regarding what happened to them would be less likely to be vocal about the issue?

Consider someone who, for whatever period of time, came to believe (either on their own or with the 'help' of a group or individual) that they were abducted by aliens.

If this person should later come to the conclusion that this idea was wrong, they may be very embarrassed to admit and discuss that they had come to believe something which might now sound like utter hogwash to them. And wouldn't they also be less likely to be involved in any 'UFO/abduction' related affairs, such as email lists like this one, organizations and publications, etc (in short, wouldnt they be likely to say 'Screw this' and walk away from the entire business, leading to a lack of negative anecdotes, on average)?

It reminds me of the arguments regarding Alcoholics Anonymous and the number of addicts it has helped - that being, how do we measure the number the folks who walk into one meeting and never come back, either because they dealt with their problems on their own, or continued to live with them unsolved (btw, I am not knocking AA, it has helped many people, but I don't think anyone has an idea how many people it failed to help, which is my point).

I would guess the negative anecdotes, while not non-existent, may be much harder to come by....then again, while what I just said may not be an anecdote, it is an admitted speculation ;-)

I know this is a somewhat seperate issue from what Kevin was discussing (people who still believe they have been abducted, and have had their lives turned upside down by that belief), but I thought it was another aspect worthy of throwing in the pot.

Best,  
TB

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: **Greg Sandow** <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 12:33:44 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 18:19:11 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Tim D. Brigham <[TBrigham@ksinc.net](mailto:TBrigham@ksinc.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:45:18 -0500

>Is it not a safe assumption that people who have been harmed by,  
>or at the very least, changed, their beliefs regarding what  
>happened to them would be less likely to be vocal about the  
>issue?

Very good thought, Tim.

Of course, in a quasi-organized abductee situation -- I'm thinking of Budd Hopkins, and his occasional support group meetings (they haven't been held regularly, at least in recent years) -- you might get people talking about their doubts to each other. And that would come out informally, not in the meetings, necessarily, but in private conversation. For what it's worth, I've heard of almost none of that, and I've been very friendly with many of the people in Budd's circle. (John Velez can speak about this with more knowledge than I have.)

Also, the skeptics are there for anyone who wants to go public with a recantation. They provide an incentive to speak out -- not for everyone, obviously, but maybe for some.

Greg Sandow

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: RIPT & MJ-12

From: David Rudiak <[DRudiak@aol.com](mailto:DRudiak@aol.com)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 13:10:08 EDT  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 18:43:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 11:11:14 EDT  
>Fwd Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 20:35:57 -0400  
>Subject: Re: RIPT & MJ-12

>Here is the real important part of this posting. There are  
>subjective judgments being made. We are interpreting what we see  
>with a best guess regardless of the sophistication of the  
>equipment.

Most of the message on casual inspection is ambiguous (about 80%), but some of it is not (about 20% of the words can be made out without much difficulty). There is near unanimity of opinion to certain words and phrases. Furthermore, it is NOT a case of everything goes. Letter counts, spelling, and grammatical rules of semantics and syntax greatly restrict the number of interpretations that can be applied to the more ambiguous sections. We may not be able to say with absolute certainty that sections of the message say exactly this or that. But we can certainly eliminate many interpretations and narrow it down to a few likely possibilities. The gist of the message is generally pretty clear, even if some of the specifics (e.g., abbreviation of an unknown military unit being referred to) are very much open to interpretation.

>We are interpreting the message in the context of the  
>assumption that it relates to the Roswell case.

Of course, because it obviously relates to the Roswell case (see below). Context is a valuable tool used by cryptographers, or photointerpreters, or whomever, trying to pull out a signal partially buried in noise. Human language is inherently ambiguous even in the best of circumstances. Humans apply context all the time to disambiguate meaning. And the noisier the situation, the more context is applied. Common examples include reading bad handwriting or picking out the thread of conversation in noisy cocktail party chatter.

Sure it's possible to go badly astray if one isn't careful, but you are asking us to throw out an extremely valuable tool of language interpretation.

>We have no evidence that this is the case. All we KNOW is that Ramey, on  
>July 8, was holding this document in his hand.

Kevin, this is like catching Ramey with a smoking gun in his hand pumping the last bullet into the corpse and then saying that we have no evidence that he was involved with this particular murder.

Of course there is plenty of evidence.

First of all timing. He is holding the message at the very height of the Roswell brouhaha, the very reason the photos were taken in the first place. It's not the next day or the next week. Ramey was in the midst of spinning the story for the press. He'd just gotten off the phone with at least one reporter and also the Pentagon press room.

But more importantly are the WORDS that can clearly be made out in this message (or have nearly unanimous agreement).

2nd & 3rd lines. "...the victims [or James Easton's "remains"] of the wreck you forwarded [or "conveyed" -- same thing] to ... at Fort Worth, Tex.

So something [nearly everybody reads it as "victims"] of some "wreck" were sent on to Fort Worth. How many "wrecks" were there in this period and how many of them had to have something sent on to Fort Worth, whether "victims" or "remains"?

4th line. Something relating to "the 'disc'".  
6th line. Something relating to "weather balloons."

Whatever the specific context, how many messages did Ramey normally handle that contained a reference to "the 'disc'" or to "weather balloons?" Of course, directly beneath him was the wreckage of a weather balloon (the corpse?) which Ramey was in the midst of passing off as the explanation for the Roswell base "flying disc" press release.

5th line. The word "Roswell" is probably there. [Though RPIT mysteriously reads this as "Magdalena"]

7th line. Last word is "crews."

Whatever was going on, "crews" were involved and it had something to do with "the wreck."

Unless you can come up with some other period wreck that required shipping of something to Fort Worth, would be referred to as a "disc," somehow involved "weather balloons" and "crews," and required Gen. Ramey's personal attention at the height of a press feeding frenzy over a crashed "flying disk," I think we can safely conclude that this message had something to do with the Roswell incident.

David Rudiak

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Bruce Maccabee <[brumac@compuserve.com](mailto:brumac@compuserve.com)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 14:13:55 -0400  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 18:44:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 09:05:14 -0400  
>From: Peter Brookesmith Mendoza <[DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com](mailto:DarkSecretPB@compuserve.com)>  
>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

>With the compliments of the Duke of mendoza:>

>>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 11:39:46 -0700  
>>From: Judith Dale <[judithdale@earthlink.net](mailto:judithdale@earthlink.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>>Yes, well, the CDC and WHO would like us to believe that the  
>>origin of HIV lies in the Green Monkey. However, there is also  
>>the theory that HIV was grown in the biological warfare labs,  
>>which interestingly are often in the same companies that  
>>produce vaccines.

>Here are the antidotes to this kind of factoid:

I thank Menoza for his excellent discourse on AIDS history and  
"propaganda."

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 24](#)

## Re: Crisis..... What Crisis

From: Jerry Anderson <[jerry@uforesearch.freemove.co.uk](mailto:jerry@uforesearch.freemove.co.uk)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 19:29:13 +0100  
Fwd Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 18:49:38 -0400  
Subject: Re: Crisis..... What Crisis

Dear List,

My view at present, is that Ufology is in turmoil....and judging from some of the recent postings to this list, I am convinced that this is the case.

No doubt there will be responses from some of you refuting the claim, that is your opinion and your right. For now, please hear me out.

In an 'ideal' world, we would all get along fine and agree with anything and everything. However ideal that sounds, one can't help but realise that it would be extremely boring and mundane! I encourage constructive criticism and support lively and stimulating debate on all matters. what I certainly do NOT condone is character assassination, back stabbing, and condescending behaviour....the like of which we have been witness to in the past, and just recently.

There are many, many, investigators in the UFO field that are conducting excellent research, despite the usual lack of funds, resources, and everything else that is part and parcel of Ufology, including making mistakes....which we are ALL guilty of to one degree or another! Whatever our social or educational background, we all have a common interest for one reason or another. That in itself connects us. There must be some reason why we all find this subject so fascinating. Enthusiasm to find the truth is encouraged, but at the same time it can lead us astray. Enthusiasm to prove that there is nothing is blinkered, and can be cold and calculating, as in the Max Burns episode.

I have never met Max, but if I did I would probably feel as though I should apologise on behalf of the so-called intellectuals that did a dis-service to Ufology by 'setting up' a researcher who had no way of checking the credentials of an unknown source. What other option did Max have but to follow the 'lead' up? Any investigator worth his/her salt would have done the same, I don't care who they are.

Hoaxing and researching by the same person/s do not go together and only succeed in rendering the perpetrators as unreliable and fraudulent. I'm all for trying to find the truth, but I do not want to be associated with people of that ilk, nor do I wish to have anything to do with so-called researchers ridiculing others.

There are no experts in Ufology, just experts in areas of research connected with it. Dear colleagues, let us try and exchange information and notes.....not insults.

Jerry Anderson - UFOMEK (UK)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |



[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Crisis..... What Crisis?

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 19:46:25 EDT  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 03:29:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Crisis..... What Crisis?

>From: Jerry Anderson <[jerry@uforesearch.freemove.co.uk](mailto:jerry@uforesearch.freemove.co.uk)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Crisis..... What Crisis?  
>Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 19:29:13 +0100

Dear List, and you others ... you know who you are! Please allow me to prove a point. Please? Thank you. Just sample the following and when you come to the end, I will explain. I am not marking this post with a scarlet "S" and I am aksing that EBK not post a "Caution, Humor" caveat just this one time. I promise never to aks this again... (as he crosses the only two fingers he has, having lost the last two in a game of tiddly winks)... Here we go.

>Dear List,

>My view at present, is that Ufology is in turmoil...and judging  
>from some of the recent postings to this list, I am convinced  
>that this is the case.

Turmoil ... agitation, confusion, dither, flap, lather, pother, stew, tumult, turbulence ... according to that Miriam broad. We concur.

>No doubt there will be responses from some of you refuting the  
>claim, that is your opinion and your right. For now, please  
>hear me out.

Oh no, Mo... UFO research is in such a state.

>In an 'ideal' world, we would all get along fine and agree with  
>anything and everything. However ideal that sounds, one can't  
>help but realise that it would be extremely boring and mundane!  
>I encourage constructive criticism and support lively and  
>stimulating debate on all matters. what I certainly do NOT  
>condone is character assassination, back stabbing, and  
>condescending behaviour....the like of which we have been  
>witness to in the past, and just recently.

Me needer, Mo. Say Jerry, I hope you don't mind my appellation, "Mo." It's just that it sort of rhymed with "Oh no!"

>There are many, many, investigators in the UFO field that are  
>conducting excellent research, despite the usual lack of funds,  
>resources, and everything else that is part and parcel of  
>Ufology, including making mistakes....which we are ALL guilty of  
>to one degree or another!

Sorry Jerry. I do not agree here. We do not all make mistakes. For example, in the area of character assassination, some people out there have never made a mistake from my perspective. In fact, quite the opposite. Every time someone attempted to assassinate my character, no matter which voice in my head was speaking to me at the time, the assassin was dead on right, each occasion. Especially, uh, well, doesn't matter who it was....

>Whatever our social or educational  
>background, we all have a common interest for one reason or  
>another. That in itself connects us.

Please forgive me for contradicting you again, Mo, but no one is at all connected with me who does not have at least ONE Ph.D. Which is why I refer to Mr. Errol Bruce Knapp as "DOCTOR Kanappy!" Whenever I speak with, correspond with or otherwise communicate with anyone on any subject, if they do not have at least one Ph.D., I will not carry on the communication. That is why I confer an "Honorary" Gesundt Ph.D. on them prior to the communication.

And this is why I sent Dr. Kanappy a copy of my Curriculum Vitae framed in 24 carrot gold plate. He never published it on this list. However I cannot blame him. Such a CV would intimidate anyone out there. Which is also why I had to sort of chuckle at the person who just got a Ph.D. and announced it on UpDates. I mean, for crying out loud, only ONE LOUSY Ph.D.? Aint nuttin to brag about. I got twelve.

>There must be some reason  
>why we all find this subject so fascinating. Enthusiasm to find  
>the truth is encouraged, but at the same time it can lead us  
>astray. Enthusiasm to prove that there is nothing is blinkered,  
>and can be cold and calculating, as in the Max Burns episode.

Of course there are. We all want to appear on TV, radio and in print. That's why most of us who claim to be "experiencers" are lying through our teeth! We just want the attention it gives us. I know that's my reason.

>I have never met Max, but if I did I would probably feel as  
>though I should apologise on behalf of the so-called  
>intellectuals that did a dis-service to Ufology by 'setting up'  
>a researcher who had no way of checking the credentials of an  
>unknown source. What other option did Max have but to follow the  
>'lead' up? Any investigator worth his/her salt would have done  
>the same, I don't care who they are.

>Hoaxing and researching by the same person/s do not go  
>together and only succeed in rendering the perpetrators as  
>unreliable and fraudulent. I'm all for trying to find the truth,  
>but I do not want to be associated with people of that ilk, nor  
>do I wish to have anything to do with so-called researchers  
>ridiculing others.

Absolutely wrong again. Cheeses, Jerry, Mo, whoever you are, you just don't get it do you! Hoaxing and researching by the same person is essential to the hoax. Each time you get hoaxed by an ex-spurt, you are not intimidated. But each time you get hoaxed by a non believer, a skeptic, you feel ill-used, don't you? Now do you get it?

>There are no experts in Ufology, just experts in areas of  
>research connected with it. Dear colleagues, let us try and  
>exchange information and notes.....not insults.

Here we have a conundrum. I agree, and I also disagree. I agree that there are no experts in ufology. But there are a whole bunch of has-been drips (ex-spurts) in ufology and there always will be.

As for the insults. If you do not insult someone, you are not debating correctly. I can prove it. Look at any political campaign in any country, for any office, even dog catcher, and you will never see or hear of such a campaign without insulting and demeaning your opponent. Our entire planet is ruled by people who have done exactly that. Are we on the same frequency yet?

>Jerry Anderson - UFOMEK (UK)

Do you remember that at the opening of this post, I said I would explain why I aksed for your forbearance? I said that I would explain? Remember?

Well, I lied.

Dr. Jaime Gesundt, CSUSADHOFMW,C,P & Deli Meats.

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]

[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

From: Sharon Kardol <[sharon@hotmix.com.au](mailto:sharon@hotmix.com.au)>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 10:16:23 +0800  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 03:41:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'

>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 18:37:25 -0700  
>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>From: Phillip S Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>

>>From: GT McCoy <[gtmccoy@harborside.com](mailto:gtmccoy@harborside.com)>  
>>To: "UFO UpDates - Toronto" <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: 'The AIDS-ET Connection'  
>>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 21:50:30 -0700

Mr Duke,

Your post was very interesting, but I hoping you could clarify a few things.

>Dear Mr. McCoy,

<snip>

>It appears your understanding of human science cloning  
>procedures is imperfect. So far only the gray aliens have  
>produced alien/human hybrids. I refer you to Dr. David M.  
>Jacobs' 1998 book The Threat. It is all on this important  
>subject.

And your basing your "perfect" understanding on the the beliefs of one book?

>The "monkey bite" idea is politically correct just like the  
>"Roswell balloons" etc. If you buy one you buy both as they are  
>brought you as part of the same politically correct package.  
>There is no good evidence for the monkey bite idea despite the  
>government's trying hard.

Is there evidence disproving the monkey bite theory, though?

<snip>

>You characterize HIV as a "hard to get" disease. According to  
>AmFAR by 2000 AD 110 million people will have HIV of which 10  
>million are children. According to Dr. Grmek M.D. Ph.D.the  
>spread is "exponential" with "cataclysmic" expectations. As you  
>say, all that's necessary to control transmission is to control  
>people's sexual activities. Is that easy? Likely? You know the  
>answer.

I think what he was saying is that it should be a hard to get disease. We know how to prevent it's spread yet it infects more and more people everyday.

<snip>

>When enough people are sick, dying and dead, which will be  
>sooner than you think (if you ever think) human civilization

>will collapse. Eliminating organized human opposition to The  
>Day.

I was following you until there. Aids will never take over enough of the population for it to collapse because we too much about how to prevent it's spread. We could effectively eliminate it's spread from our planet tomorrow if there was a collaborative effort across the world. And what does "The Day" refer to? Starting to sound a little paranoid.

<snip>

>Nor on the  
>abductee whose HIV test changed with his implant removal. How do  
>you explain these facts? FACTS. Not funny (to you) criticisms  
>without basis. But \_facts\_.

Interesting case, but are there anymore examples to back up your claims, or is this it? Many strange things happen in nature, and occur as one offs, so how is this any different to a one off "interesting, but that's all" type of situation?

<snip>

>Finally, regarding your angry statements "Who do you think you are..."  
>I reply thusly:

>I am a graduate of ...

<snip>

Nice to know about all your qualifications, Mr Duke, but why does Mr McCoy have to have lead the same life as you to be just as well educated and researched? (whether through traditional education or self taught). With all your degrees and contact with Nobel Prize winners, this ET and Aids "connection" is a theory of yours and as we do not yet have hard concrete evidence that grays even exist, it goes beyond nothing more than a theory. No matter how well researched. Very interesting, but just a theory.

<snip>

>The evidence that HIV/AIDSs are purposeful ET alien creations is  
>all laid out in my book. Get the book and read it and then if  
>you want criticize. But please don't criticize what you don't  
>know about and don't understand. Thank you.

This doesn't help your case at all. Spend my hard earned money, just on your word? If I buy a book on Ufology, it is because I have heard from others of it's great content and thought provoking material, and because the author has revealed why I should buy it. So tell me, why should anyone buy your book?

>Phillip S. Duke Ph.D.  
>[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)

Cheers  
Sharon Kardol

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO Updates Main Index](#)

**UFO Updates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: **Mark Cashman** <[mcashman@ix.netcom.com](mailto:mcashman@ix.netcom.com)>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 00:45:50 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 04:24:54 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Bluehare Dark Peak <[bluehare24@hotmail.com](mailto:bluehare24@hotmail.com)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 17:29:45 GMT

>[Non-Subscriber? Post and 'as is' --ebk]

>ATTENTION UFOLOGISTS  
>A MESSAGE FROM GENIUS LOKI FOLLOWS

>We are a group of people, active in UFO hoaxing since  
>the mid 80s, and going under the collective name of Genius Loki.

If true, disgusting.

It's not as if the noise level isn't high enough.

No wonder this great "ufologist" doesn't want to reveal his  
name. What a coward!

Tar and feathers, anyone?

-----  
Mark Cashman, creator of The Temporal Doorway at  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com>  
- Original digital art, writing, music and UFO research -

UFO cases, analysis, classification systems, and more...  
<http://www.temporaldoorway.com/ufo/index.htm>  
-----

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Crisis..... What Crisis?

From: **Michel M. Deschamps** <[ufoman@ican.net](mailto:ufoman@ican.net)>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 01:07:19 -0400  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 16:43:08 -0400  
Subject: Re: Crisis..... What Crisis?

>From: Jerry Anderson <[jerry@uforesearch.freeseerve.co.uk](mailto:jerry@uforesearch.freeseerve.co.uk)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Crisis..... What Crisis?  
>Date: Thu, 24 Jun 1999 19:29:13 +0100

<snip>

>Hoaxing and researching by the same person/s do not go  
>together and only succeed in rendering the perpetrators as  
>unreliable and fraudulent. I'm all for trying to find the truth,  
>but I do not want to be associated with people of that ilk, nor  
>do I wish to have anything to do with so-called researchers  
>ridiculing others.

>There are no experts in Ufology, just experts in areas of  
>research connected with it. Dear colleagues, let us try and  
>exchange information and notes.....not insults.

Well said, Jerry.

Not only are we researchers, but also, teachers. It is our  
"job" to share the information we have collected with the rest  
of the world. We must set a good example for the young people  
who will follow in our footsteps.

Michel M. Deschamps  
MUFON Provincial Section Director for Sudbury, Ontario, Canada  
and UFO eyewitness

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Otherworld Reality Conference - Review PT. 2

From: **Stephen Miles Lewis - ELFIS** <[elfis@austin.rr.com](mailto:elfis@austin.rr.com)>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 01:35:34 +0000  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 17:02:45 -0400  
Subject: Re: Otherworld Reality Conference - Review PT. 2

Otherworld Reality  
"Exploring the Ontological Status of Imaginal Consciousness"  
Conference Review Part 2  
by SMiles Lewis  
[www.elfis.net](http://www.elfis.net)

Part 1  
<http://www.elfis.net/RnR/smlotw.htm>  
Abstracts-Bios-Links  
<http://www.elfis.net/RnR/absbio.htm>

Conference Day 2  
Sunday 5/2/99

With the conference title of Otherworld Reality and its stated agenda of Exploring the Ontological Status of Imaginal Consciousness, this symposium's work was cut out for it. The previous days explorations into the reality of imaginal experiences, while providing a fundamental background for the entirety of the wide spectrum of otherworld consciousness, lacked the physical data required to satisfy most as to the true nature of their ontological status. An anthropologist, philosopher, dream researcher, mathematician and others seemed to come up short when it came to truly "pinning down" the physical REALITY of Imaginal Encounters. Though they each gave details of the phenomena which point to the validity of information revealed through the experiencing of imaginal consciousness, the second days' line-up of speakers beckoned us onward towards more arena's within which to continue our pursuit.

The second morning of the conference, having a better grasp of getting around on the tubes, I used the Circle line to get to Embankment station right by the conference location near the river Thames. I arrived just in time to say hello to a few people and make my way upstairs to take my seat.

The actual conference speaking room was a square high-ceilinged hall on the second floor of the Royal Society of Arts, which the brochure calls the Great Room. The main doors enter upon its tiered space midway up the stepped enclosure. All four walls are adorned in an almost garrish panorama representative of a Renaissance style by painter James Barry titled The Progress of Human Knowledge. It was both impressive and perhaps a little gawdy. The centerpiece of the room's high ceiling was an apparent cuppola which had a circular patch at its center (which turned out to be a sky light opened only briefly before the first speaker after lunch). The room could supposedly seat up to 200 audience members. The head of the tiered hall falls at the bottom level to your right as you enter its main double doors from the south side. On this bottom level were the panel chairs behind a long narrow table. Facing it head on one finds the actual speaker's podium to one's right; a video camera watching the audience over the speakers' shoulders and the slide, overhead/video projector screen hanging above and behind the panel table. Most intriguing to me was the doorway, usually closed, at the back left of the panel table, which when opened revealed an impressive atrium-like stone

stairwell area which may have connected at least four other rooms across two levels. . .

Peter Rojcewicz

The first speaker was Peter Rojcewicz whom I'd the pleasure of sharing lunch with the day before. Peter's paper was originally to be an overview of the different types of imaginal experiences from ufo encounters to NDEs and beyond. However, he changed his paper topic completely to address the deepening problem of higher education and its lack of encompassing noetics to better the life loving capacities of the student body. I had a prelude of his paper from speaking with him the previous day over sandwiches with Brian Johnson, Tony Arcari, and Michael Grosso. Peter is an excellent speaker, and though I was a little disappointed at not hearing his descriptions of the multitudes of imaginal experiences (including his own encounter with an MIB), this fact reminded me of the Eastern perspective that it is not as important to focus on these phenomena as such, so much as it is important to learn the lessons they may teach us so that we may better our living within this reality.

That is what his focus was on; the incorporation of the lessons to be learned from these phenomena within the existing institutions of higher learning. A return to the charge of these schools to more fully educate the students at what it is to be human. Not to continue the existing monetary paradigm which Colleges and Universities find themselves in today. With conviction and compassion Peter convinces us of the necessity to do so if we ever hope to turn around the downward spiral of the materialist paradigms which have brought us so close to the brink of dehumanized existence we find ourselves already knee-deep in today.

Peter began with a quote from Jung on the nature of the addict; the addiction is ultimately a thirst for gnosis and wholeness. This thirst for wholeness is within all of us, especially those who seek after these phenomena. Peter states that the "healing of the split requires a long multidisciplinary effort." Unfortunately, in our culture, "curing is usually a quick fix."

Mr. Rojcewicz' proposition for fixing the same split in our gnosis institutes was to state that "Noetic Education promotes development of other modes of knowing; experiential, moral, aesthetic. Extrarational modalities encompassing analytical approaches to myth, etc." Why should we accept such a proposal? Because, "all modes of seeing have blindspots." The Noetic student becomes a "Human Intellectual Hermes" capable in the art of the "Reading of Images," cultivating an "Aesthetic Literacy."

Peter went on to say that "lack of this literacy propogates the ability to be manipulated, for image is the primary source of philosophy." This is the "paradoxical nature of Image as psychic basis and social reality." All human experiencing of "physical, social and religious realities is inferred as image."

Ultimately the two consequences of the adoption of such an Aesthetic Literacy, according to Rojcewicz, is the knowledge that "we are tools for exploration, primary instruments of learning" and the "discovery of the interior life of exterior matter."

Peter's concluding remarks were very Jungian in their understanding of the need for the integration of the Shadow: There is "no wholeness without pathology."

Richard Rudgley

Richard Rudgley provided the second presentation which was an extremely good ethnography of the imaginal as found within the ancient global entheogenic (psychedelic plants) shamanic traditions. Mr. Rudgley, though a reserved speaker, did a fine job of illustrating the incredibly long history of the use of such psychoactive compounds as ayahuasca, ginger, tobacco, mushrooms, the elusive soma, and more, dating back perhaps as long as 60,000 years to the time of the neanderthals. He gave specific information on many aspects of this most valuable area of research that I was not nearly as familiar with as I had thought. He was also rather humorous in that dry British way.

Beginning with an appreciation of the fact that western cultural approaches to psychoactives are similar to the west's approach to the imaginal Rudgley embarked upon his own investigative approach which embraces the plants value as imaginal facilitators. A litany of examples of the varying degrees of use of such plants throughout both old worlds and new lends evidence for a cultural difference instead of a lack of biodiversity as the probable reason. It seems to always flourish among cultures which come to integrate instead of irradiate. Other variables needed to understand disparities of use among different cultures revolve around issues of researcher bias. One such bias being more investigation into the sacred use of such plants in male mystery cults as opposed to female ones.

Amongst some New Guinea initiatory rites, akin to those of Masonics and other secret societies, there is a documented system of 12 successive levels starting the neophyte out with the ceremonial use of large amounts of ginger often coupled with fasting. Though typically not considered a psychoactive plant, ginger can apparently become so if used within an enculturated "mystery religion" context. Initiates use these trance catalysts to travel out of the body with the help of ancestor spirits whereupon they gain the knowledge of that particular level's lesson. Increasingly difficult lessons are rewarded with increased ecstatic ascetism. Apparently narratives from the Americas' offer similar reports.

Mr. Rudgley proceeded to elucidate the even more unknown, to me, use of tobacco as a psychoactive facilitator. He chronicled its spread from South America where it originated to eventual be spread world wide. Tobacco, again in sufficiently excessive amounts, has been used for generations by shamans as a near death induction technique to learn the origins of disease, says Mr. Rudgley. The smoking of 5 or 6 three foot cigars in one session is not uncommon. Prior to the European invasion tobacco use was entirely sacred. Continuing the tobacco chronicle Richard suggested that perhaps the origins of agriculture arose from the cultivation of sacred plants and not utilitarian food production. He also raised the issue of the early European perspective of all smoke as hellish and thus demonic in nature. Mr. Rudgley ended the tobacco expose with a reminder that when the "Russians" introduced it to the Siberians they quickly took it up for psychoactive use.

Then came an expose of the Ayahuascan "Vine of the Soul" used by over 70 groups in South America and made from a mixture of over 100 plants. This entheogen's use has been dramatically interwoven within and throughout the entirety of these cultures. All aspects of their daily and artistic lives is informed by the geometry of the realms opened by the concoction. The variety of admixtures and cultural contexts creates a multitude of different effects, however all of them create a consistently recognizable "psychic shorthand" of shapes and forms as well as an appreciation that THIS reality is the UNreality as compared to the opposite Western take. There is also a sexual connotation dealing with metaphors of the Cosmic Womb, says Rudgley.

In a brief informational on Peyote, Rudgley spoke of the discovery of peyote cacti remains found in a thousand year old grave. He gave one example of the negative effects of psychoactive use upon an aboriginal culture which involved the sudden use of peyote by its warrior class. Previously its use had been forbidden to all except the shamen. The use of the drug outside the sacred context of the caste system undermined the entire social order of the community.

Toward the end of his talk, Richard Rudgley pondered the identity of the elusive Soma described in the ancient Iranian Divine Comedy. It describes the use of two psychoactives. Was it some combination of Ephedra, Cannabis, and/or Opium? Again the question of how far back psychoactive use goes within human history is raised. Perhaps 60,000 years to a famous "flower burial" which found that the pollen of six of the species had identifiable medicinal properties, including ephedra.

Finally, Richard surprised me with a hum-dinger piece of information; DMT may exist in higher levels in the spinal fluids of schizophrenics. Shades of Dennis and Terrence McKenna's assertions that the human brain can produce a DMT experience "on the natch." Rudgley mused on the possibility of

Kundalini symbolology being connected to this idea of DMT laced spinal fluid. Niedam [sic?] is the term he used to describe the physiological creation of psychoactives. Something he thinks may ultimately lead to a new field of paraphysiology.

During the brief tea break I found myself again speaking with a beautiful psychic I had been questioned by at the end of yesterday's proceedings. She and her husband of seven years (a man who conspicuously looked like Bill Clinton) spoke to me about their use of new digital camera techniques and technologies which allow for the photographing and interpreting of human energy fields. She uses these in her practice of the shamanic arts to heal many people. She also spoke to me of the negative effects that one speaker at an ISEEM conference in Colorado had inflicted upon her (and possibly the other audience members).

Karl Jansen

Returning from the break we were treated to the most animated speaker of the conference by far, Mr. Karl Jansen, who spoke on Ketamine and the NDE. His paper had been retitled "Ketamine: the Mental Modem." Not only was he the most animated speaker, walking back and forth across the stage utilizing the wireless mike that no-one else seemed interested in using, but he also utilized the slide projector to good effect. His sense of humor also shone through and his flamboyant gestures were even more exaggerated by his extreme height.

Mr. Jansen's perspectives provided valuable insights into Ketamine. It helped dispell some of the myths I had heard as well as providing vital information about it and its effects within the brain. He even commented upon its use within the Club/Dance Culture as well as informing me of several things I didn't know like that continued use can create boyles and that it is commonly prescribed, at least in Britain, for ashmatics as well as for women with regard to obstetrics and gynecology. His intention to found a Quantum Psychiatry is indeed a much needed, yet obviously difficult goal.

At first he focused on K's (Ketamine's) connection to the NDE and NBE, near death and near birth experiences, respectfully. Yes, K trips can induce experiences whose narrative is nearly identical in character to those of NDEs. The near BIRTH experience is equally valid from Jansen's point of view. "Why are we so resistant to birth memory?" Karl repeated the refrain again and again that K does not (usually) stop or lower the heart rate, nor lower the rate of breathing. He lamented its 30 year safety record and emphasized the point that someone who has an NDE is not necessarily close to death. In fact he ultimately believes that the NDE is akin to the brain chemistry effects of K and is in actuality a defense mechanism to protect against brain death.

Jansen describes the narrative descriptions of the effects of NDEs and K as being similar in their content. Both describe psychedelic insights about reality, personality, sacredness, similar sounds, travel by tunnel into a light at high speed, conviction of death, God, OBEs, other realities, re-experienced memories, life reviews, clarity, a border between realms. As in some NDE cases, K trippers, though unconscious, can often recount the conversations and actions of spectators in the room with them. Both K trippers and NDEers insist they were not hallucinating, that the events actually happened. Mr. Jansen stressed his opinion that just because NDEs can be induced does not mean that they are unreal. In both experiences, he believes, the brain is re-tuned to a different reality; a reality of quantum connectedness wherein the mind's eye can "toggle between life and death" as well as travel to any place and time without the physical body going anywhere. In this way he equates the timeless realm that is contacted in these NDEs and K-trips as perhaps explicated by Bell's Theorem: a hyperspace where all realities exist as a single point.

Both NDEs/NBEs and K-trips can be very therapeutic if undertaken within a safe environment. Benefits include more concern for others, less depression, anxiety, and neurosis. However it should be stressed that there is a dark side to Ketamine. Besides the boyles, there is the same very seductive quality that is the nature of the imaginal. Karl Jansen continually spoke of the Faustian metaphor and of several

instances where Ketamine enthusiasts took that final trip never to return. However, he emphasized that of these cases only one of them could truly be termed an overdose - it is nearly impossible to do so with this drug. He insists that these individuals simply chose to not toggle back to the worlds of the living. In each case the person was very happy in their life but felt it was time to move on. In this same way, Jansen made a point to not condemn people who make reality choices that we can hardly fathom; he specifically cited the case of Heaven's Gate (during the end of conference panel discussion).

Mr. Jansen concluded with a much too detailed explanation of just how Ketamine works within the chemistry of the brain. This is where he outlined his belief that the NDE is in effect a defensive mechanism to protect against brain death. He reiterated his conviction that K actually allows the human mind to penetrate new realities or "Transpersonal Fields" and that this should ultimately lead us into the new domain of quantum psychiatry.

#### Lunch

Lunch time brought the inevitable waiting around in the hopes of hooking up with someone with whom to share in the continued networking of ideas. Luckily I again found myself in the right place at the right time. This time, as before, it was with the presence of Michael Grosso, but the invitation came from the other luminary amongst our forming lunch troupe, Stanley Krippner. I had reintroduced myself to him yesterday right before his presentation of Vallee's paper/outline. Accepting the invitation I joined the entourage which ended up dining in a nice little Italian restaurant right around the corner - in nearly the opposite direction as the previous days food venture.

Among our group was a young man (perhaps my junior) who was lucky enough to get some sort of "scholarship" or grant to attend. More interesting to me was the presence of Roger Woolger, a transpersonal psychotherapist with skills in regressive hypnosis. Also present were Anthony "Tony" Arcari (again) and some 'followers' of Mr Woolger's that were a married couple whose names elude me. During our meal I found myself talking mostly with Woolger and the wife of said couple; both of them are extremely experientially educated in all these matters. This wonderful lady would turn out later to be one of the major instigators of a fantastic round of dialogue had during the final Q&A panel discussion at the end of the conference.

#### Dean Radin

Once back at the conference it was time for the final speaker who was one of the main draws to this event for me; parapsychologist Dean Radin. Having read his book the Conscious Universe, which I highly recommend, I was already aware of most of what he presented but the sheer joy of his speaking style, his sense of humor, his command of the data, and his effective use of the overhead projector made him the perfect ending to the conference. Also, I was overjoyed to hear him state certain phrases and ideas as well as his assertion that there were no less than 11 on-line random number generators around the world continuing the work into Field Consciousness effects.

Of all the speakers at this conference, Dean Radin was most certainly the one who best addressed its agenda of exploring the ontological status of the imaginal. Within Radin's speech we heard of the most convincing evidence for the physical reality foundation of psi phenomena and its related aspects of imaginal consciousness.

Like so many other speakers before him, Dean began with a Jung quote. This time it was Jung's words on the interconnectedness of psyche and matter. Radin also began with a couple of joke statements. He lamented that there is "no career track for parapsychology," and asserted in anticipation of the skeptics regard to these phenomena that "reality isn't what it used to be."

You see, "measurement is addictive" according to Radin. He stated this in the context of describing the three realms within which we find ourselves looking at data; that of the objective, subjective, and what he calls the intersubjective.

The intersubjective is his term for the imaginal. He described the term in relation to the sender/receiver paradigm which has yielded much success in the now famous telepathy in dream-state experiments utilizing the ganzfeld technique.

The really interesting information, though, had to do with Radin's continuing research of Roger Nelson and what they term Field Consciousness Effects. The idea, simply put, is that, if one human mind can influence systems as disparate as other minds and even machines, then what of the focused attention of MANY MINDS. This type of experiment tries to verify the influence of mass consciousness on the output of random systems, in most cases, an electronic random number generator. Results have been startlingly successful.

Dean Radin collected many of these cases in his book and reviewed them generously during his speech to the conference. In all test cases, random number generators began producing LESS RANDOMNESS coincident with events which were known to be watched by large numbers of people. Some of these events included Olympic broadcasts, the O.J. Simpson verdict, Princess Diana's funeral, New Year's Eve, the recent Baseball homerun excitement, and many many more.

These experiments are part of the Global Consciousness Project, also called the EGG, or Electro Gaia Gram. The reference being to both a metaphoric EEG of the planetary consciousness and the obvious symbolisms inherent in any egg analogy.

By far, the greatest addition to establishing the ontological status of the imaginal is to be found in the data Dean Radin presented next; that of the terrestrial and extraterrestrial forces (geomagnetic and otherwise) discovered that play a part in the human ability to access the imaginal. Some time ago, Michael Persinger and Martha Adams investigated the connection of geomagnetism and incidents of psi, both in spontaneous and lab cases. What they found were higher numbers of psi incidence during periods of lower geomagnetic activity. Since many people had been searching for some electromagnetic compomant to the mechanisms of psi, this was a breakthrough towards new areas of research. These new avenues are paying off and may soon be a rather firm foundation for new paradigms of exploration.

On-line random number generator experiments, coupled with retro-causation (aka retroPK) research have confirmed an extraterrestrial component to psi conducive states: the full moon. Long known in the occult for its psychic importance, science has finally proven it does indeed effect the realms of the physical AND psychical. Web sites like Mr. Walker's [www.fourmilabs.com](http://www.fourmilabs.com) have shown that INTENTION can be effective backwards in time. The majority of positive effects were concurrent with the Full Moon.

One of the many examples of comparative, complimentary research into the effects of the moon upon the human psychic faculty is best summed up by Radin's research into the nightly payouts at gambling establishments. With the consent of the casinos, Dean looked at the nightly payouts and determined that the old gambler adage that you win more during the full moon... IS TRUE. Though, as he put it to the casinos, "gamblers just lose less on these nights."

Finally, Dean Radin regailed us with yet another recently discovered extraterrestrial influence on human psychic functioning: Cosmological effects. I had heard of the important discovery of a local sidereal time component to better psi results but Radin put them into a context I wasn't familiar with, that of facing into or out of our own galaxy. It seems that, when facing into the galaxy, there are of course higher EM levels than if one is facing out into deep space. These higher EM levels are deleterious to the average psychic human. However, other evidence has shown this to be the opposite with psychically gifted individuals. They seem to actually do better on days of high geomagnetic activity and so may also do better by facing into our galaxy.

Radin concluded by harkening back to the works of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and his ideas of the noosphere - human consciousness entwined about the planet as the next aspect of human evolution. Dean used the moebius strip analogy to help

explain how it is that some people may in fact perceive information that most of us cannot. Perhaps these people have some faculty that is either emergent or dormant within each of us. Perhaps we will all soon acquire the ability to perceive time and space as a moebius strip wherein one side is the physical/objective reality we all share and the other side is the psychical/subjective realms that mystics have described for millennia. Maybe gifted psychics have already developed this intersubjective talent for seeing the psychical and physical as the moebius strip whose dualistic qualities are simply gained through the inverting of one end of the spectrum to connect with the Other. Perhaps.

#### Question & Answer Audience/Panel Discussions Exploring the Imaginario

The conclusion to the conference was the long-awaited Q&A Panel Discussion whereby audience members were allowed to ask specific questions they had prepared and submitted to Stanley Krippner on note cards. Krippner was the Panel Chair and began the discussion by utilizing new insights gained from Tony Arcari's recent Saybrook paper on the differences and similarities between certain consciousness research terminologies. Tony had spoken to me of these concepts as well, and though they seemed simple enough, I had a hard time coming to grips with them. Krippner went so far as to create a drawing of these ideas on the overhead projector. However, this too failed to totally enlighten me on these ideas. I did like Stanley's use of the term Imaginario, though, to encapsulate these concepts.

Most of the questions and answers were rather staid and uninteresting until one particular note card from a female audience member pointed out the distinct lack of women on the panel. Stanley Krippner did an excellent job of balancing the potentially chaotic nature of ensuing audience/panel dialogue which erupted over this issue. He supported the observation with his own disappointment at this fact but assuaged any discontent with the news that several women had indeed been invited to participate but were all unavailable due to other engagements (no pun intended). Skeptic Susan Blackmore was one of the invitees who was unable to attend. He went on to incorporate the valuable insights offered by female audience members which, as I said, led to some of the best dialogue I have witnessed in years. Female audience member after female audience member chimed in with their own perspectives on the issue of the seeming lack of female representation within the imaginal/shamanistic traditions discussed within the course of the conference.

Most everyone addressed the prevailing biases in researching gender related issues of consciousness studies. The general consensus was that it is always difficult for a member of one sex to investigate the mystery religions of the opposite sex. Also, modern scientific experiments very often exclude female subjects in their projects. Reasons range from fear of drug effects upon the female subject who might become pregnant during the experiment, to underlying problems within a male dominated field which often simply ignores the feminine.

Richard Rudgley asserted that he was not only aware of female psychoactive societies but also of male ones which practice such acts as ritual penile blood-letting, as a sort of menstrual envy.

Charles Laughlin stated that women have easier access to these states and thus don't need the neurocognitive drivers such as initiatory rites. Someone else mentioned the differences between men and women's corpus collosum connections. Still others mentioned some experiments which point to gender differences in psychic ability: men do better influencing machines where as women do better in less mechanistic type exercises.

Another audience member brought up the subject of transgender/transsexual shamanism to which Charles Laughlin pipe up, "speaking as the only cross-dresser on the panel..." to which the entire panel and audience laughed heartily. Of course, the subject was then treated with much more respect as we were all reminded that both cross-dressing male and female shamans have both suffered at the hands of people inside and outside of

their own tribe. Most shamanic traditions address androgyny in one form or another, usually identifying it with its own set of vast powers. Yet even those cultures often look down upon such transexual behaviours, typically reacting with prejudice and violence.

Another point was made that is relevant to the debate over sexual differences; that of trauma and its differing dissociative effects upon men and women. It is generally accepted that males get angry and externalize their anger where as females get depressed and internalize their feelings. It should not surprise us then when we discover that in America, more men are jailed and more women seek therapy than in any other country.

Finally, perhaps the most consternating aspect of the Q&A was the continual focusing by certain audience members upon the topic of Out of Body Experiences and other psi phenomena which seem to imply that human consciousness can move beyond the body. Particularly, two older gentleman whom I had eavesdropped on throughout the conference, had repeatedly talked amongst themselves about their own psi experiments whereby they placed a set of 3 random numbers atop a wardrobe and challenged any psychic to astral travel and discern the numbers.

Many panel members addressed these issues, citing different examples of psi experiments which lend credence to this very ability. Michael Grosso went so far as to recount his own encounter with a particular student's ability to do such, in this case actually moving an object in his home, apparently during an OBE. It was around this time that Paul Devereux was obviously growing weary of such old paradigm thinking, as he had his head down in frustration. He proceeded to launch into a perhaps less than technical explanation for why he feels this is a moot issue. He tried to sum up what had been spoken of repeatedly throughout the conference and its importance for new modes of thinking, re-stating the consensus that the human mind can and does move beyond spacetime and there potentially interacts with all matter and energy at an informational level - not on a physical, old paradigm level where the mind LEAVES the body. "There is no body to leave, therefore it is useless to continue talking about such matters in terms of Out of Body Experiences and Astral Travel."

While I understood exactly what he was trying to say, I also sympathized with his frustration at trying to get across these ideas to people who sometimes can not quite grasp the implications of what has been said. I suppose a better tack would have been to simply accept that such phenomena as OBEs, astral travel, remote viewing, clairvoyance, etc. are the old paradigm ways that humans developed to interact within these timeless, spaceless realms of Otherworld Reality. Once this is stated, it should be a little easier to then go on and try to find new paradigms which better describe the true nature of these realms. Easier said than done, eh?

All in all it was perhaps the best start towards actualizing the new paradigms explicit within the narratives of experiences of the imaginal that we could have hoped for. I for one do see an over-arching structure forming from out of these many varied speakers' presentations.

We have evidence of human exploration of these Otherworld Realities dating far back into human evolution, using such neurocognitive drivers as psychedelics, visionary states and meditation. We have similar explorations right up to the present in the form of lucid dream research. From anthropologists we learn that the information gained within these excursions into Otherworlds often has value towards our understanding of the orders within nature. The physicists and mathematicians tell us these things are possible and we may be on the verge of understanding the mechanics behind such phenomena. Philosophers implore us to take this evidence to heart and to apply it to the institutions which sustain our civilization. Meanwhile, parapsychologists are helping draw the maps that will lead us towards a better understanding of psi phenomena and how it acts as interface between humanity and these Otherworlds.

Good job Consciousness Connection! May this set the stage for a continuing dialogue and exploration of our imaginal realms and



the hopes they bring for a better world. Book me for the next one!

Afterward

The following days found me doing the touristy site-seeing bit, befriending several students residing in the University youth hostel where I was staying, as well as shopping for boots and books in the Soho district. I toured the Tower of London, saw the Family Jewels and the Tower Bridge.

My new found friends and I spent one night in a club below Leicester Square dancing to the same crappy music one finds in clubs back in the States. We wandered home through nearly deserted streets, past the gay bar that had been bombed a few nights earlier. Our long walk ended with a late night beer fest in the youth hostel commons area. The following day I heard that 7 people had been shot that night in a London club.

The friendliest of the University students I had gone dancing with was a tall, thin Belgian (nearly ten years my junior) named Mike. I spoke to him about American parapolitics (conspiracy theory) and UFO stories. I told him of his own country's dramatic publicized tracking of UFOs with military aircraft radar. He had no knowledge in any of these areas, specifically stating he'd never heard about his own country's UFO cases. Not that surprising I suppose.

My tours of the city were limited by time and resources but I managed to spend exactly the amount of money I took with me. No more no less. Had I bought those cute UFO/Alien postcards at the Alien Cafe, which was a stone's throw away from Palace - literally, I would not have had enough money to take the tube ride back to Heathrow airport. This tube ride nearly caused me to miss my flight due to delays along the tracks.

At one point our subway car stopped above ground. I looked up and saw a very interesting sight: through a huge window in someone's flat I could see two life-size inflated 'grey' aliens. One was blue the other green. Their big black wrap-around eyes stared at me, speaking volumes without telepathy. Hanging on the wall behind and between them was a life-size paper cut-out human skeleton, mimicking the aliens black eyes with a relevance not entirely lost upon my own exhausted and frustrated frame.

Finally, the subway car lurched into motion again and managed to get me to my plane on time. The flight home was pleasant and uneventful. Much of the time I simply gazed out the airplane window watching the beautiful roiling contrail from a previous transatlantic flight which lay on our right side nearly the entire way back to America. All the while I considered its snaking trail in light of the current contrail conspiracy schmaltz making the rounds through the gullible American psyche. Aaaaaahh yes, back to America and its United States of Unconsciousness.

Will we ever wake from our evolutionary slumber?

SMiles Lewis

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Mike Wootten <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 14:47:26 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 21:39:22 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Teri Edgar <[uzrgrrl@mindspring.com](mailto:uzrgrrl@mindspring.com)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:53:12 -0700

>Hi Kathleen,

>I'm beginning to doubt that those with "closed minds" will ever  
>have a sighting, even if a 'FO lands in their driveway. Reality  
>is based on our perceptions and if we cannot stretch our minds  
>to accept anything beyond what society has told us it's alright  
>to believe in, how will we ever perceive a UFO?

>Your point about God is a good one. How can we accept the  
>reality of God, who only a few biblical characters claimed to  
>have seen (and described as a UFO encounter) and, yet, not  
>believe in UFOs who so many around the globe have seen?

>In fact, I rather believe that unless we do stretch our minds a  
>great deal, we will never find "proof" of UFOs. Perhaps it's  
>time the human race started to grow up and evolve past the five  
>senses and take notice of the evidence for other realities.

I'm afraid you seem to be missing the point here. I don't  
approve of hoaxing, but this clearly illustrates that the  
majority of ufologists don't have the capacity to truly  
investigate the UFO phenomenon. Open mindedness has nothing to  
do with this issue.

If we really wanted to find out what UFOs were - from undefined  
IFOs to ET - then religious words like 'belief' and 'open mind'  
should be kept locked away. Ufology will never be a science if  
we are not hard nosed critics of the 'evidence'. Question and  
doubt everything and you might just find some real answers.

Alchemy would still be practised today if science had not  
learned those lessons and I would not be typing this out on a  
PC!

Keep bashing those rocks together!!!!

Mike Wootten  
IUN

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Mike Wootten <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 14:47:26 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 21:24:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Teri Edgar <[uzrgrrl@mindspring.com](mailto:uzrgrrl@mindspring.com)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:53:12 -0700

>Hi Kathleen,

>I'm beginning to doubt that those with "closed minds" will ever  
>have a sighting, even if a 'FO lands in their driveway. Reality  
>is based on our perceptions and if we cannot stretch our minds  
>to accept anything beyond what society has told us it's alright  
>to believe in, how will we ever perceive a UFO?

>Your point about God is a good one. How can we accept the  
>reality of God, who only a few biblical characters claimed to  
>have seen (and described as a UFO encounter) and, yet, not  
>believe in UFOs who so many around the globe have seen?

>In fact, I rather believe that unless we do stretch our minds a  
>great deal, we will never find "proof" of UFOs. Perhaps it's  
>time the human race started to grow up and evolve past the five  
>senses and take notice of the evidence for other realities.

I'm afraid you seem to be missing the point here. I don't  
approve of hoaxing, but this clearly illustrates that the  
majority of ufologists don't have the capacity to truly  
investigate the UFO phenomenon. Open mindedness has nothing to  
do with this issue.

If we really wanted to find out what UFOs were - from undefined  
IFOs to ET - then religious words like 'belief' and 'open mind'  
should be kept locked away. Ufology will never be a science if  
we are not hard nosed critics of the 'evidence'. Question and  
doubt everything and you might just find some real answers.

Alchemy would still be practised today if science had not  
learned those lessons and I would not be typing this out on a  
PC!

Keep bashing those rocks together!!!!

Mike Wootten  
IUN

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 25](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Mike Wootten <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 14:47:26 +0100  
Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 21:44:13 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Teri Edgar <[uzrgrrl@mindspring.com](mailto:uzrgrrl@mindspring.com)>  
>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:53:12 -0700

>Hi Kathleen,

>I'm beginning to doubt that those with "closed minds" will ever  
>have a sighting, even if a 'FO lands in their driveway. Reality  
>is based on our perceptions and if we cannot stretch our minds  
>to accept anything beyond what society has told us it's alright  
>to believe in, how will we ever perceive a UFO?

>Your point about God is a good one. How can we accept the  
>reality of God, who only a few biblical characters claimed to  
>have seen (and described as a UFO encounter) and, yet, not  
>believe in UFOs who so many around the globe have seen?

>In fact, I rather believe that unless we do stretch our minds a  
>great deal, we will never find "proof" of UFOs. Perhaps it's  
>time the human race started to grow up and evolve past the five  
>senses and take notice of the evidence for other realities.

I'm afraid you seem to be missing the point here. I don't  
approve of hoaxing, but this clearly illustrates that the  
majority of ufologists don't have the capacity to truly  
investigate the UFO phenomenon. Open mindedness has nothing to  
do with this issue.

If we really wanted to find out what UFOs were - from undefined  
IFOs to ET - then religious words like 'belief' and 'open mind'  
should be kept locked away. Ufology will never be a science if  
we are not hard nosed critics of the 'evidence'. Question and  
doubt everything and you might just find some real answers.

Alchemy would still be practised today if science had not  
learned those lessons and I would not be typing this out on a  
PC!

Keep bashing those rocks together!!!!

Mike Wootten  
IUN

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Filer's Files #25 - 99

From: George A. Filer <[Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com)>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 13:39:15 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 09:54:14 -0400  
Subject: Filer's Files #25 - 99

Filer's Files #25 --1999, MUFON Skywatch Investigations  
George A. Filer, Mutual UFO Network Eastern Director,  
June 25, 1999, [Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com) (609) 654-0020

AIR VICTORY MUSEUM OWNER DIES IN F-86 PLANE CRASH

On Thursday evening I met with Steve Snyder and his wife about future plans for the museum. On Saturday, I'm sorry to report this great innovator and visionary died while flying his beloved F-86 Sabre jet during his performance at the South Jersey Regional Airport. He was flying low over the runway after performing some acrobatics and the Korean vintage jet's right wing dipped and touched the ground. The aircraft cart-wheeled into a wooded area and burst into flames. We lost a fine person and friend. I had been trying to convince Steve of the reality of UFOs for several years. He seemed to be coming over to thinking that UFOs just might be real. He had allowed me to place an expanding UFO exhibit in the museum. Steve had graduated from Georgia Tech has an aeronautical engineer, and UFOs were tough for him to accept. Thursday he said, "My biggest stumbling block to ET is the tremendous distances between our Earth and other solar systems!" I attempted to explain NASA engineer Paul Hill's findings regarding the time requirements for interstellar travel. After listening to my arguments, Steve said, "Lets have a UFO Dance at the museum. I'll get a model UFO to fly from the center of the floor and every one will go wild!" We laughed and agreed to have a UFO dance at the museum. Steve was a wonderful guy who invented the square parachute and piloted aircraft for 7000 hours while running several companies. In Steve Snyder's honor, I'm providing a summary of Paul Hill's concepts, "Unconventional Flying Objects." Perhaps Steve can put these concepts to the test?

INTERSTELLAR TRAVEL: ACCELERATION AND MISSION PROFILE: Most writers, and physicists too, in estimating the time for interstellar travel, neglect the effect of the accelerating portions of the trip on the trip time, making the simplifying assumption that the vehicle makes the entire trip at constant velocity. This is probably done because the requisite equations are scarce items in the literature... snip. 4. It is possible for an interstellar trip to be very short. The trip from our nearest neighbor, Alpha Centuri, a triple star system 4.3 light years away made by acceleration at 140 g to a v/c of 0.9999 is accomplished from a standing start to a standing finish in 6 weeks. Snip At the highest speeds considered, the travel time is not at all proportional to the distance. For example at 20 g and v/c=0.9999 we read a distance of 25 light years takes 0.6 years on board, while a distance of 100 light years is covered in almost a year. The reason is easy to visualize. Once the vehicle is up to speed, vast amounts of additional distance may be covered during the coast period with but little increase in time and, obviously, with no increase in additional light year covered while coasting.

CONCLUSION: I hope I have made it clear that there is an important distinction to be made between the time experienced by the space traveler and the time which passes meanwhile on the home planet and on the planetary destination. The tremendous



acceleration, speed, and energy capability displayed by UFOs make them well suited to capitalize on this distinction by the attainment of greatly reduced on board times realizable by approaching the speed of light. Even an approach to 90 percent of light gets the job done for the nearer stars. Higher fractions of light speed give attractive time reductions for longer trips. Don't be misled by the countless statements in the literature that interstellar distances and the speed of light constitute some kind of barrier to space travel. There are only two paths to this conclusion: Nobody in the universe has the technology to approach light speed. Observer time is significant, and on board time is to be ignored. Both paths are false ones. The confused second view is the more common. Its proponents are using the observed time for light to travel as the shortest possible time for passage. "Totally false." Thanks to Paul Hill, "Unconventional Flying Objects." Pages 268-279 Editor's Note: The sailors who crossed the ocean a couple hundred years ago and those settlers who crossed the West in wagon trains would find the trip aboard a fast space ship to another star system a reasonable time period. The biggest problem would be that their friends and relatives would be unlikely to be alive when they returned, so they might decide to bring them along. Speaking of friends, Steve Snyder will be painfully missed and I send my condolences to his wife Barbara and two sons.

#### RHODE ISLAND

WARWICK MUFON Assistant State Director Janet Bucci writes. "I thought you might want to know I am investigating another case. Friday evening June 11, 1999, at around 11:00 PM a gentleman in Warwick, was looking out his window at the sky and spotted three lights acting strangely. They were gambling about as if playing and headed toward the ground, whereupon they became one light. The light shot back up in sky and separated into three lights again. This sequence repeated over and over again, while the gentleman watched for about half-an-hour. The details are as yet unknown since the investigation has not yet been started but thought you'd want to hear that we have a potential sighting in the works.

#### NEW JERSEY ORBS AND OTHER ANOMALIES

PARAMUS, NJ -- Vinny Polise writes, "At the present time I have been experiencing what some in the Ufology and Paranormal Field call ORBS." Orbs over the past years have been showing themselves to certain individuals, such as myself and have bought themselves to my attention. What is this phenomenon? We are unable to comprehend what they are and where they come from. In the beginning of my research, around 1990, I started investing time in the Pine Bush, New York, phenomena better known as the Lower Hudson Valley Sightings. Pine Bush is known for being one of the UFO capitals of the world. Between 1990 and 1999, I personally witnessed many strange phenomena relating to UFOs and other dimensional beings. Photographing became part of my research and would indeed prove to be a monumental improvement in what we believe to be the reality of another dimension. Strange anomalies would appear on my photos and negatives. Whether it be strange light streaks, Orbs, Paranormal Mist, or just plain ghostly shadows, I knew there was something extremely strange going on in the area. Time went on and these phenomena would still be registering on all types of camera equipment, no matter how inexpensive the camera would still register these images. TV shows such as, Sightings, A&E, The Learning Channel, and so on have all been to the Pine Bush area. Sightings actually video taped a flying Manta or V shaped craft in the late 80's along with other phenomena. This phenomenon is ongoing. What I have found is that the area is not critical, but the person and his attraction to the phenomena are. That's right, the phenomena from my perspective is everywhere, but there is one catch. This phenomena is attracted to certain individuals. The ability to film these images and anomalies come from within the individual. During the past two years, the Pine Bush activity has followed me home to Paramus, New Jersey. This is a border town close to New York. It is a quiet little community where I found an open area and a semi-dense wooded area close to my home. I have been filming there for over a year. The results have been phenomenal. The phenomenon of the "Orbs" is one "we" may or may not find an answer too. There are a lot of single people doing individual studies on this "orb" concept and phenomena. Basic studies done

by myself have shown me that "orbs" have an intelligence, are able to move at rapid speeds, disappear, appear, change color, shape, and size all in the blink of an eye. Usually you need the camera to pick them up but sometimes they are visible to the naked eye. Orbs tend to be in another dimensional level, but have the ability to interchange dimensions. I think within time we may one day be able to communicate with other dimensional worlds and their inhabitants. Orbs are not harmful, and seem to only be as curious of us as we are of them. I have found that a simple "asking" will entice these orbs to come closer to the individual filming them, as you can see in the photos. There have been times that I have been so close I could have actually grabbed one of them, but they have an ability to maneuver and disappear. What I am looking for with these orbs, is contact on a conscious level, to learn from them, and possibly getting a glimpse of their reality! Thanks to: Vinny Polise. See photos at: The Pine Bush Vortex,

(<http://members.aol.com/ufocontat/pinebush/>).

#### FLORIDA

LOXAHOCHÉ -- Endrick Torres a 19 year old student reported to BUFOD that he saw a UFO near Wellington on June 20, 1999. Two of my relatives and several neighbors spotted something in the sky at 10:30 PM.. It was very bright but not moving. At first we thought it was a star or a plane, but I have never seen a star not blinking and a plane not moving. I grabbed a pair of binoculars to get a better view. It was a strange object with three vertical lights close to each other that from afar, looked like one glow. It stayed like this for a half an hour, so we started filming. It kept on like this for the remainder of the tape until the video ended. When the camera stopped filming, the object started moving and changing shape. It went from a vertical line to an oval shape then to an ellipse and back. The top light changed from white to red and morphed that way. This went on for 30 minutes until 12:00 AM, when we lost sight of it to the west. It was hovering towards the bell glade area. We watched the video and everything came out pretty good. There were times when it was difficult to see because my hand was moving but the good shots are unmistakable. The hovering craft made no noise and had many lights that changed shape and color at an estimated 800 feet. Thanks to BUFOD' Ben Field - [ben@abcfield.force9.co.uk](mailto:ben@abcfield.force9.co.uk). and <http://www.abcfield.force9.co.uk>

#### TEXAS

LAKE LEWISVILLE Last week, I reported a June 6, 1999, sighting of three large maneuvering lights. The correct date is June 9, 1999. Amy writes, "What is interesting is that I saw this 'splitting' UFO almost exactly two years to the day. On June 7, 1997, I saw a huge moonlike UFO that hovered in the field behind my house." All hell seemed to break loose that month. I got some of it on video tape! It changed my life so much that I went from ignoring general UFO reports to reading every UFO report I could get my hands on for the last two years. I came across some amazing discoveries in my studies (well, amazing to me). Just the other night I saw a bright flash of light that lit up the sky. Then a few seconds later all the power went out in my house leaving me staring at a blank computer screen in total darkness. Power seemed to be out on the entire block, but who can tell in these small towns where they roll up the streets at 8:00 PM? (grin). The power came back on within 5 minutes. Something mighty weird seems to be going on back there. I've heard the area where I saw the moonlike UFO is owned by the Army Corps of Engineers. I've seen many strange beams of light coming from the ground all over the place yet there is nothing out there but open fields and small houses for miles. Guess it's time to take a hike. <grin> Only way I know to access the area is dirt bike or on foot. Thanks to Amy Hebert -  
[yelorse@swbell.net](mailto:yelorse@swbell.net)

#### WASHINGTON

LONGVIEW -- I met with Peter Davenport concerning updates on the February 25, elk abduction in Washington. Apparently, more witnesses were interviewed by the MUFON investigator Bob Fairfax. The witnesses who are of Mexican descent were planting seedlings on the side of a mountain. They would have been plainly visible from the air. A small craft roughly in the shape of the heel of a shoe, (an elongated disc with the back cut off), flew over and picked up a running elk. The fourteen

forestry workers were all frightened by the UFO abduction of the elk and remained close together for the rest of the day. During the investigation an elk was later found that might have been involved in the abductions. The elk had no visible signs of injury but had ticks still embedded in the elk's neck. Both the ticks and the elk were dead. When an animal dies the ticks quickly leave because the temperature lowers and the blood flow stops. The Game and Wildlife officer says, there have been hard conditions this year for animals and most are undernourished and many have starved. The craft was 10 to 12 feet long and only slightly larger than the elk. Several witnesses felt the UFO appeared to grow larger to accommodate the elk. Thanks to Peter Davenport. Editors Note: It is very unusual for UFOs to attempt to pick up animals in broad daylight in front of 14 witnesses. The UFO's aircrew may also have problems in obtaining food.

#### UTAH

MIDVALE -- Tim Hagemeister Director NACOMM reports a Sunday, June 20, 1999, sighting at 4:10 to 4:20 PM of three silver round objects. One object particularly convinced me what I was seeing was not anything I have ever seen before. Its movement was sharp and at one point not moving at all for several minutes. We're looking to find any other reports for same area. This is an initial sighting report and more detailed report will follow in the coming days. Thanks to Tim Hagemeister Director NACOMM [www.nacomm.org](http://www.nacomm.org)

#### CHILE

COCHRANE -- Luis C. Sanchez Perry Chilean Director Skywatch International reports that on June 20, 1999, a married couple that live on Chilean military land reported a UFO sighting. Last year a 400 meter triangular UFO was seen in this same area. The couple report three times a day from Predio Backer to the Coihaique military base, where the following report was obtained. On Sunday night at 8:30 PM, they saw five luminous objects fly over their house in a linear formation (O O O O O). They were three meters apart heading south. About 300 meters from the house they stopped. Four of the objects merged into one lighting up the entire sky. The fifth object remained static. Both of the objects started moving very slowly from their position to a nearby hill called "La Meceta." Once over the hill, the five objects separated in all directions. They gathered again in a line formation (O O O O O) and left heading for the city of Punta Arenas. The sky was clear and the entire sighting lasted about 14 minutes. During the sighting, they tried to radio the police in Cochrane, but the radios failed to function until the UFO's departed. Thanks to military officer Rodrigo Bravo from Coihaique base who ordered that this report be released. This is the first official case as far as I know where a UFO sighting is officially registered in the Daily Event Book and released to the public. In normal circumstances this sighting would not be registered. But Rodrigo Bravo is a good friend of mine and he is very interested in UFO's. So he thought it was time for the military take a more serious and opened attitude about UFOs. Let hope it works.

COIHAIQUE -- During May numerous military personnel reported UFO sightings in the middle of military exercises. 1) Two lights (red and orange) were seen going from the ground to the sky (vertically), one after the other at Las Vandurrias 24 kilometers east of Coihaique at 8:30 PM. 2) Small star like object moving erratically (up, down and sideways) with flashes of light that illuminated all the sky. This lasted a few minutes. After about five minutes it happened again but on the opposite side of the sky. 3) Many soldiers saw a ball of orange light come horizontally out of "Cerro Piramide" without a tail.

UFO FLIES NEAR A COMMERCIAL AIRLINER -- On May 23, 1999, a UFO was witnessed by the flight crew and passengers for thirty minutes. The sighting started over Puerto Natales, and the commander invited some passengers to the cabin to have a better view of the UFO. The Commander then contacted the control tower that also had a visual contact with the UFO and it's movements. All the radio contact between the aircraft and control tower was recorded on tape. There was no radar contact with the UFO. The Flight number and pilot's name are being withheld. This case is being investigated by the UFO group AION. ([aion@chilesat.net](mailto:aion@chilesat.net)) Thanks to Luis C. Sanchez Perry Chilean Director Skywatch Int.

## BELGIUM TRIANGLES

Aviation enthusiast Eric Morris states: "On Saturday 12th June, I attended the Woodford Airshow held at British Aerospace, Woodford, Cheshire. At approximately 12:45 PM I made my way over to a group of pilots who were talking to the public and giving stickers out to enthusiasts. I managed to get into conversation with two of these men, one the pilot of a Royal Netherlands Air Force aircraft and the other an F-16 pilot. After a few minutes I asked them candidly about the 'Belgian UFO incidents' of 1989/90 and without any hint of a lie they told me that firstly, they were knowledgeable about the case. Secondly, they knew the name of Colonel Wilfred de Brouwer who was most closely associated with the case at the time -- from an official point of view. The pilot laughed when asked about triangular 'UFOs' and stated that they were/are not UFOs as such but classified aircraft. I feigned surprise and said that the press and public thought differently. This encouraged them to be a little more forthcoming and they added that 'an experimental aircraft' had been involved and had developed problems. The men stated that knowledge of this incident was not exactly limited to Belgium and that Dutch, UK and German radars were affected by this and that some tracks were made. In the UK radar stations on the East coast had, apparently, picked the aircraft up. They argued that the jet fighters were tasked to track the experimental aircraft in the air for some reason. They knew the Belgian pilots involved. They were adamant that this was not a UFO sighting and having had conversations with other NATO pilots had discovered that NATO Air Forces were 'in the know.' Official statements, of the type put out by de Brouwer, were little more than a smokescreen to hide the facts. The actual craft in question was, as far as they knew, of European design and they didn't know about any possible US involvement. America was not mentioned in this respect. They also had heard about cover-ups of incidents at RAF Boscombe Down. The aircraft in question were F-16's Serial J-256, J-259, attached to R. Netherlands AF Squadron 299, 301, 311." I am prepared to make a statement in front of a Solicitor in the form of an affidavit if required. This statement is true to the best of my recollection and for further information I can be contacted as follows; Eric Morris, 78 Greenall Rd, Northwich, Cheshire CW9 5RN. Tel (01606) 330567. Tim Matthews comments; Although this is a remarkable account some of the facts fit what we know. Derek Sheffield's "UFO - A Deadly Concealment" indicates that the MOD (UK) knew all about it and that North Atlantic Ground Defence Environment (NADGE) radar picked the aircraft up. Importantly, he states that anything reported to one country's radar would necessarily be passed on to the rest in the loop. He also indicates there was an official cover-up and it is remarkable to note how Ufologists who believe in a UFO cover-up treat the Belgian military as a different and truthful entity, when claiming there is a Covert Agenda of UFO cover-ups at the highest levels of power. Thanks to Tim M. [matthews@zetnet.co.uk](mailto:matthews@zetnet.co.uk) Editor's Note: Our government's know which UFO reports are real and those that are not. We gain little by pushing reports that may not be true. Certainly, UFOs could have been involved, but within NATO military circles this version of the report is considered true.

## RUSSIA

ROSTOV -- Anatoly Kutovoy reports I have received some details regarding the UFO from one fellow from Rostov in the Northern Caucasus. The UFO was filmed by Liudmila Goryacheva, a university student, her address is known. Also Moscow TV evening program 'Vzgliad' (translated as 'Look') interviewed two of the witnesses. The girls told what they had seen. There was also a report about the UFO on one of Rostov's local radio stations. The local newspaper "Evening Rostov" has also published an article. The UFO was sighted to the west (or West-North-West), 25 degrees above horizon. The events continued for about a month. A Rostov university student is trying to investigate but he does not have much time for investigation. Best regards, Anatoly Kutovoy

## MIB MOVIE MAY HIDE UFO

I have possible UFO sighting. During the movie, Men In Black (M.I.B.) there is a strange white dot that slowly moves across the sky. This occurs during the scene where the bug takes the

doctor from the morgue to the space ship that is disguised as a water tower. This happens before the bug climbs the ladder to the ship. This is just one of the sightings. Thanks to Chris: [kirk.stauss@teleweb.net](mailto:kirk.stauss@teleweb.net)

MUFON CONFERENCE: July 2-4, 30th Annual MUFON 1999 International UFO Symposium at Hyatt Regency Crystal City Hotel in Arlington, Virginia. E-mail [mufonhq@aol.com](mailto:mufonhq@aol.com) for details.

#### KECKSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA UFO CRASH DOCUMENTARY

Kecksburg UFO crash/retrieval Video Documentary. Most readers are familiar with the Roswell event, but many are unaware that a similar incident occurred in Pennsylvania in 1965, near a small rural community called Kecksburg. Veteran UFO researcher Stan Gordon, has been gathering information on this case for many years, and has produced a studio made 92 minute video called "Kecksburg The Untold Story." This production recently won the 1998 EBE film award for the Best Historical UFO Documentary. The video contains interviews with many people who have information about the case including witnesses who saw the object in the sky. Also with those who say they came across a large metallic acorn shaped object with strange markings, partially buried in the ground, before the military arrived on the scene. Among those interviewed are reporters who were on location that night, a witness who says he saw the odd acorn shaped object on the back of an army flatbed tractor trailer truck, and civilians who claim they were confronted by armed military personnel. For the first time, some witnesses speak out on camera discussing information that suggests that there could have been a cover-up to withhold the truth about what occurred near Kecksburg. A startling revelation is revealed here from a witness, who says he saw a body in the same building with the Kecksburg object, at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, only days after it was delivered there. Also contained in the documentary are some of the actual audio excerpts from the WHJB radio special called "Object in the woods," which was broadcast soon after the incident in a "cut and edited version." To order your copy of "Kecksburg The Untold Story" send a check or money order to: Stan Gordon Productions, P.O. Box 936, Greensburg, PA 15601. Attention: Dept. GF. The cost of the tape including shipping and handling is \$35.90. For PA residents the cost including tax, S&H is \$38.05. For PA residents living in Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties the total cost is \$38.41. For more information, check out Stan's updated Website at [www.westol.com/~paufu](http://www.westol.com/~paufu)

MUFON JOURNAL For more detailed investigative reports subscribe by writing to 103 Oldtowne Road, Sequin, TX 78155-4099 or E-mail [Mufon@aol.com](mailto:Mufon@aol.com). Filer's Files Copyright 1999 by George A. Filer, all rights reserved. Readers may post items from the Files on their Websites provided that they credit the newsletter and its editor by name and list the date of issue that the item appeared. Send your letters to me at [Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com). If you wish to keep your name confidential please so state.

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Roger Evans <[moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com](mailto:moviestuff@cyberjunkie.com)>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 22:41:53 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 13:59:41 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Mike Wootten <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
>Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 14:47:26 +0100  
>Fwd Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 21:24:14 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>>From: Teri Edgar <[uzrgrrl@mindspring.com](mailto:uzrgrrl@mindspring.com)>  
>>To: <[updates@globalseve.net](mailto:updates@globalseve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:53:12 -0700

Previously, Teri has offered:

>>I'm beginning to doubt that those with "closed minds" will ever  
>>have a sighting, even if a 'FO lands in their driveway. Reality  
>>is based on our perceptions and if we cannot stretch our minds  
>>to accept anything beyond what society has told us it's alright  
>>to believe in, how will we ever perceive a UFO?

Mike replied:

>I'm affraid you seem to be missing the point here. I don't  
>approve of hoaxing, but this clearly illustrates that the  
>majority of ufologists don't have the capacity to truly  
>investigate the UFO phenomenon. Open mindedness has nothing to  
>do with this issue.  
>  
>If we really wanted to find out what UFOs were - from undefined  
>IFOs to ET - then religious words like 'belief' and 'open mind'  
>should be kept locked away. Ufology will never be a science if  
>we are not hard noised critics of the 'evidence'. Question and  
>doubt everything and you might just find some real answers.  
>  
>Alchemy would still be practised today of science had not  
>learned those lessons and I would not be typing this out on a  
>PC!

Hi, Mike.

You mentioned alchemy, science and religion. Alchemy became a science only after the practice of experimentation and observation was combined with copious note keeping to prevent repetition of errors and failed results. But, make no mistake, there were many occasions where someone simply thought, "What if I mixed this with this?" and came up with success, sometimes on the first try! Science today is not much different. In this fashion, I believe that many of the greatest advances in science came as a result of a leap of faith; someone in a lab or workshop simply wondering "What if...?"

Thus the fine line between religion and science disappears, if only for a moment. But it is within this moment that man shines the brightest as he demonstrates the ability to predict beyond what is predictable; to recognize the unrecognizable.

Remember, Thomas Edison had a minimal grade school education. Henry Ford was illiterate and signed his name with an 'X'. DeForrest was credited with "inventing" the amplification tube but could not explain how it worked in court when challenged over his patent. These are a few examples of people that used

intuition as much as anything to explore the world around them. The "evidence" they studied was invisible to their contemporaries as it could only be seen through the eyes of someone with an open mind and a belief in the impossible.

Therefore, with all due respect, I think it is you that's missing the point. The "evidence" you suggest we should be hard nosed critics of simply does not exist...yet. This is not to say that it isn't right before our very eyes; indeed, it may very well be. However, since we really don't have a clue what we are looking for there's a very good chance that we might overlook it unless we drop our preconceived notions of what UFO's and ET's are supposed to "be".

I understand your frustration at the apparent "guessing game" that seems to invite anyone calling themselves a "UFO researcher". However, discoveries are not the sole property of the scientific elite. On the contrary, the average Joe on the street may fare better than the rigidly disciplined scientist when it comes to asking "What if...?" Since the average person hasn't been taught about what can't be possible, he or she is more likely to recognize what is possible or, more importantly, what is actually happening in front of their very eyes.

BTW, the concept of the "PC" was initially considered foolish by virtually everyone in the computer industry. It took a few people asking "What if...?" to make it a reality.

Take care,

Roger Evans

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Month-Long Sightings In Iran?

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 05:32:21 GMT  
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 14:15:18 -0400  
Subject: Month-Long Sightings In Iran?

Source: alt.alien.visitors

Stig

\*\*\*

From: "news" <[bihrf@yahoo.com](mailto:bihrf@yahoo.com)>  
Newsgroups: alt.alien.visitors  
Subject: sighting  
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 14:32:57 +1000  
Organization: The University of Newcastle

People in the south east of Iran (between end of May and 20th of June 99) were witnessed a purple light in the sky for about a month every night. There was no explanation for such a event and the light went away without any sign.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Doug & Dave?

From: John Gilbert <[john@greendome.force9.co.uk](mailto:john@greendome.force9.co.uk)>  
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 17:56:44 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 20:30:57 -0400  
Subject: Doug & Dave?

>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>Date: Sat, 22 May 1999 03:37:55 +0200 (MET DST)  
>Subject: 'London Evening Standard' On Rockefeller  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>In 1992, two Southampton men, Doug Bower and Dave Chorley,  
>confessed to making corn circles: every summer night for 20  
>years. Their method was simple: rakes and planks of wood to  
>bash down the crop, ropes to guide them to a perfect circle,  
>loops of wire on hats to guide straight lines.

Just to take-off on a different thread. Does anyone here believe that these two people actually ever made a single crop circle? Not only have they failed to make one with anyone watching, but they claim to have made perfect straight lines with a loop of wire attached to the brim of a baseball hat. Now think about it, that wouldn't actually work.

John.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: John Gilbert <[john@greendome.force9.co.uk](mailto:john@greendome.force9.co.uk)>  
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 17:56:44 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 20:29:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>Date: Sat, 22 May 1999 03:37:55 +0200 (MET DST)  
>Subject: 'London Evening Standard' On Rockefeller  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>In 1992, two Southampton men, Doug Bower and Dave Chorley,  
>confessed to making corn circles: every summer night for 20  
>years. Their method was simple: rakes and planks of wood to  
>bash down the crop, ropes to guide them to a perfect circle,  
>loops of wire on hats to guide straight lines.

Just to take-off on a different thread. Does anyone here believe that these two people actually ever made a single crop circle? Not only have they failed to make one with anyone watching, but they claim to have made perfect straight lines with a loop of wire attached to the brim of a baseball hat. Now think about it, that wouldn't actually work.

John.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: Teri Edgar <[uzrgrrl@mindspring.com](mailto:uzrgrrl@mindspring.com)>  
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 07:46:25 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 20:48:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Mike Wootten <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 14:47:26 +0100

>>From: Teri Edgar <[uzrgrrl@mindspring.com](mailto:uzrgrrl@mindspring.com)>  
>>To: <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:53:12 -0700

>>Hi Kathleen,

>>I'm beginning to doubt that those with "closed minds" will ever  
>>have a sighting, even if a 'FO lands in their driveway. Reality  
>>is based on our perceptions and if we cannot stretch our minds  
>>to accept anything beyond what society has told us it's alright  
>>to believe in, how will we ever perceive a UFO?

>>Your point about God is a good one. How can we accept the  
>>reality of God, who only a few biblical characters claimed to  
>>have seen (and described as a UFO encounter) and, yet, not  
>>believe in UFOs who so many around the globe have seen?

>>In fact, I rather believe that unless we do stretch our minds a  
>>great deal, we will never find "proof" of UFOs. Perhaps it's  
>>time the human race started to grow up and evolve past the five  
>>senses and take notice of the evidence for other realities.

>I'm afraid you seem to be missing the point here. I don't  
>approve of hoaxing, but this clearly illustrates that the  
>majority of ufologists don't have the capacity to truly  
>investigate the UFO phenomenon. Open mindedness has nothing to  
>do with this issue.

>If we really wanted to find out what UFOs were - from undefined  
>IFOs to ET - then religious words like 'belief' and 'open mind'  
>should be kept locked away. Ufology will never be a science if  
>we are not hard nosed critics of the 'evidence'. Question and  
>doubt everything and you might just find some real answers.

>Alchemy would still be practised today if science had not  
>learned those lessons and I would not be typing this out on a  
>PC!

>Keep bashing those rocks together!!!!

Dear Mike,

Friend, I'll stand by what I wrote. Einstein said: "Imagination is more important than knowledge." Science is held back by old beliefs, by the lack of leaps of the imagination. If one rigidly holds to old paradigms, new ones will remain hidden. UFOs have demonstrated that our knowledge of physics is limited--that we have much more to learn. Certainly you don't believe that science has reached its zenith, that we know all there is to know. In order to discover new truths, we have to stretch our minds, to reach out further than we have, which means letting go of old beliefs that clog our ability to perceive new truths.

Open-mindedness has everything to do with science.

"Sit down before fact like a little child, and be prepared to give up every preconceived notion, follow humbly wherever and to whatever abyss Nature leads, or you shall learn nothing."  
--T. H. Huxley

Sincerely,  
Teri Edgar

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 26](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 21:48:01 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 20:51:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 13:54:48 -0400

>>Date: Sun, 20 Jun 1999 22:36:54 +0100  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse [was: Re: Budd Hopkins]

>>and remember that these sorts of claims (Satanic and abduction)  
>>can wreck people's lives.

>Documentation, please, on how abduction claims have wrecked  
>lives.

>Anecdotes not welcome, since they can easily be countered with  
>situations I've personally observed, in which people pulled  
>themselves together by coming to terms with their reported  
>abduction experiences.

>Let's have some statistical data. What proportion of abductees  
>have wrecked their lives by thinking they've been abducted?

Oh, come on, is this serious? Statistical data on wrecked lives?  
No anecdotes (i.e. actual examples of wrecked lives)? I can  
assure you that lives have been wrecked by claims of Satanic  
Ritual Abuse - anecdotes only, sorry, as unfortunately for some  
peculiar reason no-one seems to be collecting percentages of  
"wrecked lives" as opposed to "slightly concerned lives",  
"rather worried lives", or "terribly upset lives". Maybe the  
Office of Population and Statistics could put a question in  
their 2001 Census.

--  
John Rimmer  
[www.magonia.demon.co.uk](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk)  
Official Sponsors of the 1999 Solar Eclipse

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## UFO Sighting & Mag Detector Activity?

From: Stan Gordon <[paufu@westol.com](mailto:paufu@westol.com)>  
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 19:41:06 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 08:29:57 -0400  
Subject: UFO Sighting & Mag Detector Activity?

Report of UFO Sighting With Possible Activation of Magnetic  
Detector in Pennsylvania

From Stan Gordon.

Report UFO sightings and other phenomena in PA (24 hours a day)  
724-838-7768 Stan's UFO Anomalies Zone Website:  
[www.westol.com/~paufu](http://www.westol.com/~paufu)

The following report is from UFO researcher Jim Brown of  
Smithfield, Pa. Jim has been an associate of mine for many  
years, and with his extensive electronics background has built  
an elaborate magnetic anomaly detector (besides many other  
devices) in his home. For more information on Jim's UFO research  
and his other projects, check out his website at:  
<http://www.hhs.net/jbrown/>

Magnetic Anomaly Detector Activation Report --J. Brown

The Magnetic Anomaly Detector (MAD) alarm at my residence was  
activated at 0108 hrs. 27 April, 1999. On activation, I first  
checked realtime readings on the unit and confirmed they were  
outside baseline, indicating a valid anomalous condition. Within  
30 seconds of the alarm activation, I went outside and began  
observations.

Conditions were high altitude broken clouds and haze.  
Temperature 45 degrees F. Winds were calm. The moon was high in  
the sky, but was somewhat obscured by the haze. Mars and only a  
few of the brightest stars were visible. I was not able to see  
or hear anything out of the ordinary. I continued to observe for  
about 20 minutes without results. (2 aircraft were seen at high  
altitude over this span of time, these likely were commercial  
aviation. This is not uncommon at this location.)

I went back inside and saved the data from the MAD. By this  
time, the system had established its new baseline level. I  
cleared the circular buffer, saved data to disk, reset the  
alarm, and the system was back in its scan mode.

As I write this report, (0830 hrs. 27 April), there have been no  
additional alarms reported.

-----  
Additional Report of Object Sighted by Witnesses

(This report was received 18 May regarding the above sighting  
along the power line which runs 800 feet behind my residence.  
The sighting occurred about 3 miles east of my location on  
Chestnut Ridge, 27 April at about 0100 hrs, or approx 8 minutes  
prior to the activation of the MAD. Data indicates the two  
events may be related. What follows is an excerpt of the

narrative portion of the report currently under investigation. Names are withheld at the request of witnesses.)

... Me and ( ) were parked along Skyline Drive under the power line by Pondfield. About 1 (o'clock), I saw what looked like a star over toward Elliottsville. There wasn't one there a minute before. We watched it and it looked like it was moving slowly toward us. We thought this was strange, but it was probably just a plane. We didn't pay much attention to it for a couple minutes. Next time I looked out I could see it was no plane. I could see it was a bright circle of light sort of like a doughnut. Where the hole was it was glowing a blue color. It was over the power line coming toward us from the east.

It looked like a doughnut glowing white with the blue glow in the center. As it went over the car, i heard a humming sound that sort of went through the car. ( ) said she could hear a whistle, but I didn't hear that. At the time I felt like I was falling. I lost my sense of direction and felt dizzy. ( ) said she just felt something evil was in the car but I didn't. This lasted a couple minutes or so. The light passed over the car and kept going down the mountain toward Uniontown. It disappeared behind the trees. We just sat there and talked about this for a half hour, then I took ( ) home. We wanted to report this, but didn't know who to call. ... (The narrative continues with personal info.)

-----  
6 June, 1999 Sound duplicated under Test Conditions.

A test setup using 3 audio generators, gating control, and a mixer was configured to allow each witness to attempt to duplicate the sound they heard. I interviewed each separately, and was present to provide advise on the use of the equipment, not the settings themselves. The witnesses had control over parameters and adjusted the setup as they felt was the the most accurate representation of the sounds heard.

In summary, there were slight discrepancies in the setup, but only to the extent one would expect. One set up was 92 hertz, the other 112. Both added a pulsating sound to the signal, and both said it varied slightly in pulse rate, one said from 8 - 12 pps, the other from 9 - 16. One witness also added a high frequency component, (the whistle reported previously) at 13 khz. The witness who does not report hearing the whistle does say he has a hearing impairment, and a simple test I performed here using one of the generators confirms he cannot hear above 4.5 khz in one ear and 6 khz in the other.

A point of note, the pulse rate superimposed on the magnetic wave from the MAD unit falls within the range both witnesses reported. When the original magnetic source signal is converted to a bit mapped graphic and displayed, the signal contains an 88 to 94 hertz component pulsating at between 8 to 14 pps. The absence of the high frequency component reported cannot be used conclusively since, due to the sample rate of the MAD, this is well above the ability of the instrument to record. Sample rate is approx. 350 to 400 per second. In conclusion, the similarities between the sound generated by the test and the actual magnetic field recorded by the MAD appear to more than coincidence, however the source of the magnetic disturbance is still under investigation. To date, no conclusive evidence has been uncovered.

-----  
25 June, 1999 Follow up contact of both witnesses.

Neither report any subsequent contacts or any new recollections about their original sighting. Both are sticking with the report as they presented it originally. There has been no additional activation of the MAD system as of this date.

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 20:58:46 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 08:33:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Tim D. Brigham <[TBrigham@ksinc.net](mailto:TBrigham@ksinc.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:45:18 -0500

>>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 01:18:34 -0400

>>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>>>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:56 EDT  
>>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

<snips>

>Hi Greg, Kevin, etc.

>First, congrats again to 'Doc Kev' on his acadmemic  
>accomplishment. As an aside- kevin, may I ask what your  
>dissertation was on? Just curious if you were at all able to  
>bring in the UFO stuff into your work, even in an indirect  
>manner.

Tim, All -

Again, thanks. My dissertation was called "The Influence of  
Preexisting Belief in UFOs on the Identification of Ambiguous  
Astronomical and Meteorological Stimuli." The point was not to  
determine if UFOs were extraterrestrial or some other phenomena  
but to study the influence of belief structure on the  
identification of somewhat obscure objects.

I had hoped to do something with sleep paralysis and alien  
abductions, but couldn't get the review committee to go along  
with that. This was sort of a compromise.

KRandle, Ph.D.  
[www.randlereport.com](http://www.randlereport.com)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Month-Long Sightings In Iran?

From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 18:13:40 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 08:38:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Month-Long Sightings In Iran?

>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)  
>Subject: Month-Long Sightings In Iran?  
>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 05:32:21 GMT

>Source: alt.alien.visitors

>Stig

>\*\*\*

>From: "news" <[bihrf@yahoo.com](mailto:bihrf@yahoo.com)>  
>Newsgroups: alt.alien.visitors  
>Subject: sighting  
>Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 14:32:57 +1000  
>Organization: The University of Newcastle

>People in the south east of Iran (between end of May and 20th of  
>June 99) were witnessed a purple light in the sky for about a  
>month every night. There was no explanation for such a event and  
>the light went away without any sign.

Dear Stig:

Maybe that's why some people have so few reports from the Middle  
East.

Best

- Larry Hatch

= = = = =

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: **Larry Hatch** <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 18:20:30 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 08:41:42 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>From: John Gilbert <[john@greendome.force9.co.uk](mailto:john@greendome.force9.co.uk)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Doug & Dave?  
>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 17:56:44 +0100

>>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>>Date: Sat, 22 May 1999 03:37:55 +0200 (MET DST)  
>>Subject: 'London Evening Standard' On Rockefeller  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>In 1992, two Southampton men, Doug Bower and Dave Chorley,  
>>confessed to making corn circles: every summer night for 20  
>>years. Their method was simple: rakes and planks of wood to  
>>bash down the crop, ropes to guide them to a perfect circle,  
>>loops of wire on hats to guide straight lines.

>Just to take-off on a different thread. Does anyone here believe  
>that these two people actually ever made a single crop circle?  
>Not only have they failed to make one with anyone watching, but  
>they claim to have made perfect straight lines with a loop of  
>wire attached to the brim of a baseball hat. Now think about it,  
>that wouldn't actually work.

Dear Mr Gilbert:

Somehow, I have difficulty seeing two fellows, late from some  
pub, sucessfully oiling a pair of roller skates -- let alone  
hoaxing a decent crop circle.

It sounds more like a gang of four ( or six or eight ) all of  
whom have agreed on some agenda of humor or whatever.

In any case, I thing these matters belong on some "cereology"  
page or discussion group.

I cannot find a link to ufology outside of the predictable  
failings of the human specie

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

= = = = =

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## UFO Shows on TLC Tonight

From: Dave Pengilly - UFO\*BC <[david\\_pengilly@dccnet.com](mailto:david_pengilly@dccnet.com)>  
Date: 26 Jun 1999 19:30:29 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 08:44:43 -0400  
Subject: UFO Shows on TLC Tonight

TLC Presents: A Night of UFOs  
Sunday, June 27, 1999

- 1) UFOs: 50 Years of Denial  
5 and 8 p.m. PDT
- 2) UFOs Uncovered: Are Aliens Here?  
6 and 9 p.m. PDT
- 3) UFOs Uncovered: Dark Secrets  
7 and 10 p.m. PDT

\*\*\*\*\*

Dave Pengilly  
[dave@ufobc.org](mailto:dave@ufobc.org)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

From: [KAnder6444@aol.com](mailto:KAnder6444@aol.com)  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 00:17:50 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 08:48:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>From: Mike Wootten <[mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk](mailto:mike@woottenm.freemove.co.uk)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed  
>Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 14:47:26 +0100

>Open mindedness has nothing to do with this issue.

>If we really wanted to find out what UFOs were - from undefined  
>IFOs to ET - then religious words like 'belief' and 'open mind'  
>should be kept locked away. Ufology will never be a science if  
>we are not hard nosed critics of the 'evidence'. Question and  
>doubt everything and you might just find some real answers.

Mike I have to disagree with you. (Nice messages Teri and Roger)

This is the first time I heard that "open mind" or "belief" was a religious term.

I have a "belief" in my ability at work to be a number one sales person. If I didn't -- I might not sell anything. Selling has nothing to do with having a great product, its about "believing" and "attitude". And this is not religion, this is American corporate business.

Evidence? Do we have hard nose facts that Einstein is right. No I don't think so, he's got just a "theory". I never would have married once if I did not have "faith". The hard nose statistics would have called me a gamble at 50% failure rate. I was.

Faith? I am glad Queen Isabella had "faith" in Columbus for after all most people considered him a mad man. I wouldn't have moved to Seattle in 1990 from L.A. had I not had "faith" I could find a better life here. I had no guarantees. Most of us never do in everything we do in life.

Scientist? Who do we know today is a scientist of ufology? No one actually. Because some people might have degrees in this or that does not mean they have the answers. Is Stan or John Mack or Steven Greer a scientist?

Joe Firmage bills himself as a scientist. He does not have a degree. He has money, he has intelligence but he has no degree in any science field/business/arts/etc. Technically speaking he is a scientist for if you look it up in the dictionary it says a scientist is a person who studies science. So we all are scientist for that matter.

I think we are finding today, Mike, that everything in life is a theory. Who are we? Do we really know? Is your life and the internet real? Are our dreams maybe the reality? What is reality anyway? If we don't keep an open mind we may never learn. Tunnel vision is the worst enemy to learning and evolving.

Kathleen Andersen  
Seattle

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: neil morris <[neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 10:58:47 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 08:53:04 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>From: John Gilbert <[john@greendome.force9.co.uk](mailto:john@greendome.force9.co.uk)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Doug & Dave?  
>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 17:56:44 +0100

>>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>>Date: Sat, 22 May 1999 03:37:55 +0200 (MET DST)  
>>Subject: 'London Evening Standard' On Rockefeller  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>In 1992, two Southampton men, Doug Bower and Dave Chorley,  
>>confessed to making corn circles: every summer night for 20  
>>years. Their method was simple: rakes and planks of wood to  
>>bash down the crop, ropes to guide them to a perfect circle,  
>>loops of wire on hats to guide straight lines.

>Just to take-off on a different thread. Does anyone here believe  
>that these two people actually ever made a single crop circle?  
>Not only have they failed to make one with anyone watching, but  
>they claim to have made perfect straight lines with a loop of  
>wire attached to the brim of a baseball hat. Now think about it,  
>that wouldn't actually work.

>John.

John and List,

A couple of months back here in the UK a BBC team, I think it was from the "Country File" program at BBC Bristol, challenged Doug and Dave + their team of helpers to produce a "circle" under real life circumstances out in the fields at night. They did produce a circle/design at night and with hords of circle watchers in the vicinity, even though the camera team was a bit of a dead givaway.

I don't think it really proved anything in the end though, other than, yes the hoaxers can "do it" at night and under the eyes of the watchers.

Neil.

-----  
Neil [Morris@Home](mailto:Morris@Home).

Email: [Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)

Web Site: Roswell - Alien Autopsy - The Fort Worth Photographs  
<http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/>

-----  
[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: **dave bowden** <[dave.bowden@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:dave.bowden@cableinet.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 11:14:56 +0000  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 08:55:15 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>From: John Gilbert <[john@greendome.force9.co.uk](mailto:john@greendome.force9.co.uk)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Doug & Dave?  
>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 17:56:44 +0100

>>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>>Date: Sat, 22 May 1999 03:37:55 +0200 (MET DST)  
>>Subject: 'London Evening Standard' On Rockefeller  
>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>In 1992, two Southampton men, Doug Bower and Dave Chorley,  
>>confessed to making corn circles: every summer night for 20  
>>years. Their method was simple: rakes and planks of wood to  
>>bash down the crop, ropes to guide them to a perfect circle,  
>>loops of wire on hats to guide straight lines.

>Just to take-off on a different thread. Does anyone here believe  
>that these two people actually ever made a single crop circle?  
>Not only have they failed to make one with anyone watching, but  
>they claim to have made perfect straight lines with a loop of  
>wire attached to the brim of a baseball hat. Now think about it,  
>that wouldn't actually work.

Hi all,

I've just joined the list and I must say I'm impressed looking  
back over the archives at some of the thought provoking  
conversations.

As far as I'm concerned John, if Doug and Dave had created so  
many crop circles it would have been done by Doug Dave & Co.  
Surly two guy's on their own couldn't have achieved so much.

I would also like to know how these two old Southampton men knew  
how to gain access to the world media.

You're quite right about the 'ol loop on a baseball cap trick,  
you could walk a wavy line and still keep the church roof in  
view.

Of course there are hoaxers and some of them are quite good at  
what they do but this poses another question. If Doug and Dave  
were sponsored in order to stop the hordes from trampling over  
the evidence why not choose someone who can make a convincing  
circle instead of these two who probably couldn't write their  
names in the snow.

Dave.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## New Project 1947 Web Site

From: **UFO UpDates - Toronto** <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 09:09:13 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 09:09:13 -0400  
Subject: New Project 1947 Web Site

From: Moderator, UFO Updates - Toronto

For those subscribers who really want to dig below the surface of UFO phenomena, John Stepkowski has re-established the Project 1947 web site at:

<http://www.project1947.com/>

Nicely done John. I know that you've been through some trying digital times recently and the site is a substantial asset to serious research.

Errol

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Joseph Trainor and UFO ROUNDUP - Mystery Solved!

From: John Hayes <[jhayes@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cableinet.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 12:58:00 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 09:58:15 -0400  
Subject: Joseph Trainor and UFO ROUNDUP - Mystery Solved!

Thanks to Maurice DesJardins, a subscriber to UFO UpDates Mailing List, we now have information on what has happened to Joseph Trainor, the editor of UFO Roundup.

Joe's letter follows in it's entirety as copied by Maurice:

=====

June 23, 1999

Dear Maurice:

I received your letter yesterday. Thank you for the opportunity to explain what's happening with UFO Roundup. Please feel free to put this letter on the Net. I never realized so many people were readers of the newsletter!

A couple of things spurred my move to Minnesota. Back in October my landlord in Warwick gave me the option of dropping my apartment lease. I decided to do so, mainly because if I'd found a better paying job in New England, I wanted to be able to move immediately. Well, after I did so, the landlord raised my rent by \$50, so it went from \$515 per month to \$565!

Back in October, I had two jobs--my day job in East Greenwich, and I also taught a course in fiction writing at the Brown University Learning Community, so I could pay the rent. But Brown wasn't going to run one of my courses in April--not enough applicants. And I couldn't handle the rent with just my retail job, so I had to clear out by May 1.

I stayed online until April 15th. The following day I moved the furniture out of my apartment, disconnected my computer and left for good on Monday, April 19. With my car loaded with essentials, I set out from Pawtucket at 8:30 AM on April 20. (What a day to leave! I knew it was the anniversary of Mohammed's flight to Medina--Al Hajira in Arabic. But it was also Hitler's birthday and the day of the Columbine Massacre--I can sure pick 'em!)

Anyway, here's the itinerary of my "Millennium Bugout."

APRIL 20--from Pawtucket, RI to Buffalo, NY with a stop for lunch in Pottersville, NY.

APRIL 21--from Buffalo, NY to Erie, PA to Cleveland, Ohio to Toledo, Ohio to Bay City, Mich. I stayed at the Euclid Motel in Bay City, where I stayed in June, 1982.

APRIL 22--from Bay City, Mich. to Mackinac City, Mich. to St. Ignace, Mich. to Seney, Mich., to Ironwood, Mich. where I spent the night. At long last, I was in the Northland.

APRIL 23--from Ironwood, Mich. to Bayfield, Wis. to Ashland, Wis. to Superior, Wis. then over the Platnick Bridge to my destination, Duluth, Minn. I arrived in Duluth at 11:15 AM.

I didn't bring my computer with me, though. Instead I worked out a deal with my sister Carolyn. We had some needed

upgrade work done--addition of a CD drive for one--and as soon as I found an apartment, she was going to ship it to me.

Well, I moved in her on May 1. However, the installation took longer than I expected, and Ca wasn't able to ship my computer via UPS until May 17. I had my telephone server, US West, by then of course, so I plugged in and attempted to access AOL.

Then came the nasty shock. AOL has no local access number in the Duluth area code--218. Instead, you have to use AOL.net and they have a surcharge of 10 cents a minute--\$6 per hour!--on that, even though I'm working again at a full time job, that's a little too pricey for me. Remember, I used to spend 10 to 12 hours a week on-line looking for news for UFO Roundup. No way I can afford \$6 for access.

Right now I'm hunting around for a local Internet server in the 218 area code. I will probably end up dropping my AOL subscription. When I get my new server, I'll be back on-line. I still have a few moving-related tasks to complete, so getting back on-line isn't a priority right this minute. But I do hope to resume UFO Roundup or start a new volume as soon as I'm able.

Again, Maurice, thanks for getting in touch.

Best wishes, Joe Trainor

P.S. Would you contact my UFO Roundup partner John Hayes and pass on this info? You can reach him at:

[jhayes@cablenet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cablenet.co.uk)

=====

Thankfully Joe is well and will be back at some point in the future. When I hear from him I will post an update.

My thanks to Maurice DesJardins for passing the message on.

Regards,

John Hayes

[jhayes@cablenet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cablenet.co.uk)  
[webmaster@ufoinfo.com](mailto:webmaster@ufoinfo.com)

UFOINFO:- <http://ufoinfo.com>  
UFO Roundup:- <http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>  
Filer's Files:- <http://ufoinfo.com/filer/>  
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences:-  
<http://ufoinfo.com/ufoicq/>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Theorist Predicts Life in Universe is Common

From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 06:10:00  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 11:41:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: Theorist Predicts Life in Universe is Common

[List only]

Source: AstroNews (Astronomy Magazine), 22 June 1999,  
<http://www.kalmbach.com:80/astro/news/news/0699Origins.html>

Stig

\*\*\*

ORIGIN OF LIFE

Theorists Predicts Life in Universe is Common, Waiting for  
Discovery

\*\*

The hypothesis that life is unique to Earth could prove to be just as implausible as theories of Divine Creation. Chemist Robert Shapiro suggests that the laws of nature might favor the generation of life throughout the universe.

Shapiro's arguments are presented in "Prebiotic cytosine synthesis: A critical analysis and implications for the origin of life," in the April 13, 1999, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

Shapiro, a professor of chemistry at New York University, also lays out his argument in a new book entitled Planetary Dreams, published by John Wiley & Sons. In the book and paper, Shapiro argues that standard origin-of-life theories are badly flawed. Such theories are dependent on a miraculous event: the once-in-a-universe spontaneous generation of nucleic acids DNA or RNA that make up plant, animal, and microbial genes or some related molecule.

Shapiro, a specialist in the chemistry of DNA and RNA, marshals an array of data to argue that the simplest kind of cellular life may arise as a predictable result of organic chemistry and the physics of self-organizing systems whenever planets exist with the right constituents and conditions: a liquid or dense gas medium (not necessarily water), a suitable energy source, and a system of matter capable of using the energy to organize itself. He calls this hypothesis the "life principle." Furthermore, he argues that no predictable directions exist for life's later development from these basic beginnings.

In addition, he argues that humankind's search for life beyond Earth should continue to focus on those nearby worlds -- Mars, Jupiter's moon Europa and Saturn's moon Titan -- where the conditions appear to support the development of life.

He writes, "The debate over extraterrestrial life has been carried out with a great deal of passion, but with little progress, for centuries. Only in the last decades have we gained the ability to move it forward by collecting data at close range. We can send robots to inspect likely worlds such as Mars, Europa and Titan, and return photographs, information and samples, or, if we choose, we can go there ourselves and look

around. We may find existing life, remnants of extinct life, or chemical systems evolving in the direction of life. Alternatively, we may encounter monotonous wastelands, lacking any sign that a process relevant to life has taken place there. The results will help decide which of two very different views of the Universe is more nearly correct."

22 June 1999

If you've come to this page from an outside link and you don't see the ASTRONOMY Magazine Logo at the top of the page \*Click Here

ASTRONOMY is a Registered Trademark of Kalmbach Publishing Co.  
Copyright © 1996,1997,1998,1999 Kalmbach Publishing Co.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 09:57:57 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 12:14:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 21:48:01 +0100  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>>>and remember that these sorts of claims (Satanic and abduction)  
>>>can wreck people's lives.

>>Documentation, please, on how abduction claims have wrecked  
>>lives.

>>Anecdotes not welcome, since they can easily be countered with  
>>situations I've personally observed, in which people pulled  
>>themselves together by coming to terms with their reported  
>>abduction experiences.

>>Let's have some statistical data. What proportion of abductees  
>>have wrecked their lives by thinking they've been abducted?

>Oh, come on, is this serious? Statistical data on wrecked lives?  
>No anecdotes (i.e. actual examples of wrecked lives)? I can  
>assure you that lives have been wrecked by claims of Satanic  
>Ritual Abuse - anecdotes only, sorry, as unfortunately for some  
>peculiar reason no-one seems to be collecting percentages of  
>"wrecked lives" as opposed to "slightly concerned lives",  
>"rather worried lives", or "terribly upset lives". Maybe the  
>Office of Population and Statistics could put a question in  
>their 2001 Census.

Delightful, John. If, ever in the future, you whisper even a  
hint that any UFO believer is unscientific, I trust you'll blush  
the deepest, most embarrassed red.

Statistics on wrecked lives? No, statistics on abduction  
research. Or at least information about it. For instance: "I've  
had the opportunity to observe 20 people who've worked with an  
abduction investigator who does regressive hypnosis in stadiums  
during football games. After knowing these 20 people for more  
than a year, I've watched 14 of them become the worst kind of  
football hooligans."

At least something like that, for God's sake. Not just bland  
general allegations. Another way to put this, John, is that I'm  
asking how large your sample is, when you say "remember that  
[abduction] claims can wreck people's lives." How many  
abductees, even approximately, do you imagine you know anything  
about, and what percentage of them ruined their lives?

If you can't answer a question like that, you're just gossiping.

Greg Sandow

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)



## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: WBAI RADIO

From: Paul Williams <[paulw@escape.com](mailto:paulw@escape.com)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 11:08:46 -0400  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 12:17:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: WBAI RADIO

Hello,

Now you folks living in the hinterlands can pick up on the best of New York radio. Please visit either [www.wbaifree.org](http://www.wbaifree.org), or my website for program listings and webcast scheduals. WBAI has some of the most provocative programs on the air in America, we are non commercial and listener sponsored. WBAI tell's it like it is so please check us out. And tell a friend. Attached is recent pix of myself. Please hit .ram link, that will launch your real audio player. Today is the Gay Pride march and we'll be webcasting the live from the march and station. Please pass the word. And again either hit .ram link, or visit the two site. Their fun sites.

Paul Williams  
Executive Producer UFO Desk  
WBAI NY 99.5 FM  
ICQ#32519151  
Listen to UFO Desk on the web,  
<http://www.escape.com/~paulw/ufodesk.html>  
Long Live Samori Marksman Hero of the People!  
<http://205.158.50.198/rams/wbai.ram>  
Hit this link to hear WBAI live webcast.  
UFO Desk alternate Sunday nite/Monday mornings at 1am.

[ ] MVC-001s.jpg

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: BWW Media Alert 19990627

From: [BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com)  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 11:11:51 EDT  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 12:18:17 -0400  
Subject: Re: BWW Media Alert 19990627

Bufo Calvin  
P O Box 5231, Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Internet: [BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com)  
Website: <A

href="<http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>"><http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>  
</A>

<A href="<http://www.onelist.com/subscribe/bwnl>">Bufo's WEIRD NEWS LINKS</A>

<A href="<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/redirect-home/bufosweirdworld>">Link  
to Amazon.com  
</A>

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED (permission is granted to reproduce or redistribute this  
edition of Bufo's WEIRD WORLD provided that attribution is made to  
<http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin>. It is good etiquette to check with  
strangers before you e-mail them something. If you forward this, please make  
sure it is clear that you are forwarding it).

June 27, 1999

As usual, let me know what you think at <A href="mailto:  
[bufocalvin@aol.com](mailto:bufocalvin@aol.com)">BufoCalvin@aol.com  
</A>.

On to the listings: Times are generally Pacific.

LIVE EVENTS (Lectures, conferences, etc.)

Fred Beckman, a major figure in UFO research, will be speaking at the Redwood  
City (California) Women's Club on Thursday, July 1, at 7:30 PM. I've spoken  
with Fred a few times, and he is a must-see if you are in the area.

CONTACT INFO: Charles Grotzky at 650-343-5202, e-mail at

[charles@shiftreality.com](mailto:charles@shiftreality.com), website at

<A href="<http://www.shiftreality.com/>"><http://www.shiftreality.com/></A>

RADIO

Eddie Middleton's very popular show in the South, Nightsearch, has a website  
at

<A href="<http://listen.to/nightsearch>"><http://listen.to/nightsearch></A>.

Starting soon, the new website at

<A href="<http://www.nightsearch.net/>"><http://www.nightsearch.net/></A>.

Unfortunately, no streaming audio. Sundays from 2:00 to 4:00 PM (Pacific).

The call-in line is 901-365-1430.

Don Ecker, of UFO MAGAZINE, hosts STRANGE DAZE on the Liberty Works. It can  
be heard on streaming Real Audio at

<A href="<http://www.broadcast.com/radio/talk/lwrn>"><http://www.broadcast.com/radio/talk/lwrn>  
</A>.

Mike Jarmus, REALITY AND BEYOND, 7:00 PM Sundays,

<A href="<http://spectrum.orn.com/omega.ram>"><http://spectrum.orn.com/omega.ram>  
</A>. Streaming audio available

Sunday, June 27, 7:00 PM, Michael Cremona, on alternative history

ART BELL - DREAMLAND

Currently, the most popular talk show on this area.

<A HREF="<http://www.artbell.com/>"><http://www.artbell.com/></A>. Live streaming audio (and video) available.

#### JEFF RENSE - SIGHTINGS

Jeff is well-versed on the topics, but likes to let the guests speak, resulting in one of the best radio shows on these topics. You can hear Real Audio of the show, and there are archives as well. Go to

<A HREF="<http://www.sightings.com/>"><http://www.sightings.com/></A> for more information. The show is on at 7:00 PM Pacific Monday through Friday, and 8:00 PM Pacific on Sunday. You can hear it anywhere through your computer. Please note that Jeff also often covers topics which I do not consider relevant to this list. To subscribe to the Jeff Rense Weekly E-news (which includes articles and a complete guest listing), e-mail (subject: Subscribe) <A HREF="mailto:[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)">mailto:[jocelyn@dewittec.net](mailto:jocelyn@dewittec.net)</A>.

Tuesday, June 29, 7:00 PM, Ingo Swann, who developed the "remote viewers" for the military. Don't miss this repeat!

Wednesday, June 30, 7:00 PM, Michael Lindemann, Weekly UFO/World report; Constance Clear on abductions

Thursday, July 1, 7:00 PM, repeat with Peter Robbins on the Bentwaters UFO case

Friday, July 2, repeat with John Vasquez on a possible mass abduction at Fort. Benning

#### PAUL WILLIAMS & SCOTT CARR: UFO DESK

This New York show has been around for years, but is now available on streaming audio. The website is

<A HREF="<http://www.escape.com/~paulw/ufodesk.html>"><http://www.escape.com/~paulw/ufodesk.html></A>.

It runs at 8:00 PM (Pacific) on Sundays.

#### JEFF MISHLOVE AND THE VIRTUAL UNIVERSITY

Webcast every weekday at 8:00 PM for two hours, with a repeat at 10:00 PM.

Webcast at

<A HREF="<http://www.wisdomradio.com/>"><http://www.wisdomradio.com/></A>.

#### ERSKINE OVERNIGHT

Webcast 9:00 PM to Midnight with an immediate repeat at

<A HREF="<http://www.talkamerica.com/>">Talkamerica.com</A>

#### TELEVISION

##### CHANNEL 7 (Australia)

Saturday, July 3, 10:50 PM (time zone unknown), SIGHTINGS (episode unknown)

##### THE DISCOVERY CHANNEL (Europe)

Monday, June 28, midnight (GMT+1), LONELY PLANET (includes a trip to Roswell)

Monday June 28, 1:10 PM (GMT+1), ARTHUR C. CLARKE'S MYSTERIOUS WORLD: THE RIDDLE OF THE STONES (British megaliths)

Tuesday, June 28, 9:00 PM (GMT+1), AREA 51 - THE REAL STORY

Thursday, June 30, 1:10 PM (GMT+1), ARTHUR C. CLARKE'S MYSTERIOUS WORLD: UFOS

##### THE DISCOVERY CHANNEL (USA)

Saturday, July 3, 9:00 PM, SUPER PSYCHICS (debunking)

Thursday, July 1, 10:00 PM, INTO THE UNKNOWN: MONSTERS OF THE DEEP

Friday, July 2, 1:00 AM, INTO THE UNKNOWN: MONSTERS OF THE DEEP

Saturday, July 3, 2:00 PM, INTO THE UNKNOWN: MONSTERS OF THE DEEP

Next Sunday, July 4, 1:00 AM, SUPER PSYCHICS (debunking)

##### THE LEARNING CHANNEL (USA)

Sunday, June 27, 8:00 PM, UFOS: FIFTY YEARS OF DENIALS

Sunday, June 27, 9:00 PM, UFOS: UNCOVERED: ARE ALIENS HERE?

Sunday, June 27, 10:00 PM, UFOS UNCOVERED: DARK SECRETS (includes pilot UFO sightings and Area 51)

Sunday, June 27, 11:00 PM, UFOS: FIFTY YEARS OF DENIALS

Monday, June 28, 12:00 AM, UFOS: UNCOVERED: ARE ALIENS HERE?

Monday, June 28, 1:00 AM, UFOS UNCOVERED: DARK SECRETS (includes pilot UFO sightings and Area 51)

Wednesday, June 30, 7:00 PM, STRANGE SCIENCE: UNUSUAL PEOPLE (includes spontaneous human combustion and psychic artists)

Thursday, July 1, 1:00 AM, STRANGE SCIENCE: UNUSUAL PEOPLE (includes spontaneous human combustion and psychic artists)

Thursday, July 1, 10:00 PM, STRANGE SCIENCE: MYSTERIOUS SKIES (includes UFOs)

Friday, July 2, 1:00 AM, STRANGE SCIENCE: MYSTERIOUS SKIES (includes UFOs)

Friday, July 2, 10:00 PM, STRANGE SCIENCE, ODD SOUNDS (including talking ghosts, ringing rocks, and the Taos hum)

Saturday, July 3, 1:00 AM, STRANGE SCIENCE, ODD SOUNDS (including talking

ghosts, ringing rocks, and the Taos hum)  
Saturday, July 3, 5:00 PM, UFOS: FIFTY YEARS OF DENIALS  
Saturday, July 3, 6:00 PM, UFOS UNCOVERED: ARE ALIENS HERE?  
Saturday, July 3, 7:00 PM, UFOS UNCOVERED: DARK SECRETS  
Next Sunday, July 4, 2:00 PM, STRANGE SCIENCE: MYSTERIOUS SKIES (includes  
UFOS)  
Next Sunday, July 4, 3:00 PM, STRANGE SCIENCE: UNUSUAL PEOPLE (includes  
spontaneous human combustion and psychic artists)

LOCAL CABLE (USA)

Sunday, June 27, 1:30 AM, Manhattan Neighborhood Network (NY), BEYOND THE  
UNEXPLAINED (  
<A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
</A>): second part of a four-parter on the Andreasson/Luca family abductions

Sunday, June 27, 9:30 PM, CABLEVISION OF WOODBURY NY (CH35/80/96), BEYOND THE  
UNEXPLAINED (  
<A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
</A>): third part of a four-parter on the Andreasson/Luca family abductions

Monday, June 28, 10 AM, CABLEVISION OF RIVERHEAD NY (CH27), BEYOND THE  
UNEXPLAINED (  
<A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
</A>): fourth part of a four-parter on the Andreasson/Luca family abductions

Monday, June 28, 11 PM, CABLEVISION OF YONKERS NY (CH 59/37), BEYOND THE  
UNEXPLAINED (  
<A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
</A>):  
JUNE 28,1999ABDUCTIONS PART 4

TUESDAY CH 34 830PM CABLEVISION OF YORKTOWN HEIGHTS NY BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED  
(  
<A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
</A>):  
JUNE 29, 1999 ABDUCTIONS PART 4

TUESDAY CH 6 830 PM COMMUNITY TV OF SANTE FE, NEW MEXICO BEYOND THE  
UNEXPLAINED (  
<A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
</A>):  
JUNE 29.1999 JACKIE KANTOR SPIRITUALIST

TUESDAY,  
JUNE QUEENS QPTV CH 56 10PM BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED (  
<A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
</A>):

WEDNESDAY CH 12 830PM GATEWAY ACCESS 12 SPRING CREEK NY BEYOND THE  
UNEXPLAINED (  
<A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
</A>):  
JUNE 30, 1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PART 1 ABDUCTIONS

WEDNESDAY PAC 8 OF LOS ALAMOS NEW MEXICO CH 8 4PM BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED (  
<A  
HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>  
</A>):  
Various paranormal topics

WEDNESDAY CH12 MINNESOTA CABLE ACCESS TRAC 12 4PM& 1130PM BEYOND THE  
UNEXPLAINED (  
<A

HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>

</A>):  
JUNE 30.1999 TONY "THE BARD" IZZO "POET" SINGER" COMPOSER

THURSDAY CH 25 5PM CABLEVISION OF HAUPPAGUE NY BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED (  
<A

HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>

</A>):  
THURSDAY CH 27 10 AM LTV OF EASTHAMPTON NY BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED (  
<A

HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>

</A>):  
JUNE 24, 1999 ABDUCTIONS PT 4

FRIDAYS CH 8 9PM PAC 8 TV OF LOS ALAMOS NEW MEXICO BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED (  
<A

HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>

</A>):  
JUNE 25, 1999 THE ANDREASSON LUCA FAMILY PT 3 ABDUCTIONS

FRIDAYS CH 99 930PM CABLEVISION OF BROOKHAVEN NY BEYOND THE UNEXPLAINED (  
<A

HREF="<http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>"><http://members.aol.com/Rosebuds6/index.html>

</A>):  
JUNE 25, 1999 ERICH VON DANIKEN "AUTHOR" CHARIOT OF THE GODS"

NBC (USA)

Sunday, June 27, 8:00 PM, DATELINE NBC: Joe Firmage, the CEO who quit to investigate UFOs

THE SCIENCE CHANNEL

New schedule again, since March 29, 1999.

Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 9:00 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE (don't know which one)

Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 9:30 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE

Weekdays, 10:00 AM, STRANGE BUT TRUE?

Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 5:00 PM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE

Every day but Tuesday and Saturday, 5:30 PM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE

Weekdays, 6:00 PM, STRANGE BUT TRUE?

Every day but Monday and Sunday, 1:00 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE

Every day but Monday and Sunday, 1:30 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE

Tuesdays through Saturdays, 2:00 AM, STRANGE BUT TRUE?

Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, 9:00 AM and 9:30 AM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE'S

MYSTERIOUS UNIVERSE

Wednesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, 5:00 PM and 5:30 PM, ARTHUR C. CLARKE'S

MYSTERIOUS UNIVERSE

Saturdays, OUT OF THIS WORLD all day long

THE SCI-FI CHANNEL (US Feed)

Sightings

Tuesday, June 29, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS (haunting; underwater UFO)

Wednesday, June 30, 11:00 SIGHTINGS (Washington DC UFOs; Whitley Strieber;;

Japanese exorcism)

Thursday, July 1, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS (Socorro UFO landing documents; shamans)

Friday, July 2, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS (pilot UFO disappearance ((Valentich?))

Tuesday, July 6, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS (abduction; haunted house)

Wednesday, July 7, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS (Civil War past lives; psychic spies;

1962 UFO)

Thursday, July 8, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS (Mantell UFO case; psychic detectives;

ghosts)

Friday, July 9, 11:00 AM, SIGHTINGS (Peruvian UFOs; psychic prediction;

Martian structures)

SYNDICATED (USA)

Monday, July 5, MONTEL WILLIAMS: psychic Sylvia Browne

---

This is Bufo saying, "If =everything= seemed normal, that =would= be weird!"

---

You can stop receiving this from me just by asking (note: it is commonly redistributed, and I can't control you getting it from those sources) by e-mail at [BufoCalvin@aol.com](mailto:BufoCalvin@aol.com). You can also subscribe or unsubscribe to Bufo's

WEIRD WORLD Media Alert the same way. Also, please let me know if there is something in the media you think I should cover. Deadline is Tuesday, the week before.

---

Back to <A HREF="<http://members.aol.com/BufoCalvin/index.html>">BufoCalvin's Home Page

</A>

Back to <A HREF="<http://members.aol.com/bufocalvin/ma.html>">Bufo's WEIRD WORLD Media Alert

</A>

Back to <A HREF="<http://members.aol.com/weirdware/books.html>">Bufo's WEIRD WORLD Books

</A>

E-mail to <A HREF="mailto:[bufocalvin@aol.com](mailto:bufocalvin@aol.com)">BufoCalvin@aol.com</A>

Search for other documents from or mentioning: [bufocalvin](#) | [jocelyn](#)

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:46:05 +0100  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 12:20:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 18:20:30 -0700  
>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Dear Mr Gilbert:

>Somehow, I have difficulty seeing two fellows, late from some  
>pub, sucessfully oiling a pair of roller skates -- let alone  
>hoaxing a decent crop circle.

Granted, you couldn't do it on Coors or Bud Lite or whatever you  
guys drink over there, but these boyos would probably have been  
drinking Wadworths 6X or Gale's HSB. After a few pints of those,  
crop-circles would be no problem - Mandelbrot figures, the lot.

-- John Rimmer

[www.magonia.demon.co.uk](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk)

Official Sponsors of the 1999 Solar Eclipse

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)



# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 27](#)

## Re: Filer's Files #25 - 99

From: Phillip S Duke <[drpduke@juno.com](mailto:drpduke@juno.com)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 10:51:50 -0700  
Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 12:30:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Filer's Files #25 - 99

>From: George A. Filer <[Majorstar@aol.com](mailto:Majorstar@aol.com)>  
>Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 13:39:15 EDT  
>Subject: Filer's Files #25  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>

<snip>

>INTERSTELLAR TRAVEL: ACCELERATION AND MISSION PROFILE: Most  
>writers, and physicists too, in estimating the time for  
>interstellar travel, neglect the effect of the accelerating  
>portions of the trip on the trip time, making the simplifying  
>assumption that the vehicle makes the entire trip at constant  
>velocity. This is probably done because the requisite equations  
>are scarce items in the literature... snip. 4. It is possible  
>for an interstellar trip to be very short. The trip from our  
>nearest neighbor, Alpha Centuri, a triple star system 4.3 light  
>years away made by acceleration at 140 g to a v/c of 0.9999 is  
>accomplished from a standing start to a standing finish in 6  
>weeks. Snip At the highest speeds considered, the travel time  
>is not at all proportional to the distance. For example at 20 g  
>and v/c=0.9999 we read a distance of 25 light years takes 0.6  
>years on board, while a distance of 100 light years is covered  
>in almost a year. The reason is easy to visualize. Once the  
>vehicle is up to speed, vast amounts of additional distance may  
>be covered during the coast period with but little increase in  
>time and, obviously, with no increase in additional light year

>CONCLUSION: I hope I have made it clear that there is an  
>important distinction to be made between the time experienced by  
>the space traveler and the time which passes meanwhile on the  
>home planet and on the planetary destination. The tremendous  
>acceleration, speed, and energy capability displayed by UFOs  
>make them well suited to capitalize on this distinction by the  
>attainment of greatly reduced on board times realizable by  
>approaching the speed of light. Even an approach to 90 percent  
>of light gets the job done for the nearer stars. Higher  
>fractions of light speed give attractive time reductions for  
>longer trips. Don't be misled by the countless statements in  
>the literature that interstellar distances and the speed of  
>light constitute some kind of barrier to space travel. There  
>are only two paths to this conclusion: Nobody in the universe  
>has the technology to approach light speed. Observer time is  
>significant, and on board time is to be ignored. Both paths are  
>>false ones. The confused second view is the more common. Its  
>proponents are using the observed time for light to travel as  
>the shortest possible time for passage. "Totally false."  
>Thanks to Paul Hill, "Unconventional Flying Objects." Pages  
>268-279 Editor's Note: The sailors who crossed the ocean a  
>couple hundred years ago and those settlers who crossed the West  
>in wagon trains would find the trip aboard a fast space ship to  
>another star system a reasonable time period. The biggest  
>problem would be that their friends and relatives would be  
>unlikely to be alive when they returned, so they might decide to  
>bring them along.

Mr. Filer has done ufology an important service by writing about  
the work of Dr. Paul R. Hill deceased. Dr. Hill's excellent book  
"Unconventional Flying Objects" republished by Hampton Roads is  
before me as I write.

Dr. Hill acknowledges that his treatment of Interstellar Space Flight is based on the Lorentz equations of Relativity "incorporated by Einstein as a cornerstone of his Special Theory of Relativity" (pg. 264). Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity was published in 1906 and confirmed during the total Solar Eclipse of 1918. So it has been around awhile. Ufologists who discuss Interstellar Spaceflight must do their homework first. Relativistic concepts definitely apply here.

The work of Dr. Hill is generally excellent, however he does not consider the fact that as acceleration decreases apparent on board time, it also increases on board apparent mass. Therefore the energy requirement to accelerate the increasing mass also increases. Even with atomic energy the calculated energy requirements to obtain very close to light speeds become prohibitive. Due to this consideration, practical travel to stars beyond roughly hundreds of light years away appears unlikely.

The bottom line on this is, that even if lengthy social time considerations (on the planet of origin) are ignored, Relativistic energy considerations evidently prohibit practical travel to the more distant stars. And therefore to other galaxies.

It may be of interest that the Betty Hill Star Map pinpointed her alien abductor's home planet to be only 25 light years away, a practically close distance according to Relativistic considerations.

The theoretical situation with respect to "Black Holes" in space, is different. The enormously strong gravity of such holes has a number of effects, including the very marked slowing of elapsed "on board" time, so that in theory a wormhole in space originating at one end as a Black hole and terminating at the other in a distant Galaxy, might allow travel to extremely distant locations in very little on board time. Of course the immense gravity should crush anything living into a layer one molecule thick, but at least in theory such travel is possible via Black Holes.

It is not difficult to calculate that at a constant comfortable one g acceleration to midpoint, with a constant one g deceleration to destination, travel to any planet in the solar system from within the solar system is brief and does not involve Relativistic considerations. As I recall such a trip from Earth to Mars takes less than a week. Travel within the solar system is much easier than to the stars.

Persons interested in further reading are referred to Einstein's Universe by Nigel Caldwell Wings Books, and Dr. Hill's book recently republished by Hampton Roads.

Phil Duke Ph.D.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: **Greg Sandow** <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:36:49 -0400  
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 08:17:57 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>Somehow, I have difficulty seeing two fellows, late from some  
>>pub, sucessfully oiling a pair of roller skates -- let alone  
>>hoaxing a decent crop circle.

>Granted, you couldn't do it on Coors or Bud Lite or whatever you  
>guys drink over there,

Jack Daniels. Wild Turkey. Maker's Mark. 120-proof Berghoff's  
bourbon, only sold at Berghoff's in Chicago. One sip will  
demonstrate why Britain lost its empire.

The U.S., therefore, should be full of crop circles -- not just  
Mandelbrots, but detailed encodings of the entire Bible,  
inscribed on amber waves of grain.

Greg Sandow

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: John Hayes <[jhayes@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cableinet.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:48:24 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 08:16:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 10:58:47 -0700  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: neil morris <[neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>From: John Gilbert <[john@greendome.force9.co.uk](mailto:john@greendome.force9.co.uk)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Doug & Dave?  
>>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 17:56:44 +0100

>>>From: Stig Agermose <[stig.agermose@get2net.dk](mailto:stig.agermose@get2net.dk)>  
>>>Date: Sat, 22 May 1999 03:37:55 +0200 (MET DST)  
>>>Subject: 'London Evening Standard' On Rockefeller  
>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>>In 1992, two Southampton men, Doug Bower and Dave Chorley,  
>>>confessed to making corn circles: every summer night for 20  
>>>years. Their method was simple: rakes and planks of wood to  
>>>bash down the crop, ropes to guide them to a perfect circle,  
>>>loops of wire on hats to guide straight lines.

>>Just to take-off on a different thread. Does anyone here believe  
>>that these two people actually ever made a single crop circle?  
>>Not only have they failed to make one with anyone watching, but  
>>they claim to have made perfect straight lines with a loop of  
>>wire attached to the brim of a baseball hat. Now think about it,  
>>that wouldn't actually work.

>A couple of months back here in the UK a BBC team, I think it  
>was from the "Country File" program at BBC Bristol, challenged  
>Doug and Dave + their team of helpers to produce a "circle"  
>under real life circumstances out in the fields at night. They  
>\_did\_ produce a circle/design at night and with hords of circle  
>watchers in the vicinity, even though the camera team was a bit  
>of a dead giveaway.

>I don't think it really \_proved\_ anything in the end though, other  
>than, yes the hoaxers \_can\_ "do it" at night and under the eyes of  
>the watchers.

Hello Neil,

I remember this being reported but did not see the programme  
that resulted. What I would like to know is:

Did the BBC crew use night vision cameras?

If I recall correctly there were reports of researchers being  
stopped by the police.

Regards,

John Hayes

[jhayes@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cableinet.co.uk)  
[webmaster@ufoinfo.com](mailto:webmaster@ufoinfo.com)

UFOINFO: - <http://ufoinfo.com>

Re: Doug & Dave?

UFO Roundup:- <http://ufoinfo.com/roundup/>  
Filer's Files:- <http://ufoinfo.com/filer/>  
AUFORN Australian UFO Reports and Experiences:-  
<http://ufoinfo.com/ufoicq/>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: **Larry Hatch** <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 13:05:35 -0700  
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 08:20:43 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 20:58:46 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>>From: Tim D. Brigham <[TBrigham@ksinc.net](mailto:TBrigham@ksinc.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 23:45:18 -0500

>>>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>>>Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 01:18:34 -0400

>>>>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>>>>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 10:55:56 EDT  
>>>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>>>>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

><snips>

>>Hi Greg, Kevin, etc.

>>First, congrats again to 'Doc Kev' on his acadmemic  
>>accomplishment. As an aside- kevin, may I ask what your  
>>dissertation was on? Just curious if you were at all able to  
>>bring in the UFO stuff into your work, even in an indirect  
>>manner.

>Tim, All -

>Again, thanks. My dissertation was called "The Influence of  
>Preexisting Belief in UFOs on the Identification of Ambiguous  
>Astronomical and Meteorological Stimuli." The point was not to  
>determine if UFOs were extraterrestrial or some other phenomena  
>but to study the influence of belief structure on the  
>identification of somewhat obscure objects.

>I had hoped to do something with sleep paralysis and alien  
>abductions, but couldn't get the review committee to go along  
>with that. This was sort of a compromise.

>KRandle, Ph.D.  
>[www.randlereport.com](http://www.randlereport.com)

Dear Kevin:

The title of your dissertation is interesting.

Did you present any findings which could be summarized here, at  
least briefly?

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

= = =

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: **Larry Hatch** <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 13:44:35 -0700  
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 08:24:46 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:46:05 +0100  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 18:20:30 -0700  
>>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>Dear Mr Gilbert:

>>Somehow, I have difficulty seeing two fellows, late from some  
>>pub, successfully oiling a pair of roller skates -- let alone  
>>hoaxing a decent crop circle.

>Granted, you couldn't do it on Coors or Bud Lite or whatever you  
>guys drink over there, but these boyos would probably have been  
>drinking Wadworths 6X or Gale's HSB. After a few pints of those,  
>crop-circles would be no problem - Mandelbrot figures, the lot.

>-- John Rimmer

>[www.magonia.demon.co.uk](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk)  
>Official Sponsors of the 1999 Solar Eclipse

Dear John:

When I wrote that, I had just stuck my nose into a pint bottle  
of one of Samuel Smith's (Tadcaster Yorks) brews.

Very tasty, and not entirely unlike Samuel Adams brews from  
Boston. Rather pricey however in California. [I keep some Coors  
for the very hottest of days.]

To get to the point, by the time the sun came up I was having  
difficulty watering the lawn with a simple hose and sprinkler ..  
now maybe that's just me.

A crop circle would have been out of the question in my  
particular case.

Best wishes

- Larry Hatch

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp



Re: Doug & Dave?

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: Sean Jones <[tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk](mailto:tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 20:45:39 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 08:35:28 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 10:58:47 -0700  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: neil morris <[neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>A couple of months back here in the UK a BBC team, I think it  
>was from the "Country File" program at BBC Bristol, challenged  
>Doug and Dave + their team of helpers to produce a "circle"  
>under real life circumstances out in the fields at night. They  
>\_did\_ produce a circle/design at night and with hords of circle  
>watchers in the vacinity, even though the camera team was a bit  
>of a dead givaway.

>I don't think it really proved anything in the end though, other  
>than, yes the hoaxers can "do it" at night and under the eyes of  
>the watchers.

>Neil.

Hi Neil

Yes the country file was there, and so was I and about thirty others to try and stop them. Darren Danks semi organised a UK-UFO-Network weekend crop-watching. Whilst we where out Paul Damon heard that there was a tv team out to fake a CC and we went out with Paul and Matthew Williams (he of the "I faked crop circles to research the researchers" fame).

Whilst we was there a member of the UK-UFO-Network asked Dave about the crop circle faking bonaza and Dave told him that the likes of "Team Satan" have been faking some of the more advanced patterns and that he also knew of many more people who did exactly the same. This led Andy (of UK-UFO-Network) to believe all crop circles are faked.

Now I have no opinion on whether crop circles are hoaxed en masse or are "intelligently" made by some other "force" but if the same statistics apply to crop circles as UFO's then roughly 95percent can be explained.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 28](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 18:25:54 +0100  
Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 08:13:53 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 09:57:57 -0400

>>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 21:48:01 +0100  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>>Oh, come on, is this serious? Statistical data on wrecked lives?  
>>No anecdotes (i.e. actual examples of wrecked lives)? I can  
>>assure you that lives have been wrecked by claims of Satanic  
>>Ritual Abuse - anecdotes only, sorry, as unfortunately for some  
>>peculiar reason no-one seems to be collecting percentages of  
>>"wrecked lives" as opposed to "slightly concerned lives",  
>>"rather worried lives", or "terribly upset lives". Maybe the  
>>Office of Population and Statistics could put a question in  
>>their 2001 Census.

>Delightful, John. If, ever in the future, you whisper even a  
>hint that any UFO believer is unscientific, I trust you'll blush  
>the deepest, most embarrassed red.

>Statistics on wrecked lives? No, statistics on abduction  
>research. Or at least information about it. For instance: "I've  
>had the opportunity to observe 20 people who've worked with an  
>abduction investigator who does regressive hypnosis in stadiums  
>during football games. After knowing these 20 people for more  
>than a year, I've watched 14 of them become the worst kind of  
>football hooligans."

>At least something like that, for God's sake. Not just bland  
>general allegations. Another way to put this, John, is that I'm  
>asking how large your sample is, when you say "remember that  
>[abduction] claims can wreck people's lives." How many  
>abductees, even approximately, do you imagine you know anything  
>about, and what percentage of them ruined their lives?

>If you can't answer a question like that, you're just gossiping.

>Greg Sandow

And this from someone who admitted just a few months ago that  
abduction researchers don't even have statistics on what  
proportion of their subjects are Black, White or Hispanic.

--  
John Rimmer  
[www.magonia.demon.co.uk](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk)  
Official Sponsors of the 1999 Solar Eclipse

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

## UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: **Tim D. Brigham** <[TBrigham@ksinc.net](mailto:TBrigham@ksinc.net)>  
Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 19:58:33 -0500  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 08:51:58 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Kevin Randle <[KRandle993@aol.com](mailto:KRandle993@aol.com)>  
>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 20:58:46 EDT  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>To: [updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)

>Again, thanks. My dissertation was called "The Influence of  
>Preexisting Belief in UFOs on the Identification of Ambiguous  
>Astronomical and Meteorological Stimuli." The point was not to  
>determine if UFOs were extraterrestrial or some other phenomena  
>but to study the influence of belief structure on the  
>identification of somewhat obscure objects.

>I had hoped to do something with sleep paralysis and alien  
>abductions, but couldn't get the review committee to go along  
>with that. This was sort of a compromise.

>KRandle, Ph.D.  
>[www.randlereport.com](http://www.randlereport.com)

Hi Kevin,

Sounds very interesting. Actually, if you have seen any of my posts a few weeks back, your dissertation relates to an idea I am considering examining on a minor scale (ie, small study). That is- are there significant ERP (event related brain potential- recorded via EEG) differences in UFO experiencers or abductees vs. the general population when they evaluate ambiguous stimuli? Is there some difference that we can measure going on in the brain when an experiencer sees/experiences something ambiguous? I still have to do a lot of lit reviews before I can decide if this is even feasible, but still, I think it may prove promising. Tim

)+( [TBrigham@ksinc.net](mailto:TBrigham@ksinc.net)  
<http://zap.to/DevilsAdvocate> The Devil's Advocate  
<http://zap.to/MindPhuck> Operation MindPhuck  
"Better to go hungry than to feast on lies."  
)+(

[ [Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Re: Satanic Abuse

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## BBC: 'Fying Saucer' Grounded

From: Steven J. Dunn <[SDunn@logicon.com](mailto:SDunn@logicon.com)>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 05:04:38 -0700  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 08:56:31 -0400  
Subject: BBC: 'Fying Saucer' Grounded

Sunday, June 27, 1999 Published at 03:12 GMT 04:12 UK

'Flying saucer' grounded

A flying saucer project which attempted to turn science fiction into science fact has reportedly been thwarted by a lack of funds.

Aviation engineers in the Russian city of Saratov developed a small prototype craft two years ago, according to Ren TV in Russia. But the project has now been shelved because the money has run out.

Now workers at the plant are "hoping for some assistance from on high, or maybe even from aliens," the TV said. Although the shape of the craft takes its inspiration from old science fiction movies, the aim of its designers is said to be no less than the first step towards "an absolutely new concept of flying".

"The new aircraft is fundamentally different from all means of transportation known so far," the TV report said.

The original concept for the saucer, perhaps optimistically named "Ecology and Progress", envisaged a craft that could move at 700 km/h, accommodate up to 1,000 people and land anywhere, including mountainous terrain or water.

An air cushion system would allow it almost vertical take-off and landing. It was not clear from the report whether the prototype was actually capable of getting off the ground.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)





# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: **Jerome Clark** <[jkclark@frontiernet.net](mailto:jkclark@frontiernet.net)>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 99 09:23:25 PDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 09:00:09 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 18:25:54 +0100  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse  
>>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 09:57:57 -0400

>>>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 21:48:01 +0100  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>And this from someone who admitted just a few months ago that  
>abduction researchers don't even have statistics on what  
>proportion of their subjects are Black, White or Hispanic.

John,

With all due respect, this is no answer at all. At least everybody agrees that abductees come from a variety of races and ethnic groups. That's noncontroversial. To make a blanket statement such as yours -- that abductions wreck lives -- without offering a shred of real evidence to that effect is quite something else, however.

Jerry Clark

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: Neil Morris <[Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 15:48:02 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 09:09:55 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:48:24 +0100  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Hayes <[jhayes@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:jhayes@cableinet.co.uk)>  
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>A couple of months back here in the UK a BBC team, I think it  
>>was from the "Country File" program at BBC Bristol, challenged  
>>Doug and Dave + their team of helpers to produce a "circle"  
>>under real life circumstances out in the fields at night. They  
>>\_did\_ produce a circle/design at night and with hords of circle  
>>watchers in the vacinity, even though the camera team was a bit  
>>of a dead givaway.

>>I don't think it really \_proved\_ anything in the end though, other  
>>than, yes the hoaxers \_can\_ "do it" at night and under the eyes of  
>>the watchers.

>Hello Neil,

>I remember this being reported but did not see the programme  
>that resulted. What I would like to know is:

>Did the BBC crew use night vision cameras?

John (and Sean,thanks for the comments from the "other side"<g>)

The BBC crew were using "nightvision" on the camera and though I  
said the "Doug and Dave" crew \_did\_ manage to complete their  
"design", and I think there were around 6 in the D+D team, it  
was a very near run thing and dawn was breaking by the time they  
were finished.

>If I recall correctly there were reports of researchers being  
>stopped by the police.

You'd best ask Sean (Sean Jones <[tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk](mailto:tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk)>)  
about that as he was there, I do remember "some" agro being  
filmed in the prog, I only wish I'd have taped it now.

I've an open mind about C-circles, but I can remember being  
mighty impressed by a photograph shown by a visiting Russian  
speaker to one of the Sheffield BUFORA Conferences (same year as  
they had the AA film) of a beautiful circle, but not in a crop  
field, this was impressed into a frozen Siberian river. It's  
that sort of evidence that leads me to feel we're dealing here  
with an extreamly rare but natural process.

Neil.

|                    |   |                                               |                             |              |   |   |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| *                  | * | *                                             | *                           | *            | * | * |
| Neil Morris.       | / | 101101101                                     | Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc | 10110101010\ |   |   |
| Dept of Physics.   | 1 |                                               |                             |              |   | 1 |
| Univ of Manchester | 0 |                                               |                             |              |   | 0 |
| Schuster Labs.     | 1 | Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES |                             |              |   | 1 |
| Brunswick St.      | 0 |                                               |                             |              |   | 0 |

Re: Doug & Dave?

Manchester. 1 1  
UK. \0101010110010110110010110101101011011110101011010/  
G8KQO

E-mail: [neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk](mailto:neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk)

Roswell and Alien Autopsy Archive-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/>  
Dave Willetts Home Page-> [http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/dave\\_willetts/](http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/dave_willetts/)  
Mike Sterling Home Page-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/mike-s/>  
Tim Morgan Home Page -> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/tim-m/>

\* \* \* \* \*

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Satanic Abuse

From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 10:51:08 -0400  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 09:12:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 18:25:54 +0100  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>>At least something like that, for God's sake. Not just bland  
>>general allegations. Another way to put this, John, is that I'm  
>>asking how large your sample is, when you say "remember that  
>>[abduction] claims can wreck people's lives." How many  
>>abductees, even approximately, do you imagine you know anything  
>>about, and what percentage of them ruined their lives?

>>If you can't answer a question like that, you're just gossiping.

>>Greg Sandow

>And this from someone who admitted just a few months ago that  
>abduction researchers don't even have statistics on what  
>proportion of their subjects are Black, White or Hispanic.

Exactly. I stated this very plainly, without first having to be  
challenged. (Though only concerning Budd Hopkins; I don't know  
about other researchers).

I think I named it as a problem, but if I didn't, I've done so  
in the past about other missing abduction statistics, such as  
the percentage of abductees who have the allegedly unexplainable  
marks Budd so often talks about.

Give it up, John. You're not making sense. This isn't a  
discussion about who's less scientific, abduction researchers or  
skeptics. I've always said abduction research has problems. It's  
a discussion about whether you, John Rimmer -- when you say  
abduction claims have ruined lives -- know what you're talking  
about.

Greg Sandow

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: New Project 1947 Web Site

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 12:33:08 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 10:13:00 -0400  
Subject: Re: New Project 1947 Web Site

>From: Moderator, UFO Updates - Toronto

>For those subscribers who really want to dig below  
>the surface of UFO phenomena, John Stepkowski has  
>re-established the Project 1947 web site at:

><http://www.project1947.com/>

>Nicely done John. I know that you've been through  
>some trying digital times recently and the site  
>is a substantial asset to serious research.

>Errol

Dear Errol, List and Mr. Stepkowski;

Thank you so much for this referral, Errol. I just audited the site and stayed overly long in the process, finding the information first rate and extremely interesting. I shall be spending a lot more time there in future.

The best reason I wish to learn from facts as opposed to someone's puffed up ego, is that I really want to know if I should be laughing at myself or that inflated ego I keep assigning to my boss for proper treatment of the offending silly fossifer/researcher.

I don't have the answers, just a lot of questions. But a lot of good, hard working folks out there have some of the facts we need to get to the answers.

The problem I have, and the resulting frustration, is being able to separate the facts from the horse hockey. Separating fact from someone's fiction (portrayed as "truth") is the best part of reading Jacques Vallee. And for your further intellectual delight, I suggest reading his "UFO Chronicles of the Soviet Union," Subtitled 'A Cosmic Samisdat.' It bears repeating.

This book explores areas of research which, in this country, or virtually anywhere in the "enlightened" West, would be laughed at from here to our own limited eternity. At least there, and up until the writing of that book, the Russian researchers were working together, in spite of differences in their research tools, paradigms and things which here would never be considered serious. They are doing something, or had been, that we cannot. They were cooperating. Will wonders never cease!

In spite of lots of humor, some satire and a lot of kidding around, I do appreciate good, factual information which is capably and honestly presented. Such a breath of fresh air that even Gesundt can't and won't butt in with his own brand of culpable stupidity, is this site.

Thank you and Mr. Stepkowski. Well done, even without a number of Ph.D.'s - I shall retire to Bedlam!

Jim Mortellaro

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: dave bowden <[dave.bowden@cableinet.co.uk](mailto:dave.bowden@cableinet.co.uk)>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 17:14:33 +0000  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 10:04:15 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>From: Greg Sandow <[gsandow@prodigy.net](mailto:gsandow@prodigy.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?  
>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:36:49 -0400

>>>Somehow, I have difficulty seeing two fellows, late from some  
>>>pub, sucessfully oiling a pair of roller skates -- let alone  
>>>hoaxing a decent crop circle.

>>Granted, you couldn't do it on Coors or Bud Lite or whatever you  
>>guys drink over there,

>Jack Daniels. Wild Turkey. Maker's Mark. 120-proof Berghoff's  
>bourbon, only sold at Berghoff's in Chicago. One sip will  
>demonstrate why Britain lost its empire.

>The U.S., therefore, should be full of crop circles -- not just  
>Mandelbrots, but detailed encodings of the entire Bible,  
>inscribed on amber waves of grain.

So why isn't it?

Are you suggesting an alien communication would be made with the  
people living on the land that contains the largest collection  
of weapons?

Does that in some way make you feel superior??

All the time this mentality continues we are not likely to be  
contacted.

Try to remember we are all humans living on the planet we call  
Earth. Regardless of what piece of land we happen to have been  
born on.

Dave.

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Max Burns UFO Hoax Exposed

From: **Matthew Williams** <[truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net](mailto:truthseekers@truthseekers.screaming.net)>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 20:16:20 +0100  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 10:34:05 -0400  
Subject: Re: Max Burns UFO Hoax Exposed

>From: David Clarke <[crazydiamonds@compuserve.com](mailto:crazydiamonds@compuserve.com)>  
>Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 12:05:41 -0400  
>Fwd Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 20:25:12 -0400  
>Subject: Re: Max Burns Hoax Exposed

>Max never fails to amaze and entertain. No one has to lead him  
>up the garden path, as he is quite capable of doing that  
>entirely by himself His ability to misinterpret, distort and  
>misrepresent facts really does deserve some kind of special award;  
>as I've said before he is simply incapable of interpreting any  
>kind of evidence correctly. Nowhere have I ever claimed that six  
>specific aircraft from any specific airbase were the cause of  
>the sonic booms recorded near Sheffield on March 24, 1997.  
>That is a simple fact, something neither Max nor his  
>"Truthseeker" friends could bring themselves to accept.

Well you are making the point that there was a covert mission on top of the one already admitted to. This is not proven and is just as much fiction as the type of horrific accusations you make against Max. You seem incapable of keeping it "un-personal" which is why behind the scenes I have now joined in the little 'war' going on. Not to defend the Sheffield case, not even to defend Max Burns, but instead to defend anyone who should come under the massive attacks you and Andy Roberts make against them. If somebody disagrees with you, god help them, thats all I can say. And this has been noticed... by many people, not just myself.

You have made a bad name for yourself in British Ufology by attacking people and not facts. When you resorted to attempts to get people arrested (partially successful) by virtue of your fabricated and exaggerated version of how somebody had failed to pay a minor tax bill - you scraped as low as almost any could get.

Seeing as you claim that Max and myself have a problem with the facts... lets ignore the Sheffield case and look at the fabricated facts you put forward to get Max arrested. This was nothing to do with UFO investigation - this was pure bitterness because you were being challenged and you were so sure of yourself and your high moral ground that you investigated and interfered with a legal matter which involved someone else. This can only show you up to be the type of nasty character who would also perpetrate the Blue Hare UFO hoax of which Max and myself were the victims. This does not say that you are the Bluehare conspirator, but simply that you seem absolutely capable of it. This is the impression shared by many I have spoken to...

And did I cause this? Or did your arrogant, ignorant, childish and downright rude behaviour toward another human being give you this title? You have egg on your face and I am quite happy to keep telling people what an untrustworthy character you are and to never trust you or Andy Roberts with any personal information. You are leakier than a lake!

>For the benefit of the hard of hearing, I reproduce the relevant  
>section from the conclusions to my Howden Moor report which  
>demonstrates once again how Max is incapable of telling the  
>truth:



>>There clearly was a military exercise taking place centred upon>  
>>the Peak District that night, one phase of which (now officially  
>>admitted) is timed from 7.30-9.30pm, when the RAF claim all  
>>their aircraft were safely grounded and accounted for. However,  
>>the evidence from both witnesses in Derbyshire and South  
>>Yorkshire and the sonic booms recorded by the BGS suggest a  
>>covert part of this operation continued after the booked  
>>operation had been officially completed. Many more aircraft were  
>>involved in this exercise than has been officially admitted as  
>>is clear from the 13 low-flying complaints lodged with the RAF  
>>on March 24 from widely separated areas of the British  
>>coastline.

>>It is clear that a formation of Tornado aircraft travelled  
>>across the Peak District on a southeast to northwest flightpath  
>>between 9.45 and 10pm, coinciding with the first of two sonic  
>>booms recorded 12 minutes apart from the Sheffield area.

>Discredited my own research?

>I think not!

No but as I stated before - your "conclusions" are only suppositions and do not form fact. Max is on equal par with you here because you simply cannot prove that aircraft caused the sonic booms, as much as the evidence Max has which proves that his witnesses changed their stories.

Another interesting fact is how all of Max's witnesses changed their stories after you and Andy R. got to them. You then made big claims about how you could show that Max Burns had lied about their witness testimonies and that the witnesses were claiming their words had been twisted.

However the truth of the situation, as you well know is that Max Burns played a tape recording of one witness who states that he was happy to allow Max to use his name, details of his statement and claimed that the man he encountered stank of aviation fuel.

After you got to the witness the story changes to the witness having not given permission to Max to talk about his case - that Max had twisted his words. Your eyes lit up when you tried to use this against Max but sadly you have been put back in your seat because Max then produced the audio taped recording of this mans voice. So you neatly skip over this major point in the case and go onto aircraft causing sonic booms being your latest evidence to damn Max's research with.

When are you going to learn... its not a game of politics... who is seen to be right... and who has the loudest voice... who can dig up the most dirt on the other researcher. Its about the case in question.

You have damaged the credibility of the IUN and yourself and a man of your standing with apparent Doctor qualifications should not be involving himself in such petty battles, and should be sticking to the facts.

I did once make a challenge to David Clark to meet Max Burns and discuss the differences at an open lecture, so that time could be saved and people could be brought back together for the benefit of research and this case. Clark point-blank refused to attend any such meeting... even when we offered to stage it at our expense in his home town. This proves beyond any reasonable doubt that Dr Clark's intention is to carry on a petty war via email - he is not interested in any resolution to this case unless it is the case being dismissed.

Lastly, we cannot ignore the possibility that there is some other, hidden, agenda - for who would make it their life's goal to attack others in such a harsh manner?

So I make, for a second time, the offer of an open debate, chaired by a person/persons agreeable to both parties at a location near to Mr Clark's so that the case notes can be discussed in public.

Will Dr Clark find the time in his busy schedule to attend, or is there something odd going on here. Does Mr Clark have to hide behind his emails to this and other Lists in order to prove his

case. Can he not do this in public - with all of the vitriol and hate left behind?

Matthew Williams  
Truthseekers Research  
<http://www.truthseekers.freemove.co.uk>

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://AliensOnEarth.com)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave? [Caution: 'umour]

From: Jim Mortellaro <[Jsmortell@aol.com](mailto:Jsmortell@aol.com)>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 13:25:50 EDT  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 10:18:14 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave? [Caution: 'umour]

>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 13:44:35 -0700  
>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:46:05 +0100  
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>From: John Rimmer <[magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk](mailto:magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk)>  
>>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 18:20:30 -0700  
>>>From: Larry Hatch <[larryhat@jps.net](mailto:larryhat@jps.net)>  
>>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>>>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>>Dear Mr Gilbert:

>>>Somehow, I have difficulty seeing two fellows, late from some  
>>>pub, successfully oiling a pair of roller skates -- let alone  
>>>hoaxing a decent crop circle.

>>Granted, you couldn't do it on Coors or Bud Lite or whatever you  
>>guys drink over there, but these boyos would probably have been  
>>drinking Wadworths 6X or Gale's HSB. After a few pints of those,  
>>crop-circles would be no problem - Mandelbrot figures, the lot.

>>-- John Rimmer

>>[www.magonia.demon.co.uk](http://www.magonia.demon.co.uk)  
>>Official Sponsors of the 1999 Solar Eclipse

>Dear John:

>When I wrote that, I had just stuck my nose into a pint bottle  
>of one of Samuel Smith's (Tadcaster Yorks) brews.

>Very tasty, and not entirely unlike Samuel Adams brews from  
>Boston. Rather pricey however in California. [I keep some Coors  
>for the very hottest of days.]

>To get to the point, by the time the sun came up I was having  
>difficulty watering the lawn with a simple hose and sprinkler ..  
>now maybe that's just me.

>A crop circle would have been out of the question in my  
>particular case.

>Best wishes

>- Larry Hatch

Sirs, Madams, John, Larry, Greg, and Al...

As I explained in a direct post to Mr. Rimmer, if only you  
people would accept my offer to manufacture Creep Circuses ...  
crop circles, sorry, when in your Gripple cups, I am certain  
that, like the alien abductors who fly sans wobble or wig was  
when using Gripple, that all your attempts at crop circles will  
be successful. At last, there will be amber waves of grain right

Re: Doug & Dave? [Caution: 'umour]

here in the US, of various and sundry complex shapes, tinted purple with the early morning sunshine, and spilled Gripple Grappa... not to mention weewee tinted purple. Not only is Gripple inebriating, it's also a mild diuretic thru the kidneys.... and it makes your garden grow sideways, too.

Gesundt

[ [Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#) ]  
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

**UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp**

---

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

# UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena  
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: [UFOUpdatesList.Com](http://UFOUpdatesList.Com) > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

## Re: Doug & Dave?

From: Jilain <[jilain@plinet.com](mailto:jilain@plinet.com)>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 13:51:01 -0600  
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 10:37:02 -0400  
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 20:45:39 +0100  
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <[updates@globalserve.net](mailto:updates@globalserve.net)>  
>From: Sean Jones <[tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk](mailto:tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk)>  
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

<snip>

>Now I have no opinion on whether crop circles are hoaxed en  
>masse or are "intelligently" made by some other "force" but if  
>the same statistics apply to crop circles as UFOs then roughly  
>95 percent can be explained.

It's that nagging little 5 percent that is the problem, don't ya  
think? It just won't seem to go away.....

Just a thought.....

[jilain@plinet.com](mailto:jilain@plinet.com)  
ICQ #7524076  
IRC Undernet #Devils\_Tower

~~~Tell me not, in mournful numbers,  
Life is but an empty dream!
For the soul is dead that slumbers,
And things are not what they seem.~~~

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

Western Australia To Help In Alien Search

From: Stig Agermose <stig.agermose@get2net.dk>
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 20:59:09 GMT
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 11:15:49 -0400
Subject: Western Australia To Help In Alien Search

Source: Australian Broadcasting Corporation,

<http://www.abc.net.au:80/news/state/wa/archive/metwa-28jun1999-14.htm>

Stig

North-western WA to help in alien search
Monday 28 June, 1999 (4:36pm WST)

**

The north-west of Western Australia will soon play a vital role in the search for extraterrestrial life.

The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence Research Institute will develop the historic OTC satellite dish site at Carnarvon, as well as a site at Derby.

The institute will add two new radio telescopes to its network of 80, searching space for signals around the world.

The institute's director, Noel Wellstead, says the telescopes will be used to search for radio, as well as visual signals.

"We're also looking in the optical spectrum, looking for signs of advanced communications networks that may in fact use laser beams to channel the information, much like we do here with fibre optic cables, and we're looking for those types of emissions from within the nearby regions of our own solar system," he said.

© 1999 Australian Broadcasting Corporation
Updated: Mon Jun 28 16:45:00 1999 (WST)

WST = Western Standard Time

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

Mars Lander And Possibly Life Sites Eyed

From: Stig Agermose <stig.agermose@get2net.dk>
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 02:19:39
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 11:22:49 -0400
Subject: Mars Lander And Possibly Life Sites Eyed

Source: Discovery (Channel) News Brief,

<http://www.discovery.com/news/briefs/brief4.html?ct=37780d5e>

Stig

Mars Lander Sites Eyed

**

Scientists gathered at the University of Buffalo last week to choose a landing site for a planned 2001 Mars mission amid rumors that NASA budget cuts might scuttle the mission.

The Mars Surveyor 2001 Landing Site Workshop convened June 22-24 to select a range of potential targets, according to mission manager Dave Spencer of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

According to Spencer, conference participants agreed on five categories for the 2001 landing: Mars' ancient highlands; layered deposits in the Valles Marineris (the so-called "Grand Canyon of Mars"); sites known to contain iron; ancient lakebeds; and ancient hydrothermal, or hot spring, regions.

The hot springs would be "everyone's top choice" because it would present the best candidate for possible evidence of past life, says Spencer. "Unfortunately, it's the only one of the five we haven't identified at any location."

He adds that an instrument aboard a Mars orbiter now en route to the planet might be able to pick out such a region later this year.

Meanwhile, the Mars Global Surveyor will take high resolution images of approximately 40 possible sites that fit the first four categories.

Spencer expects the primary landing site to be announced in January.

Three days before the conference began, a Planetary Society press alert said both the 2001 mission and a comet lander called Champollion had been canceled by NASA headquarters.

The Planetary Society is a nonprofit organization co-founded by the late Carl Sagan to promote planetary exploration.

"We heard a rumor," says Louis Friedman, the society's executive director. "There's no question that NASA has a budget problem, but there's also no question that the public supports Mars exploration. We decided that public attention was needed to save the mission."

According to Friedman, the ploy worked, and NASA backed down on canceling the Mars mission, although he says the comet lander still faces the ax.

"There was conversation about it," says Spencer of the rumored cut. "But the scuttlebutt is that we're out of danger for the moment."

By Michael Ray Taylor, Discovery News Brief

Picture: Malin Space Science Systems/NASA

Related Stories:

*Mission to Mars '99
*Search Our Space Directory

Tune in Fridays at 9 p.m. ET on the Discovery Channel.

Copyright © 1999 Discovery Communications Inc.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

The Millennium Project News - June 28, 1999

From: Paul Anderson - TMP / CPR-Canada <psa@direct.ca>
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 15:41:19 -0800
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 11:24:10 -0400
Subject: The Millennium Project News - June 28, 1999

The Millennium Project News
News and Updates from The Millennium Project

<http://persweb.direct.ca/psa>
(frames)

June 28, 1999

WEEKLY BRIEFING:

First, apologies for no edition last week; the past week was very hectic with a number of matters that needed to be attended to, with work on this update being delayed as a result. We should now be caught up to speed!

The crop circle season in England continues full steam, with new formations being reported almost every day. As of this update, the number is almost sixty. Many new, beautiful and intricate formations this year (but then isn't that what we expected?). Also, the larger of the two East Field formations from June 12 was about 1,020 feet long, not 700 feet as initially reported. It's "serpent" companion was about half that size. More circles being found in Holland, Germany and the Czech Republic as well.

The new sample photo and image archives have been added to the web site in Special Research Projects for the Mystery Contrails and Radar Anomalies to provide an initial visual presentation of these phenomena. One can then explore the related reports and links for much more additional information. More of my own contrail photos are being scanned and will be added to the web site shortly.

See below for complete listing of this week's news and updates.

Wishing a good week to all of you.

Paul Anderson
Director
The Millennium Project

NEWS AND REPORTS

<http://persweb.direct.ca/psa/news.html>

- * Latest Crop Circle Reports from England
- * Unknown Object Photographed Over Area 51 Prior to People's Rally
- * Filer's Files #25 - June 25, 1999
- * SETI Swamped By Volunteer Alien-Seekers
- * Theorist Predicts Life in Universe is Common
- * NASA Launches Fossil-Finding Telescope

- * Hubble Catches "Cosmic Butterfly"
- * Hubble Completes Majestic Galaxy Portrait
- * The Stonedisks of Baian-Kara-Ula
- * Comparison of Face on Mars and Shroud of Turin
- * From Mars, with Love
- * Nessie Spotted on Nessie Cam?

SPECIAL RESEARCH PROJECTS

<http://persweb.direct.ca/psa/srp.html>

Y2K:

- * Washington Post Page One Y2K Article
- * U.S. Government Y2K Grade Improves to 'B-'

Mystery Contrails:

- * New - Sample Photo Archive

Radar Anomalies:

- * New - Sample Image Archive

The Millennium Project News is the e-mail update service of The Millennium Project, an independent research organization initiated in January 1999 as an alternative source of news and information to the mainstream media. TMP was founded by future studies researcher Paul Anderson, also director of Circles Phenomenon Research Canada.

TMP News is published weekly or as breaking news develops, with the latest news and reports, information on TMP events and web site updates and is available free by subscription; to be added to or removed from the mailing list, send your request, including either "subscribe TMP News" or "unsubscribe TMP News" and e-mail address to: psa@direct.ca

TMP welcomes your news leads and submissions. Forward all correspondence to:

E-Mail:
psa@direct.ca

Tel / Fax:
604.731.8522

Mail:
Suite 202 - 2086 West 2nd Avenue
Vancouver, BC
V6J 1J4
Canada

© The Millennium Project, 1999

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

PRG - Program Announcement

From: **Stephen G. Bassett** <ParadigmRG@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 20:00:06 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 11:27:50 -0400
Subject: PRG - Program Announcement

Paradigm Research Group

Program Announcement - June 28, 1999

Program: Coast to Coast with Art Bell

Guest: Stephen Bassett - lobbyist, consultant, founder
of PRG, author of the Paradigm Clock website

Date: Thursday/Friday, July 1-2

Time: 11:00 pm PST

Title: The State of the Politics & Science of UFOs

Topics: Has the "Empire Struck Back"
Health/morbidity of UFO/ET research/activists
Self-inflicted wounds
MUFON '99 International Symposium (July 2-4)
UFO State Ballot Initiative

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

Satanic Abuse

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 23:44:23 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 11:29:11 -0400
Subject: Satanic Abuse

>From: Kevin Randle <KRandle993@aol.com>
>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 20:58:46 EDT
>Fwd Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 08:33:17 -0400
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>My dissertation was called "The Influence of
>Preexisting Belief in UFOs on the Identification of Ambiguous
>Astronomical and Meteorological Stimuli." The point was not to
>determine if UFOs were extraterrestrial or some other phenomena
>but to study the influence of belief structure on the
>identification of somewhat obscure objects.

Good work, Kevin:

Is it possible to get a copy of your dissertation or read in
online? It sounds like it is right down the line of my interest
in the role that astronomical stimuli play in the subject.

Clear skies,
Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

Re: Doug & Dave?

From: Bob Young <YoungBob2@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 00:03:47 EDT
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 11:30:40 -0400
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>From: Greg Sandow <gsandow@prodigy.net>
>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:36:49 -0400
>Fwd Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 08:17:57 -0400
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

<snipped>

>The U.S., therefore, should be full of crop circles -- not just
>Mandelbrots, but detailed encodings of the entire Bible,
>inscribed on amber waves of grain.

Hi Greg, List:

Maybe the difference is that over here you could get shot for
destroying somebody's crops. I have always wondered what the
local farmers are saying about all of these going on, with
people tramping all over the fields when they are discovered.
Do they have their theories about what's happening and why don't
we ever hear about them?

Clear skies,
Bob Young

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 29](#)

Re: Doug & Dave?

From: Neil Morris <Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 15:42:53 +0100
Fwd Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 11:47:26 -0400
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 10:23:38 -0400
>From: Bruce Maccabee <brumac@compuserve.com>
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>

>>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 10:58:47 -0700
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>From: neil morris <neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

><snip>

>>A couple of months back here in the UK a BBC team, I think it
>>was from the "Country File" program at BBC Bristol, challenged
>>Doug and Dave + their team of helpers to produce a "circle"
>>under real life circumstances out in the fields at night. They
>>_did_ produce a circle/design at night and with hords of circle
>>watchers in the vacinity, even though the camera team was a bit
>>of a dead givaway.

>>I don't think it really proved anything in the end though, other
>>than, yes the hoaxers can "do it" at night and under the eyes of
>>the watchers.

>They did it at night...BUT

<snip>

>.
>.
>.did they do it in total darkness?
>
>(HINT: there were cameras watching,,,,,,,,,
>

Bruce,

Yes it was "done" under ambient night conditions, ie darkness<g>, the BBC team used "nightvision" on the video camera to make the recording, and as Sean confirmed in an earlier post the circle researchers had got wind of the hoaxing attempt and were in the general area trying to track D+D+Co down, so use of any form of "lighting" out in the landscape would have been a dead givaway.

It proved it could be done, thats all.
It didn't/couldn't prove they were ALL hoaxes.

Neil.

--
* * * * *
Neil Morris. /101101101 Virtual Bumper Stickers Inc 10110101010\
Dept of Physics. 1
Univ of Manchester 0
Schuster Labs. 1 Computer Programmers DO IT with BITS of BYTES 1
Brunswick St. 0
Manchester. 1
UK. \0101010110010110110010110101101011011110101011010/

Re: Doug & Dave?

G8K0Q

E-mail: neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk

Roswell and Alien Autopsy Archive-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/>
Dave Willetts Home Page-> http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/dave_willetts/
Mike Sterling Home Page-> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/mike-s/>
Tim Morgan Home Page -> <http://adm2.ph.man.ac.uk/tim-m/>

* * * * *

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

Re: Doug & Dave?

From: **Jerome Clark** <jkclark@frontiernet.net>
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 99 10:30:42 PDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 09:43:14 -0400
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 17:14:33 +0000
>From: dave bowden <dave.bowden@cableinet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>From: Greg Sandow <gsandow@prodigy.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?
>>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:36:49 -0400

>>>>Somehow, I have difficulty seeing two fellows, late from some
>>>>pub, sucessfully oiling a pair of roller skates -- let alone
>>>>hoaxing a decent crop circle.

>>>Granted, you couldn't do it on Coors or Bud Lite or whatever you
>>>guys drink over there,

>>Jack Daniels. Wild Turkey. Maker's Mark. 120-proof Berghoff's
>>bourbon, only sold at Berghoff's in Chicago. One sip will
>>demonstrate why Britain lost its empire.

>>The U.S., therefore, should be full of crop circles -- not just
>>Mandelbrots, but detailed encodings of the entire Bible,
>>inscribed on amber waves of grain.

>So why isn't it?

>Are you suggesting an alien communication would be made with the
>people living on the land that contains the largest collection
>of weapons?

>Does that in some way make you feel superior??

My word, guy. John and Greg were joking. No reason to get
your back crammed up against the wall, or to croak out a dopey,
uncalled-for anti-American slam. I'd respond in kind and ask if
Brits lack a sense of humor, if John Rimmer in this very
exchange hadn't already proved otherwise. Jeez, Dave, lighten
up!

>Try to remember we are all humans living on the planet we call
>Earth. Regardless of what piece of land we happen to have been
>born on.

Wow. You must be some kinda deep thinker, dude.

Jerry Clark

[[Next Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

Re: Doug & Dave? [Caution: 'umour]

From: John Rimmer <magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 16:06:08 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 09:56:52 -0400
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave? [Caution: 'umour]

>From: Jim Mortellaro <Jsmortell@aol.com>
>Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 13:25:50 EDT
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?
>To: updates@globalserve.net

>As I explained in a direct post to Mr. Rimmer, if only you
>people would accept my offer to manufacture Creep Circuses ...
>crop circles, sorry, when in your Gripple cups, I am certain
>that, like the alien abductors who fly sans wobble or wig was
>when using Gripple, that all your attempts at crop circles will
>be successful. At last, there will be amber waves of grain right
>here in the US, of various and sundry complex shapes, tinted
>purple with the early morning sunshine, and spilled Gripple
>Grappa... not to mention weewee tinted purple. Not only is
>Gripple inebriating, it's also a mild diuretic thru the
>kidneys.... and it makes your garden grow sideways, too.

>Gesundt

Most sense I've seen on this mailing list for a long time.

--
John Rimmer
www.magonia.demon.co.uk
Official Sponsors of the 1999 Solar Eclipse

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

Re: Doug & Dave?

From: Sean Jones <tedric@tedric.demon.co.uk>
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 22:43:02 +0100
Fwd Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 10:14:17 -0400
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 13:51:01 -0600
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: Jilain <jilain@plinet.com>
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

Hi Jilain

>It's that nagging little 5 percent that is the problem, don't ya
>think? It just won't seem to go away.....

and that's why we are all in this game <G>

--

In an infinite universe infinitely anything is possible.
Sean Jones

Homepage--<http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Zone/1745/index.htm>
UFO page--<http://www.tedric.demon.co.uk/>

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

Re: Satanic Abuse

From: **Leanne Martin** <leanne_martin@hotmail.com>
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 19:20:38 PDT
Fwd Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 10:16:12 -0400
Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>From: Greg Sandow <gsandow@prodigy.net>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse
>Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 10:51:08 -0400

>>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 18:25:54 +0100
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>From: John Rimmer <magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>>Subject: Re: Satanic Abuse

>>>At least something like that, for God's sake. Not just bland
>>>general allegations. Another way to put this, John, is that I'm
>>>asking how large your sample is, when you say "remember that
>>>[abduction] claims can wreck people's lives." How many
>>>abductees, even approximately, do you imagine you know anything
>>>about, and what percentage of them ruined their lives?

>>>If you can't answer a question like that, you're just gossiping.

>>>Greg Sandow

>>And this from someone who admitted just a few months ago that
>>abduction researchers don't even have statistics on what
>>proportion of their subjects are Black, White or Hispanic.

>Exactly. I stated this very plainly, without first having to be
>challenged. (Though only concerning Budd Hopkins; I don't know
>about other researchers).

>I think I named it as a problem, but if I didn't, I've done so
>in the past about other missing abduction statistics, such as
>the percentage of abductees who have the allegedly unexplainable
>marks Budd so often talks about.

>Give it up, John. You're not making sense. This isn't a
>discussion about who's less scientific, abduction researchers or
>skeptics. I've always said abduction research has problems. It's
>a discussion about whether you, John Rimmer -- when you say
>abduction claims have ruined lives -- know what you're talking
>about.

>Greg Sandow

Hi all,

Has anybody given thought to the idea that the 'wrecked lives'
and the 'abduction experience' may be just symptoms of some
other condition?

Regards,
Leanne];-)

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](#)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

Re: Doug & Dave?

From: **Greg Sandow** <gsandow@prodigy.net>
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 23:42:47 -0400
Fwd Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 10:18:06 -0400
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 17:14:33 +0000
>From: Dave Bowden <dave.bowden@cableinet.co.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Are you suggesting an alien communication would be made with the
>people living on the land that contains the largest collection
>of weapons?

>Does that in some way make you feel superior??

>All the time this mentality continues we are not likely to be
>contacted.

>Try to remember we are all humans living on the planet we call
>Earth.

And that some of us might even have a sense of humor.

Greg Sandow

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

British Aerospace Sponsors Research Into

From: Stig Agermose <stig.agermose@get2net.dk>
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 08:33:51
Fwd Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 10:22:41 -0400
Subject: British Aerospace Sponsors Research Into

First of all thanks to Robert Chambers of British Aerospace for making this information public. After his e-mail of June 29 to various newsgroups I'll bring Project Greenglow's "objects clause."

Stig

From: Rob Chambers <robert.chambers@bae.co.uk>
Newsgroups: sci.physics.electromag,sci.physics,alt.sci.physics.new-theories
Subject: Anyone for antigravity/propellantless propulsion?
Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 14:04:06 +0000
Organization: British Aerospace Systems & Equipment

I would like to find out if anyone knows someone who would like to give a presentation, talk, demonstration etc. of their theory, concept or invention, in the UK to interested parties from British Aerospace, UK academia and Ministry of Defence (among others), or who has some good suggestions for further development of their own theory or concept. I have been in contact with Dr Ron Evans, head of the BAE-funded "Project Greenglow" (<http://www.greenglow.co.uk>), who indicated that he has had problems finding academics (or anyone else) willing to speak about antigravity and related concepts. BAE has been looking at antigrav in a poorly-funded way since 1986, but would like to raise the level of interest in the UK and start testing some concepts and examining some theories (time permitting).

Please reply by email to

robert.chambers@bae.co.uk

as I don't often have the opportunity to catch up with newsgroups....

Rob....

"If we knew what it was we were doing, it would not be called research, would it?" - Albert Einstein

And here's Project Greenglow's objects clause which you'll find among the interesting links at the homepage mentioned above,

<http://www.greenglow.co.uk>

What is Project Greenglow?

British Aerospace is sponsoring a speculative research programme in the realm of gravitational physics with the aim of initiating some new areas of research and priming technology development, with the hope that subsequent implementation, could lead to

significant advances in the aerospace industry. For historical reasons we have called this programme project Greenglow.

We see Project Greenglow as the beginning of an adventure which other enthusiastic scientists from academia, government and industry might like to join, particularly those who believe that the gravitational field is not restricted to passivity and who have new theories, to the contrary, which they would like to propose. The network provided by Project Greenglow could provide the arena for publicising, debating and pursuing these ideas. We feel that emphasis should be given to those theories which can be tested in a laboratory at moderate cost and which, if successful, could be developed into technical applications for the aerospace industry.

Our approach to the research programme will be much along the lines of the newly established NASA Breakthrough Propulsion Physics Programme which has, as its central theme, the goal of developing propellantless propulsion. We hope that there will be elements where our two programmes come together and we will support interaction between the two. Following the lead set by NASA, it is intended that most of the administrative effort and day-to-day communications will be conducted via the Internet. Also, the aim will be to keep the research programme as open as possible, within the restrictions imposed by academic ownership and commercial return on investment, as we recognise that there is a great deal of interest throughout the world on gravitational research, particularly on the possibility of the control of gravitational fields. We may wish to harness this support in our quest for funding.

Due to the major interest in propellantless propulsion, Project Greenglow will contain a part where Future Concept Engineers can speculate on the impact which advances in gravitational technology might have on the design and sphere of operation of aerospace vehicles of the future. Artistic interpretations of these ideas should further stir the imagination of the scientists and engineers who participate in the project.

To determine the level of professional interest in this venture, we are planning to hold a Discussion Meeting, where some of us can get together and describe our present vision of Project Greenglow and talk about the way forward. Details of the Time and Venue will be posted on the Netlater. At this Meeting we would hope to form a small Steering Group, whose main tasks will be maintaining programme cohesiveness and awareness, the arranging of a series of topical seminars and the planning of a larger event (akin to the NASA BPP Workshop) next year for the presentation of ideas and results and agreeing the next stage in the collaborative programme.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at [AliensOnEarth.com](http://www.aliensonearth.com)

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

Re: Doug & Dave?

From: Ron Decker <decker@wt.net>
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 05:42:32 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 17:08:20 -0400
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1999 15:42:53 +0100
>From: Neil Morris <Neil@adml.ph.man.ac.uk>
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Bruce,

>Yes it was "done" under ambient night conditions, ie darkness<g>,
>the BBC team used "nightvision" on the video camera to make the
>recording, and as Sean confirmed in an earlier post the circle
>researchers had got wind of the hoaxing attempt and were in the
>general area trying to track D+D+Co down, so use of any form of
>"lighting" out in the landscape would have been a dead givaway.

>It proved it could be done, thats all.
>It didn't/couldn't prove they were ALL hoaxes.

Neil,

With all due respect, this is the sort of thing those schooled
in the Amazing Randi branch of knowledge will use to confirm
that it -does- prove that the balance of crop circles are
hoaxes.

Their logic goes something like this: 'If I can reproduce it
through slight of hand, etc., then the (choose your paranormal
or otherwise unexplainable event) must be hoaxed by evil-minded,
avaricious charlatans bent on taking your money.'

I ran into this sort of medieval thinking with my brother-
in-law, an avowed atheist. He saw the PBS (?) program on Doug
and Dave and concluded that all crop circles are manmade (by
D&D no less). It made no difference to him that D&D are not
continent-hopping circle hoaxers; they are responsible for crop
circles. Case closed. Mystery solved.

How many others out there in TV Land have come to the same
conclusion?

Best regards,
Ron.

[[Next Message](#) | [Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com

UFO Updates

A mailing list for the study of UFO-related phenomena
'Its All Here In Black & White'

Location: UFOUpdatesList.Com > [1999](#) > [Jun](#) > [Jun 30](#)

Re: Doug & Dave?

From: **Tim D. Brigham** <TBrigham@ksinc.net>
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 09:59:30 -0500
Fwd Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 19:19:29 -0400
Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>Date: Sun, 27 Jun 1999 15:46:05 +0100
>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>From: John Rimmer <magonia@magonia.demon.co.uk>
>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>Date: Sat, 26 Jun 1999 18:20:30 -0700
>>From: Larry Hatch <larryhat@jps.net>
>>To: UFO UpDates - Toronto <updates@globalserve.net>
>>Subject: Re: Doug & Dave?

>>Dear Mr Gilbert:

>>Somehow, I have difficulty seeing two fellows, late from some
>>pub, sucessfully oiling a pair of roller skates -- let alone
>>hoaxing a decent crop circle.

>Granted, you couldn't do it on Coors or Bud Lite or whatever you
>guys drink over there, but these boyos would probably have been
>drinking Wadworths 6X or Gale's HSB. After a few pints of those,
>crop-circles would be no problem - Mandelbrot figures, the lot.

Alright, I'd like to think I have a thick hide and can separate
personal feelings from rational discussion, but Mr. Rimmer's
anti- American propaganda has reached a new height. Merely
because we can take in our alcoholic beverages without having to
use a _spoon_ does not mean that they are inferior to the Queen's
(or Jack or whatever's)fine products. I respect you
foreigners luv of that thick goo, but also understand that many
of us prefer whatever goes down the easiest and don't always feel
that less is more. Means to an end, afterall.

Too bad I could never con Jim Moseley into getting email, cause
we'd have a definite (drunken) catfight on our hands with this
one. Then again, I thought at the very least Dennis Stacy would
back me up on this and have already set you 'blokes' straight
..... *sigh*

Brigham

)+(TBrigham@ksinc.net
<http://zap.to/DevilsAdvocate> The Devil's Advocate
<http://zap.to/MindPhuck> Operation MindPhuck
"Better to go hungry than to feast on lies."
)+(

[[Previous Message](#) | [This Day's Messages](#)]
[This Month's Index](#) |

[UFO UpDates Main Index](#)

UFO UpDates - Toronto - Operated by Errol Bruce-Knapp

Archive programming by Glenn Campbell at AliensOnEarth.com